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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

The purpose of the present study was to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. For the present study, multicultural supervision was defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic (supervisor, supervisee, and client) supervisory relationship is racially/ethnically different from the other members. This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter presents an abbreviated version of the entire dissertation. The second chapter reviews the theoretical and empirical literature and leads into the rationale for the present study. The third chapter describes the methodology of the study. The fourth chapter presents the results of the study. The fifth chapter provides implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

Organization of Chapter I

Chapter I is a condensed version of the entire dissertation and, as a result, some sections of this chapter may appear verbatim in later chapters. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section is the introduction, which reviews the relevant literature and states the purpose of the study and the research question. The second section defines the methods, including background literature concerning the design of the study, sampling procedure and participants, researcher competence or sensitivity, data collection instrument, data collection procedures, and data analysis
for the present study. The third section describes the participants and findings of the present study. The fourth section discusses the implications of the results and recommendations for future research.

Introduction

Supervision is considered to be an important aspect of counseling practice (Borders, 1994; Stone, 1997) and a critical ingredient of training in counseling and psychology programs (Carroll, 1996; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). Supervision is also believed to be an essential area of training for supervisees to acquire multicultural knowledge and skills (Holloway, 1992; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). Despite the focus on multicultural training and multicultural competencies in the counseling psychology literature (e.g., Atkinson, Thompson, & Grant, 1993; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Quintanna & Bernal, 1995), surprisingly little empirical attention has been given to multicultural supervision (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Leong & Wagner, 1994). Even less empirical attention has been given to White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. Yet, most supervision is conducted by White supervisors (Fong & Lease, 1997).

The majority of the literature in multicultural supervision is theoretical in nature (Leong & Wagner, 1994). The sparse theoretical literature regarding multicultural supervision tends to focus on White supervisors, even though the racial or ethnic background of the supervisors is not always identified. This theoretical literature is not well organized and often authors offer a wide range of recommendations concerning White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices. Some of the issues that the authors have recommended White supervisors to consider...
when conducting multicultural supervision include awareness concerning diversity issues, addressing diversity issues, racial supervision patterns, communication issues and issues of power.

In terms of awareness concerning diversity issues, D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) reported that White supervisors who are able to assess their own racial identity and their supervisees’ racial identity tend to have a better understanding of multicultural supervision interactions concerning race. On the other hand, White supervisors who lack awareness of their own racial identity and their White privilege may practice unintentional racism in supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997). Several scholars have highlighted the importance of understanding racial supervision patterns between White and African American supervisors, supervisees, and clients (Bradshaw, 1982; Chandler & Hunt, 1980; Hunt, 1987; Williams & Halgin, 1995). For example, White supervisors working with White supervisees who have African American clients need to be careful to not reinforce stereotypes of African American clients. They also need to be conscious of focusing too much on race and avoiding over pathologizing African American clients’ behaviors and attitudes (Bradshaw, 1982).

A number of authors within the theoretical literature have also indicated that White supervisors have a responsibility to understand different ethnic and racial groups’ styles of verbal and nonverbal communication in multicultural supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Multicultural supervision tends to be biased toward a White style of communication to the neglect of other cultural communication styles. White supervisors who are unaware of other cultural verbal and nonverbal communication styles may make inaccurate conclusions regarding their minority supervisees (Fong & Lease, 1997). Power is another issues that White
supervisors need to be aware of when conducting multicultural supervision (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Fong & Lease, 1997; Gopaul-McNicol & Brice-Baker, 1998; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Inherent in supervision is a power structure that assigns power to supervisors. Minority individuals who have been exploited and deprived of power may react sensitively to abuse of power, especially by a White individual (Williams & Halgin, 1995).

Leong and Wagner (1994) reviewed the multicultural supervision literature and were able to identify only three empirical articles on the subject (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Vander Kolk, 1974). Since Leong and Wagner’s review, an additional four empirical articles that addressed multicultural supervision have been published (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997). However, none of the seven empirical articles specifically examined White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Two of the articles (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994), which focused on critical incidents and supervisory relationships in multicultural supervision, have direct relevance to the present study because they addressed supervisors’ effective and ineffective practices in multicultural supervision.

Fukuyama (1994) examined “critical incidents” in multicultural supervision. Critical incidents in supervision occur when there is an incident that causes changes in supervisees’ understanding of their effectiveness as therapists (Fukuyama, 1994; Heppner & Roehlke, 1984). Ten racial/ethnic minority persons who completed their predoctoral internship at American Psychological Association (APA) accredited internship sites were asked to describe a positive critical incident and a negative critical incident that contributed positively or negatively to their professional development.
Supervisees’ perceptions of effective supervisor practices in multicultural supervision consisted of supervisors’ openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and encouragement of supervisees to work in multicultural activities. Participants in this study described experiencing openness and support as not being personally stereotyped by their supervisor, supervisors trusting them to work on difficult therapy cases involving cultural issues, and general support and encouragement in their work with clients who were culturally different. Culturally relevant supervision was described by participants as being matched with a supervisor based on ethnic background, feeling supported in their work on cultural issues, and helping bring to awareness cultural values and their effects on the therapeutic relationship with clients. Examples of opportunities to work in multicultural activities were described by participants as presentations in multicultural counseling course, working at an ethnic minority student walk-in clinic, and group supervision on diversity issues (Fukuyama, 1994).

Ineffective supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision included supervisors’ lack of cultural awareness and supervisees’ doubt about supervisors’ abilities. Participants described supervisors’ lack of cultural awareness as being unaware of cultural norms, the use of slang, and not understanding cultural pride. Questioning supervisors’ abilities was described by participants as casting doubt on an intervention used with racial/ethnic minority clients (Fukuyama, 1994).

Constantine (1997) examined the supervisory relationship concerning multicultural issues between 30 predoctoral interns and their individual supervisors on internship. Supervisors and supervisees were asked to respond to two open-ended questions pertaining to their supervisory relationship. One of the open-ended questions asked how the supervision relationship could have been enhanced regarding
multicultural issues. Participants reported that the supervisory relationship could be enhanced regarding multicultural issues if supervisees would work with additional ethnic minority clients, discuss diversity issues more often in supervision, and process cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee.

Overall, the existing literature regarding multicultural supervision supports the notion that cultural differences exist in multicultural supervision and that White supervisors need to understand cultural differences when practicing multicultural supervision. Furthermore, the current knowledge regarding multicultural supervision is based more on theory than empirical research. Although two empirical studies have identified some effective and ineffective practices by supervisors in multicultural supervision (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994), they only provide a limited picture of what constitutes effective and ineffective practices. In addition, none of the empirical studies specifically examined White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision.

The present study is meant to provide a systematic, empirical exploration of a broad range of effective and ineffective multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors. It was the intent of this study to paint a more organized and a broader perspective of multicultural supervision by White supervisors than currently exists in the theoretical and limited empirical multicultural supervision literature. Further, the picture of White supervisors’ practices that emerged from this study are firmly grounded in the experiences of professionals and students involved in multicultural supervision.

In order to provide a clearer picture of the range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, the present study utilized qualitative reports from professional and student members of the American
Psychological Association (APA) who are interested in multicultural issues and who are also practitioners. The present study used qualitative methods, which are beneficial in exploring topics in which a limited amount of information exists in investigating complex phenomena (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997).

Purpose of the Study and the Research Question

The purpose of the present study was to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) reported that qualitative researchers examine descriptive and exploratory questions. The research question for the present study was: “What is a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision?”

Methods

Three previous qualitative studies used a similar research design to describe biased or exemplary practices related to sexism or heterosexism in psychotherapy or student affairs work (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets, Hancock, Cochran, Goodchilds, & Peplau, 1991). These three qualitative studies used an open-ended written questionnaire to attain incidents of biased and exemplary practices related to work with a population who faces oppression. The incidents were given by professionals knowledgeable about working with that population. The results of these studies have been helpful in developing guidelines for professional practice and curriculum materials for graduate training concerning sexism and heterosexism in psychotherapy or student affairs work (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991). The present study utilized an adaptation of the qualitative methodology.
used in the three previous biased and exemplary studies to describe a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in order to help guide White professionals in their practice and training in multicultural supervision. The research design was reviewed and approved by Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A).

In this section, the methods used in the study are described: (a) sampling procedure, (b) researcher competence or theoretical sensitivity, (c) data collection instrument, (d) data collection procedures, and (e) data analysis. A more detailed description of the research methods is provided in Chapter III.

**Sampling Procedure**

Qualitative studies employ purposeful sampling, targeting individuals who possess knowledge of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The present study used purposeful sampling to target participants who have knowledge of White supervisors’ biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Knowledgeable participants in the present study were individuals who have a professional interest in multicultural issues and have experience either being a supervisor or a supervisee. Participants who fit into this category were 594 professional and student members of Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues) of the American Psychological Association (APA) who were also practitioners. The participants for the present study were obtained from the APA research office (see Appendix B), which has information concerning which members are involved in clinical practice and has the names and addresses of all its members (student and professional) as well as the Divisions to which they
belong. All student members in Division 45 ($n = 297$) and a random sample of professional members ($n = 297$) were invited to participate in the present study ($N = 594$). The random sample of professional members was selected in order to have equal numbers of professional and student members of Division 45. The rationale for using a large sample was based on the research question of the present study, which was to describe and illustrate a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The present author expected that a large sample was necessary to obtain a broad range of biased and exemplary practices. Interviewing a small sample of White supervisors who have knowledge of multicultural supervision might provide depth of information but likely would not identify a broad range of possible biased and exemplary practices.

**Researcher's Competency or Theoretical Sensitivity**

In qualitative studies, it is important to demonstrate the researcher’s competence or theoretical sensitivity, since the results of a study are created by the researcher’s involvement in the data (Creswell, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Strauss and Corbin defined theoretical sensitivity as a researcher’s personal qualities of insight into the meaning of data. Locke, Spirduso, and Silverman (1993) termed this process of including information about the researcher in a proposal as “coming clean” (p. 114). The process of coming clean involves the researcher reporting personal values, assumptions, and biases concerning the topic of the study. The process of coming clean is not intended for the researcher to become impartial to the phenomena of interest (Locke et al., 1993). Coming clean brings awareness to a researcher and the reader how his or her
personal view of the phenomena of interest may influence the research process (Locke et al., 1993).

The present researcher's personal and professional experiences, beliefs and assumptions of the phenomena of interest, and knowledge of the literature, will be discussed. This personal and professional information is provided for readers in order that they may understand the "lens" through which the present researcher has composed the study and given meaning to the data.

I, the researcher, am a 37-year old White heterosexual man in the final stages of my doctoral degree in counseling psychology. I come from a middle-class background, and I was born and raised in the Midwest. My professional experience with multicultural counseling and supervision has occurred in conjunction with my studies as a master's and doctoral student in counseling psychology. I have taken a course in multicultural counseling and a course in supervision. As part of the latter course, I supervised a master's student over a 4-month period; however, the supervision was not multicultural in nature. In addition, I have participated in a small amount of multicultural counseling in university counseling center, community agency, departmental clinic, and elementary school settings during my master's and doctoral studies. I also have a small amount of experience as a supervisee participating in multicultural supervision with seven supervisors during my master's and doctoral studies. Recently, as a predoctoral intern I have gained more experience in multicultural counseling, and as a supervisee in multicultural supervision working with seven racial/ethnic clients over a 9-month period. Furthermore, a significant amount of my research and scholarship (e.g., Lark, Croteau, & Paul, 1996a, 1996b; Lark & Paul, 1998; Munley, Vacha-Haase, Busby, & Paul, 1998; Nilsson, Paul, Lupini, & Tatem, 1999) has also focused on multicultural issues.
In terms of my beliefs and assumptions, I believe that White supervisors' multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their own awareness of multicultural/diversity issues, their own level of racial identity development, their awareness of minority identity development, and their knowledge of other races and cultures. I also believe that White supervisors' cultural values and biases as well as their unexamined racial attitudes influence their multicultural supervision practices. A complete list of assumptions and beliefs are presented in Chapter III.

Data Collection Instrument

The present study used an open-ended written questionnaire (see Appendix C) which was designed to elicit from participants incidents of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The written questionnaire was adapted from Croteau and Lark's (1995) and Garnets et al.'s (1991) biased and exemplary studies. The questionnaire included four open-ended questions. An introductory paragraph instructed participants that they may draw their responses from a variety of sources, including their own experiences with White supervisors in multicultural supervision or reports from friends or colleagues regarding their experiences with White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The first question asked participants to describe one to three incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor that was biased, inadequate, or inappropriate. The second question asked participants to describe one to three incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor demonstrating special sensitivity. The third question asked for participants' opinions of professional practices by a White supervisor that are especially harmful in multicultural supervision. The last question
asked for participants' opinions of professional practices by a White supervisor that are especially beneficial in multicultural supervision.

Each participant also filled out a demographic sheet (see Appendix D), which included age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, training status, highest degree, degree program, work setting and geographic location, supervision experience, clinical experience, multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision experience, number of courses or workshops in multicultural counseling or supervision, and level of involvement in multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The 594 participants were sent a packet that included a cover letter (see Appendix E) to inform participants about the purpose of the study and confidentiality as well as to invite them to participate in the study. The packet also included the open-ended written questionnaire, demographic sheet, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Similar to Croteau and Lark's (1995) study, an incentive in the form of a sticker promoting "cultural awareness" (see Appendix F) was also included in each packet. Each packet had a number posted on the top right corner of the questionnaire corresponding to a participant in the study. The number on the questionnaire was used to track unreturned questionnaires. When a questionnaire was returned, an individual other than the present researcher wrote down the number and cut off the right corner of the questionnaire. This individual did not have access to the list of participants and their corresponding numbers. The present researcher did not view a questionnaire until the right corner and corresponding number had been cut off, which ensured that any returned questionnaires could never be traced to an individual.
participant. Two weeks after the original mailing a second packet was sent to
participants who had not returned their questionnaire. The second packet included
the same items as the first packet except for a different cover letter (see Appendix G).
A follow-up postcard (see Appendix H) was sent 2 weeks after the second mailing to
participants who had not returned a questionnaire.

Ten questionnaires were undeliverable due to the wrong addresses. Of the
remaining 584 questionnaires sent out to participants, 51 questionnaires were
returned after the first mailing, 43 questionnaires were returned after the second
mailing, and 10 questionnaire were returned after the third mailing. A total of 104
questionnaires were returned, resulting in an 18% response rate.

Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis in qualitative research involves the researcher reducing a large
amount of data into patterns, categories, or themes and then providing this
The present study’s data analysis procedures involved five different phases. The first
phase consisted of “unitizing” the data from the questionnaire. Unitizing is identifying
chunks or units of meaning within the data (Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al.,
1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). A unit of meaning in the
present study for questions 1 and 3 consisted of a participant’s verbatim report of
each incident of biased and exemplary practice in multicultural supervision by White
supervisors. A unit of meaning for questions 2 and 4 consisted of a participant’s
verbatim report of professional practices that contributed to White supervisors biased
and exemplary practice in multicultural supervision. The unitizing of data in the
present study yielded 1,498 independent units of data. Each of the 1,498 units of data
The transcribed data within the four groups were then imported into a qualitative software program, QSR NUD*IST (NVIVO). NUD*IST is an acronym for Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching, and Theorizing. Creswell (1998) reported that QSR NUD*IST software programs effectively allows researchers to organize files, search for themes or categories, cross or combine themes, and diagram categories into visual pictures.

The second phase involved the present researcher identifying categories and subcategories within the 1,498 units of data and developing thick written descriptions of categories and subcategories. The categorizing and naming of phenomena is termed open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The present researcher collapsed the four groups developed in phase one into two groups, corresponding to exemplary practice (questions 2 and 4) and biased practice (questions 1 and 3). The present researcher then separately examined the exemplary practice group (questions 2 and 4) and the biased practice group (questions 1 and 3) for tentative categories and subcategories using an adaptation of the constant comparative method. The constant comparative method of data analysis involves developing inductive categories and making comparisons of the categories to all other units of meaning in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). In the case of the present study, tentative categories and subcategories were developed separately for the biased practice group and the exemplary practice group by the present researcher. The tentative categories and subcategories in the biased practice group and the exemplary practice group were then compared back to the raw data of the group from which they were generated. This process of revising tentative categories and subcategories to see if they fit was repeated a number of times until a final set of 20 categories
emerged within the biased practice group and 26 categories within the exemplary practice group as well as several subcategories for each category.

The third phase consisted of the researcher in the present study combining categories and subcategories that had a similar relationship in the biased practice group and repeating the same process in the exemplary practice group. The process of putting data back together in a new way by developing connections between categories and subcategories is called axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process of axial coding yielded 10 categories of biased practice and 9 categories of exemplary practice as well as several subcategories in each category. The present researcher then selected units of data that illustrated each category and subcategory of biased and exemplary practices.

Phase four involved two peer auditors (doctoral students) comparing the raw data with the 19 categories and subcategories developed in phase three to determine if these categories are based on what the participants stated. Based on the feedback from the peer auditors, one category was combined with another category in the exemplary group and a number of definitions of categories were also revised. My doctoral chair, Dr. James Croteau, then audited the categories and subcategories two times in order to determine whether the categories and subcategories were clear, internally consistent, and meaningful. Based on feedback from my doctoral chair, 5 themes and 11 subthemes of biased practice and 6 themes and 8 subthemes of exemplary practice emerged.

Phase five involved a multicultural audit of the categories and subcategories developed in phase four. The audit was conducted by Dr. Ruperto Perez who has extensive experience concerning multicultural issues. Dr. Perez is Filipino, born in the Philippines, but raised in the United States. The multicultural audit in the present
study served as a procedure to check whether the findings are consistent with the multicultural literature and are not culturally biased. The present researcher and three of the auditors (my doctoral chair and the two peer auditors) are White and will interpret the findings from their own majority viewpoint. Based on the feedback of the multicultural audit, none of the themes or subthemes was changed.

Results

This section describes the results of the present study. This section is divided into three subsections: (1) description of the participants of the study, (2) participant reports of biased practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, and (3) participant reports of exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. In the last two subsections, quotes from participants’ stories and opinions are woven throughout the results. Some of the participant quotes may contain grammatical mistakes that can cause problems in terms of readability of the results. For the purpose of enhancing the clarity of some quotes, material was excluded using ellipses and words were added using brackets.

Participants

There were 104 participants in the present study. Eighty-three (80%) of the participants were female and 21 (20%) of the participants were male. Ages ranged from 22 years to 61 years ($M = 36, SD = 10.42$). The racial breakdown of participants consisted of 28 (27%) Chicano/Hispanic/Latino, 24 (23%) African American/Black, 21 (20%) Caucasian, 17 (16%) Asian American, 6 (6%) Multiracial/Biracial, 3 (3%) Pacific Islander, 2 (2%) Other, 2 (2%) American Indian, and 1 (1%) international. The majority of participants, 89 (86%), identified as heterosexual, 12
(11%) identified as gay/lesbian, 2 (2%) identified as bisexual, and 1 participant did not answer this question. Fifty (48%) of the participants had doctoral degrees, 44 (42%) had master degrees, 9 (9%) had bachelor degrees, and 1 (1%) Other. Participants were almost evenly split concerning their level of training; 53 (51%) were professionals and 51 (49%) were graduate students. The degree programs of participants included 49 (47%) clinical psychology, 40 (38%) counseling psychology, 11 (11%) Other, and 4 (4%) school psychology. Twenty (19%) of the participants worked in counseling centers, 18 (17%) in hospitals, 18 (17%) two or more sites, 15 (14%) Other, 13 (12%) in academic departments, and 7 (7%) in private practice. Geographically, participants worked in 27 different states, with California 29 (28%) and New York 14 (13%) having the most participants.

Regarding participants’ multicultural experiences, 84 (81%) had attended two or more multicultural counseling workshops, 56 (54%) had attended one or more supervision courses, and 62 (59%) had been involved in three or more research projects concerning multicultural issues. In terms of participants’ multicultural clinical experiences, 75 (72%) had worked with six or more clients concerning multicultural issues, 60 (58%) had one to three supervisors address multicultural issues in their own supervision, and 47 (45%) had supervised four or more supervisees for whom multicultural issues were addressed. See Appendix I for further details regarding participants’ demographic information.

**Biased Practices of White Supervisors**

The biased practice results were derived from responses from both question 1 and question 3 of the survey. Question 1 requested specific stories or incidents of White supervisors’ biased practices in multicultural supervision. Question 3 requested
opinions about professional behaviors or attitudes that contribute to White supervisors' biased practices in multicultural supervision. In response to question 1, participants provided 343 stories (82,708 characters) of White supervisors' biased practices in multicultural supervision. However, 43 (16,812 characters) of these biased stories were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 300 final stories of bias consisted of 6 or more lines of typed transcript per story on average; a number of stories, however, were between 20 to 30 lines. Thirty-nine (37%) of the participants contributed two or more stories of biased practices. In response to question 3, participants provided 483 opinions (31,909 characters) about professional behaviors or attitudes that contribute to biased practices by White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Sixty-two (6,112 characters) opinions were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 421 final opinions consisted of one line of typed transcript per opinion on average. Forty (38%) of the participants provided three or more opinions of professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to biased practices.

Five themes and 11 subthemes emerged in the data analysis of respondents' stories (question 1) and opinions (question 3) of White supervisors biased practices (see Figure 1). This section is divided into five subsections corresponding to the five biased practice themes. Within each subsection, the overall biased practice theme and all its subthemes are defined first. Then each theme or subtheme is explained and illustrated with participants' verbatim words whenever possible.
1) **Biased Practice Theme One:** White supervisors fail to address multicultural issues in supervision  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors fail to address cultural issues that influence treatment or conceptualization of clients  
   (b) White supervisors fail to address the impact of race/ethnicity in interactions with racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients  
   (c) White supervisors fail to address supervisees' perceptions or inquiries concerning multicultural issues  
   (d) White supervisors fail to address multicultural issues and instead expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues  
   (e) White supervisors fail to address racist remarks made in supervision  

2) **Biased Practice Theme Two:** White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees based on biased assumptions of their abilities  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues  
   (b) White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for their counseling skills or therapeutic actions  

3) **Biased Practice Theme Three:** White supervisors act as if they are multiculturally sensitive when they are not  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors believe they are open to or competent in multicultural issues when they are not  
   (b) White supervisors give “lip service” to multicultural issues but their actions do not support multiculturalism  

4) **Biased Practice Theme Four:** White supervisors’ attempt to incorporate multicultural issues involve overgeneralized or inaccurate assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors assume that racial/ethnic minority supervisees always have a complete understanding of or connection to their racial/ethnic community  
   (b) White supervisors inaccurately see issues involving culture or racism in the work of their racial/ethnic minority supervisee  

5) **Biased Practice Theme Five:** White supervisors pathologize supervisees or clients because of their race/culture or ethnicity  

Figure 1. Biased Practice Themes and Subthemes.
Biased Practice Theme One: White Supervisors Fail to Address Multicultural Issues in Supervision

This biased practice theme is divided into five interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors who fail to consider cultural issues that influence treatment or conceptualization of clients. Some respondents described this biased practice in short phrases such as, “excluding cultural factors when case conceptualizing,” “making a diagnosis without considering the cultural factors,” and “negating that race or culture influences counseling.” One participant described a lack of incorporating multicultural issues in the clinical treatment of clients as, “Only looking at or using the Western approach with a client.” Another respondent described the possible future consequences of this biased practice by stating,

Especially harmful is when White supervisors teach other White students that cultural difference and racial issues are irrelevant in therapy and do not have bearing on the client’s problems. Thus, the legacy continues to pass on from White supervisor to a White student who, in time, may become a supervisor him/her self.

The second subtheme included White supervisors that fail to address the impact of race/ethnicity in their interactions with racial/ethnic supervisees and clients; this subtheme was also referred to by a number of participants as being “colorblind.” For example, one participant described this biased practice as, “ignoring or not discussing race, taking the stance ‘I see no color.’” A White supervisor discussed the extent of “colorblindness” that occurred in one of her African American psychiatry residents in a predominantly White clinical setting.

When I [supervisor] brought up how race influenced her [the supervisee/resident] reactions and those of the client and how it helped or hindered the progress of therapy, she [supervisee/resident] said I was the first supervisor in 3 years to ask her about race and ethnic issues. So for 3 years she worked with a nearly all White population, and not one of her all White supervisors (psychiatry MD’s and Psychology Ph.D’s) asked her about or explored these issues. I was floored no one ever discussed such an important variable. This
was 12 years ago. I’ve never forgotten it. It was very sad for her and her clients to be forced to be “color blind” when color was often a powerful issue in [an] all White conservative place. Her clinical success would be hampered not by a lack of skill but an expectation of color silence by those training her.

An African American respondent depicted an incident of White supervisors’ “colorblindness” as not addressing issues of racial differences in his first practicum class:

One of my first clients was a young Chinese student who had been raped by a Black man. The fact that I am Black never was addressed, never came up in the therapy or in supervision. I think I needed a supervisor who could help me deal with my feelings and help me address these issues with the client.

Other participants referred to “colorblindness” in the form of White supervisors’ assumption that, “all people are like White people.” One respondent described this as, “Never acknowledging any differences and acting like everyone is White and evaluating by White standards.” Some participants also described “colorblindness” as White supervisors’ belief that everything can be applied “universally” or that we are “all humans.” For example, “wanting everyone to be the same,” “expecting everyone to hold the same values and beliefs,” and the “assumption that the majority culture’s methods are universal or most desirable” were phrases used by participants.

The third subtheme included White supervisors discounting supervisees’ perceptions or inquiries concerning multicultural issues. Some participants described this biased practice as dismissing “concerns supervisees have related to cultural issues,” or discounting an “intern’s feeling and perceptions of cultural issues influence on client dynamics.” A supervisee depicted this biased practice by a White supervisor when discussing treatment issues of a biracial client who tended to become involved in abusive relationships:
When the . . . [supervisee] first presented this case to [her] supervisor, he [supervisor] stated that the supervisee was taking “too long” explaining the cultural/racial issues involved; this was simply like any other abusive relationship conflict, according to the supervisor. When . . . [the supervisee] attempted to point out that the client’s father was abusive and White, and this pattern was being recreated somehow in [the client’s] relationships with lovers, [the] supervisor answered that this interpretation was “subjective, based only on supervisee’s clinical psychodynamic orientation, and most likely inaccurate.” He [supervisor] also stated that . . . [the supervisee] had the tendency to “make too much of the race issue” . . .

Another supervisee described her experience in discussing with her White supervisor the possible influence culture has on the personality of an Asian client, “He [supervisor] negated that culture had anything to do with it . . . [and would rather not] discuss it [culture] at all.”

The fourth subtheme involved White supervisors that fail to address multicultural issues and instead expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues. For example, a respondent stated, “I was asked to teach other students about being Black.” Another respondent described the resentment she felt when asked to “educate” White supervisors as, “I detest being asked to ‘educate’ my supervisors and I hate being treated as the token multicultural expert/novelty.” In addition, an African American female supervisee in a practicum class expressed her frustration on being expected to educate her White supervisor and all White classmates:

He [supervisor] could offer no explanation as to why African Americans and other minorities might feel they are being treated unfairly or why they contribute to such “self-destructive behaviors.” I [supervisee] being frustrated offer my instructor and class a 10 minute Black history lesson from the 50’s thru the 90’s. How could this White, non-informed counselor/instructor educate Whites on how to be cultural sensitive when he himself was not?

The fifth subtheme involved White supervisors that fail to address racist remarks in supervision. One participant described an incident of this biased practice while observing a female supervisee in group supervision: “. . . the supervisee stated
that she would not conduct psychotherapy with minority clients (racial, ethnic, gay, etc.) as she did not feel comfortable working with ‘them.’ The supervisor did not address this with the group or the individual supervisee.”

Another respondent stated that White supervisors have, “a lack of knowledge or total dismissal of how to handle cases where a European American client makes a racist remarks or ethnic remarks.” A participant described her reaction to a White supervisor not addressing the racist remarks made by a supervisee during group supervision:

. . . [the supervisor] made no attempt to address the [racist] statement. I expected her [supervisor] to address the student directly and invite him [the student] to address the implications of such a statement. I expected her [supervisor] to – at the very least – weave this incident into our discussion of treatment issues of diversity and working with the culturally “different” . . . .

Biased Practice Theme Two: White Supervisors Negatively Evaluate or Reprimand Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees Based on Biased Assumptions of Their Abilities and/or Views

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme included White supervisors that negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues. For example, a respondent described this biased practice by stating:

I observed a White supervisor inform a fellow student to encourage her minority client to assimilate to White culture without regard to the clear ostracism that would occur from the client’s culture . . . When I mentioned this neglect of the client’s culture [to] the supervisor, [he] “chastised” me in front of my peers.

A Hispanic participant depicted this biased practice by a White supervisor in discussing a marital case involving an Hispanic woman in front of a group of students, “When I suggested that part of the conflict might stem from differing
cultural expectations of marriage, he [supervisor] said ‘NO, that’s not it,’ in a manner that I felt shut me down and devalued my perspective to the group.”

The second subtheme involved White supervisors negatively evaluating or reprimanding minority supervisees for their counseling skills or therapeutic actions. One respondent described this biased practice as, “Evaluating and making recommendations (lukewarm or negative) regarding skills of ethnic persons.” An American Indian supervisee described being reprimanded by a White supervisor as

... I [supervisee] told a client who was also American Indian that I didn’t see her as “sick,” ... she had grown accustomed to labeling herself [sick] from the years of being in and out of institutions. I was trying to speak to her cultural values of holism and [to] convey hope. But the supervisor thought I was harming her by giving her too much hope. I was reprimanded and threatened [by the supervisor] with possible termination from the agency.

In addition, a Latino supervisee depicted this biased practice as part of a vocational psychology course:

... I was assigned several students to contact as possible counseling clients. English is not my first language, so when I told my supervisor that I had been confronting trouble finding counseling clients. The supervisor told me rudely that it was because I was, “scaring clients off because of my accent.”

Another participant depicted this biased practice as, “Making assumptions about the skill level of the ethnic persons as inferior without knowledge of persons background.” Some respondents stated that White supervisors have, “a lower standard because a supervisee or a client is from a different culture,” or that they are “not accepting the ability of non-Whites.” In addition, a participant described White supervisors perceiving racial/ethnic supervisees’ cultural characteristics as “deficits or weaknesses.” An Asian American supervisee provided an incident of this biased practice involving her writing of progress notes:

As an intern with prior work experience in the community I am used to writing “med. compliant” to convey in short hand “compliance with medication.” However when I wrote [med. compliant] ... in a progress note
my White supervisor said “Don’t worry, it’s probably just an English thing you didn’t learn.” I had to point out that [writing med. compliant] . . . was a training issue, because I was trained in community psychology and was asked to write the short hand in a progress note by a nurse practitioner.

**Biased Practice Theme Three: White Supervisors Act as If They are Multiculturally Sensitive When They are Not**

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors who believed they are open to or competent in multicultural issues when they are not. For example, one participant stated, “The most harmful professional practices by White supervisors are the practices by supervisors who believe they are culturally competent . . . [yet] they are unaware of their own biases, prejudices, and racism . . .” Some respondents used short phrases in describing White supervisors who believed they were open to multicultural issues as, “pretend open minded,” “assume that they understand,” and “think that he/she is more aware or knowledgeable than [he/she] actually is.” Another participant described this biased practice as, “Acting like they’re culturally aware when in reality they are extremely ignorant.”

The second subtheme included White supervisors who give “lip service” to multicultural issues but they do not support multiculturalism. One participant described this biased practice by stating that White supervisors “know the correct thing to say and do, but personally do not support the practice of multiculturalism.” Another participant depicted this hypocrisy as, “White supervisors are too quick to give ‘lip service’ to . . . ‘movements’ (such as multiculturalism) without really learning to explore dimensions of their [supervisors] own Whiteness and biases and how these come into play in contact with supervisees and others.” Similarly, respondents also described this practice as “talking the talk” but not “walking the
walk" concerning multicultural issues in supervision. A respondent depicted his experience being the only African American male in a practicum class of six White students and a White supervisor:

During class we covered counseling African Americans and cultural mistrust was discussed. The professor emphasized how African Americans may distrust counselors due to racism and discrimination. During our final meeting, students met privately with the graduate assistants and the professor. I was criticized and received a lower grade because I was not open enough and I seemed to have trouble trusting in comparison to my White classmates who seemed to be very open and trusting in the class. So much for practicing what you preach.

