

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

1-1-2009

## Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Experiences and Supervision Satisfaction

Jacqueline Renee Moreno  
*University of Denver*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd>



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Moreno, Jacqueline Renee, "Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Experiences and Supervision Satisfaction" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 881.  
<https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/881>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact [jennifer.cox@du.edu](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

MULTICULTURAL EVENTS WITHIN GROUP SUPERVISION:  
MINORITY EXPERIENCES  
AND SUPERVISION SATISFACTION

---

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
the Morgridge College of Education  
University of Denver

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Jacqueline R. Moreno  
June 2009  
Advisor: Maria Riva, Ph.D.

©Copyright by Jacqueline R. Moreno 2009

All Rights Reserved

Author: Jacqueline R. Moreno  
Title: Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Experiences and  
Supervision Satisfaction  
Advisor: Maria Riva, Ph.D.  
Degree Date: June 2009

## ABSTRACT

The current investigation utilized a mixed-methods design. In Phase I, 76 ethnic minority graduate students in psychology and counseling Master's and doctoral programs completed surveys that explored their general experiences in group supervision as well as the occurrence of multicultural events, and positive and negative factors of the reported events. Surveys also assessed supervisees' perspectives of their supervisor's multicultural competence level, group supervision satisfaction, and their own racial identity and multicultural competence. In Phase II, 20 volunteers from the first phase participated in qualitative interviews that explored in more depth the multicultural event they more briefly discussed in the survey and what factors contributed to this event being a positive or negative experience. Quantitative findings indicated significant, positive relationships between perceived supervisor multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction, and supervisee multicultural competence and racial identity development. The relationships between racial identity and group supervision satisfaction, and supervisee multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction were not significant. The relationship between supervisee multicultural competence and perceived supervisor multicultural competence was found to be significant, although not hypothesized. Findings indicated that perceived supervisor multicultural competence was a significant predictor of group supervision satisfaction in a multiple regression when combined with other variables. Themes emerged from the qualitative analyses including

what factors contributed to positive and negative experiences. The data were grouped into General, Typical, and Variant responses. Participants reported group leaders being directive, addressing multicultural issues, openness, and the impact of their own ethnic identity as variables that led to positive experiences. Typical responses to negative events included the supervisor being responsible for the outcome, supervisors' multicultural awareness, and not addressing cultural issues. These and other results highlight the implications for both training and practice to effectively address multicultural events in group supervision.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people that I would like to thank for their help during this process. First, I'd like to thank my committee. Dr. Maria Riva, my advisor, mentor, and committee chair, helped ease the transition into Colorado, and welcomed me into the doctoral program. I especially thank her for taking the time during her Sabbatical year to guide me through completion of this project. I would like to say thanks to Dr. Kathy Green for helping me through statistics classes and being there for me when I had many questions. Although she may not know this, Dr. Maria Salazar has been an inspiration for me, especially as a Latina. I attended the National Institute through the Center for Multicultural Excellence and listened to her talk regarding ethnic minorities in academia. When I heard her speak, I was immediately inspired and was provided hope for Latinas such as myself to continue to strive no matter how difficult the process is.

I would especially like to take the time to thank my family and friends. My parents have instilled willpower and a sense of accomplishment in me. My siblings have remained patient and continue to remind me of the great person that I can be. Thank you friends for being there for me and always pushing me along, and thank you for taking me in when I needed to finish. Grandma, this year would not have been possible without your generous help. Lastly, I dedicate this to my Grandfathers, who passed away early on in my doctoral education. I thank them for being my guardian angels, reminding me of how proud they are of me, and being a constant source of shining light. Without you both, I wouldn't have continued on.

## Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Review of the Literature .....	1
Research on Individual Supervision .....	3
Research on Multicultural Individual Supervision .....	4
Research on Group Supervision.....	6
Research on Multicultural Events in Group Supervision .....	8
Models of Multicultural Supervision .....	12
Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies .....	13
Summary .....	14
Review of the Problem.....	15
Importance of Studying the Problem .....	17
Review of Variables and Measures.....	19
Hypotheses (Phase I).....	20
Question (Phase II) .....	21
Definitions.....	21
Chapter II: Review of the Literature .....	24
Individual Supervision .....	25
Multicultural Individual Supervision .....	26
Racial Identity .....	29
Multicultural Competency .....	32
Supervision Satisfaction.....	33
Models of Multicultural Supervision .....	38
Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development .....	39
Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies .....	40
Group Supervision .....	42
Multicultural Events In Group Supervision .....	46
Summary .....	47
Chapter III: Methods.....	49
Development of the GSMEQ and Telephone Interview.....	50
Pilot Study.....	51
Phase I.....	52
Participants.....	52
Procedures.....	55
Measures .....	58
Research Design and Data Analysis .....	63
Phase II.....	68
Participants.....	70
Procedures.....	72
Transcription Process.....	73
Training the Research Assistant.....	73

Measures .....	75
Research Design and Data Analysis .....	76
Summary .....	77
Chapter IV: Results and Analyses .....	79
Phase I.....	80
Data Preparation and Composite Scores.....	80
Reliability, Descriptives, and Correlations of Assessments .....	81
Descriptive Statistics of Survey Response Data .....	82
Analyses of Hypotheses.....	96
Additional Findings .....	97
Qualitative Results from Phase I.....	101
Phase II.....	112
Reliability and Validity Analysis.....	112
Themes.....	113
Multicultural Supervision Competencies' Ratings .....	131
Analysis of Research Question .....	133
Summary .....	138
Chapter V: Discussion .....	140
Specific Findings and Implications.....	140
Limitations .....	155
Suggestions for Future Research .....	156
Summary.....	158
References.....	159
Appendices	
Appendix A: Background Questionnaire.....	170
Appendix B: Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire.....	173
Appendix C: Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory .....	177
Appendix D: The Supervision Questionnaire .....	181
Appendix E: The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM).....	183
Appendix F: The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R).....	185
Appendix G: Semi-Structured Telephone Interview .....	188
Appendix H: Participant Informed Consent for Surveys.....	189
Appendix I: Informed Consent for Telephone Interviews.....	191
Appendix J: Participant Informed Consent for Pilot Study .....	193
Appendix K: Letter to Participants .....	194
Appendix L: Updated Email to Program Directors .....	195
Appendix M: Revised Recruitment Letter to Students .....	196
Appendix N: IRB Letter of Approval .....	197
Appendix O: IRB Renewal Letter of Approval .....	198

List of Tables

1.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Phase I.....	54
2.	Phase I Hypotheses/Question, Analyses, and Variables.....	64
3.	Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Phase II.....	71
4.	Phase II Question, Analyses, and Variables.....	77
5.	Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients of the Supervision Satisfaction, Multicultural Competence, Racial Identity, and Perceived Supervisor’s Multicultural Competence Assessments for the Current Study and Normed Data.....	82
6.	Descriptive Statistics from the SQ.....	83
7.	Descriptive Statistics of the CCCI-R.....	85
8.	Descriptive Statistics of the MEIM.....	87
9.	Descriptive Statistics of the SMCI.....	89
10.	Descriptive Statistics of the Other Variables of the Background Questionnaire.....	92
11.	Descriptive Data for Ethnic Minority Clients.....	93
12.	Descriptive Statistics of the Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire.....	95
13.	Correlations of Composite Scores of Assessments for the SQ, MEIM, CCCI-R and SMCI.....	97
14.	Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Multicultural Competence, Racial Identity, Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, Age, Gender, Ethnicity, and Event Predicting Group Supervision Satisfaction.....	101
15.	Domains, Categories, and Frequencies of Qualitative Data from Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire.....	110
16.	Domains/Categories and Frequencies of Qualitative Data in Telephone Interviews.....	130

17.	Domains/Categories and Frequencies Regarding Positive and Negative Experiences when Reporting Multicultural Events in Group Supervision.....	136
-----	--	-----

## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

#### Review of the Literature

Supervision is one of the key elements for training in counseling psychology programs. Considerable research has been conducted on certain variables such as the dyad of the supervisor and supervisee within individual supervision, professional development, skills and training, outcomes, and evaluation (Goodyear & Guzzardo, 2000). Multicultural supervision, which has been described as addressing cultural issues that occur in individual supervision, also has received some attention in the individual supervision literature particularly the role of individual differences, including culture. Another specific type of supervision is group supervision, which is commonly used in most training sites. Bernard and Goodyear (2008) define group supervision as:

the regular meeting of a group of supervisees (a) with a designated supervisor or supervisors, (b) to monitor the quality of their work, and (c) to further their understanding of themselves as clinicians, of the clients with whom they work, and of service delivery in general. These supervisees are aided in achieving these goals by their supervisor(s) and by their feedback from and interactions with each other (p. 244).

Research in the area of group supervision has increased in the past five years and the literature has shown its use in several different disciplines including social work,

school psychology, nursing, clinical psychology, and speech and language therapy. Publications also have been included in international journals (e.g., Grigg, 2006; Gunter, 2006; Haboush, 2003; Horton, Lourdes Drachler, Fuller, & Carvalho Leite, 2008; Ogren, Jonsson, & Sundin, 2005; Saarikoski, Warne, Aunio, Leino-Kilpi, 2006). The emphasis of some recent studies has been on the dynamics that occur within the supervision group, although one variable that continues to receive little attention is multicultural issues. Since no studies have addressed multicultural events within group supervision, it is not known how these events are processed, the impact they have on the group, and what variables lead to positive or negative experiences for group members.

The proposed study is focused on multicultural events within group supervision. Given the limited research on group supervision and processing multicultural events, it is necessary to use the available literature on individual supervision to gain an understanding of supervision and multicultural issues. This chapter begins with a brief overview of individual supervision and the research that assesses satisfaction of the supervision experience. The second section highlights important research on multicultural issues within individual supervision and variables that have been found and thought to help understand these cultural differences. The third section reviews the research and literature on group supervision, followed by an overview of the existing literature on multicultural issues in group supervision. The chapter concludes with models of multicultural supervision, highlighting two models that focus on identity development and multicultural competencies.

### *Research on Individual Supervision*

Supervision is one of the most frequent activities of mental health professionals (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). A significant amount of supervision is provided to trainees during their graduate programs and internships. Bernard and Goodyear described supervision as being evaluative, extending over time, enhancing the professional functioning of the supervisee as well as a means to monitor the professional services that the supervisee provides. Most of the research has addressed supervision outcomes including particular training attitudes, skills, and behaviors (Holloway & Neufeldt, 1995). Another important variable that has gained a research focus is the supervisory relationship and working alliance (Inman, 2006). Additionally, research on supervision satisfaction has shown that the level of satisfaction for a trainee can be significantly affected by supervisors' style of communication and verbal interactions, and the degree to which supervisees' professional developmental needs are met (Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Killian, 2001; Krause & Allen, 1988; Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Olk & Friedlander, 1992). Also included in the satisfaction research is supervisor-supervisee fit and supervisee-supervisor self-disclosures. Cook and Helms (1988) found that supervisees were more satisfied with supervision when supervisees held the perception that their supervisor liked them and showed an interest in them. Duan and Roehlke (2001) found that satisfaction within the supervisory relationship was related to the number of supervisee self-disclosures and when both supervisor and supervisee perceived positive attitudes about one another.

Kennard, Steward, and Gluck (1987) studied the variables that influence interactions between trainees and supervisors that contribute to positive and negative experiences in supervision. They found that trainees experienced positive supervision events when supervisors were supportive, instructional, and interpretive. Positive events were also related to interest in the supervisor's feedback. Also, similarity in theoretical orientation and style led to positive experiences (Kennard et al., 1987).

Several models of supervision have been identified, including those that are psychotherapy theory-based, such as psychodynamic, person-centered, cognitive-behavioral, and systemic. Other models are based on social roles, with a focus on the supervisor providing a means of professional development for the supervisee (Ancis & Ladany, 2001), including models developed by Holloway (1987) and Bernard (1997). Still, other models include developmental approaches to supervision that focus on the supervisees' changes as they gain training and professionally develop. These models have been developed by Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992), and Stoltenberg (1981), among others. Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke (1986) identified eight empirical studies that provided support for developmental approaches in supervision. These studies indicated that there are "differences in supervision across trainee levels" (Rabinowitz et al., 1986, p. 292). These models are helpful in addressing various issues for trainee development, yet they do not focus on strategies for increasing trainees' cultural counseling competence, also known as multicultural competence.

#### *Research on Multicultural Individual Supervision*

Other important variables in supervision are gender, sexual orientation, experience levels, personality characteristics, and most salient to this study, race and

ethnicity. Research about multicultural issues in supervision has been conducted on the dyadic relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee. This research showed that a supervisor's liking and conditional interest contributed to greater supervisee satisfaction when the supervisee was an ethnic minority person (Cook & Helms, 1988). Another study reported that when supervisors and supervisees were from different cultures, both expected more problems than benefits within the dyad, when in actuality, few problems were reported (McRoy, Freeman, Logan, & Blackmon, 1986).

The dyad has been a focus of several research studies in which the supervisee was a minority and the supervisor was Caucasian. Vander Kolk (1974) found that Black trainees anticipated their supervisors would be less respectful, supportive, and empathic, and in fact there were reported problems regarding cross-cultural differences. In addition, minority trainees experienced events in supervision in which supervisors were unresponsive to culture more frequently than Caucasian trainees, as well as more negative effects including dissatisfaction with supervision (Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski et al., 2006). Other researchers have identified racial identity development as an important factor in supervision and concluded that racial matching was related to trainees' cross-cultural competence. They reported that when supervisor and supervisee were matched according to race, the supervisee was able to develop higher levels of cross-cultural competence (Hilton, Russell, & Salami, 1995).