Biased Practice Theme Four: White Supervisors’ Attempt to Incorporate Multicultural Issues Involve Overgeneralized or Inaccurate Assumptions About Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme included White supervisors assuming that racial/ethnic minority supervisees always have a complete understanding of or connection to their racial/ethnic community. Some participants described this biased practice as, “assuming the supervisee is the ‘voice’ for his/her entire ethnic group,” or “assuming a (non therapeutic) liaison between clients and supervisees when a similar cultural background exists.” Another respondent depicted this biased practice as, “Assuming all ethnic diverse students are sensitive to the needs of their [ethnic] community.” A Latina supervisee described a White supervisor wanting to use her as a connection to people in her ethnic community as, “She [supervisor] felt that just because I am Latina, somehow that automatically gave me a connection to others of my same ethnicity.”

The second subtheme involved White supervisors who inaccurately see issues involving culture or racism in the work of their racial/ethnic minority supervisee. For
instance, one participant described a racial/ethnic minority female colleague’s experience with a White supervisor who questioned the appropriateness of her intervention with a client:

Supervisor inappropriately asked whether this [intervention] was caused by the “counselor’s” difficulty with dealing with European American clients because of power differentials i.e., supervisor was speculating that ethnic counselor was trying to exert power over client because of her feelings of powerlessness.

Another participant shared an incident when a White supervisor tried to interpret his or her reactions concerning a client’s racist remarks by reporting, “In processing my own reactions and interactions regarding a client who made racist comments, my supervisor [stated], ‘So, this is particularly sensitive area for you?’ It was very disappointing for racism to be framed as my sensitivity.”

Biased Practice Theme Five: White Supervisors Pathologize Supervisees or Clients Because of Their Race/Culture or Ethnicity

One participant described White supervisors’ pathologizing of minority individuals as “thinking [that] behaviors, [and] thoughts which may be culturally appropriate are abnormal or deviant because ‘White’ people may not act that way.” Some respondents described this biased practice as “imposing clinical diagnosis on cultural practices” and “inappropriately attributing pathology to ‘culture’…” Another respondent depicted the pathologizing of supervisees by White supervisors as

... the most damaging practice is that of “pathologizing” the supervisee. This can take place indirectly, via “pathologizing” patients from a culture similar to that of the supervisee, ... [the supervisee] then becomes afraid of expressing contrary views for fear of being labeled “crazy”...

In addition, a participant illustrated an account of a White supervisor who pathologized an Asian student in a predominantly White high school:
This student has been expressing feelings of being different from others because she is Asian. She [student] perceives certain teachers to subtly give more praise and attention onto other students. My supervisor hastily told me that “She’s not the only student in the school. She’s always been a little paranoid.”

Exemplary Practices of White Supervisors

The biased practice results were derived from responses from both question 2 and question 4 of the survey. Question 2 requested specific stories or incidents of White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Question 4 requested opinions about professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. In response to question 2, participants provided 264 stories (42,709 characters) of White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Thirty-four (13,727 characters) stories were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 234 final exemplary practice stories on average consisted of three to four lines of typed transcript per story. Twenty-three (22%) of the participants contributed two or more stories of exemplary practices. In response to question 4, participants provided 408 opinions (26,360 characters) about professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to exemplary practices by White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Fifty-three opinions (5,377 characters) were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 355 final opinions consisted of one line of typed transcript per opinion on average. Forty-one (39%) participants provided two or more opinions of professional practices that contribute to exemplary practices.

Six themes and eight subthemes emerged in the data analysis of respondents stories (question 2) and opinions (question 4) of White supervisors’ exemplary
practices (see Figure 2). This section is divided into six subsections corresponding to the six exemplary practice themes. Within each subsection, the overall exemplary practice theme and all its subthemes are defined first. Then each theme or subtheme is explained and illustrated with participants’ verbatim words whenever possible.

**Exemplary Practice Theme One: White Supervisors Address Multicultural Issues in Supervision**

This exemplary practice theme is divided into three interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that challenge or question supervisees’ cultural competence or perceptions. One respondent described this exemplary practice as “questioning cultural competence regardless of ethnicity of supervisee.” Another participant believed that White supervisors should challenge the perceptions that are entrenched in minority therapists such as myself. Don’t allow minority therapists to just claim they “know” because they are minorities . . . Have to have a theoretical or research base for assumptions about a given [minority] group.

A Latina supervisee depicted an account concerning her experience with a White supervisor’s challenge to her cultural competence:

I can only recall one incident where a supervisor actually challenged me on my cultural competence . . . [and it] resulted in a lively, intellectual, [and] forward conversation. I don’t recall if we were discussing African American or Latinos, but he [supervisor] just questioned my beliefs very appropriately . . .

The second subtheme included White supervisors that address racial/ethnic or cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the supervisory relationship. Some participants described this exemplary practice using short phrases such as, “discussions of the impact of race/ethnicity in . . . [the] supervisory relationship,” or “asking trainee to share when culture affects trainee’s relationship with supervisor . . .” Another respondent depicted her experience with a White supervisor
1) **Exemplary Practice Theme One:** White supervisors address multicultural issues in supervision

**Subthemes:**
(a) White supervisors challenge or question supervisees' cultural competence or perceptions
(b) White supervisors address racial/ethnic or cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the supervisory relationship
(c) White supervisors address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees

2) **Exemplary Practice Theme Two:** White supervisors work with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients in ways that show sensitivity toward both their individuality and their membership in various racial/ethnic groups

**Subthemes:**
(a) White supervisors demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of racial/ethnic minority clients and supervisees' individuality within their racial/ethnic group
(b) White supervisors demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of different racial/ethnic minority groups

3) **Exemplary Practice Theme Three:** White supervisors work to develop their own multicultural competence in supervision and/or counseling

**Subthemes:**
(a) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through involving themselves in multicultural education and training
(b) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through examining personal issues concerning multiculturalism
(c) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients

4) **Exemplary Practice Theme Four:** White supervisors lacking multicultural competence either consult with or refer to others with more multicultural competence

5) **Exemplary Practice Theme Five:** White supervisors appreciate racial/ethnic minority supervisees

Figure 2. Exemplary Practice Themes and Subthemes.

in her first year of graduate school: “One of the first things she [supervisor] did in the first meeting was to discuss that our relationship was multicultural and we had a dialogue about what this means.” Similarly, a participant described an African
American student’s experience with a White supervisor who addressed racial differences in their supervisory relationship: “... White supervisor asked her [African American student] how she felt about having a White supervisor. Were there any cultural issues that they needed to address and that she [supervisor] was willing to address these issues.”

The third subtheme involved White supervisors that address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees. For example, a participant described this exemplary practice as “encouraging [the] supervisee to develop multiple hypotheses regarding conceptualizations informed by knowledge of [the] culture.” A Latina supervisee described an incident concerning her experience with a White supervisor in examining cultural issues in conceptualizing a White client as “[the] supervisor initiated conversations regarding culture (class and gender) to help develop greater conceptualization skills, even though ‘culture’ was not readily apparent when working with a White client.” One participant depicted a White supervisor’s exemplary practice as, “Asking about insights and requiring formulations regarding cultural and appropriate interventions in clinical cases—that are theory based and culturally sensitive.”

Exemplary Practice Theme Two: White Supervisors Work With Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees and Clients in Ways That Show Sensitivity Toward Both Their Individuality and Their Membership in Various Racial/Ethnic Groups

This exemplary theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that show their knowledge or sensitivity of racial/ethnic minority clients and supervisees individuality within their racial/ethnic group. One participant described this exemplary practice as the “realization that a
supervisee is an individual and may or may not differ from others of his/her ethnicity.” Another respondent observed some White supervisors that had taken the time to “understand the patient [racial/ethnic minority] as an individual, rather than with sweeping generalizations or as a mass of symptoms . . .” A Latina participant described an account of a White supervisor’s suggestion to examine each individual within a culture or racial group:

Had a supervisor tell me it’s always good to put on our different “lenses” according to the culture/race of our client, but it is best to remember to keep “fine-tuning” the lenses for each individual. Everyone is different and may not fit the “stereotype” that we were taught in the books and in school.

The second subtheme included White supervisors that demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of different racial/ethnic minority groups. Some participants described this exemplary practice as, “knowledge of different racial, religious, and cultural groups,” or “being aware of the history of different racial groups . . .” An African American supervisee depicted an account of a White supervisor’s knowledge and sensitivity of “greasing” African American hair:

In the 22 years since I started graduate school, I have only had one White supervisor that I can recall, who showed special sensitivity to cultural issues. We [supervisor and supervisee] were discussing an issue of a family I was seeing, where the mother reported on the behavior of the son while she was “greasing” her daughters hair. This supervisor actually knew what that [greasing] was and relayed how the girl down the street had “greased” his White daughter’s hair. He accepted this as a given thing that Blacks do (especially in the 70’s), rather than as something strange and inappropriate.

**Exemplary Practice Theme Three: White Supervisors Work to Develop Their Own Multicultural Competence in Supervision and/or Counseling**

This exemplary practice theme is divided into three interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through involving themselves in multicultural education or training. For
example, a participant described this exemplary practice as “when the supervisors have undergone significant training in order to have a good level of cultural awareness/knowledge/skills.” Another respondent described this exemplary practice as “playing an active, ongoing role in multicultural training by attending workshops and reading about multicultural issues.” Other respondents also depicted this exemplary practice as “reading professional articles on cultural issues.”

The second subtheme included White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through examining personal issues concerning multiculturalism. Some participants illustrated this exemplary practice as “challenging one’s racism and racist learnings,” or “self reflection and learning about racism, White privilege, and examining cultural issues.” Another respondent described the necessity for White supervisors to examine their biases:

Doing their own work on their own issues such as racism, sexism, homophobia. Allowing themselves to evaluate these personal issues, being vulnerable but growing from this experience. If you have racist beliefs, don’t understand White privilege and have blinders on, you won’t be able to serve the minority community, no matter how hard you try.

The third subtheme included White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients. Some participants depicted gaining cultural competence form supervisees as “readiness to learn collaboratively with interns,” or “learn from supervisees.” One respondent described the importance of listening to develop cultural competence: “Listening to ethnic students’ own experiences and being open to learning about a group that may not have a deep knowledge about.” Another participant described this exemplary practice as “being willing to be taught by the supervisee and client if they are of a different culture.”
Exemplary Practice Theme Four: White Supervisors Lack Multicultural Competence Either Consult With or Refer to Others With More Multicultural Competence

Some White supervisors who lack multicultural competence consult with, or refer to, more multiculturally competent professionals. For example, a participant gave an example of this exemplary practice:

I particularly know a White supervisor who is always eager to consult with Hispanic and Asian mental health professionals. This consultation is a good sign of “cultural sensitivity.” In one case, I [professional] was contacted by this supervisor because he was having problem understanding why a Hispanic father was “too resistant” to follow through with a family therapy plan that the supervisor [White] designed to assist in the management of “conflicts” in his immediate family (including his wife and three children). I told the supervisor that he would have to modify his treatment plan to give more “control” to the father because among many Hispanic men the cultural value of “machismo” and “marianismo” is something very significant in their family/social relationships.

Another respondent described an incident regarding a supervisee’s experience with a White supervisor referring a client due to language issues: “Supervisor instructed trainee, after discussion and explanation, to refer client to another therapist, one that had cultural linguistic competency [speaking Spanish] to work with the client [who was from Central America].”

Other White supervisors who lack multicultural competence consult with racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients. A multiracial/biracial supervisee described this exemplary practice: “I [supervisee] have encountered many White supervisors who realize the limits of their knowledge and . . . non-White experience, and they [supervisors] are willing to defer to my [supervisee] knowledge or greater insight. This is a very important trait.” Another participant depicted an incident of a White supervisor’s proposal to consult with a client regarding cultural issues as:

In a testing case a supervisor was extremely careful in helping me figure out if a potential disorder was more culturally bound and not really a DSM-IV.
disorder. Symptoms in question related to extreme religiosity, including involvement in Voodoo and magical thinking. To help determine this, she suggested that I ask the client about all African-American individuals if they had the same beliefs or just her . . .

Exemplary Practice Theme Five: White Supervisors Appreciate Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees

Some participants described this exemplary practice using short phrases such as “asking for my (ethnic/racial minority) opinion and not dictating,” “when they [White supervisors] see you for your working abilities and talents, and not by what you look like, or what your race is,” and “showing true respect for cultural differences and making no jokes about them.” An African American respondent described some ways White supervisors appreciate ethnic/racial minority supervisees by stating:

When they [White supervisors] are honest and supervise you like they would any other student. However, it is also helpful for them [White supervisors] to listen to and possibly validate our [racial/ethnic minority supervisees] feelings when we discuss issues during supervision that pertain to multicultural issues.

An Asian American supervisee described an account of a White supervisor’s sensitivity and respect towards her after she confronted him about a prejudicial remark as:

. . . supervisor referred to my culture as oriental, I gently let him know I preferred to be referred to as “Asian.” He got this: The next time he made a reference to me he used the term “Asian.” I appreciated this—he was an old timer, a man in his 70’s who was not exposed to multicultural thinking. Yet I appreciated his respect and sensitivity and willingness to change.

Exemplary Theme Six: White Supervisors Admit Their Biases Regarding Multicultural Issues

Some participants used short phrases to describe this exemplary practice concerning ignorance of multicultural issues: “admission of not knowing,”
“acknowledging their ignorance,” and “willing to admit their limitations of cultural knowledge.” Another respondent depicted a lack of ignorance regarding multicultural issues by White supervisors as “barring true knowledge in the cross-cultural field, it is essential that the supervisors not be arrogant, that they are willing to admit ignorance . . .” A participant further stated that White supervisors should be “acknowledging any lack of knowledge about the supervisees or supervisees culture/ethnicity instead of pretending to be an expert.”

Other respondents described this exemplary practice in terms of White supervisors admitting of their biases of multicultural issues. Some participants depicted this exemplary practice as “being open to criticism that they are biased,” “admitting to bias and prejudice,” and “acknowledging their own assumptions and biases.” One respondent described the benefits of White supervisors being open to their own biases and prejudice: “White supervisors who are aware of their own prejudice and bias can benefit students who need to explore alternative theories or therapeutic interventions. In general, these types of supervisors are more open.”

Discussion

This section is divided into four subsections: (1) parameters of the present study, (2) overview of the results, (3) apparent contradictory findings, and (4) implications of the results for practice and training.

Parameters of the Study

This section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection addresses the parameters of the present study’s research design. The second subsection addresses the parameter of the present study’s transferability of the results.
Parameters of the Research Design

One parameter of the qualitative design of the study is that the present researcher conducted the majority of the data analysis. Having one researcher conduct the majority of the qualitative analysis can be limiting because he or she may view the data from only one perspective based on his or her experience and thus may miss other viewpoints of the data or disregard the meaning of the data. The present researcher incorporated three audits within the data analysis procedure in an effort to ensure that the results of the study were not based solely on the researcher but on the phenomena of the study. The three audits in the present study did add to the confirmability of the results. However, a stronger approach to data analysis would have been a group approach to the primary analysis in addition to the audits, which would have allowed for multiple perspectives of examining data and minimizes misinterpreting the meaning of the data. Thus, it is important to note that the results of the present study are, for the most part, heavily based on the present researcher's perspective.

An additional possible parameter of the present study is the lack of depth concerning the themes of White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices. The purpose of the present study was to identify a broad range of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision and not to go into depth concerning practices. In order to classify a broad range of White supervisors' practices, the present researcher used an open-ended questionnaire to collect data from a large sample. Traditional qualitative studies typically interview a small sample of individuals for depth concerning a particular aspect of a phenomenon. Data from a traditional in-depth qualitative study allow researchers to interpret a specific aspect of a
phenomenon in great detail but do not provide much breadth concerning that phenomenon. The participants' reports from the present study provided a broad range, or breadth, of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision but, they did not provide much detail concerning those practices. Each individual theme in the present study may seem shallow, providing almost naive information regarding multicultural supervision. Yet, when themes are combined, they provide meaning and significance in understanding White supervisors' multicultural supervision practices. Thus, it is important that the themes of the present study are not interpreted as providing great depth or detail concerning White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices. However, the results should be interpreted as providing a breadth of White supervisors' practices and as a starting point for future in-depth qualitative studies, as well as quantitative investigations.

Although the purpose of the present study was not to obtain a complete consensus of participants regarding the identification of White supervisors' practices, this lack of consensus could be viewed as parameter the present study. A similar parameter was identified in Croteau and Lark's (1995) biased and exemplary study. Based on this parameter, it is critical that the present results are not interpreted as a consensus of what professionals and graduate students regard as White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices, but rather as a survey of a broad range of biased and exemplary practices. Given that the purpose of the present study was to collect and describe a broad range of White supervisors biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision, striving for a complete consensus would have been counterproductive to this purpose. Given the current lack of information on White supervisors, the present researcher believes that the first step in understanding White
supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices is identifying a broad range of practices.

Another possible parameter of the present study could be the low (18%) return rate. A parameter of a low return rate may be that some areas of White supervisors’ practices were not identified in the present study. However, in qualitative studies there are no set rules regarding sample size. Qualitative sampling is dependent on selecting information-rich cases that are important to the purpose of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990). The purposeful sampling technique used in the present study targeted participants who had knowledge of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. One of the strengths of the study, which will be discussed later in this subsection, was the purposeful sampling procedure. Clearly, the participants in the present study were knowledgeable about multicultural issues and multicultural supervision, represented different racial/ethnic groups, and had a wide variety of training levels. Even though the present study had a low return rate, the participants were information rich and were able to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of White supervisors’ practices.

Another parameter of the research design was in providing an explicit narrative of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Croteau and Lark (1995) reported that the storytelling nature of qualitative data may make the phenomena of study more real for the readers of the study. Thus, while these results do not establish any sense of the quantity of biased or exemplary multicultural supervision practices, the narrative reports from participants in the present study may be more persuasive than quantitative data in illuminating White supervisors’ practices for readers. For example, the narrative reports of participants provide readers with an actual picture of experiences of biased and
exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Croteau and Lark (1995) also stated that the storytelling nature of qualitative data at an emotional level might motivate professionals to change their behavior. Correspondingly, the narrative reports from participants in the present study also captured their emotions concerning White supervisors' practices, which may also motivate White supervisors to change their behavior. For example, White supervisors reading the participants' stories of White supervisors' failure to address the impact of race or ethnicity in the supervisory relationship may encourage White supervisors to develop their own multicultural awareness/knowledge.

In discussing the parameters, it is important to note that the research design was based on a critique of the three previous biased and exemplary studies (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991). The critique of those studies was conducted to make improvements in the present study's methodology over those of its predecessors. The present study improved on the previous methodologies by linking different aspects of the methods with each other. For instance, the present research question is linked with the sampling procedure, and the data collection instrument is linked with the research question and sampling procedure. The present methodology also combined the strengths of the three previous studies by explicitly describing and providing a rational for each aspect of the methods (Croteau & Lark, 1995), auditing of the data analysis procedures (Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991), and providing thick written descriptions of the findings (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991). Linking different aspects of the methods and combining the strengths of the three previous methodologies improved the overall methodology regarding of the present biased and exemplary research design. In addition, linking different aspects of the methods and explicitly describing
and providing a rational for each aspect of the methods in the present study contributed to a clear and consistent research design, which adds to the dependability of the results.

Also important to note is the success of the purposeful sampling procedure that aimed at sampling individuals who have knowledge of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The participants in the present study were indeed knowledgeable about multicultural issues and multicultural supervision. For example, among the participants, 84 (81%) had attended two or more multicultural counseling workshops, 62 (59%) had been involved in three or more research projects concerning multicultural issues, 75 (72%) had worked with six or more clients concerning multicultural issues, and 60 (58%) had one to three supervisors address multicultural issues in their own supervision. Having knowledgeable participants in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

The high representation of different racial/ethnic groups among the participants also adds to the argument for successful purposeful sampling. The racial breakdown of participants in the study consisted of 27% Chicano/Hispanic/Latino, 23% African American/Black, 20% Caucasian, 16% Asian American, 6% Multiracial/Biracial, 3% Pacific Islander, 2% American Indian, and 1% international. The strength of the diverse representation of races adds to the credibility of the results, because the participants’ stories and opinions of White supervisors are from a variety of different racial perspectives. The purpose of the present study was to identify a “broad range” of White supervisors’ practices, and having a wide spectrum of racial/ethnic participants in the sample of the present study made it more likely to classify a broad range of practices. Additionally, having wide range of racial/ethnic
participants in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

Successful purposeful sampling is also supported by data on the participants' level of training. The participants were almost evenly split regarding their level of training, with 53 (51%) being professionals and 51 (49%) being graduate students. Having an almost even split regarding level of training among the participants gives the results more credibility because the results are based on a wide variety of levels of supervisees' and supervisors' experiences of training, practice, and professional development. Again, the purpose of the present study was to identify a "broad range" of White supervisors' practices, and having a large sample of professionals and graduates in different stages of training made it more likely to classify a broad range of practices. Similarly, having a large sample of professionals and graduates in different stages of training in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

Lastly, in discussing parameters, it is important to note the author's own membership in the group whose issues were being studied. This strength is similar to one identified in Croteau and Lark's (1995) biased and exemplary study in which the authors identified as members of the cultural group being investigated. A number of authors have cautioned White researchers about conducting multicultural research on minority individuals due to potential racial and ethnic biases (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993; Parham, 1993; Sue, 1993). In the present study, a White researcher focused on White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision to capitalize on his knowledge of his own culture as opposed to studying individuals from cultures different than his own.
Transferability of the Results

A parameter of the present study's results is the transferability. At a philosophical level, generalizing or transferring the results from a qualitative (constructivism) study differs dramatically compared to a quantitative (positivism) study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Quantitative studies employ random sampling because it allows for generalizations back to the population (Creswell, 1994; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). Qualitative research employs purposeful sampling, which provides the researcher with a sample that is representative of the information needed. However, the data from this type of sample are less generalizable than data from a randomized sample (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990).

The responsibility of the transferability of the results of a qualitative study lies with the reader and not the author of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1981; Marshall & Rossman, 1995). For example, readers of the present study need to take into account the participants' multicultural counseling and supervision experiences and their views regarding multicultural supervision and White supervisors when applying the results to their particular sample and situation. The participants were practitioners and members of Division 45, which indicate their interest and knowledge of diversity issues and clinical supervision. Although the sample is one of the strengths of the present study, it is important for readers to critically examine the possible transferability of results to other populations with less knowledge of diversity issues as well as to nonclinical supervisory relationships such as mentoring and academic advising. Additionally, the readers of the present study need to take into account the researchers and their own level of experience with multicultural counseling and
supervision when applying the results. In summary, even though the present researcher believes that the study provides a template of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision, readers need to think realistically and critically whether the results are applicable to their specific sample and situation.

Overview of the Results

The results of the present study can be viewed as a map of effective supervision practices for White supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. To construct this map, the present researcher combined exemplary and biased themes of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision identified in Chapter IV. Four general areas of effective supervision practices of White supervisors conducting multicultural supervision were identified when biased and exemplary themes were combined. The intent of such an approach is to provide the reader with a useful synthesis of the biased and exemplary practices reported by the participants in this study. In contrast, the exemplary and biased themes reported in Chapter IV involved participants identifying, describing, and classifying a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

This section is divided into four subsections corresponding to the four areas involved in effective multicultural supervision practices for White supervisors. The first subsection involves the development of multicultural competence in White supervisors. The second subsection involves White supervisors who lack multicultural competencies being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multicultural knowledgeable individuals. This subsection also involves White supervisors being open to admitting to their own ignorance’s or biases. The third subsection involves White supervisors being sensitive and knowledgeable of racial/
ethnic minority supervisees. The fourth subsection involves White supervisors addressing multicultural issues in supervision.

**Developing Multicultural Competence**

Participants reported that one component of effective multicultural supervision practice for White supervisors involved developing multicultural competence. White supervisors can develop multicultural competence through multicultural education and training opportunities, such as attending classes and workshops that focus on multicultural issues. Multicultural education also consisted of reading about multicultural issues in professional journals and other works. White supervisors can also develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients. For example, White supervisors can learn from supervisees or clients by listening to their stories, experiences, or knowledge concerning multicultural issues.

The participants in the study suggested that it is also essential that White supervisors develop multicultural competence through examining their own personal issues concerning multiculturalism. Examining personal issues may consist of supervisors investigating their potentially biased attitudes/beliefs about multiculturalism. It seems especially important that White supervisors examine their biased assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees' abilities. If these biased assumptions are not examined, White supervisors can give inappropriate negative evaluations concerning racial/ethnic minority supervisees' counseling skills or therapeutic actions. In addition, if White supervisors' biased assumptions of racial/ethnic minority supervisees' abilities are not examined, they may give negative evaluations of supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues in supervision.
Furthermore, if White supervisors do not examine their biased assumptions of racial/ethnic minorities, they might pathologize their racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients.

To develop multicultural competencies, White supervisors also need to examine their overgeneralized or inaccurate assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees. If White supervisors do not address their overgeneralizations of racial/ethnic minority supervisees, they could assume that all racial/ethnic minority supervisees have a complete understanding of their racial ethnic group. Additionally, White supervisors that do not examine their overgeneralizations can assume that all racial/ethnic minority supervisees are closely linked to their particular racial/ethnic communities. These overgeneralized assumptions can also lead White supervisors to focus on issues involving culture or racism in supervision with racial/ethnic minority supervisees for whom these issues are not directly relevant.

**Being Open to a Lack of Multicultural Competence**

Participants reported that another component of effective supervision practice for White supervisors involved being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals when lacking multicultural competence. White supervisors who are open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals demonstrate their sincerity around their lack of multicultural understanding and their willingness to learn about multicultural issues. White supervisors can consult with multiculturally competent racial/ethnic minority supervisees, clients, or other professionals. It is critical for White supervisors who lack multicultural competence to be open to admitting their own ignorances or biases regarding multicultural issues with supervisees. If open to their
own ignorances or biases concerning multicultural issues, White supervisors are more apt to be receptive to multicultural issues in supervision.

Additionally, it is important that White supervisors do not act as if they are multiculturally sensitive or aware when they are not. White supervisors who believe they are competent in multicultural issues when they are not are likely to commit biased practice in multicultural supervision because of their lack awareness concerning multicultural issues. Furthermore, White supervisors who give “lip service” to multicultural issues but whose actions do not support multiculturalism may also engage in biased practice in multicultural supervision.

**Sensitivity and Knowledge of Racial/Ethnic Minorities**

The participants in this study demonstrated that another component of effective supervision practice by White supervisors in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors being sensitive and knowledgeable of racial/ethnic minorities. Such sensitivity toward racial/ethnic minority supervisees appears to be critical for White supervisors. For example, White supervisors who are sensitive of racial/ethnic minority supervisees can be supportive of cultural differences they bring to supervision and not view them as something detrimental to the supervisory process.

It is also essential that White supervisors working with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients demonstrate sensitivity and knowledge toward both their individuality and their membership in various racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, White supervisors working with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients demonstrate sensitivity and knowledge when they are attentive to the fact that a wide range of within-group differences are expressed by individuals in each racial/ethnic minority.
group. Not only is it important for White supervisors to acknowledge racial/ethnic minorities’ individuality, but they must also demonstrate their sensitivity or knowledge of different racial/ethnic minority groups.

**Addressing Multicultural Issues**

According to participants, another component of White supervisors’ effective practice in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors addressing multicultural issues in supervision. Specifically, it is important for White supervisors to address racial/ethnic and cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the supervisory relationship. For example, White supervisors working with supervisees who are racial/ethnic minorities must acknowledge that the supervisory relationship is multicultural. White supervisors who fail to address racial/ethnic issues that impact the supervisory relationship take a “colorblind” position. A colorblind position is defined as White supervisors who interact with racial/ethnic supervisees without the consideration of the impact of race in their supervisory relationship (Williams & Halgin, 1995). Not only is it essential for White supervisors to address multicultural issues with supervisees, but to also challenge supervisees’ cultural competence and not presume that all racial/ethnic minority supervisees are multiculturally competent.

In addition, it is critical for White supervisors to address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees. White supervisors who fail to address multicultural issues in client formulations may give the impression that multicultural issues are not important or valued. Furthermore, it is important for White supervisors to address multicultural issues in supervision and not expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues.
For example, racial/ethnic minority supervisors who have been asked to educate White supervisors or supervisees may feel resentment concerning this expectation.

**Apparent Contradictory Findings**

A number of the themes or subthemes in the present study appear to contradict one another. For example, one exemplary subtheme (subtheme 3 of exemplary theme 3) involved White supervisors developing multicultural competencies by being open to learning from supervisees or clients. This subtheme was supported by another exemplary theme (exemplary theme 4) that included White supervisors who lacked multicultural competence consulting with racial/ethnic minority supervisees. However, these findings of exemplary practice appear to be contradictory to another finding in the biased themes (subtheme 4 of biased theme 1). This biased practice theme involved White supervisors who failed to address multicultural issues and expected racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues. Thus, some racial/ethnic minority supervisees were finding this practice of “educating” White supervisors biased and inappropriate.

These seemingly contradictory findings may indicate that there are subtle differences between supervisors who are open to learning from their supervisees and supervisors who overrely upon their supervisees for multicultural education. In the former case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are aware of their multicultural limitations, are open to learning from supervisees, and communicate this openness. In the latter case, supervisees could have a negative reaction to supervisors who rely upon them too much rather than taking responsibility for their own multicultural development. This may explain why being educated by the supervisee was present under both exemplary and biased practices in
multicultural supervision. Data from the current study, however, are not fully sufficient to explain the phenomena. However, White supervisors should be cautious about overreliance on their supervisees.

Another contradictory finding included an exemplary theme (exemplary theme 5) that involved White supervisors being sensitive and supportive of racial/ethnic minority supervisees in supervision. This theme was potentially contradictory to an exemplary subtheme (subtheme 1 of exemplary theme 1) that indicated effective practice in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors who challenge or question supervisees’ cultural competence or perceptions. Again, these two exemplary findings could send mixed signals; on the one hand, it is important for White supervisors to support racial/ethnic minority supervisees, and on the other hand, it is also important to challenge racial/ethnic minority supervisees.

These possibly contradictory findings may be due to differences between White supervisors’ multicultural awareness/knowledge. In the former case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are multiculturally aware enough to be sensitive and supportive of racial/ethnic minority supervisees. In the later case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are multiculturally competent and are able to use their multicultural awareness/knowledge to appropriately challenge a supervisee’s cultural competence. This might explain why both supporting and challenging supervisees were present in exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Again, data from the current study are not fully adequate to explain this phenomena.

These apparently contradictory findings highlight the importance for White supervisors to be conscious of the fact that multicultural supervision, like all supervision, is not straightforward and concrete, but that it is complex and fluid.
Therefore, it is critical that White supervisors who conduct multicultural supervision make decisions about working with each supervisee on an individual basis because each multicultural supervisory relationship is different and unique. For example, a White supervisor should carefully assess whether it would be appropriate to approach a supervisee about consulting him or her or whether to seek consultation with someone else. Similarly, a White supervisor should also carefully assess whether it would be appropriate to be supportive or challenge a supervisee’s cultural competence or perceptions in supervision. Additionally, White supervisors would need to assess whether they are multiculturally aware/knowledgeable enough to challenge a supervisee’s cultural competence. One method for making each of these assessments could be to have process dialogues with supervisees about how they experience supervisors who need to be educated and who challenge their cultural competence.

**Implications for Training and Practice**

The implications of the results for training and practice for the present study are applicable on various levels. The implications of the results were patterned after Croteau and Lark’s (1995) and Stage and Hamrick’s (1994) belief that to promote multiculturalism effectively there needs to be improvements at multiple levels.

At an individual level, the biased and exemplary themes of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision may act as a powerful tool for self-reflection for the reader. Reading the descriptions of the participants’ experiences with White supervisors may assist White students and professionals to reflect upon their own multicultural supervision practice. For example, White supervisors reading the exemplary theme concerning the importance of addressing multicultural issues in
supervision may reflect on whether or not they have addressed multicultural issues in supervision. If they are not addressing multicultural issues in supervision, reflecting on the theme may motivate them to address multicultural issues in supervision. On the other hand, if White supervisors are addressing multicultural issues in multicultural supervision, reflecting on the theme may validate their supervision practice.