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) reported that racial identity may influence cultural communications between supervisor and supervisee. They found that when both supervisors and supervisees held high racial identity levels, cultural issues were more likely to be emphasized within supervision. They also found that when

supervisors had higher racial identities than their supervisees, they were more apt to create a supportive environment for discussing cultural issues. Killian (2001) found similar results indicating that the exploration of cultural issues within supervision promoted supervisees' multicultural competence. Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) also found that racial identity development was related to self-reported multicultural competence.

Gainor and Constantine (2002) suggested that trainees should receive supervision that focuses on multicultural issues in order for them to be able to conceptualize their cases within a multicultural framework. This type of supervision is important in building a trainee's multicultural competence and allows the trainee to gain higher levels of satisfaction with supervision.

Fukuyama (1994) had participants report positive and negative critical incidents that occur in multicultural supervision. Fukuyama grouped the positive experiences as: openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and opportunities to work in multicultural activities. The negative experiences were grouped as lack of supervisor cultural awareness and questioning supervisee abilities. Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, and Ho (2001) investigated individuals in multicultural supervision and concluded that cultural interactions influenced dynamics of the supervision relationship. They found that the lack of discussion of cultural issues led to negative experiences for supervisees.

### *Research on Group Supervision*

Group supervision is a widely used method of conducting supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Holloway & Johnston, 1985). One of the earliest studies examined the current practices of group supervision at predoctoral internship sites in 1991 (Riva &

Cornish, 1995). Of the sites that responded, 65% (n = 157) conducted group supervision. Results indicated that group supervision appears to be an important aspect of training in many different types of training sites. In a similar study conducted in 2006, 15 years after the original study, 162 group supervisors participated in the online survey regarding group supervision utilization in their predoctoral internship sites, signifying that group supervision continues to be a widely used format of conducting supervision (Riva & Cornish, 2008).

Some studies have compared group supervision with individual supervision. In a study that investigated the effectiveness of group supervision versus combined group and individual supervision, Ray and Altekruze (2000) found no differences on self-reported effectiveness with clients and therapists, as well as reports by supervisor, client, and objective rater responses in these two training modalities. However supervisees preferred individual to group supervision. Prieto (1996) updated an earlier review by Holloway and Johnston (1985) and included studies from 1986 to 1994. Prieto found 24 empirical studies of group supervision. He stated that given the widespread use of group supervision in training programs, the lack of empirical research is cause for considerable concern. He also concluded that group supervision studies should be more exploratory than confirmatory in nature and evaluate functional structures, practices, and learning influences that can create future studies of more in-depth research.

Since Prieto's review over ten years ago, additional research studies have been conducted. Linton and Hedstrom (2006) identified eight studies that investigated group processes in group supervision, highlighting two specific studies. In one study, Linton (2003) identified eight themes indicative of group process phenomena in group

supervision. In the second study, Enyedy, Arcinue, Puri, Carter, Goodyear, and Getzelman (2003) found five group processes that hindered supervisee development in group supervision.

Along with highlighting hindering variables, Bernard and Goodyear (2004) outlined many advantages to group supervision including the fact that it is thought to minimize supervisee dependence; provides supervisees with greater exposure to a broader range of clients; and, increases the quantity, diversity, and quality of feedback to the supervisee. Group supervision may also provide supervisors with a more comprehensive picture of the supervisees because of the ability to observe their interactions with other group members. There is a higher chance for supervisees to use action techniques, such as role playing and other techniques (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Group supervision can also give others in the group a chance to mirror the dynamics that occur in group counseling or therapy for those supervisees that conduct process groups. Stages of group development and of multicultural competency can be used in areas of group supervision to better understand how supervisees rate the effectiveness of group supervision, particularly addressing the processing of multicultural issues and how this can affect one's rating of group supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). These advantages are commonly stated yet no research has specifically studied them.

#### *Research on Multicultural Events in Group Supervision*

The extant literature on group supervision does not identify how group supervision should be conducted or how to incorporate culturally appropriate training (Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001). In a recent study, 91% of group supervisors stated that multicultural issues are discussed in group supervision, and ranked

it as the second most common topic (Riva & Cornish, 2008). However, the literature lacks studies that include a focus on multicultural issues. One study examined hindering phenomena and critical incidents within group supervision (Enyedy et al., 2003). These authors described hindering phenomena as “those events or processes during group supervision that supervisees felt had a negative effect on their functioning” (p. 312). In their study they identified five different types of hindering phenomena: between-member problems; problems with supervisors; supervisee anxiety and other perceived negative effects; logistical constraints; and poor group time management. For one of the three clusters (supervisee anxiety and other perceived negative effects) results involved experiences of negative emotions, including fear, anxiety, alienation, and discomfort. In this cluster, one multicultural response highlighted a hindering event. The participants stated “Being the only (male, African American, Latina, etc.)” was perceived as a negative event (Enyedy et al., 2003, p. 314). It does seem apparent that being the only member of an ethnic or gender group could be perceived as a negative event, however, depending on how these differences are processed within group, they may be perceived as a positive event.

In individual multicultural supervision, it is important for supervisors to initiate discussions of multicultural issues. This is also true for group supervision. Miscommunication between supervisor and supervisees or assumptions of culture among group members can negatively impact the group experience (Garrett et al., 2001). The concern of cultural assumptions appears to be important because persons of minority status may be placed in the role of spokespersons for their culture whether or not they want to fulfill such a role.

Multicultural competence is the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are necessary in the counseling profession in order to provide services related to assessment, practice, training, and research to diverse populations (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Some counselor education training programs assume that in order for a counselor to be multiculturally competent, one only needs to acquire multicultural knowledge and basic counseling skills (Sue & Sue, 2003). Garrett et al. (2001) believed that self-exploration and self-understanding are also essential components of training in order for persons to become multiculturally competent. Multicultural competency and racial identity development have been identified in individual multicultural supervision as important variables for the study and understanding of the supervisory relationship (Ladany, Inman et al., 1997; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al., 1997). It seems reasonable to assume that these variables also are important when studying the group supervisory relationship.

Many therapists graduated before multicultural awareness was emphasized, leaving a number of group supervisors without the knowledge to address specific multicultural issues (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Knowledge and competency may also vary for certain ethnic or racial groups. There is some evidence that Caucasian counselors have less multicultural awareness than Asian American and Hispanic counselors (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Pope et al. also found that Asian American, Hispanic, and African American counselors reported more competence in multicultural awareness and relationships than did White counselors. In a recent national study of group supervisors in psychology predoctoral internship training sites, 84% identified themselves as White (Riva & Cornish, 2008).

The challenge with multicultural training is that it also involves additional variables including communication and multicultural awareness. Constantine (1997) found that supervisees reported that supervisors seemed reluctant to discuss multicultural issues. Constantine attributed this hesitancy to supervisor's lack of training. Fukuyama (1994) discovered that negative critical incidents were reported by ethnic minority supervisees in their group supervision experiences and were perceived by them to be caused by lack of supervisor cultural awareness. Supervisees also reported negative critical incidents when supervisors questioned their abilities. These types of incidents could cause problems for supervisees because of an environment in which the supervisee might not feel safe enough to discuss aspects pertaining to diversity or multiculturalism and, therefore, face the potential to lose out on an opportunity for processing these issues.

Research on supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to the supervisory process and outcome indicated a small negative correlation between levels of supervisor multicultural competence and trainee multicultural conceptualization abilities (Inman, 2006). In other words, when a supervisor was perceived by a trainee as multiculturally competent, then trainee multicultural conceptualization ability scores were lower, indicating little development of these abilities. The author indicated a few variables that could have led to this finding. However, as expected, supervisor multicultural competence was positively associated with supervisory working alliance as well as supervision satisfaction. These findings suggest that supervisees might not have obtained the knowledge to focus on multicultural issues in case conceptualizations and might lack the self-awareness and confidence to conceptualize based on diversity. They may perceive their supervisor to be highly multiculturally competent. This perception

may increase their working alliance, although they may still experience little multicultural competence personally.

Research in individual multicultural supervision has reported that multicultural competence is related to racial identity development. As Hilton, Russell, and Salami (1995) found, supervisee and supervisor racial matching was related to supervisee cross-cultural competence. Ladany et al. (1997) also found racial identity development related to self-reported multicultural competence. The authors indicated that supervisees were more likely to bring up multicultural issues in supervision when they had high levels of racial identity. However, racial identity has not been a variable investigated as a component of group supervision.

#### *Models of Multicultural Supervision*

Several models of multicultural supervision have been suggested in the individual supervision literature and may generalize to group supervision. All models emphasize that supervisors should explore their own identities and cultural awareness, as well as explore these areas with their supervisees. The following models stress this exploration and suggest ways for supervisors to perform multicultural supervision.

#### *Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development*

A particularly useful model to address the triadic relationship, that is of the supervisor, supervisee and client, and the multiple and interrelated dimensions of the identities of supervisor and supervisee is the heuristic model of nonoppressive interpersonal development (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). This model offers supervisors a framework for understanding their own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors “about themselves, their trainees, and clients across specific demographic variables (i.e., race,

ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status)” (p. 66). Within each demographic variable individuals progress through phases of interpersonal functioning, including adaptation, incongruence, exploration, and integration. These phases are similar to other models of racial identity development (Helms, 1990; 1995). Although additional research and scales are needed to operationalize the stage constructs, this model appears to be viable for multicultural supervision. The heuristic model was one of the first to be developed for the identification of cultural differences between supervisors and supervisees as well as processing the cultural dynamics in multicultural supervision (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

#### *Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies*

A second model of multicultural supervision is the Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies (Constantine & Ladany, 2001). Competency is defined as the degree to which therapists adhere to procedures relative to identified criteria or standards (Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986). In applying competency to multicultural counseling, therapists are expected to possess multicultural attitudes/beliefs in relation to working with culturally different individuals, knowledge about the impact of culture, and intervention skills to use with culturally diverse clients (Constantine & Ladany, 2001). Their research introduced six dimensions of multicultural competence that should be achieved by counselors. These are self-awareness, general knowledge about multicultural issues, multicultural counseling efficacy, understanding of unique client variables, building an effective counseling working alliance, and addressing multicultural counseling skills.

Prior to this model, the supervision literature lacked an interactive perspective that could examine the dynamics of multicultural supervision (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). This particular perspective was necessary in order to enhance the development of multicultural competence within the supervisory relationship. Ancis and Ladany (2001) introduced multicultural supervision competencies guidelines that covered five domains including personal development, conceptualization, interventions, process, and evaluation. The supervision relationship should address all five domains in order to meet multicultural competency needs for both supervisors and supervisees. These variables, including multicultural competencies of supervisor and supervisees, as well as racial identity development, impact the supervisory working relationship and therefore impact supervision satisfaction. These models of multicultural supervision could be applied in group supervision and serve as a method for addressing cultural issues in supervision. The guidelines of multicultural competencies could be adopted to group supervision as a way to increase supervisees' multicultural competency levels.

### *Summary*

Research on multicultural supervision research has emphasized the dyadic relationship found in individual supervision. Supervision in a group format has not focused on multicultural areas. Research on multicultural supervision within dyads has shown important implications including the influence of multicultural competencies, racial identity development, acculturation, and professional development on perceived satisfaction of supervision. Overall, this research suggests that satisfaction is greatly influenced by the supervisory working alliance and racial identity matching (Cook & Helms, 1988; Duan & Roehlke, 2001). Supervisor cultural awareness has an impact on

supervision satisfaction. The extent to which supervisees' training goals are met during supervision impacts satisfaction and professional development.

These variables may all be as important to group supervision as they are in individual supervision, but group supervision research continues to be limited. The research that has been conducted about group supervision includes studies of hindering phenomena or critical incidents that may occur in group supervision. The results from these studies can be extended to understand the impact of multicultural events in group supervision.

### *Review of the Problem*

Research on group supervision is limited and although variables found to be important in individual supervision may generalize to group supervision, researchers do not know what specific variables and to what degree the variables are significant. A critical issue that has received no attention to date is multicultural considerations within group supervision. Group supervision is more complex than individual supervision given that other members are present and contribute to all aspects of the experience from satisfaction to skill development. One skill that is possible to develop in group supervision is multicultural competence.

The models of multicultural supervision that have focused on individual supervision do include the assessment of identity and multicultural competencies, although much more research is needed. Little attention has been paid to the ways in which persons from ethnic minority groups experience group supervision. The multicultural competencies model points to potentially important domains that could be addressed in group supervision. The supervision literature would benefit from

investigating and assessing these domains from the perspective of ethnic minority supervisees, as current studies include samples of primarily Caucasian trainees. Statistics show that the numbers of minority persons are increasing in graduate programs in psychology. The American Psychological Association (APA) released information regarding demographics of students in graduate programs including doctoral and Master's programs, as well as student affiliates of their association (APA, 2000). The 1999-2000 Student Affiliate Survey reported percentages for students in Master's programs in psychology for the following ethnic groups: 0.6% American Indian; 3.7% Asian American; 5.4% Hispanics; 3.8% Blacks; 79.6% White; 2.2% Other; 3.9% Multiple Groups; and 0.9% not specified. Similar statistics were reported for doctoral students with: 0.4% American Indian; 5.0% Asian American; 5.2% Hispanic; 3.4% Black; 78.9% White; 2.7% Other; 3.7% Multiple Groups; and 0.7% not specified. Of these ethnic minority students, the Master's or doctoral programs they were enrolled in include: 4.2% child clinical; 41.5% clinical; and 18.8% counseling. The 1999 Doctorate Employment Survey showed a 15% minority rate (APA, 1999). The APA Research Office (1999) also compiles data on people of color in graduate school and new doctorates. In 1980, there were 11.8% students of color enrolled in graduate programs in psychology, and in 1999 that percentage increased to 19.6%. For new doctorates, in 1977 there were 7.5% people of color, and in 1999 this increased to 15.2%. These statistics show that the percentages of people of color in psychology graduate programs are steadily increasing. As more ethnic minority students attend graduate programs in psychology, supervisors will need to display multicultural awareness to work with ethnically or culturally diverse students. It is important to understand the process of how

group supervisors can be multiculturally competent, not only for ethnic minority group members, but for all group members, and how this contributes to supervision satisfaction.