Correspondingly, reading the themes may also validate and support racial/ethnic minority supervisees’ experiences of exemplary or biased multicultural supervision. For instance, a racial/ethnic minority supervisee reading the biased theme regarding White supervisors pathologizing supervisees or clients because of their race/culture or ethnicity may cause the supervisee to reflect on whether he or she has had an experience of being pathologized by White supervisors. If a supervisee had a similar experience of being pathologized by a White supervisor, it may confirm his or her experience and possibly give the supervisee strength to confront a White supervisor if this biased practice occurs again in supervision.

At a broader level, educators or trainers can use the themes and the map of White supervisors’ effective practice to guide them in developing curriculum, workshops, and in-service training programs. The map directs educators and trainers to the four key areas (developing multicultural competence, being open to a lack of multicultural competence, sensitivity and knowledge of racial/ethnic minorities, and addressing multicultural issues) to focus on when addressing White supervisors’ effective multicultural supervision practices when developing courses or other training programs. Additionally, the participants’ stories and opinions in the themes can be used to make the four effective practices concrete and real, as well as highlight
the biased practices that occur when these four areas are not addressed by White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

At an even broader level, the themes and map can assist in the beginning of a national discussion of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. Such a national discussion is critical and warranted given that the majority of supervisors conducting multicultural supervision are White and that the field of counseling psychology has taken a leadership role in multicultural issues associated with counseling. Having a national discussion on determining what are biased and exemplary practices for White supervisors in multicultural supervision may lead to discussions of what are good multicultural supervision practices. In addition to providing inspiration for future research projects, discussions concerning what are effective multicultural supervision practices could lead to the development of guidelines, principles, or competencies for all supervisors providing multicultural supervision. Competencies were developed for multicultural counseling and have been helpful in training and determining counselors’ effective practices in conducting multicultural counseling (Sue et al., 1982). Developing guidelines, principles, and competencies would be similarly helpful for supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. The present study provides an initial map or starting point of areas to focus on when developing guidelines or competencies for supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. Consequently, having national guidelines, principles, competencies of exemplary practice in multicultural supervision are likely to also be a catalyst for multiple levels of change (i.e., institutional and individual). For example, national guidelines will help institutions develop appropriate curriculum for students and professionals to conduct exemplary multicultural supervision and thus affect individual multicultural supervision practices.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The objective of Chapter II is to review the related theoretical and empirical literature regarding White supervisors’ biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. This chapter is separated into four sections. The first section defines supervision and outlines the history of supervision in counseling and psychotherapy. This section also clarifies the differences between cross-cultural and multicultural supervision as well as defines multicultural supervision for the present study. The second section examines the theoretical literature in multicultural supervision focusing on White supervisors. The third section reviews the empirical research on multicultural supervision. The fourth section presents the rationale for the current study.

Overview of Supervision

This section is divided into three subsections and includes: (1) the definition of supervision in counseling psychology, (2) the history of supervision in counseling psychology and psychotherapy, and (3) the differences between cross-cultural and multicultural supervision as well as the definition of multicultural supervision for the present study.
Definitions of Supervisor, Supervisee, and Supervision

There are many different definitions of supervision within the counseling psychology literature. Holloway (1992) stated that "Supervision is, literally, to 'oversee,' to view another's work with the eyes of the experienced clinician, the sensitive teacher, the discriminating professional" (p. 177). Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth (1982) defined supervision as a one-to-one relationship, which is designed to enhance the development and therapeutic competence in another person. Bernard and Goodyear (1998) defined supervision more specifically as:

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of the same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purpose of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the client(s) she, he or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession. (p. 6)

Bernard and Goodyear’s precise definition of supervision captures both purposes of supervision, which is for the supervisor (a) to assist a supervisee with his or her professional development, and (b) to monitor the welfare of the supervisee’s clients. Bernard and Goodyear’s definition of supervision was used as the overarching framework for multicultural supervision in the present study.

History of Counseling and Psychotherapy Supervision

The history of counseling and psychotherapy supervision can be broken down into three different phases, with each phase corresponding to a certain model(s) of counseling or psychotherapy: (1) psychoanalytic model, (2) counseling models, and (3) developmental and social role models (Carroll, 1996). The first phase of supervision, the psychoanalytic model, began in the 1920s. At this time, the focus of
training in the psychoanalytic model was personal analysis of supervisees. As more institutions established psychoanalysis training programs, analysis of supervisees began to be thought of as either personal or supervisory (Carroll, 1996; Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1976). In the 1930s, some institutions continued to employ a professional analyst who conducted both personal and supervisory analyses. However, other institutions believed that supervisory analysis should be more educational and separate from personal analysis. These institutions proposed that the supervisor’s responsibility was to teach supervisees and that any personal problems were to be referred out to a personal analyst. As a result, a controversy regarding the difference between therapy and supervision developed, which continues today (Carroll, 1996).

The second phase of supervision, involving counseling models, occurred in the 1950s. During this period, supervision models were developed out of counseling theories. The name of the supervision model usually included the name of the counseling theory, such as person-centered supervision, rational emotive supervision, and social learning approach to supervision (Carroll, 1996; Holloway, 1995). A number of advances in supervision took place during this period, such as taping of counseling sessions. Other advancements included the use of small groups and peer group supervision. During this period, supervision became more focused on didactic work and the development of skills in supervisees (Carroll, 1996).

The third phase of supervision, involving developmental and social role models, began in the 1970s and continues today. This period is characterized by a move towards an approach that employs both educational and psychosocial models which focus on tasks for supervisors and different stages of development for supervisees. Developmental models of supervision are based on developmental
psychology, which proposes that individuals progress through a number of stages in life. In developmental models, supervisees, supervisors, and supervisory relationships all progress through stages, with each stage entailing different tasks for supervisors and supervisees. Social role models of supervision address what supervisors and supervisees practice in supervision, and the various roles and tasks performed by each individual. For example, a supervisor has a set of rules and when accomplished establish expectations, beliefs, and attitudes. When a supervisor continually engages in these actions, it establishes behavioral consistency and certainty for a supervisee (Holloway, 1995).

Distinguishing Between Cross-Cultural and Multicultural Supervision

The terms *cross-cultural* and *multicultural supervision* have been used interchangeably in the counseling psychology literature (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Leong & Wagner, 1994). Some authors have defined *cross-cultural supervision* as a supervisory relationship that includes a supervisor and a supervisee from different cultural groups, such as White supervisor and an African American supervisee (Leong & Wagner, 1994; Priest, 1994). Leong and Wagner (1994) argued that the term *cross-cultural* is a more accurate term when describing the two-person-supervisory relationship (supervisor and supervisee). On the other hand, Bernard (1994) suggested that since supervision has a “triadic” nature (supervisor, supervisee, and client), it may contain more than two cultures and thus should be defined as *multicultural supervision* rather than *cross-cultural supervision*.

D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) defined *multicultural supervision* as supervisory circumstances that are affected by multiple cultural factors. These authors suggested that the term *cross-cultural supervision* would be too narrow of a
construct for professionals conducting supervision in the future. Given the changing demographics of the United States, it will be increasingly unlikely that only two cultural factors will be affecting the supervision process. It has been predicated that the majority of the major U.S. cities will be comprised mostly of non-White and non-European individuals (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1993).

The present author agrees with Bernard (1994) and D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) that the term cross-cultural supervision fails to take into account the possibility of more than two cultures in supervision. The present author also believes that multicultural supervision is a more appropriate and accurate term given the triadic nature of supervision. For the purpose of the present study, the term multicultural supervision was used instead of the term cross-cultural supervision. Multicultural supervision for the current study is defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship is racially/ethnically different from the other members.

Review of Multicultural Supervision Theoretical Literature

Leong and Wagner (1994) reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature on multicultural supervision and concluded that the limited amount of literature in this area is primarily theoretical in nature. This section examines the theoretical literature regarding multicultural supervision that is applicable to White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices. This section is divided into 10 subsections: (1) supervisors’ responsibility to address diversity issues in supervision; (2) supervisors’ and supervisees’ awareness of their own biases, privileges, stereotypes, prejudices, and feelings regarding culture and race; (3) ignorance or oversensitivity to race in multicultural supervision; (4) similarities and differences of race, culture, and
worldview between supervisors, supervisees, and clients; (5) communication differences in multicultural supervision; (6) issues of power in multicultural supervision; (7) issues of trust and vulnerability in multicultural supervision; (8) racial supervision issues and themes between African American and White supervisors, supervisees, and clients; (9) racial and ethnic identity models in multicultural supervision; and (10) a critical integration by the present author of the nine previous subsections regarding the theoretical literature. It is important to note that in the existing multicultural supervision literature the racial or ethnic background of supervisors is not usually addressed, although it is often implied that the race of the supervisors being mentioned is White.

Supervisors' Responsibility to Address Diversity Issues in Supervision

Several authors have discussed specific areas of responsibility for supervisors regarding diversity issues in supervision from theoretical and clinical points of view (e.g., Carroll, 1996; Kaiser, 1997; Morgan, 1984). Tyler, Brome, and Williams (1991) stated that supervisors are responsible to address issues of diversity because it is their professional role to bring up issues that affect therapy. Gopaul-McNicol and Brice-Baker (1998) reported that it is the responsibility of supervisors to discuss cultural differences between supervisors and supervisees, especially when majority supervisors are working with minority supervisees. Kaiser argued that supervisors should promote discussions on cultural differences and process how these differences affect therapy and the supervisory relationship. Haber (1996) also stated that it is the responsibility of the supervisor to talk openly about issues of race, culture, and diversity within the supervisory relationship in order to develop mutual respect and understanding within the relationship. One author noted that supervisees may be
hesitant to bring up diversity issues in supervision because they feel supervisors should know the importance of the topic and address it (Morgan, 1984).

Other authors pointed out that supervisors should address diversity issues early on in the supervisory relationship (Carroll, 1996; Morgan, 1984). Fong and Lease (1997) recommended that White supervisors discuss culture as well as explore minority supervisees' and their own cultural background early in the supervisory relationship. Remington and DaCosta (1989) reported that because of the time limitation of many supervisory relationships, it is important to work on racial issues as soon as possible. Fong and Lease also suggested that discussing cultural differences early prevents White supervisors and minority supervisees from making assumptions about each other regarding race, and it also clearly indicates to a supervisee that it is acceptable to talk about racial and ethnic issues in supervision.

Supervisors' and Supervisees' Awareness of Their Own Biases, Privileges, Stereotypes, Prejudices, and Feelings Regarding Culture and Race

A number of authors reported that supervisors must be aware of their own personal racial biases and countertransference issues in order not to distort the supervisory process (Morgan, 1984; Remington & DaCosta, 1989). Gopaul-McNicol and Brice-Baker (1998) suggested that supervisors need to examine their motivation and feelings when working with minority supervisees, as well as look at whether they have a sufficient knowledge base regarding the supervisees' ethnic group. Fong and Lease (1997) pointed out that some White supervisors practice "unintentional racism" in supervision. *Unintentional racism* is a term developed to describe White supervisors who have good intentions but participate in racist supervision practices, such as only considering White cultural values when working with minority
supervisees (Fong & Lease, 1997). William and Halgin (1995) reported that “Even the most sensitive White individual is likely to have threads of racism comprising the fabric of his or her personality” (p. 52).

Fong and Lease (1997) suggested that it is important for White supervisors conducting multicultural supervision to understand White privilege. White privilege has been defined as unearned benefits that White individuals receive on a daily basis due to their race, often without being aware that the benefits exist (Fong & Lease, 1997; McIntosh, 1988). Some of these unearned benefits consist of Whites’ assurance that they are widely represented in the media, that they will not be hassled in stores because of their race, and that they can buy or rent a house in most areas without worrying about experiencing discrimination based on race (McIntosh, 1988). Fong and Lease (1997) reported that White privilege allows White individuals the ability to be able to ignore anything outside of the dominant White culture without worrying about being punished or suffering any repercussions. Some authors have suggested that White supervisors’ lack of awareness of their White privilege can cause problems in recognizing and understanding other worldviews of minority supervisees and clients (Fong & Lease, 1997; Ibrahim, 1991). Fong and Lease (1997) also proposed that White supervisors who lack understanding of White privilege would not be able to empathize with minority individuals’ experiences with oppression and thus may make it difficult to conduct effective multicultural supervision.

Priest (1994) suggested that supervisors must go through six stages of awareness in order to be effective in multicultural supervision. In Stage One, supervisors are unable to see any racial or ethnic differences in supervision. During Stage Two, supervisors learn to identify cultural differences but do not understand
how to work with the information. In Stage Three, supervisors can examine similarities and differences between different cultures which can influence supervision. In Stage Four, supervisors explore their place within a culture and their self worth in terms of culture. In Stage Five, supervisors are able to respect and have some awareness of other cultures. In Stage Six, supervisors can respect supervisees’ race and ethnicity by being able to form appropriate culturally specific methodologies for supervision.

Other authors have pointed out that it is also important for supervisors to encourage supervisees to explore their own backgrounds and attitudes around race and culture, as well as how this may apply to treatment (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Morgan, 1984; Peterson, 1991). Priest (1994) stated that supervisors could enhance supervisees’ respect for diversity by examining whether supervisees have any prejudices or stereotypes regarding minority clients. Haber (1996) suggested that supervisors should explore supervisees’ values, biases, stereotypes, and prejudices concerning minority clients.

Carroll (1996) developed a model to facilitate supervisees’ multicultural awareness, which was based on parts of other models that focus on the same subject (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Cook, 1994; Gardner, 1980; Peterson, 1991; Vasquez & McKinley, 1982). This model has five stages of multicultural awareness. Each stage includes a description of supervisees’ multicultural awareness and the supervisors’ response that fosters movement to the next stage of multicultural awareness. In the first stage, Unawareness, supervisees are unable to recognize differences and apply the same counseling techniques to all clients. Supervisors need to promote growth and awareness in trainees by having supervisees examine their own attitudes and feelings around race and culture, as well
as having contact with different racial and ethnic minority groups. In the second stage, Beginning Awareness, supervisees start to have some awareness regarding different cultures, but this awareness is mainly "descriptive." Supervisors in this stage help explore feelings around culture, provide different readings about diversity, and challenge and expand supervisees' attitudes and beliefs. In the third stage, Consciousness Awareness, supervisees feel trapped between their own culture and other cultures. Supervisors must help supervisees come to terms with their interpersonal dissonance and help cultivate cultural competence. The fourth stage, Consolidated Awareness, defines supervisees as having a multicultural identity. Supervisors in this stage provide multicultural counseling experiences for trainees. In the final stage, Transcendental Awareness, supervisees are able to sensitively deal with cultural issues in counseling and supervision. Supervisors in this stage are aware that supervisees are promoting equality and cultural pluralism.

Carney and Kahn (1984) created a developmental model that helps supervisors facilitate supervisees' development as multiculturally competent counselors. Multicultural competencies has been defined as the development of three multicultural areas: awareness, knowledge, and skill. These three areas specifically involve the counselors' awareness of their biases and stereotypes of racial/ethnic minorities, the need for counselors to understand their own worldview as well as other cultures' worldviews, and to develop specific counseling skills when working with racial/ethnic minorities (Sue et al., 1982). Carney and Kahn's model is similar to Carroll's (1996) model in that it fosters awareness of diversity issues. However, Carney and Kahn's model also addresses knowledge and skills supervisees need in order to work with clients from dissimilar racial and ethnic backgrounds. The model consists of five stages which supervisees should progress through in order to be
competent multicultural counselors. Each stage of the model describes supervisees' characteristics and the environment which supervisors need to provide for supervisees to move to the next stage within the model. Within each stage there are three domains that supervisees must attend to in order to move to the next stage: (1) knowledge of other cultural groups, (2) awareness of attitudes and sensitivity to issues of diversity, and (3) specific multicultural counseling skills. If supervisees grow in one domain, this does not guarantee that they will grow in the other two domains. Progression through stages can occur in spurts and jerks, and supervisees can also be in more than one stage at once or they can regress back to an earlier stage.

In the first stage, supervisees are described as having limited knowledge of other cultures which is usually based on stereotypes. Supervisees' treatments are based on their own worldview rather than the needs of clients. Supervisors' goal in this stage is to make trainees aware of their lack of knowledge, training, and sensitivity to multicultural issues in counseling. Supervisors can accomplish this by supporting supervisees and providing structured activities such as readings on cultural groups and social barriers. In this stage, supervisees need to examine their own behaviors and attitudes around cultural groups. It is also recommended that supervisees keep a personal journal in which they describe and reflect on their experiences working in multicultural counseling.

In the second stage, supervisees are described as beginning to have awareness of their own cultural encapsulation and they approach issues of diversity academically. Supervisees are naive about their own skills, believing that they are competent to work with minorities based on their effort in Stage One. However, they still have difficulty applying appropriate counseling interventions based on the needs of minority clients. The supervisor's job in the second stage is to provide supervisees
with specific knowledge of different cultural groups in order for supervisees to realize that their ethnocentrism can affect counseling. Again, supervisors supply supervisees with a supportive and structured environment to explore issues of diversity. Supervisors should provide information regarding three areas of multicultural counseling that examine: (1) attitudinal barriers that get in the way of effective counseling, (2) ethnocentric influences of mental health, and (3) worldviews of clients. It is important in this stage for supervisees to have White role models, who can reflect on their own struggles regarding diversity issues in counseling.

Stage Three is a difficult stage that is marked by feelings of responsibility and/or guilt due to supervisees’ ethnocentrism. These feelings can cause “colorblindness,” meaning that supervisees will attempt to deny that any race or cultural differences exist. The supervisor’s task in this stage is to keep exploring multicultural issues and help trainees resolve their conflicted feelings around their ethnocentrism. This is accomplished by supervisees’ reflecting through readings, presentations, and interaction with groups from different cultures.

In the fourth stage, supervisees are characterized as being able to understand the importance of recognizing the worldview of other cultural groups. Supervisees in this stage are able to combine knowledge, attitude, and skill regarding other cultural groups with their own cultural group as well as apply appropriate multicultural interventions that match the clients’ needs. The goal for supervisors in this stage is to help facilitate the development of supervisees’ personal and professional identities. Supervisees are also encouraged to work with multicultural clients who are at their level of experience and are supervised by individuals from a variety of cultural groups.
In the fifth stage, supervisees are characterized as taking action around diversity issues and expanding their own attitudes, skills, and knowledge regarding multicultural issues as well as promoting diversity in society at large. Supervisors are to provide an environment in which they serve as mentor or consultant for multicultural issues both personally and professionally. For example, supervisors can help supervisees locate internships in multicultural settings which have training and supervision regarding diversity issues.

Ignorance or Oversensitivity to Race in Multicultural Supervision

Bernard and Goodyear (1992) reported that White supervisors who lack awareness or sensitivity to diversity issues need to be aware of promoting the “myth of sameness” when working with minority supervisees. The myth of sameness refers to White counselors who are certain that their generic skills can be used with all clients regardless of their cultural background (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Smith, 1981). Bernard and Goodyear also suggested that White counselors also tend to deny differences because they share a professional identity with the majority of counselors whom tend to be from the dominant culture, which can possibly lead to an “us versus them” mentality regarding minority clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). The myth of sameness in supervision can be challenged by having White supervisees and supervisors examine their own ethnicity before examining the culture of others.

Other authors stated that White supervisors who ignore the race of minority supervisees are taking a “color-blind” position in which they interact with supervisees without consideration of the impact on race in their supervisory relationship (McNeil, Hom, & Perez, 1995; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Color-blindness or ignoring the race of supervisees and clients has also been referred to as “hallucinatory whitening”
(Jones, Lightfoot, Palmer, Wilkerson, & Williams, 1970; Remington & DaCosta, 1989). Some White supervisors take a color-blind position because they fear that having discussions around race and racism will uncover underlying racism inside of them (Greene, 1985; Williams & Halgin, 1995).

White supervisors may also be “color-sighted,” which is the opposite of color blindness, where White supervisors are too sensitive and focused on issues of race (McNeil et al., 1995; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Color-sighted supervisors who continuously focus on race neglect other important issues in supervision and counseling. McNeil et al. (1995) stated that White supervisors who are overly culturally sensitive avoid criticizing minority trainees, which can be perceived by the trainees as insulting or patronizing. This might also cause minority supervisees to wonder if they are competent and contribute to negative stereotypes of White supervisors.

Similarities and Differences of Race, Culture, and Worldview Between Supervisors, Supervisees, and Clients

Priest (1994) reported that not only is it important for supervisors and supervisees to individually examine their awareness around diversity, but it is also important to look at diversity issues between the supervisor and supervisee. Other authors have further proposed that cultural differences should also be examined between supervisees and their clients (Peterson, 1991; Priest, 1994). Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) stated that clients, supervisees, and supervisors should examine differences in three areas: (1) from the general population (White Americans), (2) from one’s cultural group, and (3) from each other. These differences can possibly interfere with effective supervision and can cause client anger.
and resistance, counselor defensiveness, counselor over identification, supervisee resistance, poor counselor development, supervisor countertransference, and supervisor patronization. By understanding similarities and differences within the supervisory relationship, supervisors can build on areas of convergence once they have been identified (Tyler et al., 1991). Some authors have suggested that supervisors also need to make supervisees aware of convergence and divergence issues between dyads (i.e., supervisee-client, supervisor-supervisee, client-supervisor) in the triadic supervision relationship (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Gopaul-McNicol & Brice-Baker, 1998).

Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) developed a “worldview congruence model.” This complex model examines areas of convergence and divergence within the triadic members of supervision (supervisor, supervisee, and client). Worldview is referred to as the way people comprehend their relationship to the world (e.g., nature, other people, animals, the universe, institutions, God, objects) (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Sue, 1981). Different cultural groups and individuals experience the world differently, thus making worldview an important factor in the way individuals interact and perceive others in counseling and supervision. The worldview congruence model consists of eight worldview dimensions: (1) psychobehavioral modality, (2) axiology or values, (3) ethos or guiding beliefs, (4) epistemology or how one knows, (5) logic or reasoning process (6) ontology or nature of reality, (7) concept of time, and (8) concept of self (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). The worldview congruence model also consists of five patterns of both conflicts and complements that exist between the three individuals within the supervisory relationship, which are called worldview congruence situations. However, it is not important that every individual within the supervisory relationship
complement each other but rather that supervisors and supervisees recognize worldview problems that can impact supervision and counseling. In order to be able to recognize worldview conflicts in others it is vital for supervisors and supervisees to examine their own worldview first. An example of a worldview incongruence situation within a supervisory triad on the ethos (guiding belief) worldview dimension would be if the supervisor and the client value "interdependence," whereas the supervisee values "independence." Supervisors in this situation might help the supervisee examine ways independence might affect the therapeutic relationship, therapeutic approach, and intervention choices with the client.

Communication Differences in Multicultural Supervision

Supervisors and supervisees express feelings, attitudes, and thoughts by verbal and nonverbal communication in supervision (Williams & Halgin, 1995). The supervision process is dependent upon communication between the supervisor and supervisee and misinterpretation of verbal and nonverbal communication can prevent effective supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Priest (1994) reported that it is important to be aware of communication styles between supervisor and supervisee because different cultures use silence, facial expressions, the use of hands, and tone or pitch of voice in different ways. Kaiser (1997) suggested that one cultural group's style of communication may be appropriate and natural for that group but inappropriate in another cultural group. Fong and Lease (1997) reported that there is a bias toward the "White voice" and a neglect of other cultural voices in multicultural supervision. White style of communication has generally been referred to as loud and rapid speech, quick responding, direct task-oriented focus, and prolonged eye contact (Fong & Lease, 1997; Sue & Sue, 1990). However, it has
been found that some Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans generally have slower and softer speech, less direct eye contact, and approach tasks indirectly. White supervisors who are unaware of these cultural communication differences may make inaccurate conclusions regarding minority supervisees (Fong & Lease, 1997). For example, a minority supervisee might not make eye contact with a White supervisor out of respect for the supervisor. The White supervisor might interpret this lack of eye contact by a supervisee as being afraid or having interpersonal difficulties. Given that verbal communication is essential in the evaluation of supervisees, a lack of understanding of different types of verbal and nonverbal communication can influence a supervisees' training and evaluation/grade (Fong & Lease, 1997).

**Issue of Power in Multicultural Supervision**

The supervisory relationship involves the use of power (Williams & Halgin, 1995). The power in all current models of supervision belongs to supervisors who have the expertise and obligation to evaluate supervisees (Fong, 1994; Fong & Lease, 1997). Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) suggested that different racial and ethnic others are cautious in their approach to one another given race and ethnic relations in the United States. It is most likely that multicultural supervision will involve a White supervisor and a minority supervisee. Williams and Halgin (1995) reported that individuals who have been exploited and deprived of power react sensitively to abuse of power, especially by a White individual. A number of authors have suggested that power dynamics need to be carefully monitored in supervision, specifically issues of internalized racial oppression for minority supervisees (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Landrum & Batts, 1985; Landrum-Brown, 1990). Brown and Landrum-Brown
(1995) defined internalized racial oppression as conscious and unconscious psychological responses displayed by individuals regarding racism. It is characterized by psychosocial reactions to internalized stereotypes and demonstrated through system beating, blaming the system, denial of racial heritage, avoidance and rejection of Whites and majority systems, and lack of understanding of the political and psychosocial significance of race and racism. System beating in multicultural supervision may involve minority supervisees manipulating White supervisors through guilt in order not to participate in certain activities within the supervisory relationship (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Landrum & Batts, 1985; Landrum-Brown, 1990).

Fong and Lease (1997) suggested that White supervisors tend to ignore power dynamics in supervision and view both minority supervisees and minority clients as reluctant when they avoid self-disclosure and self-analysis and resist feedback. The White supervisors' negative perceptions can cause minority supervisees to feel at "fault," which interferes with the quality of supervision and may cause the supervisor to be directive and controlling, further distancing the minority supervisee and client. Williams and Halgin (1995) reported that interactions which are well intended by White supervisors may be misinterpreted by minority supervisees in supervision. Gopaul-McNicol and Brice-Baker (1998) claimed that the power differential in supervision involving White supervisors will inhibit minority supervisees' disclosure of personal material because they often feel it will be used against them.

D'Andrea and Daniels (1997) suggested that many supervisors may have problems with supervisees who are as, or more, knowledgeable regarding multicultural issues because of the power differential. Traditionally, in supervision
there tends to be an implicit understanding that supervisors are more competent and knowledgeable than supervisees. D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) stated that because the multicultural field is young and most supervisors have received little multicultural training, it is likely that minority supervisees are often more competent regarding the cultural component to counseling than their supervisors. Some authors implied that supervisors need to recognize this power differential and form a collaborative relationship with those supervisees who have similar levels of multicultural knowledge and allow supervisees who have more multicultural knowledge to teach them about diversity issues (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Gopaul-McNicol & Brice-Baker, 1998).

**Issues of Trust and Vulnerability in Multicultural Supervision**

Fong and Lease (1997) suggested that White supervisors need to be aware of issues of trust and vulnerability in multicultural supervisory relationship, which are often related to power dynamics and racial oppression. Supervisees’ level of trust in their supervisor is an essential aspect of reducing anxiety regarding supervision. Supervisees must be willing and able to be vulnerable and trusting in supervision in order to receive feedback regarding deficits and discuss personal issues that may affect counseling. Minority supervisees who lack trust and who are working with White supervisors may have a difficult time being vulnerable in the supervisory relationship. Minority supervisees may also be resistant by hiding work with clients or not addressing deeper personal issues. The lack of trust by minorities has been linked to mistreatment by White Americans throughout history (Fong & Lease, 1997; Priest, 1991; Sue & Sue, 1993; Trimble, 1988).
Fong and Lease (1997) reported that another method of exploring trust in the supervisory relationship is to examine literature about the lack of trust between African American clients and White counselors (Nickerson, Helms, & Terrell, 1994; Watkins & Terrell, 1988; Watkins, Terrell, Miller, & Terrell, 1989). This literature found that African American clients who had higher levels of mistrust had lower expectations of therapy and were less apt to seek help. Fong and Lease (1997) extended this literature to suggest that African American supervisees who have high levels of mistrust will have low expectations and will not disclose affective material to White supervisors in supervision.

Racial Supervision Issues and Themes Between African American and White Supervisors, Supervisees, and Clients

Various racial issues and themes between African American and White supervisors, supervisees, and clients have been explored in depth within the supervision literature (Bradshaw, 1982; Chandler & Hunt, 1980; Hunt, 1987; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Bradshaw (1982) examined race in supervision by focusing on four different racial triads in supervision of African American and White psychiatric residents. The first triad focused on the White supervisors, White supervisees, and African American clients. This type of supervisory triad can lead to White supervisors and White supervisees having mutually reinforcing stereotypes regarding African American clients. These stereotypes can contribute to problems associated with diagnostic assessment and early closure of pathology and strengths of African American clients. The White supervisors’ role is especially influential because they serve as a role model for White supervisees. White supervisors and White supervisees need to be careful to not overpathologize the behaviors and attitudes of
African American clients and to realize that some symptoms can be cultural adaptations. White supervisees also need to be aware that some of their countertransference can be brought on by anti-White hostility from African American clients, which can lead the supervisee to give into nontherapeutic client demands (Bernard, 1972; Bradshaw, 1982). Sometimes White supervisors and White supervisees view therapeutic progress as dealing with only racial issues, often at the expense of other important therapeutic issues or, conversely, they ignore race all together taking a color-blind position (Bernard, 1953; Bradshaw, 1982; Fischer, 1971).

The second type of triad entails White supervisors, African American supervisees, and White clients. In the early part of counseling, African American supervisees should address the issue of race with White clients (Bradshaw, 1982; Carter, 1979). By addressing the issue of race early in counseling fosters the therapeutic alliance and exposes how clients deal with difficult issues (Bradshaw, 1982). It is also important to look at whether African American counselors have some resentment towards White clients. Bradshaw suggested that White supervisors might be overcautious due to reaction formation toward African American supervisees, which will undermine the progress of White clients and the learning of African American supervisees. Also, White supervisors who have limited experience with race can be slow in helping African American supervisees understand clients’ reactions to race.

The third triad is White supervisors, African Americans supervisees, and African Americans clients (Bradshaw, 1982). Many of the same issues for the White supervisor in the first triad might reappear in this supervisory relationship, such as belief in myths or stereotypes, lack of understanding of culture, and defensiveness.
Supervisors need to take into account that each African American individual is different and that each is influenced by his or her own culture, own experience, the majority culture, and the African American culture. Williams and Halgin (1995) stated that often supervisors will match African American counselors with African American clients because they naturally assume that they will get along because they are both culturally similar. Hunt (1987) stated that White supervisors working with African American supervisees and African American clients might not challenge African American supervisees because they assume that the supervisees know how African American clients feel. In this triad, African American supervisees may not disagree with White supervisors and may ignore their own and their clients’ race in order to please White supervisors. African American supervisees might also be worried that their clients might present issues or behaviors that will negatively stereotype African Americans (Bradshaw, 1982).

The fourth triad is African American supervisors, White supervisees, and African American clients (Bradshaw, 1982). This combination can bring up real or imagined problems for White supervisees who may feel that they are being judged by African American supervisors as a racist or as ignorant. White supervisees who have these feelings may become passive or even aggressive towards African American supervisors and overcompensate with false kindness to African American clients. African American supervisors’ negative feelings toward White supervisees can also interfere with effective supervision if supervisors do not give White supervisees helpful information.

Chandler and Hunt (1980) examined issues supervisors must address in multicultural supervision regarding three different patterns between White counselors and African American clients. The first pattern, the self-authorized client advocate
(SACA), are White counselors who tend to be overly nice to African American clients in order to help them fight the “majority system.” Counseling sessions with this type of pattern tend to sound like two friends talking rather than a counselor-client therapeutic relationship. African American clients may tend to think that SACA counselors are ill-advised Whites who think they know African American people. Supervisors working with SACA counselors need to provide an environment in supervision where supervisees can: (a) examine why they established counter therapeutic norms, (b) understand their motivation for undermining their role with the client, and (c) explore their racial attitudes regarding minorities and authority and how this may reinforce the clients’ present situation.

The second pattern, the client-controller, involves White counselors taking over sessions by deciding on the content and dominating the conversation. Client-controller counselors hide behind their professional role because they fear losing control and they may distance themselves from clients in order to not look at possible negative attitudes about minorities. Client-controller counselors tend to treat minority clients like children. Supervisors’ responsibility in this pattern is to have counselors explore past experiences with racial and ethnic minorities and examine their fear of losing control. Having supervisees examine these issues decreases the possibility for “blaming the victim” attitudes.

The final pattern, the self-effacing supervisee, describes supervisees who feel that they cannot do anything right and beat themselves up because they are unable to establish relationships with African American clients. Self-effacing supervisees tend to be sensitive and are able to establish therapeutic relationships with most clients. Self-effacing supervisees believe that if they acquire more knowledge regarding African American people they will understand the client and be able to establish a
relationship. These type of supervisees’ hidden motivation tends to be that they need to be liked by all clients. Supervisors should help self-effacing supervisees examine and explore: (a) their need to liked by all clients, (b) their unrealistic expectation that minority clients will trust White supervisees, and (c) the separation of supervisees’ professional roles from personal roles.

Hunt (1980) also identified four other patterns between African American supervisees and African American clients and suggested ways in which supervisors can work with supervisees in these patterns. The first pattern, the saboteur, is the supervisee who does not like White theories of counseling and believes they are not effective for African American clients. Saboteurs present themselves as experts regarding the African American race and tend to be overprotective of African American clients by avoiding therapeutic material and asking highly personal questions. Saboteurs do not want African American clients to be open in session because they are afraid the client will come across as weak and be an embarrassment to the African American race. Supervisors need to help saboteurs work on racial and ethnic identity issues and examine reactions regarding Whites and the overprotection of African American clients.

The second pattern, the moralizer, is generally the supervisee who preaches to clients about fighting the majority system. Moralizers tend to dismiss African American clients’ problems and dominate a counseling session by talking about racial issues in society. Supervisors working with moralizers may lecture to the supervisees during supervision, which parallels the same behavior that supervisees use in session with the client. Supervisors should then process with moralizer supervisees their reactions of what it was like to be preached to in supervision and to help supervisees differentiate between therapy and lecturing. Supervisors also need to help these
supervisees respect the uniqueness of the client as an individual and help supervisees separate the need to overidentify with clients.

With the third pattern, the premature problem solver is the supervisee who is self-righteous and wants to solve everything for African American clients by lessening problems and offering easy solutions. This type of interaction does not allow for the establishment of a relationship with African American clients, thus clients are not involved in the therapy process. The supervisors’ role in this pattern is to help supervisees look at why they want to solve problems right away and make them realize that their behavior can be condescending.

The final pattern, the rescuer, is generally the supervisee who creates a dependent environment for African American clients because the supervisee tends to fear that they will become violent. Rescuers tend to dive into clients’ emotional content in order to relieve some of their personal guilt for making it in the majority society. These types of supervisees tend to make few demands on clients, are available to them at all times, and do inappropriate favors for them. Supervisors should help supervisees set boundaries in the therapeutic relationship and help them focus on client content in the session.

Racial and Ethnic Identity Models in Multicultural Supervision

A number of authors have proposed that understanding racial and ethnic identity development is essential in multicultural supervision (e.g., Cook, 1994; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hunt, 1987; Vasquez & McKinley, 1982). D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) suggested that it is essential to be able to assess both supervisors’ and supervisees’ ethnic and racial identity development in order to understand multicultural supervision. Racial identity has been described as how individuals feel,
think, and behave concerning themselves and within their racial group as well as outside of their racial group (Helms, 1990). Cook (1994) examined racial identity in multicultural supervision using Helms’ (1994) models of racial identity for Whites and people of color and Helms’ (1990) interaction model of racial identity. Cook (1994) suggested that Helms’ (1990) models of racial identity and interaction model (1994), as well as other racial identity models, can be used in providing effective supervision and discussing racial differences in a nonthreatening way in supervision. Helms (1994) suggested that a positive racial identity for Whites and people of color consists of the development of progressive ego statuses. However, an individual can start in any ego status and move back and forth between statuses.

The people of color (oversimplified descriptors—African Americans, Asians/Pacific Islanders, American Indians, Latinos) racial identity model consists of five ego statuses: (1) Conformity, which includes dependence on White society for definition and a negative attitude towards one’s own racial-cultural group; (2) Dissonance, which represents feelings of confusion about the significance and meaning of one’s race or culture; (3) Immersion/Emersion, which entails a rejection of the White culture and immersion into own culture; (4) Internalization, which is a positive commitment to one’s own racial group and the ability to respond objectively to the dominant culture; and (5) Integrative Awareness, which consists of empathy and collaboration with members of other oppressed groups.

The White racial identity model consists of six ego statuses: (1) Contact, which involves ignorance of one’s own racial identity and racial issues generally; (2) Disintegration, which represents beginning consciousness around race related issues; (3) Reintegration, which includes idealization of Whites and White culture and denouncing non-Whites; (4) Pseudo-Independence, which consists of
intellectualization of one’s race and that of others; (5) Immersion/Emersion, which includes redefining Whiteness in a nonracist perspective and helping to educate others from this perspective; and (6) Autonomy, which represents internalization of a nonracist White view and denounces the benefits of racism.

Helms' (1990) interaction model of racial identity describes relationship structures between individuals with different racial identity attitudes. Helms’ interaction model looks at the similarities and differences that can occur when members of a pair represent ego status that are “parallel” or “crossed.” Parallel pairs are individuals from the same or different races who have similar ego statuses, share the same attitudes toward people of color and Whites. Crossed pairs occur when two individuals have opposite ego statuses. Crossed pairs can also be “progressive” and “regressive.” A progressive pair involves an individual with the most power in the relationship having a more advanced racial identity than the other individual. A regressive pair includes an individual with the least amount of power in the relationship having a more advanced racial identity than the individual with more power.

Cook (1994) extended White’s and people of color racial identity combinations to supervisory relationships and compared how they might affect diversity issues in supervision. For example, a parallel pair could be a person of color who is in the Conformity ego status and a White person in a Contact ego status. A crossed pair may consist of a person of color in Immersion-Emersion ego status and a White person in a Reintegration ego status. This crossed pair may exhibit constant racial tension in supervision due to adverse sentiments toward each other. If the person of color is the supervisee and the White person is the supervisor, they may act towards each other in historical roles of “White dominance.” In this scenario, the
supervisor might abuse the position of power, and the supervisee might disrespect or not trust the supervisor. If the pair is progressive, the supervisor can often advance their supervisees' racial identity. However, if the pair is regressive there tends to be no advancement of the supervisees' racial identity, and the supervisor may often suppress the supervisee's attitudes around race (Cook, 1994).

D'Andrea and Daniels (1997) used a similar approach to Cook (1994) regarding racial identity models in supervision. However, to demonstrate their approach, these authors used only three stages of minority identity development model (MID; Atkinson, Morton, & Sue, 1993) and three stages of White racial identity ego stages/statuses (Cook, 1994; Helms, 1995). D'Andrea and Daniels stated that the use of ethnic and racial identity development theories can help supervisors and supervisees gain greater awareness around diversity issues both in counseling and in supervision. The three stages utilized in the MID are: (1) Conformity, (2) Resistance/Immersion, and (3) Synergetic. Individuals in the Conformity stage prefer the norms and values of the majority culture. They have negative attitudes regarding their own ethnic/racial group and other nonmajority individuals. Supervisors and supervisees in this stage would rather work with White clients than with non-White clients because they value Whites to a higher degree. Individuals in the Resistance/Immersion stage tend to have feelings of pride in their racial and ethnic cultural group and distrust toward White Americans. Supervisors and supervisees in this stage tend to prefer working with professional individuals from their own ethnic and racial background or another minority group. White supervisors would have a hard time with issues of trust with individuals in this stage and have to address the issues in supervision. Individuals in the Synergistic stage are at peace with their own cultural/ethnic/racial identity and are active in their community to eliminate oppression.
Supervisors working with supervisees in this stage may learn from them regarding diversity.

The three ego statuses of White racial identity are: (1) Contact, (2) Pseudo-Independence, and (3) Autonomy. Individuals in the Contact status view everybody the same and do not distinguish between races. Supervisors and supervisees in this status tend not to acknowledge culture as a factor in counseling. Individuals in the Pseudo-Independence status have an understanding that psychological development can be influenced by one's culture, race, and ethnicity. However, they may maintain generalized views of minority groups. Supervisors and supervisees in this status comprehend racial and cultural bias in counseling practices, but do not understand how to adapt these approaches to the worldviews of their clients (Cook, 1994). Individuals in the Autonomy status understand how race and culture affect their development. Supervisors and supervisees in this status are able to adapt and apply approaches to counseling in order to meet the specific needs of their minority clients.

D'Andrea and Daniels (1997) examined the interaction between supervisors and supervisees from White racial identity stages/statuses and the minority identity development model. For example, a person of color supervisee operating from Conformity stage will enjoy working with a White supervisor who is in the Contact status, because these types of supervisors tend to ignore racial issues in supervision. However, if a White supervisor in the Autonomy status works with this same supervisee, the supervisee would probably become frustrated in supervision because the supervisor would bring up culturally relevant issues in supervision.

D'Andrea and Daniels (1997) also explored supervisors and supervisees within the White racial identity statuses. For example, White supervisors in the Contact status may have a hard time working with White supervisees in the
Autonomy status because of their interest in cultural issues in counseling. However, a
White supervisee in the Pseudo-Independence status would work well around
diversity issues with a supervisor in the Autonomy stage because they are more
interested and aware of multicultural issues.

of their supervision model to the development of minority supervisees ethnic identity
in multicultural supervision. In Stage One, minority supervisees can display three
different patterns based on their ethnic identification: (1) Traditional, (2) Assimilated,
and (3) Bicultural. Traditional supervisees come from a conventional cultural
background and may not have much experience with majority culture. Supervisees
classified as Traditional tend to want to fit into the professional culture of
psychology, but may experience anxiety and a lack of confidence because they are
racially different. Assimilated supervisees have a primary identification with the
majority culture rather than their own. Assimilated individuals will have a easier time
working with majority clients than with minority clients, as they often deny their own
ethnicity because of negative stereotypes of the majority culture. Bicultural
supervisees have a positive bicultural identity and have addressed issues regarding
their ethnicity and the majority culture.

The job of supervisors in Stage One is to provide an environment of growth
and support for supervisees to help with their ethnic identification. Having a
supportive environment is crucial for a minority supervisee no matter what stage of
development they are in their identification. The transition from Stage One to Stage
Two involves supervisors being more confrontive or coaching of supervisees which
can include raising awareness, pointing out discrepancies, and probing. Stage Two is
marked by the awareness and struggle of differences between the minority and
majority culture, including the culture of psychology. Because of the awareness of
differences, minority supervisees may have problems with other related issues, such
as discrimination. Often feelings of anger and confusion arise in this stage and it is
usually directed at individuals in the majority culture. Supervisors’ role in Stage Two
is to help supervisees with their anger and validate their experiences as well as help
them move into Stage Three. Stage Three is defined as integration, which combines
the supervisees’ ethnicity and parts of their identity into a bicultural or multicultural
identity. In Stage Three, supervisees are less judgmental of majority individuals, feel
more comfortable in their own culture and majority culture, and can recognize
positive as well as negative parts of both cultures.

Critical Integration of Theoretical Literature

This section will summarize and point out limitations in the theoretical
literature on multicultural supervision applicable for White supervisors. The review of
the sparse theoretical literature on multicultural supervision applicable for White
supervisors clearly acknowledges that within multicultural supervision there are
cultural differences between the members of the triadic supervisory relationship
(supervisor, supervisee, and client). The review also plainly demonstrated the
importance of supervisors, especially White supervisors, to understand cultural
differences within the supervisory relationship when conducting multicultural
supervision.

The majority of the theoretical literature on multicultural supervision focused
on supervisors’ and supervisees’ level of awareness concerning issues of race and
culture. White supervisors who lack awareness of their own racial identity and White
privilege may practice unintentional racism in supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997).
White supervisors who are able to assess their own racial identity and their supervisees' racial identity tend to have a better understanding of multicultural supervision interactions concerning race (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997). Some authors have suggested that White supervisors who deny racial differences can take on a color-blind position, which ignores the impact of race on supervisees (McNeil et al., 1995; Williams & Halgin, 1995). On the other hand, White supervisors who focus too much on race, color-sightedness, can neglect other important supervision issues (Williams & Halgin, 1995). In addition, White supervisors working with minority supervisees need to be aware of the possibility of assuming they have similar life experiences as their supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992).

A number of authors stated that when providing multicultural supervision, supervisors must address diversity issues early and help supervisees explore their own background and attitudes around race and culture (Carroll, 1996; Fong & Lease, 1997; Morgan, 1984). Supervisors also may need to investigate collaboratively with supervisees their similarities and differences regarding race, ethnicity, and culture (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Peterson, 1991; Priest, 1994). To gain awareness around diversity issues, it has been recommended that supervisors allow minority supervisees, who are multiculturally advanced, to educate them around issues of race and culture (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Gopaul-McNicol & Brice-Baker, 1998). If White supervisors resist taking responsibility for enhancing awareness concerning diversity issues, there can be serious consequences regarding the supervisory relationship, supervisees' clinical development, and clients' well being.

Much of the theoretical literature that focused on the development of supervisors' and supervisees' multicultural awareness tended to be general in nature and lacked specific information regarding White supervisors' practices. The
generality of the theoretical literature raised a number of questions concerning White supervisors multicultural supervision practices, such as: What multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors are effective in helping supervisees develop multicultural awareness? Are any of the supervision practices by White supervisors not effective in helping supervisees gain multicultural awareness? Although a majority of the theoretical literature highlighted the importance of gaining awareness concerning multicultural issues, this literature failed to address what type of multicultural knowledge and skills are important for White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices. How do White supervisors develop multicultural knowledge and skills concerning multicultural supervision? Carney and Kahn (1984) addressed the issue of developing supervisees’ multicultural competencies of awareness, knowledge, and skills in multicultural supervision, but these authors did not go into much depth or provide specific information. What multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors are effective in facilitating multicultural knowledge and skills in supervisees? What multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors are not effective in facilitating multicultural knowledge and skills for supervisees? Furthermore, D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) suggested that many White supervisors are not as culturally competent as minority supervisees. Are the majority of White supervisors aware of their own diversity issues? Do White supervisors bring up diversity issues in multicultural supervision?

A large amount of the theoretical literature on multicultural supervision examined racial supervision patterns between White and African American supervisors, supervisees, and clients (Bradshaw, 1982; Chandler & Hunt, 1980; Hunt, 1987; Williams & Halgin, 1995). For example, White supervisors working with White supervisees who have African American clients need to be careful of not
having multicultural reinforcing stereotypes of African American clients. White supervisors within this racial supervisory pattern, also need to be conscious of focusing too much on race and not to over pathologize African American clients' behaviors and attitudes. White supervisors working with African American supervisees and White clients need to be aware of being overcautious with African American supervisees, as this can lead to not addressing important supervisory issues that can affect both the supervisees and clients' development. White supervisors in this supervisory pattern, who have limited experience with race, may also have difficulty addressing issues of culture and ethnicity with African American supervisees (Bradshaw, 1982). The theoretical literature on multicultural supervision concerning different racial supervision patterns between Whites and African Americans is more specific than the theoretical literature focusing on developing multicultural supervision awareness. However, are these specific supervision patterns applicable for White supervisors working with other cultural groups? Are there similar racial supervisory patterns among other cultural groups? What supervision practices by White supervisors are effective when working with different racial supervision patterns concerning African American and White supervisees and clients? What supervision practices by White supervisors are not effective regarding different racial supervision patterns with African American and White supervisees and clients?

A number of authors within the theoretical literature indicated that White supervisors have a responsibility to understand different ethnic and racial groups' styles of verbal and nonverbal communication in multicultural supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Multicultural supervision tends to be biased toward a White style of communication to the neglect of other cultural communication styles (Fong & Lease, 1997). White supervisors need to be aware of
their style of verbal and nonverbal communication as well as how they interpret ethnic and racial supervisees' emotions, nonverbals, jargon, terminology, and concepts in multicultural supervision. White supervisors who are unaware of other cultural verbal and nonverbal communication styles may make inaccurate conclusions regarding their minority supervisees (Fong & Lease, 1997). The multicultural supervision theoretical literature regarding communication issues is similar to the theoretical literature regarding development of multicultural awareness in that it tended to be general in nature and lacked specific information regarding White supervisors' practices. This general theoretical literature also raised a number of questions regarding White supervisors' multicultural supervision practices, such as: What are some ways White supervisors can educate themselves regarding different cultural communication styles in multicultural supervision? What supervision practices by White supervisors are effective in educating or addressing cultural communication styles in multicultural supervision? What supervision practices by White supervisors are not effective in educating or addressing cultural communication styles in multicultural supervision?

Many authors within the theoretical literature also indicated that power is an important issue for White supervisors when conducting multicultural supervision (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Fong & Lease, 1997; Gopaul-McNicol & Brice-Baker, 1998; Williams & Halgin, 1995). Inherent in supervision is a power structure that assigns power to supervisors. Minority individuals who have been exploited and deprived of power may react sensitively to abuse of power, especially by a White individual (Williams & Halgin, 1995). Minority supervisees may also be cautious in their approach to White supervisors given the historical race and ethnic relations in the United States are connected to power differences and racial minority oppression.
White supervisors who view minority supervisees as reluctant if they avoid self-disclosure and resist feedback may be ignoring the impact of power dynamics in supervision. Furthermore, White supervisors need to understand that power and racial oppression are linked with minority supervisees’ issues of trust and vulnerability in multicultural supervision (Fong & Lease, 1997). Power is an important issue for White supervisors to be aware of when conducting multicultural supervision with minority supervisees from the United States. However, are the same issues of power for White supervisors in multicultural supervision applicable to minority supervisees from countries other than the United States? What supervision practices by White supervisors are more effective in dealing with the issue of power in multicultural supervision? What multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors concerning power are not effective?

The present review also indicated that developmental models/approaches seem to have had a significant impact on current supervision practices as well as on multicultural supervision practices. Various models of racial identity, supervisor and supervisee awareness regarding diversity issues, and multicultural competencies all used a developmental approach (e.g., Carney & Kahn, 1984; Cook, 1994; Priest, 1994). An important area that the theoretical literature failed to address is that all supervision models are influenced by Western society values or majority values and thus have inherent limitations. If supervision models, including multicultural supervision models, are based on majority or White values, how effective are these models in terms of working with minority supervisees and clients? Is the overarching developmental framework from which White supervisors conduct multicultural supervision...
supervision flawed? Are traditional supervision and multicultural supervision models effective or not effective when being used in multicultural supervision?

In sum, it is obvious that cultural differences exist in multicultural supervision and that White supervisors need to understand cultural differences when practicing multicultural supervision. The review of the sparse theoretical literature applicable for White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision seems to be based on the supervisors’ level of openness and awareness concerning issues of diversity, racial supervision patterns between Whites and African Americans, communication, and power. However, there is little empirical evidence to support whether these multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors are effective. In order to establish what are effective and not effective practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, empirical research needs to be conducted on the current theoretical foundations of multicultural supervision reviewed in this chapter. The next section reviews the empirical research concerning multicultural supervision.

Empirical Research on Multicultural Supervision

Leong and Wagner (1994) reviewed the multicultural supervision literature and were able to identify only three empirical articles on the subject (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton et al., 1995; Vander Kolk, 1974). Since Leong and Wagner’s review, an additional four empirical articles that addressed multicultural supervision have been published (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997; Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997). However, none of the seven empirical articles specifically examined White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

This section examines the limited empirical research on multicultural supervision and is separated into four subsections. The four subsections are: (1) racial
identity in multicultural supervision, (2) relationship variables in multicultural supervision, (3) qualitative research on critical incidents and supervisory relationships in multicultural supervision, and (4) a critical integration by the present author of the seven empirical articles regarding multicultural supervision.

Racial Identity in Multicultural Supervision

This subsection examined two empirical studies that focused on racial identity in multicultural supervision (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. 1997; Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997). The first empirical study by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) investigated the perceptions of supervisees’ racial identity and their supervisors’ racial identity, and how these perceptions were related to the supervisory working alliance and the supervisees’ development of multicultural competence. The study also examined the influence of racial matching on the development of supervisees’ multicultural competence and the supervisory alliance.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) used Helms’ (1990) people of color and White racial identity model as well as Helms’ (1990) interaction model in their study (Helms’ racial identity and interaction models are outlined in the theoretical literature section of this chapter). Helms (1990) argued that the interaction between individuals who have different racial identity development and social power would demonstrate predictable relationship outcomes. Furthermore, Helms suggested that racial identity development occurs in two phases. Phase I involves lower levels of racial identity development and consists of cognitively less complex strategies, such as conformity and disintegration statuses for persons of color, and contact, disintegration, and reintegration statuses for White individuals. Phase II involves higher levels of racial identity development and consists of cognitively more complex strategies, such as
Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) identified four types of racial identity interactions that can be present in supervisory dyads (Cook, 1994; Helms, 1990). The first type of racial identity interaction is the regressive relationship in which the supervisee is at a more advanced racial identity status than the supervisor (i.e., supervisee–Phase II and supervisor–Phase I). The second type of racial interaction is progressive relationship in which the supervisor is at a higher racial identity status than the supervisee (i.e., supervisee–Phase I and supervisor–Phase II). The third type of racial identity interaction, parallel interaction, includes a supervisee and a supervisor who possess similar racial identity statuses. For the purpose of the study, the authors categorized two types of parallel interactions, parallel-low and parallel-high. Parallel-low interactions occur when the supervisee and supervisor have similar racial worldviews and have lower racial identity development statuses (i.e., supervisee–Phase I and supervisor–Phase I). Parallel-high interactions involved the supervisor and supervisee sharing similar racial worldviews and have higher racial identity development statuses (i.e., supervisee–Phase II and supervisor–Phase II). The researchers believed that the racial identity dynamics would predict aspects of supervision process and outcome, specifically the working alliance and the supervisor's influence on the supervisee's multicultural competence. The supervisory working alliance consists of an emotional bond between the supervisor and supervisee and an agreement regarding the tasks and goals of supervision (Bordin, 1983; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997). Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) predicted that the strongest supervisory working alliance would occur between the supervisor and supervisee who shared similar worldviews and racial identities. The
authors thought that parallel-high and parallel-low relationships would demonstrate the strongest supervisory working alliance, progressive interactions would have the next strongest supervisory working alliance, followed by regressive interactions.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) also predicted that during supervision racial identity interaction would relate to the supervisors’ influence on supervisees’ multicultural competence. Multicultural competence has been defined as whether supervisees have the knowledge, skill, and awareness to work with clients from diverse racial and cultural backgrounds (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992). The authors hypothesized that different racial identity interactions would predict different levels of multicultural competency. The authors anticipated that progressive interactions would develop the most multicultural competence, followed by parallel-high, parallel-low, and regressive interactions. The authors also expected that matching of supervisory relationship by race would also relate to the supervisors’ influence on supervisees’ multicultural competence. Specifically, the authors hypothesized that supervisors of color would facilitate greater multicultural competence than White supervisors paired with supervisees who were White or persons of color. Supervisees who have a relationship with a supervisors of color will gain a multicultural and diverse experience by just being in a relationship with supervisors of color (Gardner, 1980; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997).

Participants in Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al.’s (1997) study consisted of 105 counseling trainees (81 women, 23 men, and 1 unspecified) with an average age of 30. The racial breakdown of participants was 70% White, 10% African American, 5% Asian, 11% Latino, 1% Native American, 1% Pacific Islander, and 1% Latino/Indian. The vast majority of respondents were in counseling psychology or counselor...
education (71%), followed by clinical psychology (17%), or school counseling (9%) programs. The respondents were being supervised in college counseling centers (38%), schools (27%), and community mental health centers (22%). Participants were doctoral (43%) or master’s (49%) students and were in individual supervision with 57% female and 43% male supervisors. The supervisors’ racial breakdown in the study was 76% White, 20% African American, 2% Latino, 1% Asian, and 1% Middle Eastern.

Participants in the study filled out five instruments and a demographic questionnaire. The five instruments used in the study were: (1) the Cultural Identity Attitude Scale (CIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990a) which assessed the racial identity of supervisees of color; (2) the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990b) which measured White supervisees’ racial identity; (3) the Perceptions of Supervisor Racial Identity (PSRI), which was created for the study to measure supervisees’ perception of their supervisors’ racial identity; (4) the Working Alliance Inventory—Trainee (WAI-T; Bahrick, 1990), which assessed the supervisee’s perception of the supervisory working alliance; and (5) the Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory—Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991), which measured the supervisee’s ability to work with clients from other races and cultures.

The results concerning working alliance revealed that when supervisors had higher levels of racial identity attitude or the same level of racial identity attitude as supervisees, a strong supervisory working alliance occurred. It was also found that parallel high relationships between supervisees and supervisors reported the strongest working alliance in terms of agreement between goals and tasks of supervision as well as the strongest emotional bond. The next strongest working alliance was progressive interactions, which contradicted the original hypothesis. The authors
suggested that the reason that progressive interactions showed a strong working alliance was due to supervisors with higher racial consciousness who could empathize with supervisees with lower racial conscious and who were more sensitive to the supervisee's racial identity status. The authors stated that parallel-low interaction may lead to a low working alliance, because both the supervisor and supervisee have a general lack of racial awareness which could limit the development of a working alliance. A regressive relationship, as predicted, showed the weakest supervisory working alliance. The authors suggested that this may be due to the discrepancy between the supervisor and supervisee giving priority to racial issues which can affect the supervisory working alliance. For example, supervisees in a regressive interaction may want to bring up racial issues, but supervisors may disregard these issues which may cause discomfort in the supervisory relationship, thus affecting the working alliance.

The results regarding multicultural competence also demonstrated that supervisees rate supervisors' influence as most effective with parallel-high and progressive racial identity interactions. However, contrary to the hypothesis, progressive interactions were not more influential than parallel-high interactions concerning multicultural competence. This suggested that supervisors do not need to have a more advanced racial identity than supervisees to promote multicultural competence. These findings also suggested that supervisees are able to develop multicultural competence if given the chance, and that supervisors play a significant role in supervisees' multicultural development. As predicted, parallel-low and regressive interactions were less influential regarding supervisee multicultural development. The authors speculated that in parallel-low and regressive interactions,
supervisors and supervisees were not invested in diversity issues because of their own lower racial consciousness.

The results also revealed that racial matching did not significantly predict working alliance. However, racial matching did significantly correlate with supervisee’s perception of the supervisor’s influence regarding multicultural competence. Supervisors of color had more of a perceived impact on the development of multicultural competence of Whites and people of color supervisees than did White supervisors. The authors believed that supervisees’ interaction with supervisors of color is a multicultural experience especially for White supervisees.

The second empirical study by Ladany, Inman, et al. (1997) examined supervisee’s multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competencies as functions of supervisees’ racial identity as well as supervisors’ instructions to focus on multicultural issues. An important aspect of multicultural competence is a supervisee’s ability to conceptualize clients’ issues from a multicultural perspective. Multiculturally competent supervisees are able to conceptualize clients from a multicultural framework and are able to understand racial and cultural factors that affect the client’s presenting problem(s) as well as to provide appropriate treatment for the problem.

Ladany, Inman, et al. (1997) hypothesized using Helms’ (1990) interaction model of racial identity (outlined in the previous article in this section) that White and persons of color supervisees who reported higher levels of Phase I and Phase II racial identity statuses would also have positively self-reported multicultural competence. Furthermore, the authors predicted that supervisees who had higher levels of Phase II racial identity statuses would have greater multicultural case conceptualization ability than higher level Phase I racial identity statuses supervisees. The authors further
hypothesized that self-reported multicultural competencies related to multicultural case conceptualization ability. Finally, the authors predicted that the supervisor's instruction to focus on multicultural issues would increase the probability that supervisees would address multicultural factors when conceptualizing cases.

Participants in this study consisted of 116 trainees, in which 45% were doctoral and 55% were master's level students. The sample included 84 men and 30 women (2 did not specify gender) and ranged in ages from 21 to 58 years (mean = 30.67). The racial breakdown for participants was 75 (65%) White, 20 (17%) African American, 11 (10%) Asian American, 8 (7%) Latino, 1 (1%) Native American, and 1 (1%) biracial. Participants were being trained in counseling psychology (77%), social work (11%), clinical psychology (4%), and school psychology (3%). Participants reported that 72% had taken at least one multicultural course.

Participants in the study filled out four questionnaires: (1) the Cultural Identity Attitude Scale (CIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990a), which measures racial identity for people of color; (2) White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990b), which assesses racial identity for White people; (3) Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory—Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise et al., 1991), which measures supervisees' abilities to work with clients from different cultures; and (4) the Multicultural Case Conceptualization Ability, which was created for the study.

Participants in the study were mailed a package consisting of the four questionnaires. Participants were asked to imagine that they were a therapist and that they were given an intake on a client. They were instructed to write the origins of the problem and an effective treatment strategy for the client. The intake scenario consisted of 19-year-old African American female undergraduate student attending a predominantly White University who had recently broken up with her boyfriend and
who reported depressive symptoms and psychosocial tendencies. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions. In the first condition, the participants were instructed by their supervisor to include issues dealing with race in their case conceptualization. In the second condition, the participants were not given instructions to examine racial issues regarding case conceptualization.

The results of the study revealed that racial identity status for Whites was related to self-reported multicultural competence. Specifically, it was found that racial identity status consisting of higher ratings of pseudoindipendence was significantly related to higher self-reported multicultural competence. Consequently, White supervisees who have a high Phase II pseudoindipendence status are more apt to report higher levels of multicultural competence. However, no other White racial identity status was related to self-reported multicultural competence. The results also found racial identity statuses for persons of color were related to self-reported multicultural competence. Specifically, high levels of dissonance and awareness statuses were related to self-reported multicultural competence. The finding for dissonance suggests that a Phase I racial identity status can even predict self-reported multicultural competence. The finding also suggested that supervisees of color seem to have more of a direct relation between racial identity and self-reported multicultural competence than White supervisees. The results did not find a relationship between racial identity statuses and multicultural case conceptualization ability. It was also found that self-reported multicultural competence was not related to multicultural case conceptualization ability. However, it was revealed that supervisees from all races were more likely to conceptualize treatment strategies from multicultural perspective when instructed.
Relationship Variables in Multicultural Supervision

This subsection examines three empirical studies that focused on relationship variables in multicultural supervision (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton et al., 1995; VanderKolk, 1974). The most recent study by Hilton, et al. (1995) examined counselors' perceptions of supervision based on the supervisors’ race and level of support. The participants (student counselors) in the study consisted of 60 White undergraduate females from an advanced undergraduate psychology course. The participants had a mean age of 24 years, 80% were juniors and seniors, and 78% were psychology majors. The participants were supervised by six supervisors (three African Americans and three Whites). Each supervisor supervised four counselors in the low support condition and four counselors in the high support condition. High support supervision behaviors included: (a) head nodding; (b) smiling; (c) minimal encourages; (d) use of counselor name; (e) warm, encouraging, and approving voice; and (f) use of hand gestures. Low support supervision behaviors consisted of the absence of high support behaviors.

The counselors were measured on four dependent measures. The first dependent measure was the Anxiety Differential (AD; Husek & Alexander, 1963), which assessed the state anxiety of the counselors. The second dependent measure was the Counselor Rating Form–Short Form (CRF-S; Barak & La Crosse, 1983), which examined the effects of supervisor support and race regarding counselor performance. The third dependent measure was the Supervisory Evaluation Form–Counselor and Supervisor Forms (SEF-C, SEF-S; Marikis, Russell, & Dell, 1985), which assessed supervisee and supervisor perceptions regarding the supervision.
session. The final dependent measure was the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI; Barrett-Lennard, 1964) which assessed the supervisory relationship.

Counselors were assigned randomly to five experimental role-play counseling conditions: (1) African American supervisor—low support, (2) African American supervisor—high support, (3) White supervisor—low support, (4) White supervisor—high support, and (5) no supervision. Each counselor participated in two 20 minute counseling sessions with a client (clients used in the role-play counseling sessions were three undergraduate White females). Before each counseling session counselors were given the AD to measure their state anxiety. Supervisors observed the counseling sessions through a video monitor and rated the counselors using the CRF-S. However, counselors assigned to the no-supervision control group were not observed or evaluated by the supervisor but were rated by the client using the CRF-S after the first counseling session.