This mixed-methods study assessed ethnic minority supervisees' multicultural competence and racial identity, as well as their perceptions of their supervisor's multicultural competence in a group supervision environment. It was expected that these variables would impact the supervisees' satisfaction of group supervision in a manner similar to those in individual supervision.

### *Importance of Studying the Problem*

This dissertation was important for several reasons. Given the limited amount of research on group supervision and multicultural issues, this dissertation added to the existing literature in several ways. Prior to conducting this study, little if anything was known about multicultural critical incidents in group supervision. This study requested information from persons of color about their actual group supervision experiences and the manner in which multicultural incidents were discussed. Until now, this area had been overlooked and studies had not examined group supervision perspectives from any cultural or ethnic group, or about situations that participants have actually experienced.

Second, the study examined the types of environments and supervisory relationships that supervisees perceived were beneficial for multicultural events to be addressed and discussed within group supervision. It is important to understand the variables that facilitate or interfere with a positive experience when discussing multicultural events in group supervision. The model of multicultural supervision introduced by Ancis and Ladany (2001), shows a format of supervision where group leaders can cultivate safe environments so that supervisees can discuss multicultural

topics that may occur between members, as well as the multicultural issues that a supervisee discusses in group supervision that occurs between the trainee and client. These multicultural incidents were examined using the Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire and by telephone interviews to gain an in depth understanding of the phenomenon. Questions were asked regarding the six domains of the Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies (self-awareness, general knowledge about multicultural issues, multicultural counseling efficacy, unique client variables, counseling working alliance, and multicultural counseling skills) as related to supervisee satisfaction of group supervision.

Third, this study asked the group supervisees about their perceptions of their supervisors' multicultural competence. Supervision satisfaction correlates with the development of multicultural competencies in the individual supervision research (Ladany et al., 1997). It was expected that supervisor multicultural competence would be related to supervision satisfaction in group supervision, although this relationship had not previously been studied in group supervision.

Fourth, this study examined the relationship of participants' racial identity development and their own multicultural competence. Studies in individual supervision have indicated that these two variables are related (Ladany et al., 1997), yet this is the first study that examined this relationship in group supervision. Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) found that members from different cultures may have varying levels of cultural awareness. Including a measure of self-reported multicultural competence provided information for counseling professionals working in the area of group supervision and the potential impact of multicultural events on satisfaction and racial identity.

Fifth, this study examined different demographic variables that could influence supervisees' experience of multicultural events in group supervision, including group leader/members ethnicity, race, and gender. Again, no research has attempted to understand what variables are important in group supervision to develop a positive group supervision experience when cultural issues arise.

Finally, this study examined the relationship between racial identity development and group supervision satisfaction. Research has shown promising results in the area of racial identity development in individual multicultural supervision.

#### *Review of Variables and Measures*

This study was conducted in two phases. In Phase I, surveys were used to explore ethnic minority students' positive and negative multicultural events in group supervision. The study also addressed helpful and unhelpful factors in group supervision in general. Surveys also assessed supervisees' perspective of their supervisor's multicultural competence level, group supervision satisfaction, and their perceptions of their own racial identity and multicultural competence. In Phase II, a small number of the Phase I respondents were interviewed to explore in more depth the group supervision experience in which a multicultural event occurred.

The variables in this study and the measures used to assess these variables were: Multicultural Competence of the Supervisee, measured by the *Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R)* (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991); Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, as measured by the *Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory (SMCI)* (Inman, 2006); Racial Identity of Supervisee, as measured by the *Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)* (Phinney, 1992); and

Group Supervision Satisfaction, as measured by the *Supervision Questionnaire (SQ)* (Ladany, Hill, & Nutt, 1996). All data were obtained from supervisees of color using self-report.

The *Background Questionnaire* was used to gain information about the participant and group supervision format. Age, sex, race, ethnicity, counseling experience, supervisor race and ethnicity, and the gender, race, and ethnicity of the other group supervision members were obtained for analysis. Questions were asked about level of multicultural training, including classes and trainings they have attended. The *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* was used to assess experiences in group supervision as well as the types of critical incidents that have been experienced in group supervision related to multicultural issues.

#### *Hypotheses (Phase I)*

1. Supervisee/Participant's perceptions of their multicultural competence, as assessed by the CCCI-R, will positively correlate with group supervision satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ.
2. Perceived supervisor multicultural competence, as rated by the supervisee and assessed by the SMCI, will positively correlate with group supervision satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ.
3. Supervisee racial identity development, assessed by the MEIM, will positively correlate with group supervision satisfaction assessed by the SQ.

4. Supervisee/participants perceptions of their multicultural competence, as assessed by the CCCI-R, will positively correlate with supervisee racial identity development, as assessed by the MEIM.

*Question (Phase II)*

1. What variables help to create a positive environment for group supervision in order to process multicultural events, as assessed by the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* and qualitative telephone interviews with volunteers? What variables lead to negative experiences in group supervision?

*Definitions*

*Supervision.* In this study, supervision is defined as:

“an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 8)

*Group Supervision.* In this dissertation study, group supervision is defined as:

“the regular meeting of a group of supervisees with a designated supervisor or supervisors, to monitor the quality of their work and to further their understanding of themselves as clinicians, of the clients with whom they work, and of service delivery in general. These supervisees are aided in achieving these goals by their

supervisor(s) and by their feedback from their interactions with each other” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 235).

*Multicultural Supervision.* Multicultural supervision is defined as supervision that occurs when two or more culturally different persons, with different ways of perceiving their social environment and experiences, are brought together in a supervisory relationship with the resulting content, process, and outcomes that are affected by these cultural dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). In this study, participants were asked to describe critical multicultural incidents that refer to dimensions of race, ethnicity, language, gender, and sexual orientation.

*Culture.* In this study, “culture is defined as the belief systems and value orientations that influence customs, norms, practices, and social institutions, including psychological processes and organizations” (APA, 2002, p. 8).

*Race.* In this study, race “is the category to which others assign individuals on the basis of physical characteristics, such as skin color or hair type, and the generalizations and stereotypes made as a result” (APA, 2002, p. 9).

*Ethnicity.* In this study, ethnicity is “the acceptance of the group norms and practices of one’s culture of origin and the concomitant sense of belonging” (APA, 2002, p. 9).

*Ethnic Minority.* For the purpose of this study, an ethnic minority is an individual who is a United States citizen, English speaking, who self-reports as a person of color. The ethnic groups that were represented in this study are: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black or Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, or Multiple Ethnic Groups.

*Racial Identity Development.* Racial identity development or ethnic identity development literature is ever changing. For the purpose of this study, racial identity was defined as the way individuals view themselves as cultural/ethnic/racial beings (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997).

*Multicultural awareness.* In this study, multicultural or cultural awareness refers to the sensitivity to racism, ethnicity, or culture (APA Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs, 1993).

*Multicultural Competency.* In this study multicultural competence refers to the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are necessary in the counseling profession, in providing services related to assessment, practice, training, and research (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

*Multicultural Event (also known as Critical Incident).* Critical incidents refer to “meaningful emotional or behavioral interpersonal experiences that make an impact” (Fukuyama, 1994, p. 143) on supervisees’ levels of group satisfaction. For the purposes of this study, a critical incident referred to an event that occurred in group supervision that referred to a dimension of race, ethnicity, language, or gender.

*United States Citizen.* In this study, a U.S. citizen is defined as: individuals born in the United States and outlying possessions of the United States; foreign-born children, under age 18, residing in the U.S. with their birth or adoptive parents, at least one of whom is a U.S. citizen by birth or naturalization; and individuals granted citizenship status by Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) (U.S. Department of State, 2005).

## CHAPTER II

### Review of the Literature

#### *Multicultural Events in Group Supervision*

Group supervision is commonly practiced and considered to be an integral component in the training of professional counselors and psychologists. Research is sparse in general and almost nonexistent in some specific areas such as multicultural aspects. Bernard and Goodyear (2004) define group supervision as:

the regular meeting of a group of supervisees with a designated supervisor or supervisors, to monitor the quality of their work and to further their understanding of themselves as clinicians, of the clients with whom they work, and of service delivery in general. These supervisees are aided in achieving these goals by their supervisor(s) and by their feedback from their interactions with each other (p. 235).

Group supervision can take place early in training at practicum settings, or later in training at internship and postdoctoral sites. As the number of ethnic minority individuals attending psychology and counseling programs and completing practicum and internship requirements has increased, addressing multicultural issues within supervision has become more important. In general, the extant literature on multicultural aspects in supervision focuses on individual supervision and little is known about the impact of

processing multicultural incidents in group supervision or its relationship with group supervision satisfaction.

This chapter begins with a focus on individual supervision in order to provide a foundation for the limited group supervision literature. A definition of individual supervision is presented and followed by the research on supervision outcomes, supervisory alliance, and supervision satisfaction. This section will also include important variables that have been investigated within multicultural supervision, including racial identity and multicultural competence. The section of racial identity includes a description of Janet Helms's model of racial identity development, to understand the process of developing an ethnic identity. The next section outlines the models of multicultural supervision that have been helpful for supervisors to use with supervisees. The third section summarizes research that has been conducted on group supervision. The concluding section reviews studies that have investigated multicultural events in group supervision.

### *Individual Supervision*

Supervision is a vital aspect of psychotherapy training. As defined by Bernard and Goodyear (2009), supervision is:

an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see,

and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession (p. 7).

A supervisor can take many different roles in supervision, such as teacher, lecturer, case reviewer, monitor, therapist, and colleague (Carifino & Hess, 1987).

Supervision is a primary method to teach emerging professionals the content and skills of counseling and psychotherapy, as well as a tool to model important skills (Vasquez, 1992). Three important broad areas that supervisors are responsible for in training supervisees' professional practice include: ethical knowledge and behavior, competency, and personal functioning (Vasquez, 1992). A supervisor has two specific purposes. The first purpose includes fostering the supervisee's professional development in a supportive and educational manner (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). The second purpose is to ensure the welfare of the supervisee's client, by monitoring the client's welfare.

To understand the dynamics that occur in supervision, it is helpful to recognize the life experiences and patterns that one has gone through that have shaped their perceptions and responses to new situations (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). These life experiences, including gender/ethnic experiences, family experiences, and professional experiences, can impact a supervisor or supervisee in their supervision relationship roles and behaviors and identity. Studies have investigated the differences between the supervisor and supervisee on demographic variables, including race and ethnicity.

#### *Multicultural Individual Supervision*

The supervision literature describes multicultural supervision as addressing cultural issues that occur in individual supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Multicultural supervision has been defined as supervision that occurs when two or more culturally different persons, with different ways of perceiving their social environment and experiences, are brought together in a supervisory relationship with the resulting content, process, and outcomes that are affected by these cultural dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Pederson, 1994). Multicultural supervision contains many layers, including a “triadic process involving the supervisor, supervisee/counselor, and client, and the multiple cultural interactions and contexts that occur within counseling and supervision dyads” (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001, p. 117). Hird et al. also stated:

When two people meet in supervision or counseling, there is a negotiation that always happens. First, similarities are assessed, then dissimilarities. [Race] might be one...being from the same region might be another...having parents with similar emphases on education might be yet another. We then look to see how many of those dissimilarities can be bridged. The greater the effectiveness we have in bridging those dissimilarities the greater the multicultural competence we have in supervision or counseling (p. 117).

Research findings suggest the importance of addressing cultural issues within the supervisory relationship in order to increase supervisee multicultural competence (Inman, 2006). Failure to discuss these issues may lead to miscommunications and negative supervisory experiences by both the supervisee and supervisor. Possible reasons for these issues not being discussed in supervision could be related to the supervisor's multicultural competence levels and training. In a survey, Constantine (1997) found that 30% of the supervisees in her sample had received prior training in multicultural issues,

while 70% of the supervisors had not received this type of training. In the last 10 years, a stronger emphasis has been placed on multicultural training and the gap in multicultural knowledge and training is likely to be smaller.

Studies have shown that multicultural awareness has increased as a result of multicultural supervision. Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, and Ottavi (1994) found that multicultural supervision accounted for 3% of the variability in interns' multicultural awareness. More recent studies (Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski, et al., 2006; Constantine and Ladany, 2001) have found that providing multicultural supervision to supervisees helped increase multicultural counseling self-efficacy. It has also been shown that if multicultural topics are not brought up by supervisors, they will not be discussed within supervision (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, et al., 2001).

In the supervision literature, studies have focused on the dyad of the supervisor and supervisee, looking specifically at multicultural dyads. Goodyear and Guzzardo (2000) summarized three studies that specifically looked at dyads with ethnic minority supervisees (Hilton et al., 1995; McRoy et al., 1986; Vander Kolk, 1974). In a study that observed counseling graduate students who were divided into two groups according to whether they anticipated their supervisory relationship to be more or less facilitative, Vander Kolk found that Black trainees anticipated that their supervisors would be less respectful, supportive, and empathic. McRoy et al. discovered that both supervisors and supervisees anticipated more problems within cross-cultural supervision than were actually reported. Supervisors reported that they expected more problems with multicultural supervision than advantages, although 72% of these supervisors reported

not experiencing any problems. Researchers discussed racial identity development and concluded that racial matching was not related to trainees' cross-cultural competence (Hilton et al.). In their study, they observed 60 Caucasian females who conducted two counseling sessions with a confederate client. These counselors were supervised by 1 of 6 supervisors- 3 Caucasian and 3 African American women. The results indicated that racial matching did not predict strength of relationship between the supervisor and supervisee, but racial identity development did predict a stronger working alliance between the supervisor and supervisee. Also, supervisees reported higher levels of cross-cultural competence when racially matched.