Counselors in the supervision experimental conditions met with their supervisors after their first counseling session for a 20-minute supervisory session. Following the supervisory session, the supervisor and counselor filled out the SEF-C or SEF-S and the BLRI. Supervisees in the no-supervision control condition were instructed to stay in a waiting area for 25 minutes before the second counseling session. All of the counselors were rated on the CRF-S by their clients after the second counseling session.

The findings showed that race did not impact the rating of supervision interactions. However, support did have significant effect on counselors’ evaluation of supervision. Counselors in the high-support condition evaluated their supervision as more effective, and they found their supervisory relationship positive. Although the findings indicated that counselors who received high support rated supervision
more favorably, support was not correlated with lower anxiety or better performance in supervision.

The second study by Vander Kolk (1974) examined the relationship among personality, values, and race of graduate students in anticipation of the supervisory relationship. Over a 3-year period, 50 students (41 Whites and 9 African Americans) who began graduate rehabilitation counseling program filled out the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (1959). The questionnaire was constructed to allow students to anticipate their supervisory relationship. Scores on the questionnaire were collected on four dimensions: (1) empathetic understanding, (2) level of regard, (3) unconditional regard, and (4) congruence. Students also completed the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the Study of Values.

The results of the study revealed that students who anticipated their supervisors to be more empathic, respectful, and congruent were no different on personality and value variables than students who anticipated lower levels of facilitation. However, a comparison between African American and White students’ scores showed that African Americans had significantly lower perceptions of supervisors on all dimensions except for the unconditional regard dimension. Vander Kolk (1974) suggested that these scores demonstrated that African Americans anticipated their supervisors to be less empathic, respectful, and congruent. This finding was not surprising according to Vander Kolk, given that many African American students have an expectation of not being accepted by supervisors given that counseling programs are White dominated.

The third study by Cook and Helms (1988) examined perceptions of Asian, African American, Hispanic, and Native American (counseling and clinical) supervisees’ satisfaction with multicultural supervision as predicted by relationship
characteristics. The majority of the supervisors (88.9%) in the study were White. Participants \( (n = 225) \) completed the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI; Barrett-Lennard, 1978), Worthington and Roelke's (1979) measure of satisfaction, and a personal data sheet. The BLRI was factor analyzed to determine relationship dimensions that described the supervisees' experience in supervision. These same relationship dimensions were used in predicting supervisees' satisfaction with multicultural supervision. The five dimensions were: (1) supervisors' liking, (2) emotional discomfort, (3) conditional interest, (4) conditional liking, and (5) unconditional liking.

The results revealed that the relationship dimensions of supervisors' liking and conditional liking of supervisees were useful in predicting satisfaction with supervision. The study also demonstrated that supervisees' perceptions of their supervision relationship differed in terms of race. It was found that African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans felt significantly lower levels of liking from their supervisors than did Asians. The highest level of perceived discomfort was reported by Native Americans. Based on the results, the authors concluded that racial/ethnic groups that are the most "visible" have a more difficult time in multicultural supervision. The authors also suggested that multicultural supervisors need to be aware of the cultural background and the sociopolitical history of their supervisees. Having more information about different ethnic or racial backgrounds can allow supervisors a better understanding of how to communicate liking and caring to supervisees from different cultures.
Qualitative Research on Critical Incidents and Supervisory Relationships in Multicultural Supervision

This subsection examines two empirical studies that investigated critical incidents and the supervisory relationship in multicultural supervision (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994). The first study by Fukuyama (1994) examined "critical incidents" in multicultural supervision. Critical incidents in supervision occur when there is an incident that causes changes in supervisees' understanding of their effectiveness as therapists (Fukuyama, 1994; Heppner & Roehlke, 1984). Eighteen racial/ethnic minority persons who completed their predoctoral internship at American Psychological Association (APA) accredited internship sites were mailed surveys regarding critical incidents. Out of the 18 surveys mailed out, 10 were completed (6 women and 4 men). The racial breakdown of interns consisted of Asian Americans, African Americans, Latin and Caribbean Islanders, and International persons. The race of supervisors was not reported. Participants were asked to describe a positive critical incident, a negative critical incident, organizational or environmental factors that contributed positively or negatively to their professional development, and suggestions for making supervision multiculturally sensitive and effective.

Fukuyama (1994) was able to identify three general themes from participants responses concerning positive critical incidents: (1) openness and support, (2) culturally relevant supervision, and (3) opportunities to engage in multicultural activities. Participants in the study described experiencing openness and support as not being personally stereotyped by their supervisor, supervisors trusting them to work on difficult therapy cases involving cultural issues, and general support and encouragement in their work with clients who were different culturally. Culturally
relevant supervision was described by participants as being matched with a supervisor based on ethnic background, supporting work on cultural issues, and helping bring to awareness cultural values and their effects on the therapeutic relationship with clients. Examples of opportunities to work in multicultural activities were described by participants as presentations in multicultural counseling course, working at an ethnic student walk-in clinic, and group supervision on diversity issues.

All 10 participants in the study responded to the positive critical incidents, but only 4 responded to negative critical incidents. Negative critical incidents reported by participants fit into two general themes: (1) the supervisor's lack of cultural awareness, and (2) questioning the supervisor's abilities. Participants described supervisor's lack of cultural awareness as being unaware of cultural norms, the use of slang, and not understanding cultural pride. The second general theme, questioning the supervisors's abilities, was described by participants as casting doubt on an intervention used with racial/ethnic minority clients.

Participants described positive organizational or environmental factors that contributed to their professional development as providing support to be themselves and having supervisees from the same ethnic background to validate concerns. Participants described negative organizational or environmental factors that contributed to their professional development as social isolation and a lack of mentoring during internship.

The participants in the study offered seven suggestions for making individual supervision more multicultural sensitive and effective: (1) have supervisors initiate discussions of multicultural issues, (2) provide supervisors with more opportunities for multicultural training and have them be more aware and accepting of multicultural differences, (3) offer more diverse supervisors, (4) have opportunities to work with
culturally different individuals, (5) avoid being too multiculturally focused, (6) use a "prejudice reduction" model with clients to help them in working on others’ racism or prejudice as well as use a systems approach when dealing with issues related to racism and prejudice, and (7) explore multicultural issues with the training director in intern seminar.

The second study by Constantine (1997) examined the supervisory relationship concerning multicultural issues between 30 predoctoral interns and their individual supervisors on internship. Participants in the study were sent a questionnaire that included a demographic section and a number of open-ended questions. Interns or supervisees in the study consisted of 12 males and 17 females. The racial breakdown of supervisees was: 21 White, 2 Asian American, 1 Hispanic, 1 Native American, and 5 Other/Biracial. The mean age for supervisees was 34 years, and they had an average of 6 years of counseling experience. Supervisors in the study consisted of 10 males and 18 females. The racial breakdown for supervisors was: 27 White, 2 African American, and 1 Hispanic. The mean age for supervisors was 47 years, and they had an average of 16 years of counseling experience. Nine supervisees (30%) and 21 supervisors (70%) had never taken a multicultural counseling course; 11 supervisees (36.7%) and 4 supervisors (13.3%) had taken a multicultural course; and 10 supervisees (33.3%) and 5 supervisors (16.7%) had taken two or more multicultural counseling courses. Supervisees reported spending about 14% of their time in supervision discussing multicultural issues, and supervisors reported spending about 15% of their time in supervision discussing multicultural issues.

Supervisors and supervisees were asked to respond to two open-ended questions pertaining to their supervisory relationship. Supervisors were asked how
their supervisory relationship could be improved in general. Supervisors reported: more time with supervisees \( n = 5 \), more self-disclosure on the part of supervisees \( n = 4 \), more processing of the supervision relationship \( n = 4 \), relationship is fine and needs no improvement \( n = 4 \), more audio and video examples from supervisees \( n = 3 \), more grounding of supervisees in psychodynamic theory \( n = 3 \), matching of supervisors and supervisees by theoretical orientation, and less time on administrative issues \( n = 2 \). Supervisees were asked to respond to the same question. Supervisees reported: more time with supervisors \( n = 6 \), more feedback from supervisors \( n = 6 \), more processing of the supervision relationship \( n = 5 \), match supervisors and supervisees by theoretical orientation \( n = 3 \), relationship is fine and needs no improvement, more acceptance of supervisees abilities \( n = 2 \), less time talking about personal issues \( n = 2 \), and increased level of accountability by supervisees.

The second open-ended question asked how the supervision relationship could have been enhanced regarding multicultural issues. Supervisors stated: more ethnic minority clients for supervisees \( n = 6 \), process supervisors’ and supervisees’ racial differences \( n = 4 \), do not care about multicultural issues \( n = 4 \), supervisees to bring up multicultural issues more \( n = 3 \), explore supervisees’ ethnic background \( n = 3 \), more knowledge of multicultural issues \( n = 2 \), never thought about multicultural issues before \( n = 2 \), and relationship is fine—no need for improvement \( n = 2 \). The same question was asked of the supervisees who provided the following responses: supervisors tended to be reluctant to bring up and process multicultural issues \( n = 12 \), processing more of supervisors and supervisees cultural differences \( n = 4 \), have more discussions around racial/ethnic minority perspectives \( n = 4 \), more ethnic minority clients \( n = 3 \), have supervisors who are from different races
Constantine (1997) concluded that the study revealed a number of important issues regarding multicultural supervision relationships. Constantine also believed that the results indicated that 70% of the supervisees had taken a multicultural counseling course, whereas 70% of the supervisors had not taken a multicultural counseling course. According to Constantine, the lack of training by supervisors concerning diversity issues can possibly cause serious harm to supervisees and clients within multicultural supervision. Furthermore, the author concluded that a number of supervisors in the study also indicated that multicultural issues were not important or that they had not given much thought to diversity issues. Finally, Constantine believed that the results raised some serious concerns and questions regarding how to educate and work with supervisors who do not have an interest or are unwilling to take into account multicultural aspects of their supervisees, their clients, and their own lives.

Critical Integration of Empirical Literature

This section will summarize and examine limitations in the empirical literature on multicultural supervision. The review of the empirical literature on multicultural supervision was divided into three sections: (1) racial identity in multicultural supervision (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997; Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997); (2) impact of race on the supervisory relationship (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton et al, 1995; Vander Kolk, 1974); and (3) qualitative research on critical incidents and supervisory relationships in multicultural supervision (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994).
The empirical literature on racial identity in multicultural supervision provided important information regarding supervisees' perception of their development of multicultural competence and supervisory working alliance. For example, supervisees who perceived their supervisors' level of racial identity at the same level or higher than their own rated the supervisory working alliance as strong. In addition, supervisees' multicultural competence tended to be enhanced in supervision when they perceived their supervisors having the same or higher levels of racial identity than themselves. Supervisors of color, compared to White supervisors, were also found to have a greater influence on supervisees' development of multicultural competencies regardless of supervisees' race (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997). Furthermore, supervisees who received instruction from their supervisors to focus on race in sessions more frequently conceptualized their clients from a multicultural perspective than supervisees who were not instructed to focus on race (Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997).

Although these two studies (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997; Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997) provided important information regarding the influence of supervisors' and supervisees' racial identity in supervision, they also raised questions regarding the influence of White supervisors' racial identity in multicultural supervision. For example, why do White supervisors have less of an influence on supervisees' development of multicultural competence compared to supervisors of color? What practices by White supervisors facilitate the development of supervisees' multicultural competence? What practices by White supervisors facilitate the development of a strong supervisory working alliance? What practices by White supervisors do not facilitate the development of supervisees' multicultural competencies in multicultural supervision and a strong supervisory working alliance?
The review of the empirical studies that examined the impact of race variables, other than racial identity, on the supervisory relationship revealed that supervisees’ race has an impact on supervisees’ perception of the supervisory relationship. Hilton et al.’s (1995) results showed that White supervisees’ perceptions of the supervisory process and outcome was not impacted by their supervisors being either African American or White. On the other hand, Vander Kolk (1974) found that African American supervisees, compared to White supervisees, tended to anticipate their supervisors to be less empathic, respectful, and congruent. It is important to note that the race of the supervisors was not reported in Vander Kolk’s study. However, supervisors’ race was reported in Cook and Helms’ (1988) study, with the majority (89%) of the supervisors being White. The results of Cook and Helms’ study demonstrated that African American, Hispanic, and Native American supervisees tended to feel less liked by their supervisors than Asian supervisees.

In sum, these three studies (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton et al., 1995; Vander Kolk, 1974) indicated that supervisees’ race has an impact on their experience and perception of their supervisors. These studies seem to suggest that African American, Hispanic, and Native American supervisees tend to feel less liked by their supervisors than White and Asian supervisees. Yet, considering the racial history of the United States, it does not seem remarkable that minority supervisees would be more sensitive to issues of race, especially when working with White supervisors. These three studies also raise further questions regarding White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. Specifically, what practices by White supervisors are supportive of supervisees in multicultural supervision? What practices by White supervisors that are not supportive of supervisees in multicultural supervision?
The two empirical studies (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994) that used a qualitative methodology to examine critical incidents and supervisory relationships in multicultural supervision revealed similar findings regarding effective and ineffective supervision practices in multicultural supervision. Supervisees’ perceptions of effective supervisor practices in multicultural supervision consisted of supervisors’ openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and encouragement of supervisees to work in multicultural activities. In addition, it was reported that the supervisory relationship could be enhanced regarding multicultural issues if supervisees would work with additional ethnic clients, process racial/ethnic cultural differences within the supervisory relationship, and discuss diversity issues more often in supervision. Ineffective supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision included supervisors’ lack of cultural awareness and supervisees’ doubt about supervisors’ multicultural counseling abilities (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994).

Both of these studies (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994) provided critical information regarding effective and ineffective multicultural supervision. However, what is striking about these two studies is the lack of information regarding their analysis of the qualitative data. Neglecting to report the data analysis procedures decreases the reliability and validity of these studies, because it is not clear to a reader if the researchers accurately captured what the participants stated. In addition, Fukuyama did not provide information regarding the race of the supervisors, which makes it difficult for a reader to determine the extent the results are transferable to another context.

The current empirical literature on multicultural supervision provided some interesting and important insights into what constitutes exemplary multicultural supervision practices, such as supervisors having the same or higher racial identity.
than their supervisees (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997) and supervisors’ openness and support of supervisees’ multicultural activities (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994). However, the empirical literature concerning multicultural supervision provides a limited picture of supervisors’ effective and ineffective practices in multicultural supervision. There is even more of a limited picture of White supervisors’ effective and ineffective practices in multicultural supervision. This lack of information concerning White supervisors’ practices is not surprising given the lack of empirical literature in multicultural supervision and the fact that no study to date has exclusively focused on White supervisors practices in multicultural supervision. Thus, more research needs to be conducted on White supervisors in multicultural supervision in order to determine what are effective and ineffective practices by White supervisors. The next section will provide the rationale for conducting the present study and the use of qualitative methods.

Rationale for the Present Study

The review of the literature indicated that supervision is an essential aspect of training and professional development for counselors. The literature also supported the notion that cultural differences exist in multicultural supervision and that White supervisors need to understand cultural differences when practicing multicultural supervision. Furthermore, the current knowledge regarding multicultural supervision is based more on theory than empirical research. Although two empirical studies have identified some effective and ineffective practices by supervisors in multicultural supervision (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994), they only provide a limited picture of what constitutes effective and ineffective practices. In addition, none of the
empirical studies specifically examined White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision.

The present study is meant to be a systematic, empirical exploration of a broad range of effective and ineffective multicultural supervision practices by White supervisors. It is hoped that this study will paint a more organized and broad perspective of multicultural supervision by White supervisors than currently exists in the theoretical and limited empirical multicultural supervision literature. Further, the study’s picture of White supervisors’ practices that will emerge from the study will be firmly grounded in the experiences of professionals and students involved in multicultural supervision.

In order to provide a clearer picture of the range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, the present study utilized qualitative reports from professional and student members of the American Psychological Association (APA) who are interested in multicultural issues who are also practitioners. The present study used qualitative methods, which are beneficial in exploring topics in which a limited amount of information exists in investigating complex phenomena (Hill et al., 1997). Chapter III provides a detailed description of the qualitative methods used in the present study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. In this study, multicultural supervision was defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship (supervisor, supervisee, and client) was racially/ethnically different from the other members. To obtain this information, professional and student members of the American Psychological Association (APA) who were interested in multicultural issues and who were also practitioners were surveyed using an open-ended written questionnaire. The questionnaire requested qualitative reports of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision known or experienced by the participants. Data were analyzed to illustrate a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

The purpose of Chapter III is to provide a rationale and a description for the qualitative methods used in the present study. Three previous qualitative studies which used similar research designs to describe biased or exemplary practices related to sexism or heterosexism in psychotherapy or student affairs work (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991) were critically examined in order to establish the rationale for the methods in the present study. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section summarizes the methods employed in three previous studies of biased and exemplary practices in counseling or student affairs.
work. The second section defines qualitative reliability and validity in order to clarify the criteria for examining the methods of the previous studies. The third section critiques the methods used in the previous biased and exemplary studies. This critique is then utilized to explain the rationale for the improvements of the methods employed in the present study. The fourth section describes the methods used in the present study.

Summary of Previous Research Methods

This section is divided into three subsections corresponding to each of the three previous qualitative studies which used comparable methods to describe biased and exemplary practices of oppressed groups: (1) sex bias and sex-role stereotyping in psychotherapeutic practice; (2) biased and exemplary psychotherapeutic practices with lesbians and gay men; and (3) biased and exemplary student affairs practices concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues.

Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice

The APA (1975) Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice used an open-ended written questionnaire to obtain information on incidents of sex bias or sex-role stereotyping in psychotherapy with women. The written questionnaire was sent to 2,000 female practitioners in four different APA Divisions: 12 (Clinical Psychology), 17 (Counseling Psychology), 29 (Psychotherapy), and 35 (Psychology of Women). Three hundred and twenty questionnaires were returned. The APA Task Force categorized the participants' responses into themes from which four general areas emerged around sex bias and sex-role stereotyping that affected female psychotherapy clients. The four general
areas were: (1) fostering traditional sex-roles; (2) bias in expectations and
devaluation of women; (3) sexist use of psychoanalytic concepts; and (4) responding
to women as sex objects, including seduction of female clients. In addition, a total of
15 biased themes across each of the four general areas were defined. The
participants’ verbatim responses were used to illustrate these themes.

The APA (1975) Task Force’s questionnaire also gathered information
regarding the participants’ view of beneficial treatment techniques and how
professional psychology can successfully address sex bias and sex-role stereotyping in
psychotherapy. However, no verbatim responses were given to illustrate the findings
of beneficial treatment techniques.

Biased and Exemplary Psychotherapeutic Practice With Lesbians and Gay Men

The APA (1984, cited in Garnets et al., 1991) Task Force Committee on
Lesbian and Gay Concerns requested that Garnets et al. (1991) investigate bias in
psychotherapy with lesbians and gay men. The study by Garnets et al. is based on the
methodology used in the APA (1975) Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-Role
Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice study. The participants in Garnets et al.’s
study responded to: (a) four open-ended written questions concerning biased and
exemplary psychotherapy with lesbian and gay individuals, (b) a demographic sheet,
and (c) information regarding their professional background. The first two open-
ended questions requested that participants describe specific incidents of biased and
exemplary practice with lesbian and gay clients that they had experienced or heard
about. The last two open-ended questions asked for the participants’ opinions
concerning professional practices that contributed to biased and exemplary work with
lesbian and gay clients.
Garnets et al. (1991) surveyed an extensive and varied sample of psychologists. Surveys were sent to all members of the APA's Division 44 (Society for the Psychological Study of Gay and Lesbian Issues), and Division 35 (Psychology of Women). A random sample of 4,000 licensed APA members (balanced by gender), who were not members of Division 44 or 35, was also included. A total of 6,580 surveys were mailed; 2,544 surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 38.9%. Within the 2,544 returned surveys, 1,481 participants (58.2%) had or knew of experiences working with lesbian and gay clients.

The data analysis of the four open-ended questions began with the formation of work groups for each question. The work groups consisted of task force members and volunteer psychologists from San Francisco and Los Angeles. Individual members within each work group examined typed verbatim copies of the responses to the questions. Each of the four groups identified common themes and illustrated responses of these themes. The task force members then combined all themes of the four groups. The combination revealed three broad categories: (1) strategies for intervention, (2) issues relevant to lesbian and gay populations, and (3) issues about therapists' expertise and training. In order to identify major themes within the data, the task force combined the two positive questions and the two negative questions. A total of 17 themes of biased practices and a total of 14 themes of exemplary practices were identified. Task force members then reviewed all the responses from the four groups to select verbatim examples to illustrate the themes.
Biased and Exemplary Student Affairs Practice Concerning Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues

Croteau and Lark's (1995) study was modeled after Garnets et al.'s (1991) methodology. Participants in Croteau and Lark's study responded to demographic questions and to four open-ended written questions examining biased and exemplary student affairs practice concerning lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues. The first two open-ended questions asked participants to describe one to three incidents of biased and exemplary practice with lesbian/gay/bisexual clients which they had experienced or heard about. The two other questions requested the participants' opinions about what professional practices contributed to biased and exemplary student affairs practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual issues. The study expressly used a type of purposeful sampling, which involves targeting participants who are believed to be most likely to provide the information that is being sought (see page 8 for a discussion of purposeful sampling). The sample used in the study consisted of student affairs professionals who were members of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) Standing Committee on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Awareness. Surveys were sent to all members of the Standing Committee (N = 408). Two hundred and seventy surveys were returned, resulting in a response rate of 66%.

The qualitative data analysis in this study consisted of five different phases. The first phase involved separating the data into four categories corresponding to each of the open-ended questions. The authors then proceeded in "unitizing" the data in each of the four groups, which entails identifying units of meaning within the data. Among the four categories, 1,516 units of data were identified by the authors. In the second phase, units of data were examined repeatedly across all four groups until a tentative set of categories and subcategories emerged. The third phase included
narrowing down the tentative categories into eight major categories and a large number of subcategories and developing a written description along with illustrative examples for each category. The fourth phase consisted of reactions from professionals regarding the presentation of the eight major categories and subcategories at one of the annual American College Personnel Association conferences. Professionals at the conference thought the data were “rich,” but they found the descriptions of the categories difficult to understand because of the number and intricacy of the subcategories. Based on the feedback from professionals, the last phase consisted of narrowing the earlier categories and subcategories into 10 broad categories or themes of biased and exemplary practice and providing verbatim responses from participants to illustrate each theme.

Qualitative Reliability and Validity

This section will examine qualitative validity and reliability to establish the criteria for the next section’s critique of the methods in the three previous biased and exemplary studies. This critique is then utilized to explain the rationale for the improvements in the methods employed in the present study. While there is widespread agreement that it is important to address reliability and validity issues in qualitative methods, there is no consensus among qualitative researchers on how best to address these issues (Creswell, 1994). Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that the traditional terms for validity and reliability used in positivistic research are not appropriate when examining a qualitative paradigm. They proposed that more appropriate terms for qualitative studies include credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, which are roughly equivalent to the traditional quantitative terms, internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity.
More recently, Miles and Huberman (1994) combined the four traditional quantitative terms with the four alternative qualitative terms and added a fifth term to assess qualitative validity and reliability. Miles and Huberman's fifth term is utilization/application/action orientation. The current study utilized Lincoln and Guba's four terms as well as Miles and Huberman's fifth term to assess qualitative validity and reliability.

This section is divided into five subsections corresponding to Lincoln and Guba's (1985) four terms as well as Miles and Huberman's (1994) fifth term. The five subsections are: (1) dependability, (2) confirmability, (3) credibility, (4) transferability, and (5) utilization/application/action orientation. Each subsection will define the respective criteria for evaluating qualitative methodology and describe a technique to assess the criteria. It is important to note that qualitative reliability and validity criteria as well as techniques to establish this criteria can overlap at places.

**Dependability**

Dependability is defined as a research process which employs methods that are consistent and clear across a study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A technique to determine dependability in a study is to explicitly describe each aspect of the methods. Explicitly describing each aspect of the methods establishes dependability in a study because it clearly demonstrates to readers that the methods are clear and consistent across the study.

**Confirmability**

Confirmability is defined as a study that is based on the subjects and conditions of the inquiry rather than the researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Miles &
Huberman, 1994). A technique to establish confirmability in a study is to conduct a peer audit of the initial data analysis. A peer audit of a study will demonstrate confirmability by having peers compare the raw data with the initial findings from the data analysis to see if the analysis is based on what the participants stated.

**Credibility**

Credibility is defined as a study that is believable, authentic, and makes sense to the readers or consumers (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A technique to establish credibility in a study is to conduct an external audit of the findings to determine if they are meaningful. An external audit demonstrates credibility by having an individual who has no connection to the study examine the findings to determine if they are clear, internally consistent, and meaningful.

**Transferability**

Transferability is defined as results of a study that can be generalized to other samples or applications (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Marshall and Rossman (1995) reported that the responsibility of the transferability of the results of a qualitative study lies with the reader and not the author of the study. A technique to increase the transferability of qualitative studies is to provide “thick descriptions” of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). There are no set standards of what constitutes a thick description; however, qualitative researchers should provide the broadest amount of information to a reader in order that they may be able to understand the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Providing thick descriptions of every aspect of the methods (e.g., sample and findings) will allow readers to decide for themselves whether they can transfer the conclusions to another context.
Utilization/Application/Action Orientation

Utilization/application/action orientation occurs when the results of a study are useful in some way for the participants, researchers, and readers (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Utilization/application/action orientation is a form of transferability that Patton (1990) described as a test of face validity. The credibility of a qualitative study is judged on its face validity or authenticity by the usefulness of the information to the readers (Patton, 1990). A technique used to increase utilization/application/action orientation is to provide thick descriptions of the findings which will allow readers to decide for themselves whether the results are useful to them.

Critique of Previous Biased and Exemplary Studies and Rationale for Methodological Improvements

This section will critique the methods of the three biased and exemplary practice studies using the five criteria established in the previous section. This critique is then utilized to explain the rationale for the improvements of the methods employed in the present study. This section is divided into six subsections: (1) research question, (2) sampling procedure, (3) researcher competence or theoretical sensitivity, (4) data collection instrument, (5) data collection procedures, and (6) data analysis. In each subsection, I will first define an aspect of qualitative methods, then critique that aspect of the methods used in the three previous qualitative studies. Finally, based on that critique, I will provide a rationale for improving on the methods utilized in the present study.
Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Research Question

Qualitative studies should be designed with respect to the research question they seek to answer (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990). Creswell reported that qualitative researchers often investigate "how" and "what" types of questions because they want to describe the phenomena they are investigating. Quantitative researchers, on the other hand, often ask "why" type of questions and look for a relationship between variables in order to establish a cause and effect. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) reported that qualitative researchers tend to examine descriptive and exploratory questions. Creswell further suggested that a qualitative study should be used when exploring a phenomena in which the variables cannot be explained or identified. Because the variables of a qualitative study for the most part are unknown, qualitative research questions examine the "context" that may outline the phenomena of interest (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).

All three biased and exemplary practice articles reported their research questions. All three of the research questions provided boundaries on the phenomena of interest and framed the study in ways consistent with a qualitative approach. Only Croteau and Lark's (1995) article explicitly indicated that their study was qualitative in nature; however, they did not provide a rationale why a qualitative approach was appropriate for their study. Providing the research question in all three articles demonstrated dependability because it allowed readers to understand the basis for the design of each study.

The present study improved on the previous methods by explicitly stating the research question and providing a rationale for why this question is appropriate for the use of a qualitative approach. The linking the research question to a qualitative
method added to the dependability of the present study because it clearly demonstrated consistency and clarity in the research design to readers.

Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Sampling Procedure

Qualitative studies employ purposeful sampling, which entails sampling individuals who have knowledge of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The logic and purpose regarding sampling procedures in quantitative versus qualitative methods is quite different. Patton (1990) reported that sampling in quantitative methods is based on acquiring a sample that is random and statistically representative in order to generalize to a larger population. Qualitative sampling is dependent on selecting information-rich cases which are important to the purpose of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990). In qualitative studies, there are no set rules regarding sample size. Traditionally, a qualitative approach tends to use a small number of participants to obtain more depth through intensive interviews; however, qualitative researchers can utilize a large sample when examining breadth of experiences (Patton, 1990).

Each of the three studies used a type of purposeful sampling procedure in ways consistent with a qualitative approach. However, only Croteau and Lark's (1995) article explicitly identified and described their sampling procedure as purposeful. All three articles explained that the participants were targeted because of their possible knowledge of the phenomena being studied. All three studies used a large sample, which was appropriate given that the research question in each article was to identify a broad range (breadth) of biased and or exemplary practices. Garnets et al.'s (1991) article was the only study that explicitly reported the rationale for
using a large sample—to gather a broad range of experiences. The purposeful sampling and large sample sizes used in each of the three studies demonstrated dependability and consistency across the studies because they allowed readers to link the large samples with the research questions, which sought to identify a broad range of biased and exemplary practice of the phenomena of interest.

The present study improved on the previous methods by explicitly defining the sampling procedure as purposeful and connecting it with the research question. The present study also improved on the previous methods by providing a rationale for the purposeful sampling procedure and sample size. Explicitly defining and matching the large sample with the research question contributed to the present study’s dependability, because it plainly demonstrated to readers the consistency and clarity of the methods across the study.

Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Researcher Competency or Theoretical Sensitivity

In qualitative studies it is important to demonstrate the researcher’s competency or theoretical sensitivity since the results of a study are created by the researcher’s involvement in the data (Creswell, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Strauss and Corbin defined theoretical sensitivity as a researcher’s personal qualities of insight into the meaning of data. Theoretical sensitivity occurs at three levels: (1) knowledge of the literature, (2) personal experience, and (3) professional experience. Patton stated, “Because the researcher is the instrument in qualitative inquiry, a qualitative report must include information about the researcher” (p. 472). Locke et al. (1993) termed this process of including information about the researcher in a proposal as “coming clean” (p. 114).
The process of coming clean involves the researcher reporting personal values, assumptions, and biases concerning the subject in the study. The process of coming clean is not intended for the researcher to become impartial to the phenomena of interest. Coming clean brings awareness to a researcher and the reader how his or her personal view of the phenomena of interest may influence the research process (Locke et al., 1993). According to Patton, there is no agreed upon approach on how to establish the credibility or competency of a researcher. “The principle is to report any personal and professional information that may have affected data collection, analysis, and interpretation” (Patton, 1990, p. 472).

Only Croteau and Lark’s (1995) article provided background information regarding their personal and professional experience with the phenomena being studied. However, Croteau and Lark did not provide explicit information regarding their assumptions of the phenomena of interest in their study, which makes it difficult for readers to understand what effect their personal views had on the research process. In the APA (1975) Task Force and the Garnets et al. (1991) articles, nothing was reported about the theoretical sensitivity of the researchers. The information regarding Croteau and Lark’s level of theoretical sensitivity demonstrates dependability in their study because readers are able to understand that the researchers have a level of insight into the meaning of the data. The APA (1975) Task Force and the Garnets et al.’s (1991) articles had decreased dependability because readers were not able to clearly understand if the researchers had any level of insight into the meaning of the data.

The present study improved on the previous methods by providing explicit information regarding the present researcher’s theoretical sensitivity of the phenomena of interest. Providing explicit information regarding the present
researcher's theoretical sensitivity of the phenomena interest added to the dependability in the present study, because readers will be able to assess the researcher's level of insight into the meaning of the data.

Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Data Collection Instrument

Qualitative data collection techniques should be appropriately matched with the research question and sample (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994; Patton, 1990). Traditionally, qualitative data collection consists of open-ended interviews, written documents, and direct observation, not open-ended written surveys or questionnaires. Patton reported that open-ended responses on written questionnaires "represent the most elementary form of qualitative data" (p. 24). An open-ended questionnaire will provide more detailed responses than a quantitative approach, but not as much detail as a traditional qualitative approach of in-depth interviews. The detail of the responses to open-ended questions on questionnaires illustrates the value of qualitative methods even at this basic level of qualitative exploration (Patton, 1990).