*Racial identity.* To better understand the concept of racial identity, this section begins with a definition and an explanation of racial identity development. Thompson (1989) viewed ethnic identity as a culturally distinct population that can be set apart from other groups. Individuals may engage in behaviors based on cultural or physical criteria in a social context in which these criteria are relevant. Phinney (2000) defined ethnic identity as “a dynamic, multidimensional construct that refers to one’s identity, or sense of self, in ethnic terms, that is in terms of a subgroup within a larger context that claims a common ancestry and shares one or more of the following elements: culture, race, religion, language, kinship, or place of origin” (p. 254). Helms (1990) defined racial identity as a “sense of group collective identity based on one’s perception that he or she shares a common racial heritage with a particular racial group” (p. 3). Racial and ethnic identities do not simply imply the same construct. Ethnic identity refers to the self-conception based on a cultural group. Racial identity includes psychological mechanisms that one develops to function effectively in a society as influenced by society and

political forces (Trimble, Helms, & Root, 2003). Helms's People of Color Racial Identity Model assumes that the development of a healthy racial self-conception involves understanding internalized racism, messages that one develops saying that they are not as "good" as the White or majority group. Helms describes a "transcendence" that occurs as part of a developmental process that changes the messages that communicate inferiority.

In Helms's model, the developmental process includes six statuses and parallel schemas: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion, Emersion, Internalization, and Integrative Awareness. The idea of conformity is that the individual of color is unable to perceive the adverse effects of racial socialization on themselves and the negative internalization of messages regarding their own ethnic group (Trimble et al., 2003). Dissonance refers to ambivalence towards one's own racial group. Immersion involves psychological withdrawal into the individual's ethnic group and denigration of the White group and culture. Emersion refers to a commitment to one's own culture. Internalization includes continued efforts to respond objectively to racial issues of the individual's own cultural group and majority group and remain committed to his or her own cultural group. Integrative Awareness involves integrating various self-identities into a self-conception.

Helms developed racial identity interaction theory to describe the interaction of two or more individuals of the same or different races. An assumption of this theory is that individuals involved in the interaction have different social statuses due to race, ethnicity, or social roles. The theory is applied to the person from the lower social status involved in the interaction. Four different interaction styles can be present: parallel, crossed, progressive, and regressive. Parallel interactions are those in which schemas are used that do not involve addressing racial issues. If the individuals are of the same race or

of different racial backgrounds, they share the same stage of racial consciousness and the same attitudes about Blacks and Whites (Helms, 1989). A crossed interaction is one in which the individuals belong to opposite stages of racial consciousness, having opposing attitudes about both Blacks and Whites. Progressive interactions are typically collaborative and cooperative and the person from the higher status uses more sophisticated schemas. In these types of interactions, the person from the higher status will be able to gradually move the individual from the lower status forward toward a healthier stage. Regressive interactions involve the person with higher social status using more immature racial identity schema and this usually leads to combative situations.

Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) studied 116 doctoral and Master's level counselor trainees, and assessed their racial identity, multicultural case conceptualization abilities, self-reported multicultural competence, and supervisors' focus on multicultural issues. The authors found that racial identity was significantly related to multicultural competence; however, it was not significantly related to multicultural case conceptualization ability. The authors also reported that supervisors' focus on multicultural issues was significantly related to multicultural case conceptualization ability of the supervisee.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) conducted a study of 105 counselor trainees specifically reporting on the racial identity status of both supervisee and supervisor, and related the impact on the supervisory working alliance and the supervisor's influence on the development of the supervisee's multicultural competence. The authors surmised that racial identity may influence cultural communications between supervisor and supervisee. In their study, they found that when both supervisors and

supervisees held high racial identity levels, cultural issues were more likely to be emphasized within supervision, and supervisees reported stronger supervisory alliances. In their study, they also found that when both supervisor and supervisee were at more developed racial identity statuses, or if the supervisor was at a status higher than the supervisee, then these interactions were more influential in the development of supervisee multicultural competence. The authors also found that racial matching did not predict a stronger working alliance. However, it did relate to supervisees' perceptions of their supervisor's influence on the development of their multicultural competence. Fong and Lease (1996) found that supervisors are not as able to conduct multicultural supervision if they are below the immersion-emersion stages of their own racial identity development.

*Multicultural competency.* Additional studies in the individual supervision literature have focused on outcomes related to multicultural competence. As stated above, studies that have focused on racial identity of both supervisors and supervisees have found a relationship with multicultural competence. Like the domains of racial identity, Falender and Shafranske (2004) reported that multicultural competency consists of six dimensions: self-awareness, general knowledge of multicultural issues, multicultural-counseling self-efficacy, understanding of unique client variables, formation of an effective working alliance, and multicultural counseling skills. The literature suggests that members of different ethnic groups report different levels of competency and awareness (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994).

Killian (2001) found that the exploration of cultural issues within supervision promoted supervisees' multicultural competence. Hird et al. (2001) suggested using a multicultural counseling competence assessment in individual supervision, in order to

assess self-awareness, as self-awareness is one of the primary elements of multicultural competence. The authors conducted in-depth interviews with four interns who had received multicultural supervision. They concluded that the supervisory relationship was impacted by cultural interactions and lack of discussion led to negative experiences. Gainor and Constantine (2002) found that trainees who received more supervision that focused on multicultural issues displayed a greater ability to conceptualize cases within a multicultural framework than their peers who did not receive this type of supervision. If the supervisor was able to model how to conceptualize clients with a multicultural focus, then supervisees were able to gain this ability. The authors suggested that building trainees' multicultural competence allows trainees to gain higher levels of satisfaction with supervision.

*Supervision satisfaction.* Additionally satisfaction may be related to support, theoretical orientation, and behavioral style. Kennard, Stewart, and Gluck (1987) found that trainees reported positive supervision experiences when their supervisors were more supportive, instructional, and interpretive. A positive match included similar theoretical orientations and behavioral styles. Furthermore, ethnic minority trainees expressed greater satisfaction with supervision experiences when their White supervisors were culturally responsive (Burkard et al., 2006). Cook and Helms (1988) found that in multicultural dyads, supervisors' liking and conditional liking were most useful in predicting supervisees' satisfaction with supervision. Satisfaction increased when the trainee perceived his or her supervisor as being caring or supportive.

Moreover, supervision satisfaction is associated with supervisory working alliance, perceived supervisor multicultural competence, and trainee multicultural

competence. In a study of 147 marriage and family therapy trainees, supervisor multicultural competence was directly and positively associated with working alliance and supervision satisfaction (Inman, 2006). However, supervisor multicultural competence had a direct but negative relationship with trainee conceptualization abilities. In addition, working alliance was found to be a significant positive mediator between supervisor multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction. Although supervisory multicultural competence was found to have a negative effect on trainee conceptualization abilities, there are possible reasons. These reasons may be related to trainees' self-awareness and the ability to integrate their own cultural awareness with client diversity, and stage of development in supervision. Trainees may have needed more direct supervision, guidance, and instruction. These factors may be related to the amount of time spent in the supervisory relationship.

In her study of critical incidents that occur in multicultural supervision, Fukuyama (1994) surveyed 18 racial-ethnic minority students. Participants were asked to report a positive critical incident and a negative critical incident. The responses helped to define a framework in multicultural supervision with visibly ethnic minority supervisees (Fukuyama, 1994). The positive experiences were grouped as: openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and opportunities to work in multicultural activities. The negative experiences were grouped as: lack of supervisor cultural awareness and questioning supervisee abilities. Participants were also asked to provide suggestions for making individual supervision multiculturally sensitive and effective, including: having supervisors initiate discussions of multicultural issues; providing training for supervisors to include multicultural issues in the discussion; increase the number of ethnically diverse

supervisors; train all staff involved in the agency in multicultural issues; supervisors should not overemphasize cultural diversity issues; use a training model for prejudice reduction; and provide a seminar for interest on cross-cultural issues (Fukuyama, 1994).

Following these suggestions, Dressel, Consoli, Kim, and Atkinson (2007) recently studied supervisors in university counseling centers who had extensive experience in multicultural supervision. Their study provided a list of supervisory behaviors that support multicultural supervision, most addressing culture. The authors used a Delphi method to survey the participants. This method employs a nomination process for participants who are experienced in the particular area of study (Dressel et al., 2007). For this particular study, 21 supervisors were surveyed to arrive at a consensus on successful and unsuccessful supervisory behaviors in multicultural supervision. Thirty-five behaviors were identified as characterizing successful multicultural supervision:

1. Creating a safe (non)judgmental, supportive environment for discussion of multicultural issues, values, and ideas
2. Developing my own self-awareness about cultural/ethnic identity, biases, and limitations
3. Communicating acceptance of and respect for supervisees' culture and perspectives
4. Listening [to] and demonstrating genuine respect [for] supervisee's ideas about how culture influences the clinical interaction
5. Providing openness, genuineness, empathy, warmth, and nonjudgmental stance.
6. Validating integration of supervisees' professional and racial/ethnic identities and helping to explore potential blocks to this process
7. Discussing and supporting multicultural perspectives as they relate to the supervisees' clinical work

8. Tending to feelings of discomfort experienced by trainees concerning multicultural issues
9. Supporting supervisees' own racial/ethnic identity development
10. Presenting myself nondefensively by tolerating anger, rage, and fear around multicultural issues
11. Providing supervisees a multiculturally diverse caseload to ensure breadth of clinical experienced
12. Attending to racial/ethnic cultural differences reflected in parallel process issues (supervisor/supervisee and supervisee/client)
13. Discussing realities of racism/oppression and acknowledging that race is always an issue
14. Acknowledging, discussing and respecting racial/ethnic multicultural similarities and differences between myself and supervisees, and exploring feelings concerning these
15. Addressing a broad range of differences (e.g. learning styles, interpersonal needs, sexual orientation, religious/spiritual beliefs, race)
16. Checking out the supervisory expectations with supervisees
17. Initiating discussions about the importance of culture
18. Acknowledging and discussing power issues in supervision that may be related to racial/ethnic multicultural differences
19. Encouraging supervisees to share, within supervision, their personal and professional cultural background and experiences
20. Consulting colleagues willingly about my own reactions to racial/ethnic concerns from supervision
21. Acknowledging my own lack of knowledge on racial/ethnic multicultural differences and inviting supervisees to give me feedback and teach me
22. Testing hypotheses about my supervisees, not accepting just one view
23. Self-disclosing aspects of my own cultural background
24. Implementing knowledge and awareness of supervision theory by attending to supervisees' process and stage of development

25. Engaging supervisees in peer review with each other's cases through case conferences
26. Seeking understanding of supervisees' culture through both didactic and experiential means on my own
27. Providing written and verbal feedback regarding supervisees' multicultural interactions with staff and clients
28. Providing multicultural readings and related training experiences for supervisees
29. Being willing to confront supervisees' inadequate skills, listening if that is challenged on grounds of cultural insensitivity, but not backing away from my own standards and values
30. Allowing supervisees to see my clinical work in cross-cultural counseling and/or consultation through tapes or live observation
31. Letting supervisees take responsibility
32. Providing supervisees with information about various cultures
33. Offering supervisees mentorship and other collaborative professional opportunities with me (e.g., co-led presentations, coauthored papers)
34. Departing from Western theoretical perspectives in supervision
35. Having supervisees keep a journal that documents personal reactions to interactions with seminar facilitator and intern colleagues (pp. 57-58).

Thirty-three statements were identified as characteristic of unsuccessful behaviors in multicultural supervision. A few of the most reported behaviors included, "lacking awareness regarding my own racial/ethnic/cultural biases and stereotypes; overlooking and/or failing to discuss cultural issues; becoming defensive around racial/ethnic/cultural issues; failing to establish a working alliance and safe environment; not recognizing the power of the supervisory role; and making assumptions about the supervisees' experiences or beliefs, based on their ethnicity or culture" (Dressel et al., p. 59, 2007).

As the authors organized the successful behaviors, they found three dimensions including, supervisory tasks, important aspects of the multicultural supervisory relationship, and aspects of personal and professional growth of the supervisor and support for the same growth in supervisees. The unsuccessful behaviors were related to supervisor's lack of awareness of their own cultural biases, lack of sensitivity to impact of culture leading to negative impact, and the supervisor trying to do something but it not turning out the way intended (Dressel et al., 2007).

A study that addressed critical incidents in multicultural supervision was done by Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, and Pope-Davis (2004) reporting supervisors' and supervisees' experiences. In this study, 17 supervisees and 11 supervisors participated, and all were involved in a supervision dyad in which the supervisee and supervisor differed in gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, physical disability, or socioeconomic status. Their results indicated that the critical incidents in multicultural supervision influenced certain areas including: awareness, skill development, knowledge, exposure, confidence, recognition of need for more training, and negative influence/no benefit. The results suggested that the multicultural incidents experienced influenced multicultural competence of supervisors and supervisees, either positively or negatively.

#### *Models of Multicultural Supervision*

Some researchers have focused on increasing multicultural counseling competence through supervision. The models of multicultural supervision in the extant literature focus on the individual relationship. However, these models can be extended to group supervision. Carney and Kahn (1984) developed a model of cross-cultural counseling training. The authors included five stages of trainee development necessary

for acquiring multicultural counseling competencies. Each of the stages reflects growth in three domains including knowledge of cultural groups, attitudinal awareness and cross-cultural sensitivity, and specific cross-cultural counseling skills. The limitations of this model are that they do not include the variables about the supervisor, or focus on the supervisory relationship.

*Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development.*

A particular model that has been useful in addressing the triadic relationship and the multiple and interrelated dimensions of the identities of supervisor and supervisee is the heuristic model of nonoppressive interpersonal development (Constantine & Ladany, 2001). This model offers supervisors a framework for understanding their own thoughts, feelings, and behaviors “about themselves, their trainees, and clients across specific demographic variables (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status)” (Constantine & Ladany, 2001, p. 66). This model places individuals in one of two groups: the socially oppressed group or the socially privileged group, given a specific demographic variable. Individuals can belong to both groups, depending on the demographic variable identified. For each variable, individuals progress through phases of interpersonal functioning, including adaptation, incongruence, exploration, and integration. These phases are similar to other models of racial identity development such as the one outlined by Helms (1990; 1995). According to the identified stage, there are four possible supervisor-trainee interpersonal interaction dynamics that can be exhibited. These four dynamics include progressive (supervisor is more advanced), parallel-advanced (supervisor and trainee are at comparable advanced levels), parallel-delayed (supervisor and trainee are at comparable delayed stages), and

regressive (trainee is more advanced). The authors also identified several interventions that supervisors can use to move trainees through the various stages of the model. This model needs additional research and scales developed to operationalize the stage constructs.

### *Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies*

The literature on multicultural competencies within supervision is scarce. The ACA's (2005) *Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice* includes a section on "Supervision, Teaching, and Training" (Section F). The areas that pertain to diversity include sections F.2.b: "Counseling supervisors are aware of and address the role of multiculturalism/diversity in the supervisory relationship" and F.6.b "Counselor educators infuse material related to multiculturalism/diversity into all courses and workshops for the development of professional counselors" (Section F). The *2005 Code of Ethics* included a subsection on Multicultural/Diversity Competence in Counselor Education and Training Programs (F.11). Included are statements regarding faculty and student diversity, recruiting and retaining faculty members of diverse groups as well as recruiting students of diverse groups and providing accommodations that will enhance and support diverse student well-being and performance. F.11.c states: "Counselor educators actively infuse multicultural/diversity competency in their training and supervision practices. They actively train students to gain awareness, knowledge, and skills in the competencies of multicultural practice. Counselor educators include case examples, role plays, discussion questions, and other classroom activities that promote and represent various cultural perspectives" (Section F). This is a development from the *1995 Code of Ethics* that did not include this section on multicultural competence.

The 2002 *APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* do not directly address multicultural/diversity competence. After a long and challenging process, the “Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists” (APA, 2003) was published to be enforced in all institutions and by which practicing psychologists will abide (Arredondo & Perez, 2006). There are six guidelines: self-awareness (1 and 2); education and training (3); research as interdependent and informs different practice applications (4); applying culturally appropriate skills in clinical and other applied psychological practices (5); and, organizational change and policy (6).

Ancis and Ladany (2001) introduced a multicultural supervision competencies model that covered five domains including personal development, conceptualization, interventions, process, and evaluation. The area of development includes both supervisor and trainee development, and specifically includes knowledge about cultural differences, self-exploration of values, biases, and personal limitations. The conceptualization domain includes understanding the impact of the individual on clients’ lives and the impact of oppression and racism on clients’ lives. The skills domain includes flexibility in counseling interventions. The process domain includes developing a relationship between supervisor and supervisee of respect and open communication in which racial issues can be addressed. The outcome/evaluation domain includes relevant instruments that assess multicultural competence, and the supervisors’ ability to identify trainees’ personal and professional strengths and weaknesses. Although these models have been formulated to use in individual supervision, the same models can be applied to use in group supervision.

## *Group Supervision*

Group supervision is an intervention that is used in training professional psychologists and counselors. Like individual supervisors who take on roles of teacher, lecturer, case reviewer, monitor, therapist, and colleague (Carifino & Hess, 1987), group supervisors can also take on these particular roles.

Group supervision has many benefits for psychologists or counselors. It can be an economical use of the supervisor's time in that he or she can provide supervision simultaneously to multiple individuals (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004), and be able to solve service delivery problems in this type of forum (Kruger, Maher, Cherniss & Leichtman, 1988). It can also provide an opportunity for peers to learn from one another through feedback, especially through various interpretations of content related to discussions. From a psychodynamic point of view, the supervision group can serve as a "holding" environment, in which group members can learn to better tolerate the impact of "transference, countertransference, resistance, splitting, projections, and projective identification" that may exist among group members or brought in from clients (Moss, 2008, pp. 200-201).

The particular benefits of group supervision over individual supervision have not been studied. Ray and Altekruze (2000) investigated the effectiveness of group supervision versus combined group and individual supervision. In their study, 64 participants were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups: individual and group supervision treatment, large group supervision treatment, and small group supervision treatment. Results of the study indicated that group supervision alone and group supervision with individual supervision were equally effective in increasing

counselor effectiveness. This was rated by clients using the Counseling Rating Form-Short Version, measuring counselor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. No differences were found between the large and small group supervision formats of groups with eight group members compared to four group members.

Additional advantages indicate that group supervision minimizes supervisee dependence, that it provides supervisees with greater exploration to a broader range of clients, and that feedback for the supervisee is higher in quantity, diversity, and quality (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Group supervision may also provide supervisors with a more comprehensive picture of the supervisee, and there is a higher chance for supervisees to use action techniques such as role plays to aid training. The supervision group can also model group dynamics that occur in group and how to respond to these dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear).

Disadvantages to group supervision also have been highlighted in the literature. Bernard and Goodyear (2004) stated that the group format may not allow supervisees to get what they need from group, that there are concerns with confidentiality, and the group format is not like the format of individual counseling, being that there are more individuals involved. There are also certain group processes and interactions that may impede learning such as competition and scapegoating, and too much time may be devoted to irrelevant issues that are not of interest to other group members (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Despite the limitations in the empirical literature, it is clear that group supervision is beneficial and widely practiced (Holloway & Johnston, 1985, Riva & Cornish, 1995, 2008).

One of the earliest studies looking at group supervision examined how group supervision was practiced at predoctoral internship sites (Riva & Cornish, 1995). The authors sent out 476 surveys to internship programs listed in the Association of Psychology Predoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) Directory. Of the 243 surveys returned, 65% of the sites conducted group supervision. This survey also explored frequent issues and topics covered in group supervision including ethical and legal issues, advanced clinical skills, transference and countertransference, intake assessment and evaluation, diagnosis, theories, crisis intervention, and administrative issues. The data showed that the largest percentage of time in group supervision was spent on case presentations (56%), didactic teaching (23%), and group process (15%).

In a similar study 15 years later, the researchers sent out 621 emails to training directors (TDs) of the APPIC sites in the 2006-2007 APPIC Directory (Riva & Cornish, 2008). Unlike the previous study, the survey was done online and supervisors were asked to complete the survey, with 162 respondents. Like the earlier study group supervision was found to be frequently conducted in predoctoral internship sites. Topics discussed in group supervision were similar to the 1991 study, with the addition of two new topics that also were regularly discussed in the supervision groups: multicultural issues (91%) and group process (57.2%) (Riva & Cornish, 2008).

An aspect that is important to study is the hindering phenomena that can occur within group supervision (Prieto, 1997). Studies have identified that competition can occur between group members in supervision, and group cohesion is necessary for the group to be successful (Prieto, 1997). Specific group process interventions can be used depending on the group's stage of development. Prieto also reported that most literature

on group supervision suggests that theoretical orientation is not related to effectiveness in group supervision. Prieto felt that it was important to respond to the unique group process variables that occur.

Linton (2003) identified eight themes that are indicative of group process phenomena in group supervision. In this particular study, these themes included: positive effects of feedback, lack of constructive feedback, information dissemination, observational learning, support, effects of a priori relationships, vicarious effects of supervisor behavior, and poor time management. Linton and Hedstrom (2006) used an exploratory, modified grounded theory approach to study group processes in group supervision. They interviewed eight practicum students and seven supervisors that supervised these students. Ten domains emerged, with five indicative of group process, four describing mediating influence variables that affected experiences in group supervision, and one domain that included suggestions for group supervision. Two of the five group process domains were similar to Linton's (2003) original findings, including observation, and feedback. The other three domains included cohesion, conflict, and guidance. The mediating variables included time issues, different backgrounds, class size, and non-clinical practicum stressors. The mediating variable of different backgrounds was reported by three participants who discussed different racial and ethnic backgrounds and gender among their group members and supervisors. One participant noted "the positive effect of racial/ethnic and gender diversity in her group and that she appreciated having peers from diverse backgrounds" (pp. 61-62).

### *Multicultural Events in Group Supervision*

A decade ago Prieto (1996) summarized the research on group supervision. None of the studies reviewed looked at multicultural issues or events. Since then, some research has indirectly addressed multicultural issues within group supervision. Recent studies have addressed hindering phenomena within group supervision literature. Hindering phenomena describes “those events or processes during group supervision that supervisees felt had a negative effect on their functioning” (Enyedy et al., 2003, p. 312). Enyedy et al. (2003) elicited hindering phenomena from 49 graduate students regarding their group supervision experiences during the first phase of the research study. Of these participants, 29 volunteered to take part in the second phase of the study and 14 were randomly selected to participate as sorters. They were asked to sort the hindering phenomena into categories according to similarity. The clusters that resulted were between-member problems, problems with supervisors, supervisee anxiety and other perceived negative effects, logistical constraints, and poor group time management. Some of the main clusters were divided into subclusters. Enyedy et al. (2003) identified important additions to the area of group supervision. An aspect of multiculturalism was identified in the third cluster, supervisee anxiety and other perceived negative effects. This particular phenomenon highlighted an individual as being the only male or the only person of color within the group. This area is one that may produce a negative response. Carter, Enyedy, Goodyear, Arcinue, and Puri (2009) used the same data from the Enyedy et al. (2003) study, concentrating on helpful phenomenon for group supervision. These specific helpful variables included supervisor impact, peer impact, support and safety, specific instruction, self-understanding, and validation of experience. Although not

specific for multicultural events in group supervision, these same helpful variables seem relevant.

Riva and Cornish (2008) reported that 91% of group supervisors stated that multicultural issues are discussed in their group supervision, and ranked it as the second most common topic. The research on group supervision has increased across various disciplines, and internationally. However, this research has not attended to the multicultural differences across group members. The supervision literature can benefit from integrating the research on group dynamics, group supervision, and multicultural supervision. The studies that have been done on hindering phenomena and critical incidents can be used to model research studies in the area of group supervision, specifically evaluating the group processes that occur within this supervision format. An additional area of supervision that can be applied in group supervision is the various models of multicultural supervision that have been developed to better understand the dynamics that occur in supervision between members of different cultural groups and when multicultural aspects occur.

### *Summary*

This chapter reviewed literature on supervision, including multicultural issues in individual supervision, group supervision, and multicultural events in group supervision. Various models of supervision were discussed, specifically focusing on two models that address cultural aspects. The Nonoppressive Heuristic Model of Supervision was introduced as a promising model for understanding multicultural supervision as well as applying this model to the group supervision format, and its relation to racial identity

development. The Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies was introduced to provide an outline of necessary skills and domains that should be assessed in supervision.

It is clear that research has only begun to address group supervision. The focus on multicultural aspects of group supervision is almost nonexistent. The group supervision literature has pointed out helpful and hindering behaviors, most often related to group supervisors. This is important because group supervision is much more complex than individual supervision. The following chapter outlines the methods used in this study, and the variables assessed. This study explored the relationships of multicultural competency of supervisee, perceived supervisor multicultural competency, racial identity development, and supervision satisfaction. The study attempted to provide an understanding of the type of climate necessary and what variables are needed in group supervision to process multicultural events effectively and enhance supervision satisfaction. Also, negative group experiences were explored in order to identify variables that hindered effective processing of these multicultural events in group supervision.

## CHAPTER III

### Methods

This chapter describes the methodology that was used in this study. A mixed-method, two-phase design, in which the first phase informed the second phase was used. For each phase, a description of the participants is followed by the procedures that were performed to collect the data. Information on the instruments used for the study is presented for each of the phases. This chapter will conclude with a description of the data analysis methods.

In Phase I of this study, anonymous survey methods were used to investigate participants' experiences in group supervision, including multicultural events that may have occurred. Surveys assessed the participants' perceptions of their supervisor's multicultural competence, participants' racial identity development and multicultural competence, and level of group supervision satisfaction.

Phase II consisted of phone interviews with a subsample of persons who completed Phase I and agreed to participate in Phase II. Phase II involved qualitative methods to further explore the multicultural events described in Phase I from the perspective of ethnic minority persons. In particular, the multicultural event experienced by participants was discussed in more detail to gain a better understanding of how the event was or was not processed. The questions also addressed the participants' perceptions of the positive and negative ways in which multicultural events can be

processed in group supervision. To begin, this chapter will describe the development of the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* (GSMCEQ) and the *Semi-Structured Telephone Interview* followed by the three steps of the Pilot Study.