All three biased and exemplary practice articles used an open-ended written questionnaire. The data collection instrument in all three articles was appropriate, because it enabled the researchers to collect data from a large number of participants efficiently. Only Garnets et al.'s (1991) article provided a rationale for using an open-ended written questionnaire in the study. However, Garnets et al.'s rationale did not explicitly indicate that the open-ended written questionnaire was based on the research question and sample. The open-ended written questionnaire in all three studies matched the research question, sampling procedure, and sample size, thus demonstrating dependability to readers by providing a consistent picture of the
methods across the studies. The research question in all three studies sought to identify a broad range of biased and or exemplary practices of the phenomena of interest. The sampling procedure in all three studies targets a large number of individuals who are knowledgeable of the phenomena of interest. The open-ended written questionnaire is able to efficiently collect data from a large sample of individuals who have possible knowledge of the phenomena of interest.

Croteau and Lark’s (1995) and Garnets et al.’s (1991) studies reported demographic data which provided a picture of the participants, such as age, sexual orientation, geographical location, and years of experience with phenomena being studied. However, a rationale why they collected demographic information was not provided by the researchers. Furnishing information about the participants allows readers to make a judgment as to whether the findings can be applied to another sample which increases the possibility of transferability of the studies. The APA (1975) Task Force study did not collect demographic data, which made it impossible to know who actually participated in the study and thus impossible to make judgments about transferability.

The present study improved on the previous methods by explicitly describing the open-ended written questionnaire and providing a rationale for the use of the data collection instrument and how it is linked to the research question and sample. The present study also improved on the previous methods by explicitly describing the purpose of collecting demographic information. Explicitly describing the data collection instrument and providing a rationale for its use added to the present study’s dependability, because readers will be able to clearly determine the clarity and consistency of the methods across the study.
Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Data Collection Procedures

All three biased and exemplary articles clearly described their data collection procedures. Each of the three articles mailed their questionnaire to knowledgeable participants regarding the phenomena of interest; however, only Croteau and Lark's (1995) study mailed additional questionnaires to nonrespondents and offered an incentive to participants to return their questionnaire. Clearly stating the data collection procedures in all three articles demonstrated dependability in the studies because it allowed readers to plainly understand how the data was collected.

The present study used a similar approach to Croteau and Lark's (1995) data collection procedures by explicitly stating the procedures, offering an incentive to participants, and sending additional mailings to nonrespondents. Explicitly stating the data collection procedures contributed to the dependability in the present study, because it demonstrated to readers that the data collection procedures were clear and consistent across the study.

Critique and Methodological Improvements of the Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis in qualitative research involves the researcher reducing a large amount of data into patterns, categories, or themes and then providing this information in a narrative format (Creswell, 1994, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1995). Narrative data includes rich descriptions of the phenomena studied, allowing readers of qualitative studies to have a concrete picture of an experience (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Yet within the qualitative literature, there is no agreed upon approach regarding data analysis (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 1990). The instrument used to analyze data in qualitative studies is the researcher (Creswell, 1994; Marshall &
Maykut and Morehouse (1994) stated, "The process of qualitative data analysis is one of culling for meaning from the words and actions of the participants in the study, framed by the researcher's focus of inquiry" (p. 128). Marshall and Rossman also reported that qualitative data analysis involves identifying general statements regarding similarities or relationships across categories of data.

The APA (1975) Task Force study reported that the data were analyzed by categorizing responses into four general areas. Within these four general areas, 15 biased themes were defined and verbatim responses were used to illustrate the themes. However, the study did not report who did the analysis or how the data were put into themes and general areas. Neglecting to report the data analysis procedures decreases the confirmability and dependability of the study because it is not clear to readers if the researchers accurately captured what the participants stated.

Both Croteau and Lark (1995) and Garnets et al. (1991) clearly stated their data analysis procedures in their studies. The descriptions of their data analysis procedures provided readers with a clear understanding of how the conclusions were reached, which demonstrated confirmability and dependability in the studies. In addition, Croteau and Lark's study increased credibility by presenting their findings at a national conference and having peers provide feedback concerning their findings. Both Croteau and Lark's and Garnets et al. provided thick descriptions of the phenomena of interest in their studies, which strengthened the possibility of transferability because readers were able to have a clear picture of the finding to determine if they were applicable to another population.

The present study's data analysis procedures improved on the previous methods by: (a) explicitly stating the data analysis procedures; (b) providing audits by peers, my doctoral chair, an expert on multicultural issues (multicultural audit), my
doctoral committee (dissertation proposal and defense); and (c) providing thick written descriptions of the findings. Explicitly stating the data analysis procedures added to the dependability in the present study because readers will be able to clearly see how each aspect of the conclusions were reached. Conducting a peer audit increased the confirmability in the present study because the auditors compared the raw data with the initial findings in order to determine if they were based on what the participants stated. The audit by my doctoral chair, Dr. James M. Croteau, added to the credibility and utilization/application/action orientation in the present study, because he examined the findings to see if they were clear, internally consistent, and meaningful. The multicultural audit by Dr. Ruperto Perez increased the credibility and utilization/application/action orientation of the present study, because he examined whether the findings were consistent with the multicultural literature and not culturally biased. Thick written descriptions of the results demonstrated the possibility of transferability in the present study because providing a detailed picture of the findings increased readers’ ability to determine whether they were applicable to another context.

Description of the Methods in the Present Study

This section describes the methods employed in the present study. The methods in the present study were based on the preceding section’s critique of the methods utilized in the previous biased and exemplary studies. This section is divided into six subsections: (1) research question, (2) sampling procedure, (3) researcher competence or theoretical sensitivity, (4) data collection instrument, (5) data collection procedures, and (6) data analysis.
Research Question

The research question for the present study was: What is the broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision? As explained in Chapter II, little information is known about multicultural supervision and even less about White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. The descriptive and exploratory nature of the research question for the present study was appropriately matched with a qualitative research design.

Sampling Procedure

The present study used a purposeful sampling technique that is based on the research question. The purposeful sampling technique targeted participants who have knowledge of White supervisors’ biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Knowledgeable participants in the present study were individuals who have a professional interest in multicultural issues and have experience either being a supervisor or a supervisee. Participants who fit into this category were 594 professional and student members of Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues) of the American Psychological Association (APA) who are also practitioners. All student members in Division 45 (N = 297) and a random sample of professional members (N = 297) were invited to participate in the present study (N = 594). The random sample of professional members was selected in order for the groups of professional and student members of Division 45 to be equal. The rationale for using a large sample was based on the research question of the present study, which was to describe and illustrate a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The present
author believed that a large sample was necessary to obtain a broad range of biased and exemplary practices. Interviewing a small sample of White supervisors who have knowledge of multicultural supervision might provide depth of information but likely would not identify a broad range of possible biased and exemplary practices. The participants for the present study were obtained from the APA research office (see Appendix A), which has information concerning which members are involved in clinical practice and has the names and addresses of all its members (student and professional) as well as the Divisions to which they belong.

**Researcher’s Competency or Theoretical Sensitivity**

The present researcher’s theoretical sensitivity, including personal and professional experiences, beliefs, and assumptions of the phenomena of interest, and knowledge of the literature will be discussed. This personal and professional information is provided for readers in order that they may understand the “lens” through which the present researcher has composed the study and given meaning to the data.

I, the researcher, am a 37-year-old White heterosexual man in the final stages of my doctoral degree in counseling psychology. I come from a middle-class background, and I was born and raised in the Midwest. My professional experience with multicultural counseling and supervision has occurred in conjunction with my studies as a master’s and doctoral student in counseling psychology. I have taken a course in multicultural counseling and a course in supervision. As part of the latter course, I supervised a master’s student over a 4-month period; however, the supervision was not multicultural in nature. In addition, I have participated in a small amount of multicultural counseling in university counseling center, community
agency, departmental clinic, and elementary school settings during my master’s and doctoral studies. I also have a small amount of experience as a supervisee participating in multicultural supervision with seven supervisors during my master’s and doctoral studies. Recently, as a predoctoral intern I have gained more experience in multicultural counseling and as a supervisee in multicultural supervision working with seven racial/ethnic clients over a 9-month period.

My interest in and awareness of multicultural issues initially occurred during my master’s program in counseling psychology. During a multicultural exercise in a counseling methods class, I became aware of my own racism. Confronting and working through my own racism was difficult, but it instilled in me a commitment to multicultural issues. My multicultural commitment translated into focusing on diversity issues through research and scholarship (e.g., Lark, Croteau, & Paul, 1996a, 1996b; Lark & Paul, 1998; Munley, Vacha-Haase, Busby, & Paul, 1998; Nilsson, Paul, Lupini, & Tatem, 1999), practice, and course work. I became interested in the topic of multicultural supervision early on in my doctoral program when I selected multicultural supervision as a topic for a research paper for one of my classes. In researching the paper, I was struck by the lack of both empirical and theoretical literature on multicultural supervision. I had expected much more literature on the topic, given the extensive amount of literature in counseling psychology on multicultural counseling. I was also surprised by the fact that the majority of what we know about multicultural supervision is theoretical rather than empirical. Finally, I was puzzled by the fact that counseling psychology seemed to emphasize the importance of multicultural counseling and diversity yet tended to ignore multicultural supervision. The above impressions gained from my paper on multicultural supervision sparked my interest in the present study.
I decided to focus on White supervisors in multicultural supervision for the present study due to discussions with my doctoral chair about the appropriateness of the present author, who is White, conducting multicultural research on minority individuals. During these discussions, my doctoral chair recommend that I examine the literature regarding White researchers conducting multicultural research (e.g., Helms, 1993; Mio & Iwamasa, 1993; Parham, 1993). Within this literature, a number of authors cautioned White researchers about conducting multicultural research on minority individuals due to potential racial and ethnic biases (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993; Parham, 1993; Sue, 1993). Helms (1993) suggested that it is important for White researchers conducting multicultural research to study Whites in order to better understand their own racial group and to avoid possible racial and ethnic biases. Given the potential racial and ethnic biases of the present White researcher focusing on minority individuals in multicultural research, I decided to concentrate on White supervisors in multicultural supervision for the present study. This decision was also partly based on my review of the multicultural supervision literature which revealed a sparse amount of information on White supervisors in multicultural supervision, even though the majority of the supervisors in counseling psychology are White (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997). In addition, my own struggle as a White counselor with minority clients was also part of my decision to focus on White supervisors in the present study.

The following assumptions and beliefs about White supervisors in multicultural supervision are based on my personal experience, my professional training and experience as a counseling psychologist, my own journey with racism and diversity issues, and my review of the literature regarding the present study.
1. The majority of supervisors in counseling psychology are White and have little training in multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision.

2. Whites’ supervising minority supervisees involves issues of power, racism, trust, and safety within the supervisory relationship.

3. White supervisors’ cultural values and biases, as well as unexamined racial attitudes, affect multicultural supervision and the counseling process.

4. Many White supervisors are not aware that they are participating in racist practices when supervising racial/ethnic minorities.

5. White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their openness to take responsibility to address multicultural/diversity issues with supervisees.

6. White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their own awareness of multicultural/diversity issues.

7. White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their own level of development of racial identity.

8. White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their awareness of minority identity development and knowledge of other races and cultures.

9. White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices are influenced by their level of openness to let minority supervisees educate and teach them regarding issues of race and culture.

**Data Collection Instrument**

The present study used an open-ended written questionnaire (see Appendix C), which was designed to elicit from participants incidents of biased and exemplary
practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The open-ended written questionnaire was based on the present study's research question and sampling procedure. The research question involved identifying a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, and the sampling procedure involved seeking a large number of individuals who were knowledgeable about biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The open-ended written questionnaire was able to efficiently collect data from a large sample of individuals who have possible knowledge of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The questionnaire included four open-ended questions. An introductory paragraph instructed participants that they may draw their responses from a variety of sources when answering the questions, including reports from friends or colleagues regarding their experiences in multicultural supervision with a White supervisor or as a White supervisor in multicultural supervision. They may also draw their responses from their current or past experiences as a supervisee in multicultural supervision with a White supervisor or as a White supervisor in multicultural supervision. The first question asked participants to describe one to three incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor that was biased, inadequate, or inappropriate. The second question asked participants to describe one to three incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor that demonstrated special sensitivity. The third question asked for participants' opinions of professional practices by a White supervisor that are especially harmful in multicultural supervision. The last question asked for participants' opinions of professional practices by a White supervisor that are especially beneficial in multicultural supervision.
Each participant also filled out a demographic sheet (see Appendix D), which included age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, training status, highest degree, degree program, work setting and geographic location, supervision experience, clinical experience, multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision experience, number of courses or workshops in multicultural counseling or supervision, and level of involvement in multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision. The rationale for filling out a demographic sheet was to provide descriptions of the participants to increase the possibility of transferability by readers to another sample.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Each of the 594 participants who were professional or student members of Division 45 of the APA who were also practitioners were sent a packet that included a cover letter (see Appendix E) to inform participants about the purpose of the study and confidentiality as well as to invite them to participate in the study. The packet also included the open-ended written questionnaire, demographic sheet, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Similar to Croteau and Lark's (1995) study, an incentive in the form of a sticker promoting diversity (see Appendix F) was also included in each packet. Each packet had a number posted on the top right corner of the questionnaire corresponding to a participant in the study. The number on the questionnaire was used to track unreturned questionnaires. When a questionnaire was returned, an individual other than the present researcher wrote down the number and cut off the right corner of the questionnaire. This individual did not have access to the list of participants and their corresponding numbers. Having another person who has no access to the list write down and cut off the number on the questionnaire ensures
that any returned questionnaires can never be traced to an individual participant. The present researcher did not view a questionnaire until the right corner and corresponding number had been cut off, which also ensured that any returned questionnaires can never be traced to an individual participant. The list of names and corresponding numbers were locked in a file cabinet in the present researcher’s office and will be destroyed at the completion of the study. Two weeks after the original mailing a second packet was sent to participants who had not returned their questionnaire. The second packet included the same items as the first packet except for a different cover letter (see Appendix G). A follow-up postcard (see Appendix H) was sent 2 weeks after the second mailing to participants who had not returned a questionnaire.

Ten questionnaires were undeliverable due to the wrong addresses. Of the remaining 584 questionnaires sent out to participants, 51 questionnaires were returned after the first mailing, 43 questionnaires were returned after the second mailing, and 10 questionnaire were returned after the third mailing. A total of 104 questionnaires were returned, resulting in an 18% response rate.

Data Analysis Procedures

The present study’s data analysis procedures involved five different phases. The first phase consisted of “unitizing” the data from the questionnaire. Unitizing is identifying chunks or units of meaning within the data (Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). A unit of meaning in the present study for questions 1 and 3 consisted of a participant’s verbatim report of each incident of biased and exemplary practice in multicultural supervision by White supervisors. A unit of meaning for questions 2 and 4 consisted
of a participant's verbatim report of professional practices that contributed to White supervisors biased and exemplary practice in multicultural supervision. The unitizing of data in the present study yielded 1,498 independent units of data. Each of the 1,498 units of data was then transcribed into a word processing program and separated into four groups corresponding to each question. The transcribed data within the four groups was then imported into a qualitative software program, QSR NUD*IST (NVIVO). NUD*IST is an acronym for Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching, and Theorizing. Creswell (1998) reported that QSR NUD*IST software program effectively allows researchers to organize files, search for themes or categories, cross or combine themes, and diagram categories into visual pictures.

The second phase involved the present researcher identifying categories and subcategories within the 1,498 units of data and developing thick written descriptions of categories and subcategories. The categorizing and naming of phenomena is termed open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The present researcher collapsed the four groups developed in phase one into two groups, corresponding to exemplary practice (questions 2 and 4) and biased practice (questions 1 and 3). The present researcher then separately examined the exemplary practice group (questions 2 and 4) and the biased practice group (questions 1 and 3) for tentative categories and subcategories using an adaptation of the constant comparative method. The constant comparative method of data analysis involves developing inductive categories and making comparisons of the categories to all other units of meaning in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). In the case of the present study, tentative categories and subcategories were developed separately for the biased practice group and the exemplary practice group by the present researcher. The
tentative categories and subcategories in the biased practice group and the exemplary practice group were then compared back to the raw data of the group from which they were generated. This process of revising tentative categories and subcategories to see if they fit was repeated a number of times until a final set of 20 categories emerged within the biased practice group and 26 categories within the exemplary practice group, as well as several subcategories for each category.

The third phase consisted of the researcher in the present study combining categories and subcategories that had a similar relationship in the biased practice group and repeating the same process in the exemplary practice group. The process of putting data back together in a new way by developing connections between categories and subcategories is called axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process of axial coding yielded 10 categories of biased practice and 9 categories of exemplary practice, as well as several subcategories in each category. The present researcher then selected units of data that illustrated each category and subcategory of biased and exemplary practices.

Phase four involved two peer auditors (doctoral students) comparing the raw data with the 19 categories and subcategories developed in phase three to determine if these categories are based on what the participants stated. Based on the feedback from the peer auditors, one category was combined with another category in the exemplary group and a number of definitions of categories were also revised. My doctoral chair, Dr. James Croteau, then audited the categories and subcategories two times in order to determine whether the categories and subcategories are clear, internally consistent, and meaningful. Based on feedback from my doctoral chair, 5 themes and 11 subthemes of biased practice and 6 themes and 8 subthemes of exemplary practice emerged.
Phase five involved a multicultural audit of the categories and subcategories developed in phase four. The audit was conducted by Dr. Ruperto Perez who has extensive experience concerning multicultural issues. Dr. Perez is currently on the Advisory Committee for APA Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) Vice President for Diversity and Public Interest, an Ad Hoc Reviewer for the Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, and Chair for APA Division 17 Section on Ethnic and Racial Diversity. Dr. Perez is Filipino, born in the Philippines, but raised in the United States. Dr. Perez has considerable experience in multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision, both as a supervisor and as a supervisee. The multicultural audit in the present study served as a procedure to check whether the findings are consistent with the multicultural literature and are not culturally biased. The present researcher and three of the auditors (my doctoral chair and the two peer auditors) are White and interpreted the findings from their own majority viewpoint. Based on the feedback of the multicultural audit, the themes and subthemes were not revised.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented. This chapter is divided into three sections: (1) description of the participants of the study, (2) participant reports of biased practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision, and (3) participant reports of exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. In the last two sections, quotes from participants’ stories and opinions are woven throughout the results. Some of the participant quotes may contain grammatical mistakes that can cause problems in terms of readability of the results. For the purpose of enhancing the clarity of some quotes, material was excluded using ellipses and words were added using brackets.

Participants

There were 104 participants in the present study. Eighty-three (80%) of the participants were female and 21 (20%) of the participants were male. Ages ranged from 22 years to 61 years ($M = 36, SD = 10.42$). The racial breakdown of participants consisted of 28 (27%) Chicano/Hispanic/Latino, 24 (23%) African American/Black, 21 (20%) Caucasian, 17 (16%) Asian American, 6 (6%) Multiracial/Biracial, 3 (3%) Pacific Islander, 2 (2%) Other, 2 (2%) American Indian, and 1 (1%) international. The majority of participants, 89 (86%), identified as heterosexual, 12 (11%) identified as gay/lesbian, 2 (2%) identified as bisexual, and 1 participant did not answer this question. Fifty (48%) of the participants had doctoral
degrees, 44 (42%) had master degrees, 9 (9%) had bachelor degrees, and 1 (1%) Other. Participants were almost evenly split concerning their level of training; 53 (51%) were professionals and 51 (49%) were graduate students. The degree programs of participants included 49 (47%) clinical psychology, 40 (38%) counseling psychology, 11 (11%) Other, and 4 (4%) school psychology. Twenty (19%) of the participants worked in counseling centers, 18 (17%) in hospitals, 18 (17%) two or more sites, 15 (14%) Other, 13 (12%) in academic departments, and 7 (7%) in private practice. Geographically, participants worked in 27 different states with California 29 (28%) and New York 14 (13%) having the most participants.

Regarding participants' multicultural experiences, 84 (81%) had attended two or more multicultural counseling workshops, 56 (54%) had attended one or more supervision courses, and 62 (59%) have been involved in three or more research projects concerning multicultural issues. In terms of participants' multicultural clinical experiences, 75 (72%) had worked with six or more clients concerning multicultural issues, 60 (58%) had one to three supervisors address multicultural issues in their own supervision, and 47 (45%) had supervised four or more supervisees for whom multicultural issues were addressed. See Appendix I for further details regarding participants' demographic information.

Biased Practices of White Supervisors

This section presents the themes that were derived through qualitative analysis concerning participants’ stories and opinions about biased practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The biased practice results are a combination of responses from question 1 and question 3 of the survey. Question 1 requested specific stories or incidents of White supervisors’ biased practices in multicultural
supervision. Question 3 requested opinions about professional behaviors or attitudes that contribute to White supervisors’ biased practices in multicultural supervision. In response to question 1, participants provided 343 stories (82,708 characters) of White supervisors’ biased practices in multicultural supervision. However, 43 (16,812 characters) of these biased stories were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 300 stories of bias consisted of 6 or more lines of typed transcript per story on average; a number of stories, however, were between 20 to 30 lines. Thirty-nine (37%) of the participants contributed two or more stories of biased practices. In response to question 3, participants provided 483 opinions (31,909 characters) about professional behaviors or attitudes that contribute to biased practices by White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Sixty-two opinions (6,112 characters) were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 421 opinions consisted of one line of typed transcript per opinion on average. Forty (38%) of the participants provided three or more opinions of professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to biased practices.

Five themes and 11 subthemes emerged in the data analysis of respondents’ stories (question 1) and opinions (question 3) of White supervisors biased practices (see Figure 3). This section is divided into six subsections corresponding to the six biased practice themes. Within each subsection, the overall biased practice theme and all its subthemes are defined first. Then each theme or subtheme is explained and illustrated with participants’ verbatim words whenever possible.
| 1) **Biased Practice Theme One:** White supervisors fail to address multicultural issues in supervision |
| Subthemes: |
| (a) White supervisors fail to address cultural issues that influence treatment or conceptualization of clients |
| (b) White supervisors fail to address the impact of race/ethnicity in interactions with racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients |
| (c) White supervisors fail to address supervisees’ perceptions or inquiries concerning multicultural issues |
| (d) White supervisors fail to address multicultural issues and instead expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues |
| (e) White supervisors fail to address racist remarks made in supervision |

| 2) **Biased Practice Theme Two:** White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees based on biased assumptions of their abilities |
| Subthemes: |
| (a) White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues |
| (b) White supervisors negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for their counseling skills or therapeutic actions |

| 3) **Biased Practice Theme Three:** White supervisors act as if they are multiculturally sensitive when they are not |
| Subthemes: |
| (a) White supervisors believe they are open to or competent in multicultural issues when they are not |
| (b) White supervisors give “lip service” to multicultural issues but their actions do not support multiculturalism |

| 4) **Biased Practice Theme Four:** White supervisors’ attempt to incorporate multicultural issues involve overgeneralized or inaccurate assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees |
| Subthemes: |
| (a) White supervisors assume that racial/ethnic minority supervisees always have a complete understanding of or connection to their racial/ethnic community |
| (b) White supervisors inaccurately see issues involving culture or racism in the work of their racial/ethnic minority supervisee |

| 5) **Biased Practice Theme Five:** White supervisors pathologize supervisees or clients because of their race/culture or ethnicity |

Figure 3. Biased Practice Themes and Subthemes.
Biased Practice Theme One: White Supervisors Fail to Address Multicultural Issues in Supervision

This biased practice theme is divided into six interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that fail to consider cultural issues that influence treatment or conceptualization of clients. Some respondents described this biased practice in short phrases such as, "excluding cultural factors when case conceptualizing," "making a diagnosis without considering the cultural factors," and "negating that race or culture influences counseling." One participant described a lack of incorporating multicultural issues in the clinical treatment of clients as, "Only looking at or using the Western approach with a client." In addition, a respondent illustrated White supervisors' neglect of culture in conceptualizing cases by stating, "The omission of culture in their thinking about cases—they don't recognize the degree to which theories about humans are culture-based." Another respondent described the possible future consequences of this biased practice by stating:

Especially harmful is when White supervisors teach other White students that cultural difference and racial issues are irrelevant in therapy and do not have bearing on the client's problems. Thus, the legacy continues to pass on from White supervisor to a White student who, in time, may become a supervisor him/her self.

The second subtheme included White supervisors that fail to address the impact of race/ethnicity in their interactions with racial/ethnic supervisees and clients; this subtheme was also referred to by a number of participants as being "colorblind.” For example, one participant described this biased practice as, "ignoring or not discussing race, taking the stance 'I see no color.'” A White supervisor discussed the extent of “colorblindness” that occurred in one of her African American psychiatry residents in a predominantly White clinical setting:
When I [supervisor] brought up how race influenced her [the supervisee/resident] reactions and those of the client and how it helped or hindered the progress of therapy, she [supervisee/resident] said I was the first supervisor in 3 years to ask her about race and ethnic issues. So for 3 years she worked with a nearly all White population, and not one of her all White supervisors (psychiatry MD’s and Psychology Ph.D’s) asked her about or explored these issues. I was floored no one ever discussed such an important variable. This was 12 years ago. I’ve never forgotten it. It was very sad for her and her clients to be forced to be “color blind” when color was often a powerful issue in [an] all White conservative place. Her clinical success would be hampered not by a lack of skill but an expectation of color silence by those training her.

A Latina female described her experience of this biased practice as “refusing to take culture into account when dealing with supervisees or patients . . . gives the message that a very large chunk of reality does not count. It is a surreal experience, not to say absurd, or ‘depersonalizing’ at times.” Furthermore, an African American respondent depicted an incident of White supervisors “colorblindness” as not addressing issues of racial differences in his first practicum class:

One of my first clients was a young Chinese student who had been raped by a Black man. The fact, that I am Black never was addressed, never came up in the therapy or in supervision. I think I needed a supervisor who could help me deal with my feelings and help me address these issues with the client.

Other participants referred to “colorblindness” in the form of White supervisors’ assumption that “all people are like White people.” One respondent described this as, “Never acknowledging any differences and acting like everyone is White and evaluating by White standards.” Another participant depicted this biased practice by reporting, “To totally ignore cultural issues and to act as though all people think and behave like Whites.” In addition, a respondent stated that problems occur when White supervisors have a “lack of awareness that majority culture isn’t necessarily the ‘right’ or ‘normal’ culture . . .”

Some participants also described “colorblindness” as White supervisors’ belief that everything can be applied “universally” or that we are “all humans.” For
example, “wanting everyone to be the same,” “expecting everyone to hold the same values and beliefs,” and the “assumption that the majority cultures methods are universal or most desirable” were phrases used by participants. Another participant depicted this biased practice as, “Not addressing cultural issues because of the belief that we’re all ‘one human race’ so it doesn’t really matter.” In addition, a White supervisor conveyed to a respondent this biased practice by stating that “differences do not matter to him [supervisor]—we were all the same in his eyes. He actually said that our backgrounds, past life experiences, skills that we had learned did not matter!”

The third subtheme included White supervisors discounting supervisees’ perceptions or inquires concerning multicultural issues. Some participants described this biased practice as dismissing “concerns supervisees have related to cultural issues” or discounting an “intern’s feeling and perceptions of cultural issues influence on client dynamics.” A supervisee depicted this biased practice by a White supervisor when discussing treatment issues of a biracial client who tended to become involved in abusive relationships:

When the . . . [supervisee] first presented this case to [her] supervisor, he [supervisor] stated that the supervisee was taking “too long” explaining the cultural/racial issues involved; this was simply like any other abusive relationship conflict, according to the supervisor. When . . . [the supervisee] attempted to point out that the client’s father was abusive and White, and this pattern was being recreated somehow in [the client’s] relationships with lovers, [the] supervisor answered that this interpretation was “subjective, based only on supervisee’s clinical psychodynamic orientation, and most likely inaccurate.” He [supervisor] also stated that . . . [the supervisee] had the tendency to “make to much out of the race issue” . . .

Another supervisee described her experience in discussing with her White supervisor the possible influence culture has on the personality of an Asian client: “He
[supervisor] negated that culture had anything to do with it . . . [and would rather not] discuss it [culture] at all.”

The fourth subtheme involved White supervisors that fail to address multicultural issues and instead expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues. For example, a respondent stated, “I was asked to teach other students about being Black.” One participant described this biased practice: “Many times, it was up to me to bring in culturally appropriate interventions and strategies and I . . . [was] responsible for convincing my supervisor of their uses and also ‘training’ my supervisor.” Another respondent described the resentment she felt when asked to “educate” White supervisors: “I detest being asked to ‘educate’ my supervisors and I hate being treated as the token multicultural expert/novelty.” In addition, an African American female supervisee in a practicum class expressed her frustration at being expected to educate her White supervisor and all-White classmates:

He [supervisor] could offer no explanation as to why African Americans and other minorities might feel they are being treated un-fairly or why they contribute to such “self-destructive behaviors.” I [supervisee] being frustrated offer my instructor and class a 10 minute Black history lesson from the 50’s thru the 90’s. How could this White, non-informed counselor/instructor educate Whites on how to be cultural sensitive when he himself was not?

The fifth subtheme involved White supervisors that fail to address racist remarks in supervision. One participant described an incident of this biased practice while observing a female supervisee in group supervision: “The supervisee stated that she would not conduct psychotherapy with minority clients (racial, ethnic, gay, etc.) as she did not feel comfortable working with ‘them.’ The supervisor did not address this with the group or the individual supervisee.”
Another respondent stated that White supervisors have "a lack of knowledge or total dismissal of how to handle cases where a European American client makes a racist remarks or ethnic remarks." A participant described her reaction to a White supervisor not addressing the racist remarks made by a supervisee during group supervision:

... [the supervisor] made no attempt to address the [racist] statement. I expected her [supervisor] to address the student directly and invite him [the student] to address the implications of such a statement. I expected her [supervisor] to—at the very least—weave this incident into our discussion of treatment issues of diversity and working with the culturally "different"... 

**Biased Practice Theme Two: White Supervisors Negatively Evaluate or Reprimand Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees Based on Biased Assumptions of Their Abilities and/or Views**

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme included White supervisors that negatively evaluate or reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues. For example, a respondent described this biased practice by stating:

I observed a White supervisor inform a fellow student to encourage her minority client to assimilate to White culture without regard to the clear ostracism that would occur from the client's culture... When I mentioned this neglect of the client's culture [to] the supervisor, [he] "chastised" me in front of my peers.

In addition, a Latina supervisee described a similar incident of being reprimanded by a White supervisor for bringing up multicultural issues when examining thought disorders:

There was a Hispanic man... [on] the unit who had immigrated a few years before from Latin America and spoke broken English but was very expressive verbally, ... The supervisor selected this man as an example of someone who used "neologisms." Specifically, at one point the patient had used the word "knowledgement" for "knowledge." I pointed out to the supervisor that in Spanish the corresponding word was "conocimiento," the verb "conocer" or "saber," and the termination corresponding to "ment"... was common in
those kinds of nouns. I suggested that to use the speech of any foreigner to diagnose use of neologisms was not a very good idea as a rule. The supervisor was very adamant that he was right, that the patient was thought-disordered (which was not my point) and that I simply did not want to take supervision. He complained about me to the heads of the program.

A Hispanic participant depicted this biased practice by a White supervisor in discussing a marital case involving an Hispanic woman in front of a group of students:

When I suggested that part of the conflict might stem from differing cultural expectations of marriage, he [supervisor] said, “NO, that’s not it,” in a manner that I felt shut me down and devalued my perspective to the group.

The second subtheme involved White supervisors negatively evaluating or reprimanding minority supervisees for their counseling skills or therapeutic actions. One respondent described this biased practice as, “Evaluating and making recommendations (lukewarm or negative) regarding skills of ethnic persons.” An American Indian supervisee described being reprimanded by a White supervisor:

I [supervisee] told a client who was also American Indian that I didn’t see her as “sick,” . . . she had grown accustomed to labeling herself [sick] from the years of being in and out of institutions. I was trying to speak to her cultural values of holism and [to] convey hope. But the supervisor thought I was harming her by giving her too much hope. I was reprimanded and threatened [by the supervisor] with possible termination from the agency.

A Latino participant depicted his experience regarding this biased practices part of a vocational psychology course:

I was assigned several students to contact as possible counselies. English is not my first language, so when I told my supervisor that I had been confronting trouble finding counselies. The supervisor told me rudely that it was because I was, “scaring clients off because of my accent.”