#### *Development of the GSMCEQ and Telephone Interview*

The development of the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* included a number of phases. The first phase included the researcher writing a draft of the survey questions and interview questions and questions were pulled from the literature and from other studies. The questions were designed with the intent of obtaining as much information from the participants as possible with regards to their group supervision experiences and their experience of a multicultural event within group supervision. Items and questions were created using the criteria outlined in Fink (2002). In the next step, five experienced professionals independently reviewed the survey and telephone interview to improve content validity. These professionals were experts in the area of supervision, group supervision, and multicultural supervision. These individuals were known to the researcher and dissertation chair and were faculty members of academic graduate programs, internship programs, and professionals in private practice. The experts were contacted and emailed a copy of the GSMCEQ and interview questions and were asked to provide feedback. The feedback given was in regards to the manner in which questions were stated, the kind of information needed, and additional questions thought to be useful. The experts then emailed the researcher with their comments, and based on these comments, changes were made to improve the survey and interview. The study was then submitted to the University of Denver's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

### *Pilot Study*

Once the study was approved by the IRB, a pilot study of the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* was implemented. The pilot study had two components. First, six cognitive interviews were conducted with individuals similar to those who would participate in the study. These individuals were graduate students of color known by the researcher. The individuals were emailed and asked if they were willing to participate in cognitive interviews. Once they agreed, they were sent via email, a copy of the questionnaire and interview protocol and the Informed Consent. A date and time was arranged to call the individuals and feedback was discussed on the telephone. Before each interview, the pilot participants were presented with information from the consent form explaining the purpose of their participation in the pilot study and the risks and benefits involved (Appendix J). These cognitive interviews provided important information about the readability, definition, and clarity of questions and instructions of the questionnaire. The feedback provided from these six participants was used to revise the questionnaire and interview. Next, two graduate students were asked to complete the questionnaire in order to calculate the time it took to complete it.

After this step, the GSMCEQ was piloted. This sample included ten participants, all ethnic minority students that completed the online survey and had the option to provide feedback at the end of the survey with an open response section. These participants were individuals known to the researcher from previous academic experience. The pilot study procedure was identical to the procedures in Phase I in order to determine any difficulties with the procedure. The pilot study was conducted online, using SurveyMonkey. The participants received a consent form in addition to the Project

Information Form. After the completion of all pilot procedures, the questionnaire was again revised. The purpose of this step of the pilot study was to be sure that the online survey would run smoothly. Again, feedback was used to improve the online survey.

Due to the time commitment of the qualitative interview, only one pilot study qualitative interview took place with an ethnic-minority graduate student known to the researcher, duplicating all procedures that were to be used in the study. Feedback was obtained to improve the interview questions, and again changes were made.

### *Phase I*

#### *Participants*

Participants were self-identified United States citizens and ethnic minority persons. A United States Citizen is defined as an individual who was born in the United States and outlying possessions of the United States; foreign-born children, under age 18, residing in the U.S. with their birth or adoptive parents, at least one of whom is a U.S. citizen by birth or naturalization; and individuals granted citizenship status by Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) (U.S. Department of State, 2005). The participants were involved in doctoral level counseling psychology and clinical psychology graduate programs, Master's level students in counseling programs, students registered with the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC), or members of various ethnic minority psychology associations. These associations included the National Latina/o Psychology Association, the Society of Indian Psychologists, the Asian American Psychology Association, and the Black Psychologist Association. Some participants were also students in counseling programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational

Programs (CACREP). All participants had been involved in group supervision sometime within the previous two years.

Descriptive statistics of participants are presented in Table 2. Participants were African American/Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian American, or Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, or identify themselves as multi-ethnic. APA identifies minority student affiliates according to these minority ethnic groups. Initially some Caucasian and International students completed the survey. After removing Caucasian persons and International Students from the respondent pool, there were 95 ethnic minority persons who were also United States Citizens, and had participated in group supervision in the previous two years. It was decided that International students would not be included because of the vast variability it would include into the sample. For example, an English-speaking student from Canada would be identified as an International student, along with a Spanish-speaking student from Uruguay. Of the 95 participants, 18 were removed because of missing data and one participant was removed because it became clear that the person's description of a multicultural event did not occur in group supervision. After taking this information into account, 76 participants comprised the Phase I sample. The largest number of participants were in the age range of 26-29 (38.2%; n=29). Ages ranged from 22-25 to 50 and above. Eighty-six percent were female (n=65), and 14% were male (n=11). The sample consisted of the following: Asian or Pacific Islander (18.4%; n=14), Black or Non-Hispanic (30.3%; n=23) Hispanic (26.3%; n=20), and Multiple Racial Ethnic Groups (25%; n=19) (See Table 1). In order to protect anonymity, it was decided that any category with 3 or fewer respondents would

be reclassified in the Multiple Racial Ethnic Group. This was true for the American Indian/Alaskan Native category.

To ensure adequate power, and to decrease the possibility of committing a Type II error, an *a priori* power analysis was conducted using Cohen's power analysis (Cohen, 1988) to generate the number of participants needed in this phase of the study. Based on an *apriori* power analysis using GPOWER Version 2.0 developed by Faul and Erdfelder (1992), with a moderate effect size ( $f^2 = .33$ ), an alpha level of .05, and .8 power, a sample size of 82 was identified to protect from making a Type II error. Methods to obtain 82 participants are described in detail in the procedure section. Because only 76 participants were obtained for the study, this study may not have enough power to have prevented a Type II error.

Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Phase I (N=76)*

Variable	N	%
<b>Age</b>		
22-25	16	21.1
26-29	29	38.2
30-33	21	27.7
34-37	2	2.6
38-41	2	2.6
42-45	3	3.9
50 and above	3	3.9
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	11	14.5
Female	65	85.5

---

Ethnicity		
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	18.4
Black or Non-Hispanic	23	30.3
Hispanic	20	26.3
Multiple Racial Ethnic Groups	19	25.0

---

### *Procedures*

*Recruitment and Sample.* After the pilot study was completed, the principal investigator first attempted to enlist participants by contacting the American Psychological Association (APA) and obtain mailing labels of ethnic minority students currently enrolled in graduate programs. APA does not divulge email addresses of graduate students that are registered as student members; therefore, procedures for contacting potential participants were changed. An email was sent to the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP) listserv (see Appendix L), contacting Training Directors of counseling psychology doctoral programs. They were asked to send a link to students that described the study as well as a description of the type of participants that were needed for the study. An email also was sent to the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) Intern-Network listserv after obtaining permission from the listserv coordinator. After some responses were generated by these two methods, additional emails were sent to Training Directors of all APA accredited Clinical Psychology doctoral programs, Counseling Psychology doctoral programs, and Division 45, the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues of the American Psychology Association. Emails also were sent to coordinators of listserves for the National Latina/o Psychological Association, the

Society of Indian Psychologists, the Asian American Psychological Association, and the Association of Black Psychologists.

In the first wave of recruiting, 35 ethnic minority persons completed the survey. In order to increase sample size, methods were expanded and directors of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) programs were contacted in an attempt to recruit additional ethnic minority students to complete the online survey (see Appendix L). The contacts included doctoral students in Counselor Education as well as Marriage and Family Therapy and School Counseling, and Master's students in Community Counseling, Marriage and Family Therapy, and Rehabilitation Counseling, and School Psychology.

*Survey Revisions.* When the data from the survey were examined in more depth, some problems were identified. First, participants were ending the survey early during completion of the longest assessment, or shortly thereafter. It was then decided to modify the survey by moving this longer assessment (the *Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory- SMCI*) to the end of the survey, and prompts (i.e., smiley faces and short phrases) were added to encourage participants to complete the survey. The short phrases included, "Almost done! Keep Going! 10 questions left!" Second, it was discovered that there were participants in the sample that did not meet the criteria. Within the sample, 166 participants had identified as Caucasian, International students, or were persons of color that did not have group supervision experience. At this point, the recruitment letter and Informed Consent were reviewed. Information that described that the criteria required participants to be persons of color who were US Citizens and had also completed group supervision within the last two years was bolded, printed in larger font

size, and moved to the beginning of the consent form and recruitment letter (see Appendix M). Second emails were sent to the APPIC Intern-Network listserv, the CCPTP listserv, and directors of APA accredited clinical psychology programs with the changed formatting. Individual faculty members of various counseling psychology and counseling programs that were known by the dissertation advisor were also contacted. Emails were sent to Training Directors of all APPIC predoctoral internships. These strategies were successful and only persons who met the criteria completed the survey after these changes were made. After exhausting all methods to obtain participants, the survey was closed with 76 persons who met the criteria and completed the entire survey.

*Online Survey.* All potential participants received by email a description of the study and what participation entailed, and a link to the study through SurveyMonkey.com. To participate online, the participants clicked on the link that took them to the survey. By responding to the online survey, participants gave their consent to participate. Phase I was anonymous. They also had the option of being sent the materials by mail, however, no one requested this option. The SurveyMonkey link included: (a) information regarding the nature of the study and its potential benefits, and a description of what participation would entail (located in Appendix K), (b) a detailed consent form regarding the first phase of the study (located in Appendix H), (c) the *Background Questionnaire*, (d) the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire*, (e) the *Supervision Questionnaire (SQ)*, (f) the *Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory (SMCI)*, (g) the *Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)*, (h) the *Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R)*, and (i) information for participants to email the researcher to indicate if they would like to be entered into a drawing for a prize.

The prize was one of two \$50 gift certificates to Best Buy. The participants emailed the researcher and included their name and address if they wanted to be entered into the lottery drawing. Once the online survey was closed, two winners were chosen at random and gift certificates were sent to these individuals.

### *Measures*

The *Background Questionnaire* (Appendix A) assessed demographic variables relevant to the study. This self-reported questionnaire was developed for this study. The survey included 10 questions that asked information regarding age, gender, race, ethnicity of the participant, along with questions regarding the group leader and group members of the supervision group. The participants were asked about the number of courses they had taken related to multiculturalism/diversity and time spent in training workshops regarding diversity/multiculturalism. Questions included participants' experience with ethnic-minority clients, the approximate number of ethnic-minority clients they had seen, as well as approximate therapeutic hours they had spent with these clients.

The *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* (Appendix B) is an instrument created for this study. It is a self-report questionnaire including 16 items asking for qualitative descriptions of the most significant experience in group supervision related to multicultural issues. These multicultural events refer to dimensions of race and ethnicity. The description stated "the multicultural critical event is one in which a meaningful emotional or behavior interpersonal experience occurred." These questions took participants approximately 20 minutes to complete. The *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* began with two general questions that asked participants to identify three helpful events that occurred in their group supervision

experience and three unhelpful events. These events did not need to be related to multicultural issues. Then participants were asked to describe an experience that directly related to a multicultural issue in their group supervision experience. Subsequent questions were asked regarding the positive or negative perception of this event, the process of handling the critical event, how the group leader responded, how other group members responded to the situation, and how the participant responded to the situation. Additional questions related to supervision satisfaction and included a section for participants to give suggestions as to how multicultural events should be processed in group supervision in general, or how their specific multicultural event should have been processed. An additional question asked respondents' perspectives of what variables are needed to produce an environment that encourages the effective processing of these multicultural events.

Although the pilot studies were implemented to improve the measure, reliability and validity of this measure is largely unknown. The expert panel was used to improve content validity. Additionally, some of the questions were used in previous research on supervision, however these measures did not specifically address group supervision and multicultural issues, and therefore convergent validity was not possible to obtain. In addition, the *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* was administered to participants once, making test-retest reliability impossible to assess.

The *Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory (SMCI; Inman, 2006; Appendix C)* is a self-report measure assessing the supervisees' perceptions of the group supervisor's multicultural competence level. The SMCI is a 34-item measure, assessed on a 6-point rating scale (1 = Never to 6 = Always). The items focus on supervisor-

supervisee personal development, case conceptualization, interventions, process, and outcome/evaluations. Convergent validity for this measure has been demonstrated by correlations between the *Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised* and the *Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory*. In an earlier study, a coefficient alpha found for this measure was .97 (n=147; Inman, 2006).

The *Supervision Questionnaire (SQ)* (Ladany et al., 1996; Appendix D) is an 8-item self-report measure that assesses supervisees' satisfaction with various aspects of supervision. The responses are on a 4-point rating scale (1 = low, 4 = high) and scores can range from 8 to 32, with higher scores reflecting higher satisfaction with supervision. The measure is a paper-and-pencil questionnaire, takes approximately 10 minutes to complete, and a number of items are reverse-scored. Also, this measure was modified by asking participants to rate "group" supervision satisfaction. Research has shown internal consistency for this measure to be .96 (Ladany et al., 1996). This questionnaire was developed by Nicolas Ladany and at this time no validity statistics have been reported. The questionnaire being used is not to be confused with the *Supervision Questionnaire-Revised* (Worthington, 1984), a measure that includes 51 items measuring supervisory behaviors and supervision effectiveness. Worthington's questionnaire was not used due to the length of this survey and the length of other measures used in this study.

The *Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)* (Phinney, 1992; Appendix E) was used to assess supervisee racial identity development. This self-report measure takes approximately 15 minutes to complete, and responses are on a 4-point rating scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree), with higher scores reflecting stronger ethnic/racial identity. Scores are derived by reversing negatively worded items, summing across items,

and obtaining the mean. Scores range from 4 to 1, with 4 indicating high ethnic identity and 1 indicating low ethnic identity. The measure contains 20 items and can be used as a global measure of ethnic identity (Fischer & Moradi, 2001). It also has subscales that can be used, including Affirmation/Belonging, Identity Achievement, and Ethnic Behaviors. There is an additional subscale, the Other-Group Orientation, that was not relevant for this study and therefore not included. Removing this scale has not affected validity and reliability of this measure in other studies (Phinney, 1992). The MEIM is regularly used as a 14-item measure that obtains a total score rather than using individual subscales. The 14-item version was used in this study as a global measure of ethnic identity. Internal consistency for the 14-item measure has been acceptable to quite good (coefficient alpha of .85 for Mexican American college students; Cuellar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1998). Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) were .81 for the high school sample and .90 for the college sample (Phinney, 1992). Construct validity has been fairly good. Cuellar et al. (1998) showed global and subscale scores to be related to Mexican Americans' acculturation. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of .80 for ethnic identity exploration and .66 for ethnic identity commitment were obtained (Lochner & Phinney, 1988). Reliability coefficients for the Affirmation/Belonging subscale were .75 and .86 for the high school and college samples. For the Ethnic Identity Achievement Subscale, reliability coefficients were .69 and .80 for the two groups.

The *Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R*; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991; Appendix F) is a measure consisting of 20 items that reflect a counselor's ability to work with clients from various cultures (Ladany et al., 1997). The measure was developed from the multicultural counseling competencies given

by the Education and Training Committee of the American Psychological Association's Division 17 (Sue et al., 1982). This scale was modified for the purpose of this study, changing the word "counselor" to "supervisee." The CCCI-R takes approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The CCCI-R is comprised of three subscales, including Cross-Cultural Counseling Skill, Sociopolitical Awareness, and Cultural Sensitivity. Responses are on a 6-point rating scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating higher levels of multicultural competence. This study used a total score of the three subscales instead of individual subscale scores. Excellent internal consistency was noted in the validation sample (Coefficient Alpha of .95, LaFromboise et al., 1991), taken from a sample of 86 university students and faculty. LaFromboise et al. (1991) measured interrater reliability at .78, rising to .84 when an outlier was not included in the calculations.

The scale shows good content, construct, and criterion-related validity (Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992). LaFromboise et al. (1991) measured criterion validity. Student ratings of a videotaped female counselor were consistent with faculty conclusions regarding her multicultural counseling competence. The authors also reported that 43 African American male students gave higher ratings than females of multicultural competence to videotaped counselors enacting culture-sensitive roles. Content validity was assessed as eight graduate students classified scale items into competency categories with 80% agreement ( $\kappa = .58, p < .001$ ) (Ponterotto, Rieger, Barrett, & Sparks, 1994). In this study, the typical procedure was changed in that participants were asked to rate their own multicultural competence, and videotapes were not used.

### *Research Design and Data Analysis*

The first phase of the study used descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, grounded theory, and Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) for analysis. Descriptive statistics were calculated including mean scores, standard deviations, ranges, skewness, and kurtosis for all variables including the Background Questionnaire, Supervision Questionnaire, Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory, Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, and the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised.

*Bivariate Correlation Analyses.* Bivariate correlations were used to test Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4. The variables in Hypothesis 1 are Supervisee Multicultural Competence, as assessed by the CCCI-R and overall Group Supervision Satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ. The variables in Hypothesis 2 are Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, as assessed by the SMCI and overall Group Supervision Satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ. The variables in Hypothesis 3 are Racial Identity Development as assessed by the MEIM and overall Group Supervision Satisfaction as assessed by the SQ. The variables in Hypothesis 4 are Multicultural Competence as assessed by the CCCI-R and Racial Identity Development as assessed by the MEIM.

All statistical analyses were conducted using the statistical software package SPSS 14.0, with an alpha level of .05. Table 2 summarizes the hypotheses/question, analyses, and variables.

Table 2

*Phase I Hypotheses, Analyses, and Variables*

Hypotheses/Question	Analysis	Variables
Hypothesis 1:  There will be a significant positive relationship between multicultural competence of supervisee/participants, as assessed by the CCCI-R and overall satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ.	Bivariate Correlation	Total score from the CCCI-R  Total score from the SQ
Hypothesis 2:  There will be a significant positive relationship between perceived supervisor multicultural competence, as assessed by the SMCI and overall satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ.	Bivariate Correlation	Total score from the SMCI  Total score from SQ
Hypothesis 3:  There will be a significant positive relationship between racial identity development, as assessed by the MEIM and overall satisfaction, as assessed by the SQ.	Bivariate Correlation	Total score from the MEIM  Total score from the SQ
Hypothesis 4:  There will be a significant positive relationship between multicultural competence, as assessed by the MEIM and racial identity development, as assessed by the CCCI-R.	Bivariate Correlation	Total score from the CCCI-R  Total score from the MEIM

A correlation matrix was generated to examine strength of relationships between supervisees' multicultural competency, perceived supervisor multicultural competency, supervisee racial identity, and group supervision satisfaction, using Pearson product

moment correlations ( $r$ ). Outliers were assessed using Cook's Distance, DfFit, and DfBeta (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Scatterplots were used to assess for outliers. Outliers were not found. Before conducting the correlation, the variables from the CCCI-R, SQ, SMCI, and MEIM were examined for distribution, covariation, and multicollinearity. The data were examined to ensure that assumptions underlying correlation statistics were met.

*Grounded Theory and CQR.* The qualitative information from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* was analyzed using a modified version of grounded theory and a modified version of Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR).

In this process, the qualitative information was taken from the following questions:

- Please list three events or processes that you experienced as most helpful in your group supervision experience.
- Please list three events or processes that you experienced as least helpful in your group supervision experience.
- Describe the most influential aspect of your group supervision experience in which a multicultural event occurred or was the main theme. Please be succinct but clear in your descriptions.
- What was your reaction to this event? A reaction can be both internal and external. Please describe your cognitive/emotional/physical reaction to this event.
- How did your group leader react to this event? What did he/she do to facilitate/not facilitate resolution of the issues?
- How did other members of the group react, both internally and externally, to this event?

- If this group supervision experience was negative, what variables of this experience made it negative and how could it be changed? How could the group leader have helped to facilitate the resolution of this event?
- If this group supervision experience was a positive event, what variables of this experience made it a positive one for you?
- What suggestions would you give for group leaders or group supervision members in handling multicultural issues or events in order to make them positive experiences for the group?

Responses to these questions were analyzed using grounded theory and main themes were identified within the various questions. Authors have expressed the need for research in group supervision to be exploratory (Linton & Hedstrom, 2006). Thus, a modified grounded theory approach was used to investigate the critical incidents that occur in group supervision. Hill (1990) reported that exploratory, discovery-oriented studies investigate critical incidents from a nontheoretical stance and create theory rather than test it. Creswell (1998) described the intent of a grounded theory study to generate or discover a theory that relates to a particular situation. These situations are those in which individuals interact or engage in a process that can be in response to a phenomenon. For this study, this phenomenon was the multicultural critical event that occurred while in group supervision.

Qualitative research is generally done by coding, categorizing, and summarizing meaningful themes found in the descriptions. In grounded theory, data are first assessed with open coding, in which the “researcher forms initial categories of information about the phenomenon being studied by segmenting information” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). In

axial coding “the investigator assembles the data in new ways after open coding” (p. 57). The researcher identifies a central category and explores causal conditions, specifies strategies, identifies the context and intervening conditions, and identifies the consequences for this phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). In selective coding, the researcher “identifies a story line and writes a story that integrates the categories in the axial coding model” (p. 57). At this stage, the researcher presents hypotheses about the phenomenon. The coding in this research study was done by the researcher as well as a graduate student. The graduate student assistant was trained in this modified version of grounded theory analysis. It is modified from the traditional grounded theory approach in that more than one researcher analyzed the data. The graduate assistant was given a chapter out of the book titled *Qualitative Methods in Social Research* by Kristin Esterberg (2002) to read. The information regarding the coding process then was discussed and any questions were answered. The process of open coding and axial coding were used.

The decision was made to use consensual qualitative research (CQR) after the coding process. Once the themes were found, then a modified CQR method was used to identify domains and categories, as well as frequencies of the themes identified in the responses. The process of CQR is very similar to the type of modified grounded theory used in the coding analysis. The CQR approach was influenced by grounded theory (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997). It is similar in that both use “inductive analyses so that theories are built from the bottom up by drawing conclusions based on the data rather than specifying a hypothesis in advance and using the data to test that hypothesis, and it is concerned with meaning or understanding the phenomenon from the participant’s perspective” (Hill et al., 1997, p. 520). In grounded theory however, researchers alternate

between data gathering and data analysis as described above. In CQR, data are collected and then analyzed. For the purposes of this study, a modified version of grounded theory and a modified version of CQR were used to analyze the qualitative data. The modified version of CQR included taking the themes found from the coding process and putting them into domains, or topic areas, and core ideas within each domain. Then the domains and core ideas were looked at by frequency. The researcher and graduate assistant compared these data across cases and tabulated the number of cases that fit into each category within domains. The frequencies included General, Typical, and Variant categories. A category that applies to all cases in the sample is classified as General. A category that applies to half or more of the cases in the sample is classified as Typical. A category that applies to either two to just less than half of the cases in the sample is classified as Variant. If a category only applied to one of the cases in the sample, efforts were made to see if the core ideas within this category could fit into any other categories (Hill et al., 1997). If not, then these cases were discarded. CQR was modified in another way for the purpose of this study in that only two individuals analyzed the data. Typically, there is a team of 3-5 individuals that analyze the data and come to a consensus regarding themes, domains, and categories. The researcher made attempts to have a team of three individuals for the analysis portion of the qualitative data. However, the third individual was unable to participate due to a family emergency. Therefore, two members were involved in the coding process.

### *Phase II*

The second phase of the study included participants who completed the survey and responded affirmatively to a question asking if they had experienced a multicultural

event in their group supervision experience. At the end of the online survey, they were asked if they wanted to volunteer in an interview regarding this event and agreed to be interviewed by telephone.

*Grounded theory and deciding number of participants.* Every attempt was made to have a group of individuals who were diverse across the different ethnic minority categories and gender. Given that the male/female ratio within psychology and counseling programs is imbalanced with considerably more women, it was assumed that this same ratio would occur in both phases of the study. In grounded theory, interviews are done with approximately 20-30 people to achieve detail in the emergent theory (Creswell, 1998). Creswell recommended that “between 20-30 participants are needed to develop a well-detailed, saturated, grounded theory model” (personal communication, July 24, 2007). Grounded theory sometimes requires that the researcher continue interviewing participants until emerging themes are discovered and no new information is found (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Kathy Charmaz, a leading researcher in grounded theory, was also contacted and she stated “the larger the number of interviews, the better. If you return to earlier interviewees to follow up on your ideas, those interviews might be shorter. You need to consider your discipline, department, and future publication venues, too, when deciding on how many interviews” (K. Charmaz, personal communication, July 27, 2007). Theoretical saturation occurs when “no new or relevant data seem to emerge regarding a category, the category is well-developed in terms of its properties and dimensions demonstrating variation, and the relationships among categories are well established and validated” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 212). For Phase II, it was decided

that a minimum of 20 participants was needed to ensure that emergent themes would develop across interview data.

### *Participants*

In Phase II, 22 interviews were conducted and no additional interviews were needed because no new or relevant data emerged from the telephone interviews. Descriptive statistics for the participants in this phase of the study are presented in Table 4. Twenty-nine participants agreed to be interviewed. Twenty-two interviews were conducted, although it became clear in one phone interview that the multicultural event described did not occur within the context of group supervision but rather in a group counseling class. This person was removed from the data set entirely. Another interview included a participant who had participated in group supervision but did not experience a multicultural event. This was the first interview conducted, and served the purpose of an additional pilot interview. This left a total of 20 participants who were interviewed and their data were used for analysis. Similar to the overall sample, most participants fell in the age range of 26-29 ( $n = 8$ , 40%). Eighty percent were female ( $n = 16$ ) and 20% were male ( $n = 4$ ). The sample consisted of the following: Asian American ( $n = 5$ , 25%); Black or Non-Hispanic ( $n = 6$ , 30%); Hispanic ( $n = 8$ , 40%); and Multiple Racial Ethnic Groups ( $n = 1$ , 5%) (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Phase II (N=20)*

Variable	n	%
<b>Age</b>		
22-25	2	10.0
26-29	8	40.0
30-33	6	30.0
34-37	2	10.0
38-41	0	0
42-25	1	5.0
50 and above	1	5.0
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	4	20.0
Female	16	80.0
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	25.0
Black or Non-Hispanic	6	30.0
Hispanic	8	40.0
Multiple Racial Ethnic Groups	1	5.0

### *Procedures*

Those that did participate in the first phase of the study were asked if they were willing to participate in Phase II by completing a question at the end of the consent form. If they checked “I am willing to participate” they were also asked for their name, phone number, and email address in order to arrange a time for a telephone interview (see Appendix I). At this point, their participation was considered confidential rather than anonymous.

Twenty-nine participants volunteered to participate in the semi-structured telephone interview. One participant was not contacted because the number of needed interviews had been reached. An email was sent to the 28 persons asking that they email the researcher dates and times of availability. If they did not respond within one week, a second email was sent. Five participants did not respond to either email, and one participant was scheduled, but was unable to be interviewed due to scheduling conflicts.

Once scheduled, the interviewees were contacted by telephone and all interviews were conducted by the researcher and were audio-taped. The interviewee was briefed on the purpose of the telephone interview, the informed consent was explained, and after any questions were answered, they verbally consented to participating in the study. The interviewees were then presented with the event they reported in the online survey, and were asked to provide more detail about the incident as a form of member checking. In member checks, the researcher takes the data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions back to the participants so they can verify the accuracy of the information (Creswell, 1998). For this study, the researcher reviewed the information with participants over the telephone, that was obtained from their online surveys in Phase I while conducting the

semi-structured phone interviews. The feedback received from these participants helped shape the grounded theory that developed from the emergent themes in the qualitative descriptions. The interviews took approximately 20 to 60 minutes.

After a few telephone interviews had been conducted, the data were analyzed and questions were added to the semi-structured interview. In grounded theory, data are constantly analyzed. Glaser (1992) describes the process as a constant comparative analysis of data. Creswell (1998) referred to this process as a zigzag, where researchers gather information, analyze the data, and use the analysis to shape the process of obtaining more information, thus changing the interview questions. After every two or three interviews, the information was analyzed to compare to the emerging model. The researcher assessed this information and modified the semi-structured telephone interview. Questions were asked pertaining to the themes that emerged throughout the conducted interviews. The additional questions were added to the interview (See Appendix H). After all interviews were completed, they were transcribed by the researcher.

*Transcription Process.* The amount of time for the transcription process for each interview varied by the length of the interview, but on average took approximately 45 minutes per interview. Each interview was typed into a script in Microsoft Word.