Another participant depicted this biased practice as, “Making assumptions about the skill level of the ethnic persons as inferior without knowledge of persons background.” Some respondents stated that White supervisors have “a lower standard because a supervisee or a client is from a different culture,” or that they are
“not accepting the ability of non-Whites.” In addition, a participant described White supervisors perceiving racial/ethnic supervisees’ cultural characteristics as “deficits or weaknesses.” Another participant further described this biased practice as White supervisors “assuming that [racial/ethnic minority students] are intimidated or cannot handle situations with other colleagues or professionals.” An Asian American supervisee provided an incident of this biased practice involving her writing of progress notes:

As an intern with prior work experience in the community I am used to writing “med. compliant” to convey in short hand “compliance with medication.” However when I wrote [med. compliant] . . . in a progress note my White supervisor said “Don’t worry, it’s probably just an English thing you didn’t learn.” I had to point out that [writing med. compliant] . . . was a training issue, because I was trained in community psychology and was asked to write the short hand in a progress note by a nurse practitioner.

In addition, a biracial supervisee described her experience with a White supervisor making prejudicial statements of racial/ethnic minority clients as inferior:

I was told that I should not “get down” to my client’s level and that I should set an example for them [racial/ethnic minority clients] to achieve. Basically, I was told since I am in the “top 1%,” I should act accordingly and not “too ethnic.”

Biased Practice Theme Three: White Supervisors Act as If They Are Multiculturally Sensitive When They Are Not

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors who believed they are open to or competent in multicultural issues when they are not. For example, one participant stated, “The most harmful professional practices by White supervisors are the practices by supervisors who believe they are culturally competent . . . [yet] they are unaware of their own biases, prejudices, and racism . . .” Some respondents used short phrases in describing White supervisors who believed they were open to
multicultural issues as, “pretend open minded,” “assume that they understand,” and 
“think that he/she is more aware or knowledgeable than [he/she] actually is.” Another 
participant described this biased practice as, “Acting like they’re culturally aware 
when in reality they are extremely ignorant.”

The second subtheme included White supervisors who give “lip service” to 
multicultural issues but they do not support multiculturalism. One participant 
described this biased practice by stating that White supervisors, “know the correct 
thing to say and do, but personally do not support the practice of multiculturalism.” 
Another participant depicted this hypocrisy as, “White supervisors are to quick to 
give ‘lip service’ to . . . ‘movements’ (such as multiculturalism) without really 
learning to explore dimensions of their [supervisors] own Whiteness and biases and 
how these come into play in contact with supervisees and others.” Similarly, 
respondents also described this practice as “talking the talk” but not “walking the 
walk” concerning multicultural issues in supervision. A respondent depicted his 
experience being the only African American male in a practicum class of six White 
students and a White supervisor:

During class we covered counseling African Americans and cultural mistrust 
was discussed. The professor emphasized how African Americans may 
distrust counselors due to racism and discrimination. During our final 
meeting, students met privately with the graduate assistants and the professor. 
I was criticized and received a lower grade because I was not open enough 
and I seemed to have trouble trusting in comparison to my White classmates 
who seemed to be very open and trusting in the class. So much for practicing 
what you preach.
Biased Practice Theme Four: White Supervisors' Attempt to Incorporate Multicultural Issues Involve Overgeneralized or Inaccurate Assumptions About Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees

This biased practice theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme included White supervisors assuming that racial/ethnic minority supervisees always have a complete understanding of or connection to their racial/ethnic community. Some participants described this biased practice as, "assuming the supervisee is the 'voice' for his/her entire ethnic group," or "assuming a (nontherapeutic) liaison between clients and supervisees when a similar cultural background exists." Another respondent depicted this biased practice as, "Assuming all ethnic diverse students are sensitive to the needs of their [ethnic] community." A Latina supervisee described a White supervisor wanting to use her as a connection to people in her ethnic community: "She [supervisor] felt that just because I am Latina, somehow that automatically gave me a connection to others of my same ethnicity."

The second subtheme involved White supervisors who inaccurately see issues involving culture or racism in the work of their racial/ethnic minority supervisee. For instance, one participant described a racial/ethnic minority female colleague’s experience with a White supervisor who questioned the appropriateness of her intervention with a client:

Supervisor inappropriately asked whether this [intervention] was caused by the “counselor’s” difficulty with dealing with European American clients because of power differentials i.e., supervisor was speculating that ethnic counselor was trying to exert power over client because of her feelings of powerlessness.

An African American female supervisee further illustrated an account of this biased practice when a White supervisor tried to interpret her feelings:

I [supervisee] had a client who had drawn a picture depicting a deer with a rifle above it, he [client] had written “KKKRN” for Klu Klux Klan Red Neck.
I wasn’t especially triggered by this, but during supervision, my supervisor kept asking me how I felt about it. Initially, I tried to describe my experience as an African American raised in a predominately White neighborhood. He [supervisor] interrupted me and said “That’s not what I asked, how do you feel about it?” The original point I was trying to make was that I had been confronting racism since I was in preschool. As a result, it is possible for me to be able to deal with these issues as they come up. He [supervisor] told me that I was minimizing my client’s drawings because it served a protective factor for me. I felt like this was inappropriate on many levels because I felt like he was almost trying to instigate resentment for my client. As an African-American woman, I am constantly faced with the challenges of racism and sexism and I do not need White male [supervisor] defining for me what an appropriate reaction should be. Also, the struggle for African-Americans is to not see racism around every corner because it can be stifling. I felt as if my experiences and my work through my racial identity development had been completely neglected.

Another participant shared an incident when a White supervisor tried to interpret his/her reactions concerning a client’s racist remarks by reporting, “In processing my own reactions and interactions regarding a client who made racist comments, my supervisor [stated], ‘So, this is particularly sensitive area for you?’ It was very disappointing for racism to be framed as my sensitivity.”

**Biased Practice Theme Five: White Supervisors Pathologize Supervisees or Clients Because of Their Race/Culture or Ethnicity**

One participant described White supervisors’ pathologizing of minority individuals as, “Thinking [that] behaviors, [and] thoughts which may be culturally appropriate are abnormal or deviant because ‘White’ people may not act that way.” Some respondents described this biased practice as, “imposing clinical diagnosis on cultural practices” and “inappropriately attributing pathology to ‘culture’ . . .” Another respondent depicted the pathologizing of supervisees by White supervisors as

. . . the most damaging practice is that of “pathologizing” the supervisee. This can take place indirectly, via “pathologizing” patients from a culture similar to
that of the supervisee, . . . [the supervisee] then becomes afraid of expressing contrary views for fear of being labeled “crazy” . . .

In addition, a participant illustrated an account of a White supervisor who pathologized an Asian student in a predominately White high school:

This student has been expressing feelings of being different from others because she is Asian. She [student] perceives certain teachers to subtly give more praise and attention onto other students. My supervisor hastily told me that “She’s not the only student in the school. She’s always been a little paranoid.”

Furthermore, a participant described an incident of a White supervisor pathologizing a client because of his/her ethnicity:

I had two assessment clients with some symptoms and clinical issues. Both of them had similar results in the psychological batteries of tests. So, I diagnosed them both with adjustment disorder. My supervisor disagreed and made me change my diagnosis of one of them to conduct disorder. One client was White (adjustment disorder) and the other client was Mexican (conduct disorder).

Exemplary Practices of White Supervisors

This section presents the themes that were derived through qualitative analysis regarding participants’ stories and opinions about exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The exemplary practice results are a combination of responses from question 2 and question 4 of the survey. Question 2 requested specific stories or incidents of White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Question 4 requested opinions about professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. In response to question 2, participants provided 264 stories (42,709 characters) of White supervisors’ exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Thirty-four stories (13,727 characters) were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The
remaining 234 exemplary practice stories on average consisted of three to four lines of typed transcript per story. Twenty-three (22%) of the participants contributed two or more stories of exemplary practices. In response to question 4, participants provided 408 opinions (26,360 characters) about professional attitudes or behaviors that contribute to exemplary practices by White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Fifty-three opinions (5,377 characters) were excluded because they were not clear due to vagueness or due to not directly answering the question. The remaining 355 opinions consisted of one line of typed transcript per opinion on average. Forty-one (39%) participants provided two or more opinions of professional practices that contribute to exemplary practices.

Six themes and eight subthemes emerged in the data analysis of respondents stories (question 2) and opinions (question 4) of White supervisors' exemplary practices (see Figure 4). This section is divided into six subsections corresponding to the six exemplary practice themes. Within each subsection, the overall exemplary practice theme and all its subthemes are defined first. Then each theme or subtheme is explained and illustrated with participants' verbatim words whenever possible.

**Exemplary Practice Theme One: White Supervisors Address Multicultural Issues in Supervision With Supervisees**

This exemplary practice theme is divided into three interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that challenge or question supervisees' cultural competence or perceptions. One respondent described this exemplary practice as, “questioning cultural competence regardless of ethnicity of supervisee.” Another participant believed that White supervisors should

... challenge the perceptions that are entrenched in minority therapists such as myself. Don’t allow minority therapists to just claim they “know” because
they are minorities... Have to have a theoretical or research base for assumptions about a given [minority] group.

1) **Exemplary Practice Theme One:** White supervisors address multicultural issues in supervision  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors challenge or question supervisees' cultural competence or perceptions  
   (b) White supervisors address racial/ethnic or cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the supervisory relationship  
   (c) White supervisors address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees

2) **Exemplary Practice Theme Two:** White supervisors work with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients in ways that show sensitivity toward both their individuality and their membership in various racial/ethnic groups  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of racial/ethnic minority clients and supervisees individuality within their racial/ethnic group  
   (b) White supervisors demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of different racial/ethnic minority groups

3) **Exemplary Practice Theme Three:** White supervisors work to develop their own multicultural competence in supervision and/or counseling  
   **Subthemes:**  
   (a) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through involving themselves in multicultural education and training  
   (b) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through examining personal issues concerning multiculturalism  
   (c) White supervisors work to develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients

4) **Exemplary Practice Theme Four:** White supervisors lacking multicultural competence either consult with or refer to others with more multicultural competence

5) **Exemplary Practice Theme Five:** White supervisors appreciate racial/ethnic minority supervisees

Figure 4. Exemplary Practice Themes and Subthemes.
A Latina supervisee depicted an account concerning her experience with a White supervisor’s challenge to her cultural competence:

I can only recall one incident where a supervisor actually challenged me on my cultural competence... [and it] resulted in a lively, intellectual, [and] forward conversation. I don’t recall if we were discussing African American or Latinos, but he [supervisor] just questioned my beliefs very appropriately...

The second subtheme included White supervisors that address racial/ethnic or cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the supervisory relationship. Some participants described this exemplary practice using short phrases such as, “discussions of the impact of race/ethnicity in... [the] supervisory relationship,” or “asking trainee to share when culture affects trainee’s relationship with supervisor...” Another respondent depicted her experience with a White supervisor in her first year of graduate school, “One of the first things she [supervisor] did in the first meeting was to discuss that our relationship was multicultural and we had a dialogue about what this means.” Similarly, a participant described an African American student’s experience with a White supervisor who addressed racial differences in their supervisory relationship: “...White supervisor asked her [African American student] how she felt about having a White supervisor. Were there any cultural issues that they needed to address and that she [supervisor] was willing to address these issues.”

The third subtheme involved White supervisors that address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees. For example, a participant described this exemplary practice as, “Encouraging [the] supervisee to develop multiple hypotheses regarding conceptualizations informed by knowledge of [the] culture.” Another respondent depicted a White supervisor that examined a number of multicultural issues in developing a conceptualization of a
client “[the] supervisor asked [the] trainee about the client’s ethnicity, worldview, and language and how these issues may impact on . . . formulations of the [client’s] case.” A Latina supervisee described an incident concerning her experience with a White supervisor in examining cultural issues in conceptualizing a White client as “[the] supervisor initiated conversations regarding culture (class and gender) to help develop greater conceptualization skills, even though ‘culture’ was not readily apparent when working with a White client.” One participant depicted a White supervisor’s exemplary practice as, “Asking about insights and requiring formulations regarding cultural and appropriate interventions in clinical cases—that are theory based and culturally sensitive.”

Exemplary Practice Theme Two: White Supervisors Work With Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees and Clients in Ways That Show Sensitivity Toward Both Their Individuality and Their Membership in Various Racial/Ethnic Groups

This exemplary theme is divided into two interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that show their knowledge or sensitivity of racial/ethnic minority clients and supervisees individuality within their racial/ethnic group. One participant described this exemplary practice as the, “Realization that a supervisee is an individual and may or may not differ from others of his/her ethnicity.” Another respondent observed some White supervisors that had taken the time to “understand the patient [racial/ethnic minority] as an individual, rather than with sweeping generalizations or as a mass of symptoms . . .” A Latina participant described an account of a White supervisor’s suggestion to examine each individual within a culture or racial group:

Had a supervisor tell me it’s always good to put on our different “lenses” according to the culture/race of our client, but it is best to remember to keep
“fine-tuning” the lenses for each individual. Everyone is different and may not fit the “stereotype” that we were taught in the books and in school.

The second subtheme included White supervisors that demonstrate their knowledge or sensitivity of different racial/ethnic minority groups. Some participants described this exemplary practice as “knowledge of different racial, religious, and cultural groups,” or “being aware of the history of different racial groups . . .” An African American supervisee depicted an account of a White supervisor’s knowledge and sensitivity of “greasing” African American hair:

In the 22 years since I started graduate school, I have only had one White supervisor that I can recall, who showed special sensitivity to cultural issues. We [supervisor and supervisee] were discussing an issue of a family I was seeing, where the mother reported on the behavior of the son while she was “greasing” her daughters hair. This supervisor actually knew what that [greasing] was and relayed how the girl down the street had “greased” his White daughter’s hair. He accepted this as a given thing that Blacks do (especially in the 70’s), rather than as something strange and inappropriate.

Exemplary Practice Theme Three: White Supervisors Work to Develop Their Own Multicultural Competence in Supervision and/or Counseling

This exemplary practice theme is divided into three interrelated subthemes. The first subtheme involved White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through involving themselves in multicultural education or training. For example, a participant described this exemplary practice as “. . . when the supervisors have undergone significant training in order to have a good level of cultural awareness/knowledge/skills.” Another respondent described this exemplary practice as, “Playing an active, ongoing role in multicultural training by attending workshops and reading about multicultural issues.” In addition, a respondent illustrated a similar view of gaining multicultural competence through, “Participating in self-education about the cultural of a client, e.g., continuing education workshops, readings.” Other
respondents also depicted this exemplary practice as “reading professional articles on cultural issues.”

The second subtheme included White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through examining personal issues concerning multiculturalism. Some participants illustrated this exemplary practice as “challenging one’s racism and racist learning’s,” or “self reflection and learning about racism, White privilege, and examining cultural issues.” Another respondent described the necessity for White supervisors to examine their biases:

Doing their own work on their own issues such as racism, sexism, homophobia. Allowing themselves to evaluate these personal issues, being vulnerable but growing from this experience. If you have racist beliefs, don’t understand White privilege and have blinders on, you won’t be able to serve the minority community, no matter how hard you try.

In addition, a participant further depicted this exemplary practice by stating that White supervisors need to “Proactively examine [their] own attitudes/beliefs by having on-going discussions surrounding multicultural issues.”

The third subtheme included White supervisors that work to develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients. Some participants depicted gaining cultural competence from supervisees as “readiness to learn collaboratively with interns,” or “learn from supervisees.” One respondent described the importance of listening to develop cultural competence, “Listening to ethnic students’ own experiences and being open to learning about a group that may not have a deep knowledge about.” Another participant described this exemplary practice as, “being willing to be taught by the supervisee and client if they are of a different culture.”
Exemplary Practice Theme Four: White Supervisors Lack Multicultural Competence

Either Consult With or Refer to Others With More Multicultural Competence

Some White supervisors who lack multicultural competence consult with, or refer to, more multiculturally competent professionals. For example, a participant gave an example of this exemplary practice:

I particularly know a White supervisor who is always eager to consult with Hispanic and Asian mental health professionals. This consultation is a good sign of “cultural sensitivity.” In one case, I [professional] was contacted by this supervisor because he was having problem understanding why a Hispanic father was “too resistant” to follow through with a family therapy plan that the supervisor [White] designed to assist in the management of “conflicts” in his immediate family (including his wife and three children). I told the supervisor that he would have to modify his treatment plan to give more “control” to the father because among many Hispanic men the cultural value of “machismo” and “marikanismo” is something very significant in their family/social relationships.

Another respondent illustrated an account of a White supervisor’s demand for consultation regarding an assessment of Russian client’s cognitive ability: “My supervisor insisted that I find another professional who had done this sort of an assessment and consult with him/her.” In addition, a respondent described an incident regarding a supervisee’s experience with a White supervisor referring a client due to language issues: “Supervisor instructed trainee, after discussion and explanation, to refer client to another therapist, one that had cultural linguistic competency [speaking Spanish] to work with the client [who was from Central America].”

Other White supervisors who lack multicultural competence consult with racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients. A multiracial/biracial supervisee described this exemplary practice, “I [supervisee] have encountered many White supervisors who realize the limits of their knowledge and . . . non-White experience, and they [supervisors] are willing to defer to my [supervisee] knowledge or greater
insight. This is a very important trait.” Another participant depicted an incident of a

White supervisor’s proposal to consult with a client regarding cultural issues:

In a testing case a supervisor was extremely careful in helping me figure out if a potential disorder was more culturally bound and not really a DSM-IV disorder. Symptoms in question related to extreme religiosity, including involvement in Voodoo and magical thinking. To help determine this, she suggested that I ask the client about all African-American individuals if they had the same beliefs or just her . . .

Exemplary Practice Theme Five: White Supervisors Appreciate Racial/Ethnic Minority Supervisees

Some participants described this exemplary practice using short phrases such as, “asking for my (ethnic/racial minority) opinion and not dictating,” “when they [White supervisors] see you for your working abilities and talents, and not by what you look like, or what your race is,” and “showing true respect for cultural differences and making no jokes about them.” An African American respondent described some ways White supervisors appreciate ethnic/racial minority supervisees by stating:

When they [White supervisors] are honest and supervise you like they would any other student. However, it is also helpful for them [White supervisors] to listen to and possibly validate our [racial/ethnic minority supervisees] feelings when we discuss issues during supervision that pertain to multicultural issues.

Another participant depicted this exemplary practice as, “Being sensitive to differences and appreciating them instead of seeing them as negative.” An Asian American supervisee described an account of a White supervisor’s sensitivity and respect towards her after she confronted him about a prejudicial remark:

. . . supervisor referred to my culture as oriental, I gently let him know I preferred to be referred to as “Asian.” He got this: The next time he made a reference to me he used the term “Asian.” I appreciated this—he was an old timer, a man in his 70’s who was not exposed to multicultural thinking. Yet I appreciated his respect and sensitivity and willingness to change.
Another Asian American supervisee also depicted her experience with a White supervisor by stating that the “White supervisor understood that some interventions may be culturally awkward for my [Asian American supervisee] ethnic background. Also, supervisor did not penalize me for being culturally different in her evaluation.”

**Exemplary Theme Six: White Supervisors Admit Their Biases Regarding Multicultural Issues**

Some participants used short phrases to describe this exemplary practice concerning ignorance of multicultural issues, “admission of not knowing,” “acknowledging their ignorance,” and “willing to admit their limitations of cultural knowledge.” Another respondent depicted a lack of ignorance regarding multicultural issues by White supervisors as, “barring true knowledge in the cross-cultural field, it is essential that the supervisors not be arrogant, that they are willing to admit ignorance . . .” A participant further stated that White supervisors should be “Acknowledging any lack of knowledge about the supervisees or supervisees culture/ethnicity instead of pretending to be an expert.”

Other respondents described this exemplary practice in terms of White supervisors admitting of their biases of multicultural issues. Some participants depicted this exemplary practice as “being open to criticism that they are biased, “admitting to bias and prejudice,” and “acknowledging their own assumptions and biases.” One respondent described the benefits of White supervisors being open to their own biases and prejudice: “White supervisors who are aware of their own prejudice and bias can benefit students who need to explore alternative theories or therapeutic interventions. In general, these types of supervisors are more open.”
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the study are discussed. This chapter is divided into six sections: (1) parameters of the present study, (2) overview of the results, (3) apparent contradictory findings, (4) results within the context of the multicultural supervision literature, (5) implications of the results for practice and training, and (6) suggestions for future research.

Parameters of the Study

This section will examine the parameters of the present study’s research design and results. This section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection addresses the parameters of the present study’s research design. The second subsection addresses the parameter of the present study’s transferability of the results.

Parameters of the Research Design

One parameter of the qualitative design of the study is that the present researcher conducted the majority of the data analysis. Having one researcher conduct the majority of the qualitative analysis can be limiting because he/she may view the data only from one perspective based on his or her experience and thus may miss other viewpoints of the data or disregard the meaning of the data. The present researcher incorporated three audits within the data analysis procedure in an effort to
ensure that the results of the study were not based solely on the researcher but on the phenomena of the study. The three audits in the present study did add to the confirmability of the results. However, a stronger approach to data analysis would have been a group approach to the primary analysis in addition to the audits, which would have allowed for multiple perspectives of examining data and minimizes misinterpreting the meaning of the data. Thus, it is important to note that the results of the present study are for the most part heavily based on the present researcher's perspective.

An additional possible parameter of the present study is the lack of depth concerning the themes of White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices. The purpose of the present study was to identify a broad range of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision and not to go into depth concerning practices. In order to classify a broad range of White supervisors' practices, the present researcher used an open-ended questionnaire to collect data from a large sample. Traditional qualitative studies typically interview a small sample of individuals for depth concerning a particular aspect of a phenomenon. Data from a traditional in-depth qualitative study allow researchers to interpret a specific aspect of a phenomenon in great detail but they do not provide much breadth concerning that phenomenon. The participants' reports from the present study provided a broad range, or breadth, of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision but they did not provide much detail concerning those practices. Each individual theme in the present study may seem shallow, providing almost naive information regarding multicultural supervision. Yet, when themes are combined, they provide meaning and significance in understanding White supervisors' multicultural supervision practices. Thus, it is important that the themes of the present study are not interpreted as
providing great depth or detail concerning White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices. However, the results should be interpreted as providing a breadth of White supervisors’ practices and as a starting point for future in-depth qualitative studies, as well as quantitative investigations.

Although the purpose of the present study was not to obtain a complete consensus of participants regarding the identification of White supervisors’ practices, this lack of consensus could be viewed as a parameter of the present study. A similar parameter was identified in Croteau and Lark's (1995) biased and exemplary study. Based on this parameter, it is critical that the present results are not interpreted as a consensus of what professionals and graduate students regard as White supervisors’ biased and exemplary practices, but rather as a survey of a broad range of biased and exemplary practices. Given that the purpose of the present study was to collect and describe a broad range of White supervisors' biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision, striving for a complete consensus would have been counterproductive to this purpose. Given the current lack of information on White supervisors, the present researcher believes that the first step in understanding White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices is identifying a broad range of practices.

Another possible parameter of the present study could be the low (18%) return rate. A parameter of a low return rate may be that some areas of White supervisors’ practices were not identified in the present study. However, in qualitative studies there are no set rules regarding sample size. Qualitative sampling is dependent on selecting information-rich cases that are important to the purpose of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990). The purposeful sampling technique used in the present study targeted participants who had knowledge of
White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision. One of the strengths of the study, which will be discussed later in this subsection, was the purposeful sampling procedure. Clearly, the participants in the present study were knowledgeable about multicultural issues and multicultural supervision, represented different racial/ethnic groups, and had a wide variety of training levels. Even though the present study had a low return rate the participants were information rich and were able to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of White supervisors' practices.

Another parameter of the research design was in providing an explicit narrative of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Croteau and Lark (1995) reported that the storytelling nature of qualitative data may make the phenomena of study more real for the readers of the study. Thus, while these results do not establish any sense of the quantity of biased or exemplary multicultural supervision practices, the narrative reports from participants in the present study may be more persuasive than quantitative data in illuminating White supervisors' practices for readers. For example, the narrative reports of participants provide readers with an actual picture of experiences of biased and exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Croteau and Lark (1995) also stated that the storytelling nature of qualitative data at an emotional level might motivate professionals to change their behavior. Correspondingly, the narrative reports from participants in the present study also captured their emotions concerning White supervisors' practices, which may also motivate White supervisors to change their behavior. For example, if White supervisors reading the participants' stories of White supervisors' failure to address the impact of race or ethnicity in the supervisory relationship may encourage White supervisors to develop their own multicultural awareness/knowledge.
In discussing the parameters, it is important to note that the research design was based on a critique of the three previous biased and exemplary studies (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991). The critique of those studies was conducted to make improvements in the present study’s methodology over those of its predecessors. The present study improved on the previous methodologies by linking different aspects of the methods with each other. For instance, the present research question is linked with the sampling procedure, and the data collection instrument is linked with the research question and sampling procedure. The present methodology also combined the strengths of the three previous studies by explicitly describing and providing a rational for each aspect of the methods (Croteau & Lark, 1995), auditing of the data analysis procedures (Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991), and providing thick written descriptions of the findings (APA, 1975; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Garnets et al., 1991). Linking different aspects of the methods and combining the strengths of the three previous methodologies improved the overall methodology regarding of the present biased and exemplary research design. In addition, linking different aspects of the methods and explicitly describing and providing a rational for each aspect of the methods in the present study contributed to a clear and consistent research design, which adds to the dependability of the results.

Also important to note is the success of the purposeful sampling procedure, which aimed at sampling individuals who have knowledge of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The participants in the present study were indeed knowledgeable about multicultural issues and multicultural supervision. For example, among the participants, 84 (81%) had attended two or more multicultural counseling
workshops, 62 (59%) had been involved in three or more research projects concerning multicultural issues, 75 (72%) had worked with six or more clients concerning multicultural issues, 60 (58%) had one to three supervisors address multicultural issues in their own supervision. Having knowledgeable participants in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

The high representation of different racial/ethnic groups among the participants also adds to the argument for successful purposeful sampling. The racial breakdown of participants in the study consisted of 27% Chicano/Hispanic/Latino, 23% African American/Black, 20% Caucasian, 16% Asian American, 6% Multiracial/Biracial, 3% Pacific Islander, 2% American Indian, and 1% international. The strength of the diverse representation of races adds to the credibility of the results, because the participants' stories and opinions of White supervisors are from a variety of different racial perspectives. The purpose of the present study was to identify a "broad range" of White supervisors' practices and having a wide spectrum of racial/ethnic participants in the sample of the present study made it more likely to classify a broad range of practices. Additionally having wide range of racial/ethnic participants in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

Successful purposeful sampling is also supported by data on the participants' level of training. The participants were almost evenly split regarding their level of training, with 53 (51%) being professionals and 51 (49%) being graduate students. Having an almost even split regarding level of training among the participants gives the results more credibility because the results are based on a wide variety of levels of supervisees' and supervisors' experiences of training, practice, and professional development. Again, the purpose of the present study was to identify a "broad range"
of White supervisors' practices and having a large sample of professionals and graduates in different stages of training made it more likely to classify a broad range of practices. Similarly having a large sample of professionals and graduates in different stage of training in the present study added to the credibility and meaningfulness of the results.

Lastly, in discussing parameters, it is important to note the author's own membership in the group whose issues were being studied. This strength is similar to one identified in Croteau and Lark's (1995) biased and exemplary study in which the authors identified as members of the cultural group being investigated. A number of authors have cautioned White researchers about conducting multicultural research on minority individuals due to potential racial and ethnic biases (Mio & Iwamasa, 1993; Parham, 1993; Sue, 1993). In the present study, a White researcher focused on White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision to capitalize on his knowledge of his own culture as opposed to studying individuals from cultures different than his own.

Transferability of the Results

A parameter of the present study's results is the transferability. At a philosophical level, generalizing or transferring the results from a qualitative (constructivism) study differs dramatically compared to a quantitative (positivism) study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Quantitative studies employ random sampling because it allows for generalizations back to the population (Creswell, 1994; Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993). Qualitative research employs purposeful sampling, which provides the researcher with a sample that is representative of the information needed. However, the data from this type of sample are less generalizable.
than data from a randomized sample (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990).

The responsibility of the transferability of the results of a qualitative study lies with the reader and not the author of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1981; Marshall & Rossman, 1995). For example, readers of the present study need to take into account the participants' multicultural counseling and supervision experiences and their views regarding multicultural supervision and White supervisors when applying the results to their particular sample and situation. The participants were practitioners and members of Division 45, which indicates their interest and knowledge of diversity issues and clinical supervision. Although the sample is one of the strengths of the present study, it is important for readers to critically examine the possible transferability of results to other populations with less knowledge of diversity issues as well as to nonclinical supervisory relationships such as mentoring and academic advising. Additionally, the readers of the present study need to take into account the researchers and their own level of experience with multicultural counseling and supervision when applying the results. In summary, even though the present researcher believes that the study provides a template of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision, readers need to think realistically and critically whether the results are applicable to their specific sample and situation.

Overview of the Results

This section provides an overview of the results. The results of the present study can be viewed as a map of effective supervision practices for White supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. To construct this map, the present researcher combined exemplary and biased themes of White supervisors' practices in
multicultural supervision identified in Chapter IV. Four general areas of effective supervision practices of White supervisors conducting multicultural supervision were identified when biased and exemplary themes were combined. The intent of such an approach is to provide the reader with a useful synthesis of the biased and exemplary practices reported by the participants in this study. In contrast, the exemplary and biased themes reported in Chapter IV involved participants identifying, describing, and classifying a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

This section is divided into four subsections corresponding to the four areas involved in effective multicultural supervision practices for White supervisors. The first subsection involves the development of multicultural competence in White supervisors. The second subsection involves White supervisors who lack multicultural competencies being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals. This subsection also involves White supervisors being open to admitting to their own ignorances or biases. The third subsection involves White supervisors being sensitive and knowledgeable of racial/ethnic minority supervisees. The fourth subsection involves White supervisors addressing multicultural issues in supervision.

**Developing Multicultural Competence**

Participants reported that one component of effective multicultural supervision practice for White supervisors involved developing multicultural competence. White supervisors can develop multicultural competence through multicultural education and training opportunities, such as attending classes and workshops that focus on multicultural issues. Multicultural education also consisted
of reading about multicultural issues in professional journals and other works. White supervisors can also develop multicultural competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients. For example, White supervisors can learn from supervisees or clients by listening to their stories, experiences, or knowledge concerning multicultural issues.

The participants in the study suggested that it is also essential that White supervisors develop multicultural competence through examining their own personal issues concerning multiculturalism. Examining personal issues may consist of supervisors investigating their potentially biased attitudes/beliefs about multiculturalism. It seems especially important that White supervisors examine their biased assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees’ abilities. If these biased assumptions are not examined, White supervisors can give inappropriate negative evaluations concerning racial/ethnic minority supervisees’ counseling skills or therapeutic actions. In addition, if White supervisors’ biased assumptions of racial/ethnic minority supervisees’ abilities are not examined, they may give negative evaluations of supervisees for bringing up multicultural issues in supervision. Furthermore, if White supervisors do not examine their biased assumptions of racial/ethnic minorities, they might pathologize their racial/ethnic minority supervisees or clients.

To develop multicultural competencies, White supervisors also need to examine their overgeneralized or inaccurate assumptions about racial/ethnic minority supervisees. If White supervisors do not address their overgeneralizations of racial/ethnic minority supervisees, they could assume that all racial/ethnic minority supervisees have a complete understanding of their racial ethnic group. Additionally, White supervisors that do not examine their overgeneralizations can assume that all
racial/ethnic minority supervisees are closely linked to their particular racial/ethnic communities. These overgeneralized assumptions can also lead White supervisors to focus on issues involving culture or racism in supervision with racial/ethnic minority supervisees for whom these issues are not directly relevant.

**Being Open to a Lack of Multicultural Competence**

Participants reported that another component of effective supervision practice for White supervisors involved being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals when lacking multicultural competence. White supervisors who are open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals demonstrate their sincerity about their lack of multicultural understanding and their willingness to learn about multicultural issues. White supervisors can consult with multiculturally competent racial/ethnic minority supervisees, clients, or other professionals. It is critical for White supervisors who lack multicultural competence to be open to admitting their own ignorances or biases regarding multicultural issues with supervisees. If open to their own ignorances or biases concerning multicultural issues, White supervisors are more apt to be receptive to multicultural issues in supervision.

Additionally, it is important that White supervisors do not act as if they are multiculturally sensitive or aware when they are not. White supervisors who believe they are competent in multicultural issues when they are not are likely to commit biased practice in multicultural supervision because of their lack awareness concerning multicultural issues. Furthermore, White supervisors who give “lip service” to multicultural issues but whose actions do not support multiculturalism may also engage in biased practice in multicultural supervision.
Sensitivity and Knowledge of Racial/Ethnic Minorities

The participants in this study demonstrated that another component of effective supervision practice by White supervisors in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors being sensitive to and knowledgeable about racial/ethnic minorities. Such sensitivity toward racial/ethnic minority supervisees appears to be critical for White supervisors. For example, White supervisors who are sensitive to racial/ethnic minority supervisees can be supportive of cultural differences they bring to supervision and not view them as something detrimental to the supervisory process.

It is also essential that White supervisors working with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients demonstrate sensitivity and knowledge toward both their individuality and their membership in various racial/ethnic groups. Specifically, White supervisors working with racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients demonstrate sensitivity and knowledge when they are attentive to the fact that a wide range of within-group differences are expressed by individuals in each racial/ethnic minority group. Not only is it important for White supervisors to acknowledge racial/ethnic minorities' individuality, but they must also demonstrate their sensitivity or knowledge of different racial/ethnic minority groups.

Addressing Multicultural Issues

According to participants, another component of White supervisors' effective practice in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors addressing multicultural issues in supervision. Specifically, it is important for White supervisors to address racial/ethnic and cultural issues that impact the dynamics of the
supervisory relationship. For example, White supervisors working with supervisees who are racial/ethnic minorities must acknowledge that the supervisory relationship is multicultural. White supervisors who fail to address racial/ethnic issues that impact the supervisory relationship take a "colorblind" position. A colorblind position is defined as White supervisors who interact with racial/ethnic supervisees without the consideration of the impact of race in their supervisory relationship (Williams & Halgin, 1995). Not only is it essential for White supervisors to address multicultural issues with supervisees, but to also challenge supervisees' cultural competence and not presume that all racial/ethnic minority supervisees are multiculturally competent.

In addition, it is critical for White supervisors to address multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees. White supervisors who fail to address multicultural issues in client formulations may give the impression that multicultural issues are not important or valued. Furthermore, it is important for White supervisors to address multicultural issues in supervision and not expect racial/ethnic minority supervisees to "educate" them on multicultural issues. For example, racial/ethnic minority supervisees who have been asked to educate White supervisors or supervisees may feel resentment concerning this expectation.

Apparent Contradictory Findings

A number of the themes or subthemes in the present study appear to contradict one another. This section will identify and address these apparently contradictory findings. For example, one exemplary subtheme (subtheme 3 of exemplary theme 3) involved White supervisors developing multicultural competencies by being open to learning from supervisees or clients. This subtheme was supported by another exemplary theme (exemplary theme 4) that included White
supervisors who lacked multicultural competence consulting with racial/ethnic minority supervisees. However, these findings of exemplary practice appear to be contradictory to another finding in the biased themes (subtheme 4 of biased theme 1). This biased practice theme involved White supervisors who failed to address multicultural issues and expected racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues. Thus, some racial/ethnic minority supervisees were finding this practice of “educating” White supervisors biased and inappropriate.

These seemingly contradictory findings may indicate that there are subtle differences between supervisors who are open to learning from their supervisees and supervisors who overrely upon their supervisees for multicultural education. In the former case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are aware of their multicultural limitations, are open to learning from supervisees, and communicate this openness. In the latter case, supervisees could have a negative reaction to supervisors who rely upon them too much rather than taking responsibility for their own multicultural development. This may explain why being educated by the supervisee was present under both exemplary and biased practices in multicultural supervision. Data from the current study, however, are not fully sufficient to explain the phenomena. However, White supervisors should be cautious about overreliance on their supervisees.

Another contradictory finding included an exemplary theme (exemplary theme 5) that involved White supervisors being sensitive and supportive of racial/ethnic minority supervisees in supervision. This theme was potentially contradictory to an exemplary subtheme (subtheme 1 of exemplary theme 1) that indicated effective practice in multicultural supervision involved White supervisors who challenge or question supervisees’ cultural competence or perceptions. Again, these two
exemplary findings could send mixed signals, on the one hand it is important for White supervisors to support racial/ethnic minority supervisees, and on the other hand it is also important to challenge racial/ethnic minority supervisees.

These possibly contradictory findings may be due to differences between White supervisors' multicultural awareness/knowledge. In the former case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are multiculturally aware enough to be sensitive and supportive of racial/ethnic minority supervisees. In the later case, supervisees could have a positive reaction to supervisors who are multiculturally competent and are able to use their multicultural awareness/knowledge to appropriately challenge a supervisee's cultural competence. This might explain why both supporting and challenging supervisees were present in exemplary practices in multicultural supervision. Again, data from the current study are not fully adequate to explain this phenomena.

These apparently contradictory findings highlight the importance for White supervisors to be conscious of the fact that multicultural supervision, like all supervision, is not straightforward and concrete, but that it is complex and fluid. Therefore, it is critical that White supervisors who conduct multicultural supervision make decisions about working with each supervisee on an individual basis because each multicultural supervisory relationship is different and unique. For example, a White supervisor should carefully assess whether it would be appropriate to approach a supervisee about consulting him/her or whether to seek consultation with someone else. Similarly, a White supervisor should also carefully assess whether it would be appropriate to be supportive or challenge a supervisee's cultural competence or perceptions in supervision. Additionally, White supervisors would need to assess whether they are multiculturally aware/knowledgeable enough to challenge a
supervisee’s cultural competence. One method for making each of these assessments could be to have process dialogues with supervisees about how they experience supervisors who need to be educated and who challenge their cultural competence.

Context of Multicultural Supervision Literature

This section examines the results of the present study in the context of the multicultural supervision literature. The result of the present study echoes some of what has already been stated in the multicultural literature. The results of the present study also provide a new slant or a different “voice” to some of what has been written about in the multicultural supervision literature. This section is divided into four subsections corresponding to the four areas involved in effective multicultural supervision practices for White supervisors identified in the beginning of this chapter. The first subsection involves White supervisors addressing multicultural issues in supervision. The second subsection involves the development of multicultural competence in White supervisors. The third subsection involves White supervisors being sensitive and knowledgeable of racial/ethnic minority supervisees. The fourth subsection involves White supervisors who lack multicultural competencies being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally knowledgeable individuals. This subsection also involves White supervisors being open to admitting to their own ignorances or biases. Within each subsection the results are first presented in the context of the multicultural supervision literature and then, when applicable, present an extension, or reinterpretation, of the existing multicultural supervision literature.
Addressing Multicultural Issues

At a general level the results demonstrated that addressing multicultural issues is an important aspect of effective practices by White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The importance of addressing multicultural issues in supervision supports Tyler et al.'s (1991) proposition that supervisors are responsible for addressing diversity issues in supervision because it is their professional role to bring up diversity issues. The results also revealed on a more specific level the importance of addressing multicultural issues concerning White supervisors' practices. For example, the results indicated that White supervisors' effective practices included addressing differences among members of the triadic supervisory relationship. These findings support Gopaul-McNicol and Brice-Baker's (1998) view that supervisors are responsible to discuss cultural differences between supervisors and supervisees, especially when majority supervisors are working with minority supervisees. Constantine (1997) also found in her study that supervisors and supervisees believed that their supervision relationship could be enhanced regarding multicultural issues if racial differences were processed between supervisor and supervisee. Williams and Halgin (1995) have referred to failing to see racial/ethnic differences as "color-blindness." Color-blindness, or ignoring the race of supervisees and clients, has also been referred to as "hallucinatory whitening" (Jones et al., 1970; Remington & DaCosta, 1989). These results also indicated that White supervisors' effective practice included addressing multicultural issues that concern client formulations or conceptualizations with supervisees. This finding supports Priest's (1994) model of multicultural awareness, in which supervisors in the sixth stage of multicultural
awareness were able to form appropriate culturally specific methodologies in supervision.

Some of the specific results about addressing multicultural issues in supervision provided new insight into White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision. For example, the results illustrate that effective practice involves White supervisors challenging supervisees’ cultural competence or perceptions in supervision. This finding had not been previously addressed in the multicultural supervision literature. Even though the present study identified this practice by White supervisors as effective, White supervisors should be cautious about challenging supervisees’ multicultural competence. A White supervisor who lacks sufficient multicultural awareness/knowledge may be unable to assess a supervisee’s multicultural competence let alone challenge a supervisee’s cultural perceptions or competence. Additionally, the results demonstrated that biased practice involved White supervisors failing to address multicultural issues and expecting racial/ethnic minority supervisees to “educate” them on multicultural issues. This finding provided a new perspective on the multicultural supervision literature regarding addressing multicultural issues in supervision. Again, it seems critical that White supervisors assess whether it would be appropriate to approach a supervisee about consulting him/her or whether to seek consultation with someone else.

A number of authors have stated the importance of supervisors addressing multicultural issues early on in the supervisory relationship (Carroll, 1996; Fong & Lease, 1997; Morgan, 1984). However, the results of the present study clearly indicated that White supervisors need to address multicultural issues throughout the supervisory relationship and not only in the beginning of supervision. It is important that White supervisors address multicultural issues early in supervision, because it
signals to the supervisee that this is an acceptable area of discussion. However, if White supervisors do not address multicultural issues throughout the supervisory relationship, supervisees may interpret addressing multicultural issues early in supervision as only giving “lip service” to diversity issues.

**Developing Multicultural Competence**

The present findings indicated at a general level that developing multicultural competencies is a significant aspect of effective practices for White supervisors in multicultural supervision. On a more specific level, the findings suggested that White supervisors’ effective practices involved working to develop multicultural competence by examining their own personal issues regarding race/culture and ethnicity. This finding is supported by a number of authors (e.g., Morgan, 1984; Remington & DaCosta, 1989) who have reported that supervisors must be aware of their own personal racial biases and countertransference issues. More specifically, the results demonstrated that if White supervisors do not examine their own personal issues, they can conduct biased practices. For example, the results suggested that White supervisors may negatively evaluate or even reprimand racial/ethnic minority supervisees, based on prejudiced assumptions of their abilities. Furthermore, a lack of awareness of personal issues regarding race/culture or ethnicity may cause White supervisors to act as if they are multiculturally sensitive when they are not. Additionally, White supervisors’ prejudices concerning race/culture or ethnicity may cause a biased practice of pathologizing racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients because of their race/culture or ethnicity. This finding partially supports Bradshaw’s (1982) view that White supervisors need to be careful not to pathologize the
behaviors and attitudes of African American clients and realize that some
"symptoms" can be cultural adaptations.

The results also demonstrated that focusing inappropriately on multicultural
issues leads to biased supervision practice that could involve White supervisors
making overgeneralized or inaccurate assumptions about racial/ethnic minority
supervisees’ connection to their community. This biased practice upholds Williams
and Halgin’s (1995) proposition that some White supervisors are "color-sighted."
Color-sighted supervisors continuously focus on race to the neglect of other
important issues in supervision or counseling. Similarly, the biased practice finding of
White supervisors who inaccurately focus on culture or racism in the work of their
racial/ethnic minority supervisees, also supports Williams and Halgin’s "color-
sighted” proposition.

The results also indicated that White supervisors develop multicultural
competence through being open to learning from supervisees or clients. This result is
consistent with the literature in terms of supervisees teaching supervisors about
As stated earlier in this chapter, this result is inconsistent with another finding from
the present study regarding racial/ethnic minority supervisees “educating” White
supervisors, as being considered a biased practice. Clearly, there are some
inconsistencies between the literature and the results of the current study about White
supervisors being educated by their supervisees. Again, White supervisors should be
cautious about overreliance on their supervisees and individually evaluate whether it
would be appropriate to approach a supervisee about consulting him/her or whether
to seek consultation with someone else.
Sensitivity and Knowledge of Racial/Ethnic Minorities

At a general level, the results also established that having sensitivity and knowledge is an essential aspect of effective practice for White supervisors in multicultural supervision. On a more specific level, this involved being sensitive or knowledgeable of racial/ethnic minority supervisees and clients as individuals within their racial/ethnic group. This finding supports Brown and Landrum-Brown’s (1995) argument that racial ethnic individuals differ within their own racial/ethnic group. The results also demonstrated that White supervisors’ effective practice included being sensitive or knowledgeable of different racial/ethnic minority groups. This finding supports a number of authors’ views that it is essential to be sensitive and familiar with a variety of racial/ethnic minority groups (e.g., Carney & Kahn, 1984; Constantine, 1997; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997). Even though the above findings are relatively established within the multicultural literature, it is essential that White supervisors are sensitive to different racial/ethnic minority groups’ cultural characteristics, as well as individual differences within those same racial/ethnic minority groups.

Being Open to a Lack of Multicultural Competence

The findings also indicated at a general level that being open to one’s lack of multicultural competencies is an important aspect of effective practice for White supervisors in multicultural supervision. Specifically, the results demonstrated that the effective practice of those White supervisors lacking multicultural competence involved being open to consulting with, or referring to, more multiculturally competent individuals. D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) proposition that supervisors...
should actively consult with local communities' "cultural ambassadors" who are knowledgeable about different multicultural issues supports this finding. This finding also supports D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) view that supervisors should solicit advise from culturally diverse supervisees that have more multicultural knowledge than supervisors. Again, White supervisors should be cautious about overreliance on their supervisees and individually evaluate whether it would be appropriate to approach a supervisee about consulting him/her or whether to seek consultation with someone else. In addition, the results suggested that effective practice involved White supervisors admitting to their ignorances or biases concerning multicultural issues. This exemplary practice finding supports D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) suggestion that supervisors do not always have to be multiculturally competent in supervision and that they can be vulnerable with supervisees concerning multicultural issues.

Implications for Training and Practice

This section examines the implications of the results for training and practice concerning issues of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. The implications of the results for training and practice for the present study are applicable on various levels. The implications of the results were patterned after Croteau and Lark’s (1995) and Stage and Hamrick’s (1994) belief that to promote multiculturalism effectively there needs to be improvements at multiple levels.

At an individual level, the biased and exemplary themes of White supervisors’ practices in multicultural supervision may act as a powerful tool for self-reflection for the reader. Reading the descriptions of the participants’ experiences with White supervisors may assist White students and professionals to reflect upon their own multicultural supervision practice. For example, White supervisors reading the
exemplary theme concerning the importance of addressing multicultural issues in supervision may reflect on whether or not they have addressed multicultural issues in supervision. If they are not addressing multicultural issues in supervision, reflecting on the theme may motivate them to address multicultural issues in supervision. On the other hand, if White supervisors are addressing multicultural issues in multicultural supervision, reflecting on the theme may validate their supervision practice.

Reading the themes may also assist White students and professionals in examining their own possible prejudices concerning racial and ethnic minorities. For example, the biased theme of White supervisors reprimanding racial/ethnic minority supervisees based on biased assumptions of their abilities consists of many hurtful and painful stories of White supervisors’ prejudicial practices. These painful stories might facilitate White students or professionals to pause and reflect on the consequences of their own biases regarding racial/ethnic minorities. White students and professionals who reflect upon their possible racial and ethnic biases and discover that they may be prejudicial in their practices, may become motivated to examine their biases and be more open to multicultural issues in supervision.

Correspondingly, reading the themes may also validate and support racial/ethnic minority supervisees’ experiences of exemplary or biased multicultural supervision. For instance, a racial/ethnic minority supervisee reading the biased theme regarding White supervisors pathologizing supervises or clients because of their race/culture or ethnicity, may cause the supervisee to reflect on whether they have had an experience of being pathologized by White supervisors. If a supervisee had a similar experience of being pathologized by a White supervisor, it may confirm their
experience and possibly give the supervisee strength to confront a White supervisor if this biased practice occurs again in supervision.

At a broader level, educators or trainers can use the themes and the map of White supervisors' effective practice to guide them in developing curriculum, workshops, and in-service training programs. The map directs educators and trainers to the four key areas (developing multicultural competence, being open to a lack of multicultural competence, sensitivity and knowledge of racial/ethnic minorities, and addressing multicultural issues) to focus on when addressing White supervisors' effective multicultural supervision practices when developing courses or other training programs. Additionally, the participants' stories and opinions in the themes can be used to make the four effective practices concrete and real, as well as highlight the biased practices that occur when these four areas are not addressed by White supervisors in multicultural supervision.

At an even broader level, the themes and map can assist in the beginning of a national discussion of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision. Such a national discussion is critical and warranted given that the majority of supervisors conducting multicultural supervision are White and that the field of counseling psychology has taken a leadership role in multicultural issues associated with counseling. Having a national discussion on determining what are biased and exemplary practices for White supervisors in multicultural supervision may lead to discussions of what are good multicultural supervision practices. In addition to providing inspiration for future research projects, discussions concerning what are effective multicultural supervision practices could lead to the development of guidelines, principles, or competencies for all supervisors providing multicultural supervision. Competencies were developed for multicultural counseling and have
been helpful in training and determining counselors’ effective practices in conducting multicultural counseling (Sue et al., 1982). Developing guidelines, principles, and competencies would be similarly helpful for supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. The present study provides an initial map or starting point of areas to focus on when developing guidelines or competencies for supervisors conducting multicultural supervision. Consequently, having national guidelines, principles, competencies of exemplary practice in multicultural supervision are likely to also be a catalyst for multiple levels of change (i.e., institutional and individual). For example, national guidelines will help institutions develop appropriate curriculum for students and professionals to conduct exemplary multicultural supervision and thus affect individual multicultural supervision practices.

Implications for Future Research

This section provides recommendation for future research based on the results of the present study. This section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection addresses future areas of research regarding White supervisors’ multicultural supervision practices utilizing other types of methodologies and research designs. The second subsection presents ideas on investigations on other areas of supervision using the biased and exemplary methodology.

Utilizing Other Types of Methodologies and Research Designs

The present study provided a broad range of White supervisors’ practices, however, it did not provide much depth about their practices. Traditional qualitative methodologies utilizing in-depth interviews could provide additional information regarding the meaning of the current findings. It is likely that in depth interviews with
both supervisors and supervisees regarding their multicultural supervision experiences, with a special focus on the themes developed in the present study, could add clarity on various White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision. For example, in depth interviews could provide insight into how White supervisors can effectively address racial/ethnic and cultural issues that can influence the supervisory relationship, what are the best ways to demonstrate sensitivity towards racial/ethnic minority supervisees, and when to challenge versus support racial/ethnic minority supervisees. A qualitative study like this could also provide information on when it is or is not appropriate for White supervisors to ask to be “educated” by supervisees. In addition, qualitative interviews with White supervisors may also provide more information on the reasons for some White supervisors being more open to admitting their ignorance or biases regarding multicultural issues and striving to develop their multicultural competence compared to other White supervisors. The present researcher believes that it is critical to interview both supervisors and supervisees in order to gather in-depth information regarding the phenomena of White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision.

Quantitative methodologies could also be used to further examine the results of the present study. The themes of the present study could be developed into a scale to measure White supervisors' exemplary and biased practices in multicultural supervision. For example, a scale could assess the types and frequencies of various exemplary and biased practices experienced by ethnic/racial supervisees in supervision with White supervisors. Having information concerning the types and frequencies of biased or exemplary practices of White supervisors could guide educators and trainers about what areas to put more emphasis on when developing curriculum or workshops in multicultural supervision.
A scale designed from the present study's themes could provide important information regarding multicultural supervision when used in conjunction with other quantitative measures. For instance, a quantitative scale of biased and exemplary practices could provide information on whether experiences of biased and exemplary supervision practices are associated with other supervision and counseling constructs, such as counseling self-efficacy and supervisory working alliance. For example, it is possible that more biased multicultural practices by supervisors would have a negative impact on the supervisory working alliance when rated by supervisees. Overall, it is important to understand the relationship between multicultural supervision and other training variables in order to advance training and development in counseling psychology.

Other Areas of Supervision Using Biased and Exemplary Methodology

A review of the literature clearly demonstrates a lack of research on multicultural supervision. It seems that the present methodology of biased and exemplary practice would be an excellent technique to examine other areas of multicultural supervision as well as the experiences of members of other oppressed groups participating in multicultural supervision. For example, research on supervisors who are working with other minority supervisees, such as gay/lesbian/bisexual supervisees, international supervisees, and supervisees with disabilities, could provide critical information regarding biased and exemplary supervision practices with these groups. In a recent symposium at the American Psychological Association regarding multicultural supervision, underrepresented groups within the multicultural supervision literature of supervisees and supervisors were addressed (Rooney & Nilsson, 2000). All the presenters in this symposium pointed out the
limited amount of information, theory, and research on underrepresented groups, such as gay/lesbian and bisexual supervisees (Rooney, 2000), international supervisees (Nilsson, 2000), and Asian and Asian American supervisees/supervisors (Perez, 2000). Even though the presenters provided important pieces of information regarding these groups of supervisees/supervisors, only a limited picture of supervision practices with these groups were provided. Given the lack of information on the supervision practices of the above-underrepresented groups, the biased and exemplary research design would seem an ideal methodology and starting point, to identify a broad range of supervision practices within each of these groups.
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Open-ended Written Questionnaire
White Supervisors' Biased and Exemplary
Practices Questionnaire

Below are some questions regarding biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. When answering the questions you may draw your responses from your current or past experiences as a supervisee in multicultural supervision with a White supervisor or as a White supervisor in multicultural supervision. You may also draw your responses from reports from friends or colleagues regarding their experiences as a supervisee with a White supervisor in multicultural supervision or as a White supervisor in multicultural supervision.

In this study multicultural supervision is defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship (supervisor, supervisee, client) is racially/ethnically different from the other members.

1. Please describe in detail 1 to 3 incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor that was biased, inadequate, or inappropriate. Indicate your source of information (e.g., “A friend or colleague told me,” “Happened to me when I was a student,” “I observed it,” etc.). Please do not give information that could identify any of the persons or institutions you refer to in this questionnaire.

Use the back of this page or additional sheets if needed.
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2. Please describe in detail 1 to 3 incidents of multicultural supervision involving a White supervisor that demonstrated special sensitivity. As previously, please indicate the source of information for each incident.
3. In your opinion what professional practices by White supervisors are especially harmful in multicultural supervision?

4. In your opinion what professional practices by White supervisors are especially beneficial in multicultural supervision?

Use the back of this page or additional sheets if needed.

Thank you for your participation.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope:

Brian D. Paul, M.A./4508 Jefferson Street/Kansas City, MO 64111
Demographic Sheet

Please check or fill in all the answers below that apply. In this study multicultural supervision is defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship (supervisor, supervisee, client) is racially/ethnically different from the other members.

1. Age: __________

2. Gender:
   Male ___    Female ___

3. Choose One Primary Racial/Ethnic Identification:
   African-American/Black ___    Asian-American ___    Pacific Islander ___    American Indian ___
   Alaskan Native ___    Caucasian ___    Chicano/Hispanic/Latino ___    Multiracial/Biracial ___
   International (specify) ___________________    Other (specify) ___________________

4. Sexual Orientation:
   Bisexual ___    Gay/Lesbian ___    Heterosexual ___    Not Sure/Other ___

5. Highest Degree:
   Doctoral ___    Masters ___    Bachelors ___    Other (specify) ___________________

6. Training Status:
   Professional ___    Graduate Student ___    Other (specify) ___________________

7. Degree Program:
   Counseling ___    Clinical ___    School ___    Other (specify) ___________________

8. Work Setting:
   Hospital ___    Counseling Center ___    Academic Department ___    Community Agency ___
   Private Practice ___    Other (specify) ___________________

9. State of Work Setting: ___________________

10. Number of multicultural counseling courses taken:
   Zero ___    One ___    Two ___    Three or more ___
11. Number of supervision courses taken:
Zero____ One____ Two____ Three or more____

12. Number of multicultural counseling workshops attended:
Zero____ One____ Two____ Three or more____

13. Number of multicultural supervision workshops attended:
Zero____ One____ Two____ Three or more____

14. Number of research projects you have been involved in regarding multicultural issues:
Zero____ 1-2____ 3-5____ 6-10____ 11-15____ 16 or more____

15. Number of supervisees you have supervised:
Zero____ 1-5____ 6-10____ 11-20____ 21-30____ 31 or more____

16. Number of clients you have worked with concerning multicultural issues:
Zero____ 1-5____ 6-10____ 11-20____ 21-30____ 31 or more____

17. Number of supervisors who have addressed multicultural issues in your supervision:
Zero____ One____ Two____ Three____ 4-6____ 7-10____ 11 or more____

18. Number of supervisees you have supervised for whom multicultural issues were addressed:
Zero____ One____ Two____ Three____ 4-6____ 7-10____ 11 or more____

19. Which racial/ethnic group do you have the most counseling experience with:
African-American/Black____ Asian-American____ Pacific Islander____ American Indian____
Alaskan Native____ Caucasian____ Chicano/Hispanic/Latino____ Multiracial/Biracial____
International (specify)____________________ Other (specify)__________________________

Thank you for your participation.
Please return this Demographic Sheet in the enclosed stamped envelope:
Brian D. Paul, M.A./4508 Jefferson Street/Kansas City, MO 64111
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Recruitment Material: Initial Cover Letter and Informed Consent for Participants
Dear Colleague:

We are writing to ask for your help and participation in a research project on White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision. You have been selected specifically for this project because of your interest and experience in multicultural issues as indicated by your membership in Division 45 of the American Psychological Association. This research is part of Mr. Brian D. Paul's dissertation under the supervision of Dr. James M. Croteau in the Counseling Education and Counseling Psychology Department at Western Michigan University.

The purpose of the present study is to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. In this study multicultural supervision is defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship (supervisor, supervisee, client) is racially/ethnically different from the other members.

Despite the fact that the majority of supervisors conducting clinical supervision are White and that supervision is considered an important aspect of multicultural training, we know very little about what contributes to biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. We expect the findings of this study to have direct application in multicultural training, research, and practice. Other than contributing to any information generated by this study, there are no direct benefits to you individually, except any benefits that come from reflecting on your own or others' experiences with a White supervisor in multicultural supervision.

Participation in this study will require you to answer an open-ended written questionnaire and a demographic sheet. The open-ended written questionnaire and demographic sheet should take about 45 to 55 minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire and demographic sheet in the self-addressed and stamped envelope within two weeks. Your responses are completely confidential, so do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire or demographic sheet. Your questionnaire has an identification number on the top right corner to permit tracking of unreturned questionnaires. When a questionnaire is returned, an individual other than the present researcher will write down the number and cut off the right corner of the questionnaire. This individual will not have access to the number associated with your name, which ensures that your questionnaire is confidential. The list of names and corresponding numbers will be locked in a file cabinet in the present researcher's office and will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty or prejudice by simply returning the blank enclosed questionnaire and demographic sheet. If you do not wish to receive a follow-up questionnaire, simply write "no thanks" on the enclosed questionnaire and return it. Your return of the questionnaire indicates your consent to use the answers you supply.

We know your time is valuable, so to show our appreciation of whether you choose to participate or not, we have included a sticker promoting diversity for you.

This letter contains consent information that has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Subjects should not complete the questionnaire if this document does not show a stamped date and signature in the upper right corner. If you have any questions or problems, concerning the study, you may contact Brian D. Paul, at (816) 561-0448, or Dr. James M. Croteau, at (616) 387-5111. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (616) 387-8298, or the Vice President for Research (616) 387-8298 if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

Thank you for your time and attention. Your assistance in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Paul, M.A.
James M. Croteau, Ph.D.
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Recruitment Material: Sticker Promoting Cultural Awareness
Appendix G

Recruitment Materials: Follow-up Cover Letter and Informed Consent
Dear Colleague:

Two weeks ago we sent you a packet asking for your help and participation in a research project on White supervisors' practices in multicultural supervision. If you misplaced the original packet regarding this study and you are interested in participating here is another packet. You have been selected specifically for this project because of your interest and experience in multicultural issues as indicated by your membership in Division 45 of the American Psychological Association. This research is part of Mr. Brian D. Paul's dissertation under the supervision of Dr. James M. Croteau in the Counseling Education and Counseling Psychology Department at Western Michigan University.

The purpose of the present study is to describe, illustrate, and classify a broad range of biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. In this study multicultural supervision is defined as occurring when at least one member of the triadic supervisory relationship (supervisor, supervisee, client) is racially/ethnically different from the other members.

Despite the fact that the majority of supervisors conducting clinical supervision are White and that supervision is considered an important aspect of multicultural training, we know very little about what contributes to biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. We expect the findings of this study to have direct application in multicultural training, research, and practice. Other than contributing to any information generated by this study, there are no direct benefits to you individually, except any benefits that come from reflecting on your own or others experiences with a White supervisor in multicultural supervision.

Participation in this study will require you to answer an open-ended written questionnaire and a demographic sheet. The open-ended written questionnaire and demographic sheet should take about 45 to 55 minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire and demographic sheet in the self addressed and stamped envelope within two weeks. Your responses are completely confidential, so do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire or demographic sheet. Your questionnaire has an identification number on the top right corner to permit tracking of unreturned questionnaires. When a questionnaire is returned, an individual other than the present researcher will write down the number and cut off the right corner of the questionnaire. This individual will not have access to the number associated with your name, which ensures that your questionnaire is confidential. The present researcher will not view a questionnaire until the right corner and corresponding number have been cut off, which also ensures that your questionnaire is confidential. The list of names and corresponding numbers will be locked in a file cabinet in the present researcher's office and will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty and prejudice by simply returning the blank enclosed questionnaire and demographic sheet. If you do not wish to receive a follow up questionnaire, simply write "no thanks" on the enclosed questionnaire and return it. Your return of the questionnaire indicates your consent to use the answers you supply.

We know your time is valuable, so to show our appreciation of whether you choose to participate or not, we have included a sticker promoting diversity for you.

This letter contains consent information that has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Subjects should not complete the questionnaire if this document does not show a stamped date and signature in the upper right corner. If you have any questions or problems, concerning the study, you may contact Brian D. Paul, at (616) 561-0448, or Dr. James M. Croteau, at (616) 387-5111. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (616) 387-8298, or the Vice President for Research (616) 387-8298 if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

Thank you for your time and attention. Your assistance in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Paul, M.A.
James M. Croteau, Ph.D.
Appendix H

Recruitment Material: Follow-up Postcard
Dear Colleague:

About two to weeks ago, I sent you an open-ended written questionnaire examining biased and exemplary practices of White supervisors in multicultural supervision. I contacted you specifically because you have an interest in multicultural/diversity issues.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, Thank You. If not, please do so. The questionnaire will require about 45 to 55 minutes of your time.

If you have misplaced the questionnaire and you are interested in participating, please contact me by phone (816) 561-0448 or by email x90paul4@wmich.edu., in order that I may send you another questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Paul, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
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### Table 1

**Multicultural Counseling and Supervision Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Courses or Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Courses</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC Counseling Courses&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC Counseling Workshops</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC Supervision Workshops&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 104; MC = Multicultural.  
<sup>a</sup> = 2 participants did not respond.  
<sup>b</sup> = 1 participant did not respond.

### Table 2

**Number of Multicultural Research Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Research Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 102; MC = Multicultural; 2 participants did not respond.
### Table 3

**Experience as Supervisors: Number of Supervisees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees</td>
<td>31 (29.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $N = 104$.

### Table 4

**Experience in Multicultural Issues With Clients: Number of Clients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>9 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $N = 102$; 2 participants did not respond.
Table 5

**Supervisors Who Addressed Multicultural Issues With Participants in Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4-6 7-10 11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>17 16 27 17 17 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.3%) (15.4%) (26.0%) (16.3%) (16.3%) (2.9%) (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 103; 1 participant did not respond.

Table 6

**Participants That Supervised Supervisees Who Addressed Multicultural Issues in Supervision: Number of Supervisees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4-6 7-10 11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees</td>
<td>38 6 8 4 17 5 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.5%) (5.8%) (7.7%) (3.8%) (16.3%) (4.8%) (24.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 103; 1 participant did not respond.
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