*Training the Research Assistant.* To analyze the qualitative data, an additional individual was recruited to assist in the coding process. Students were recruited from the Counseling Psychology and School Psychology programs at the University of Denver. It was decided that due to the subjective viewpoint of the researcher, who is a person of color, it would be beneficial to have a non-minority individual to help with coding. A

Master's student in counseling was hired to help with the coding process of the qualitative interviews. She had no prior experience in qualitative research. The student was given a copy of a chapter regarding coding for grounded theory at an initial meeting (Esterberg, 2002). The chapter was discussed and any questions were answered regarding the coding process. After the student assistant had a basic understanding of the coding process, she was given a copy of the qualitative information obtained from the online survey. This information was obtained by the researcher from SurveyMonkey and copied and pasted into a document in Microsoft Word. The researcher and student assistant independently coded all interviews. A meeting was held to discuss the emergent themes and justifications of coding. In order to determine if the student assistant had a basic understanding of the coding process, the first three questions from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* were compared to determine agreement. Differences and similarities in coding were examined, and justifications were discussed regarding each coding decision. Once the researcher felt the assistant understood the process, she was then given ten interviews to code. Another meeting was held to discuss the emergent themes and justifications. After this meeting, the assistant was given the remaining interviews and followed the same process. After this process, the graduate assistant was given an article regarding CQR (Hill et. al, 1997). After a discussion of the CQR domain and categorizing process, the researcher and graduate assistant began to discuss domains, categories, and core ideas together, after individually analyzing the data (please see the Data Analysis section in Phase I for further explanations of grounded theory and CQR). Tabulations were assessed for the number of cases that fit into these domains and categories. The categories included General, Typical, and Variant. The graduate assistant

tabulated the frequencies of domains and categories that emerged from the telephone interviews.

### *Measures*

*The Semi-Structured, Qualitative Telephone Interview* (Appendix G). This semi-structured interview was conducted with participants who agreed to participate in a telephone conversation. Interviews ranged from 20 to 60 minutes to complete. This interview followed up on information obtained from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* and also asked questions regarding the domains of the Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies. The questions pertained to the variables needed to create positive group supervision experiences, and the variables that contribute to negative group supervision experiences in regards to their specific multicultural event. The participants were asked what variables contributed to whether or not this multicultural event was discussed, and any general suggestions they had to ensure positive experiences in group supervision for other supervisees. The researcher conducted all interviews by telephone. Every participant who participated in the telephone interview was mailed a \$20 gift certificate to Barnes and Noble. One participant declined to accept the gift certificate and did not give her mailing address.

*Validity of the Interview.* Due to the subjective and interpretive nature of qualitative research, the validity of the telephone interview is unknown. However, Maxwell (1992) developed five categories to assess validity of qualitative research including: descriptive validity, interpretive validity, theoretical validity, generalizability, and evaluative validity. Descriptive validity includes all of the formative data accurately reflecting what the participants say. Interpretive validity ensures that the researcher

captures the meaning of events and behaviors based on the participants' perspectives. Theoretical validity addresses the theoretical constructions that are developed during the study (Maxwell, 1992). Generalizability includes internal generalizability that is specific to the situation developed from the emergent themes. External generalizability relates to whether the results can be widely applied. Evaluative validity attempts to assess evaluations drawn by the researcher and answers all possible questions. These five categories of validity were applied by conducting triangulation methods and member checking, and the validity of the findings from the second phase was assessed. The validity of the interview is discussed in the results section.

#### *Research Design and Data Analysis*

Qualitative analysis was used to examine the information obtained from the semi-structured telephone interviews. A modified grounded theory approach was used to assess the multicultural critical events described by the participants in the telephone interviews (see Table 4). The researcher, with assistance from a graduate student, followed the steps involved in this modified version of grounded theory analysis and categorized using a modified CQR approach. The results from the questions regarding the *Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies* were assessed in SPSS to identify similarities between the suggested multicultural supervision model and data found in regards to group supervision.

Table 4

*Phase II Question, Analysis and Variables*

---

Question 1:

<p>What variables help to create a positive environment for group supervision in order to process multicultural events, as assessed by the <i>Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire</i> and qualitative telephone interviews with volunteers?</p> <p>What variables will lead to a negative experience of group supervision?</p>	<p>Grounded Theory</p>	<p>Qualitative data from the <i>Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire</i> Qualitative data from the voluntary, semi-structured qualitative telephone interviews</p>
--	------------------------	---

---

*Summary*

This is a mixed-method, two-phase study that included 76 participants in Phase I and 20 participants in Phase II. It was created to explore and understand group supervision and the ways in which multicultural events occur and are processed. One area that has not been studied earlier is the occurrence of multicultural events in group supervision and the perceptions of ethnic-minority persons of these events. In Phase I, quantitative surveys provided a general understanding of positive and negative factors in group supervision, and a description of a multicultural event if it occurred. Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, Overall Group Supervision Satisfaction, Supervisee Racial Identity Development, and Supervisee Multicultural Competence were assessed. In Phase II, qualitative interviews explored ethnic minority individuals' experiences in group supervision, and their perceptions of factors that they thought to be

beneficial in group supervision to effectively process multicultural events. Prior to this study, none have explored multicultural issues in group supervision from the viewpoint of ethnic minorities. The following chapter presents the results of this two-phase study.

## CHAPTER IV

### Results and Analyses

This study was developed to investigate the types of multicultural events that occur within group supervision and examine the relationships between supervision satisfaction and perceived supervisor multicultural competence, supervisee multicultural competence, and supervisee racial identity. This study also addressed which of these three variables had the strongest relationship with supervision satisfaction. It was a two-phase study that included both quantitative and qualitative measures. In addition, the second phase of the study addressed which factors contributed to group supervision being a positive experience and which factors led to a negative experience. This chapter describes the results from Phase I and Phase II. This chapter begins by highlighting the survey data from Phase I, including data preparation and computing composite scores, the reliability analysis, and descriptive statistics and correlations among variables. The next section outlines the qualitative data from the online survey, followed by the qualitative data from the semi-structured telephone interviews, including domains and categories from the CQR analysis. Finally, the last section details the results of the data analyses for each hypothesis and research question.

## *Phase I*

### *Data Preparation and Composite Scores*

The data were collected from an online survey using SurveyMonkey; the data then were sent to this researcher via an Excel spreadsheet. These data were transferred to an SPSS database and variables were computed and checked for missing data. It was decided by the researcher and a statistics expert, that if a participant had not answered at least half of the questions for a particular measure (i.e., SQ, SMCI, CCCI-R, MEIM), they were dropped from the sample and were not included in any analyses. Ninety-five participants were transferred into the SPSS database. Nineteen participants met the criterion for missing data, and were removed from the analyses leaving 76 participants. For these 76 participants, no individual had more than four unanswered questions. A mean was computed in SPSS for all persons who responded to the item, and this mean replaced the missing data.

In order to test the hypotheses, it was necessary to create composite scores of the participants' responses for supervision satisfaction, multicultural competence, racial identity, and perceived supervisor multicultural competence in order to obtain total scores for each variable. A composite score for the SQ was calculated for each participant by summing the total of all questions. Higher scores indicated greater satisfaction. A total composite score also was calculated for the MEIM and CCCI-R by summing the total for each questionnaire. Higher scores indicated higher racial identity and greater multicultural competence. A total composite score was calculated for the SMCI by summing the participants' scores of their perceived supervisor's multicultural

competence. Higher scores reflected the perception of greater multicultural competence of the participants' group supervisors.

*Reliability, Descriptives, and Correlations of Assessments*

Reliability analyses were conducted to examine the internal consistency of each instrument and then compare them with reliabilities from earlier studies. Internal consistency for the SQ was .94. Although Cronbach's alpha had not been used in previous studies, an internal consistency of .95 using the SQ was reported by Ladany (1996). The Cronbach's alpha for the MEIM was .89, similar to a Cronbach's alpha of .90 reported by Phinney (1992). Cronbach's alpha for CCCI-R was .92. Prior studies also showed good internal consistency (Coefficient alpha of .95 reported by LaFromboise et al., 1991). Cronbach's alpha for the SMCI was .99. This measure is fairly new and reliability studies have not been conducted. However, good internal consistency was found for this measure (Coefficient alpha = .97; Inman, 2006). Overall, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were consistent with those found for the normative data (see Table 5).

Table 5

*Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients of Supervision Satisfaction, Multicultural Competence, Racial Identity, and Perceived Supervisor's Multicultural Competence Assessments for the Current Study and Normed Data*

Assessment	Number of Items	Cronbach's alpha Current Study	Cronbach's alpha and coefficient alpha Normed Data
SQ	8	.94	.95 (coefficient alpha)
MEIM	12	.89	.90 (Cronbach's alpha)
CCCI-R	20	.92	.95 (coefficient alpha)
SMCI	34	.99	.97 (coefficient alpha)

*Descriptive Statistics of Survey Response Data*

Descriptive statistics were computed for the SQ, CCCI-R, MEIM, and SMCI. Additional descriptive data were analyzed from the *Background Questionnaire*. Other data were calculated from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* including, degree thus far, year in graduate school, number of multicultural graduate courses, and number of multicultural trainings (see Table 10). Variables that were included in the descriptive analyses included the ethnicity of clients, hours worked with ethnic minority clients, if a multicultural event occurred in group supervision, whether this event was positive for the supervisee or for the group, the supervisor's ethnicity, and the number of members in the group supervision.

*SQ*. This measure has 8 questions and scores can range from 8 to 32. The mean level of supervision satisfaction was 23.36, with a range from 9 to 32. The standard

deviation was 6.01; skewness was -.39, and kurtosis was -.74, indicating a slightly flat but normal distribution.

For the eight questions of the SQ, interval data were gathered using a 4-point rating scale. Each question could range from 1-4, and actual scores spanned the whole range for each question. Each question had different anchors (Appendix D). In describing the quality of group supervision received, participants provided an average score of 2.99 (SD = .93), which fell close to the scale point of (3) “Fair.” In response to their overall satisfaction with group supervision, participants averaged 2.99 (SD = .90), which fell close to the scale point of (3) “Mostly satisfied.” Descriptive statistics of the remaining questions are listed in Table 6.

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics from the SQ (N = 76)*

Variable	M (SD)	Observed Score Range (Composite)	Skewness	Kurtosis
Quality of supervision	2.99 (.93)	1-4	-.59	-.52
Kind of supervision	2.78 (.86)	1-4	-.46	-.26
Fit my needs	2.87 (.81)	1-4	-.38	-.20
Recommend to a friend	2.87 (1.02)	1-4	-.57	-.76
Satisfied with amount	2.91 (.87)	1-4	-.19	-.91
Helpful in roles as therapist/counselor	3.13 (.81)	1-4	-.72	.14
Overall satisfaction	2.99 (.90)	1-4	-.65	-.26
Return to supervision	2.84 (.94)	1-4	-.37	-.75
Total composite score	23.36 (6.01)	9-32 (8-32)	-.39	-.74

*CCCI-R*. The participants reported their mean level of multicultural competence to be 83.04, with a total score range from 20 to 120. The standard deviation was 18.72; skewness was -.25; and kurtosis was .55, indicating a normal distribution with a slightly peaked curve.

For the 20 items on the *CCCI-R*, interval data were gathered using a six-point rating scale. The anchors of the scale were: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) slightly disagree; (4) slightly agree; (5) agree; and (6) strongly agree (see Appendix F for measure). The following are a few of the highest rated items: in the description of their own awareness of their own cultural heritage, participants responded with a mean of 4.47 (SD = 1.60). In response to valuing and respecting cultural differences, participants averaged 4.79 (SD = 1.63). Participants responded to being aware of professional and ethical responsibilities with a mean of 4.83 (SD = 1.50). These three responses all fell between (4) “slightly agree” to (5) “agree.”

The two lowest rated items are described as follows. Participants demonstrated knowledge about client’s culture with a mean of 3.61 (SD = 1.27), which fell between (3) “slightly disagree” and (4) “slightly agree.” Participants stated that they presented their own values to their clients with an average of 3.22 (SD = 1.04), which fell between (3) “slightly disagree” and (4) “slightly agree.” The descriptive statistics of all questions on the survey are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics of the CCCI-R (N=76)*

Variable	Mean (SD)	Composite and Observed Score Range	Skewness	Kurtosis
Aware of own culture	4.47 (1.60)	1-6	-.30	-1.40
Respects cultural differences	4.79 (1.63)	1-6	-.83	-.75
Aware of their affect on clients	4.33 (1.64)	1-6	-.19	-1.38
Comfort with differences	4.08 (1.56)	1-6	.19	-1.34
Suggest referral	4.03 (1.51)	1-6	.19	-1.15
Current sociopolitical system	4.07 (1.47)	1-6	.09	-.89
Knowledge of client's culture	3.61 (1.27)	1-6	.67	.35
Understanding of therapy process	3.87 (1.46)	1-6	.50	-.92
Institutional barriers	4.14 (1.56)	1-6	.10	-1.35
Elicits responses	4.04 (1.51)	1-6	.27	-1.21
Accurately sends and receives messages	3.80 (1.30)	1-6	.91	-.55
Suggest intervention skills	3.92 (1.30)	1-6	.48	-.53
Sends appropriate messages	3.92 (1.41)	1-6	.55	-.99
Perceive presenting problem	4.54 (1.54)	1-6	-.29	-1.44
Presents own values	3.22 (1.04)	1-6	.48	1.18
Ease talking with client	4.27 (1.53)	1-6	.16	-1.71
Recognizes limits	3.95 (1.39)	1-6	.62	-1.10
Appreciates client's ethnicity	4.65 (1.54)	1-6	-.46	-1.35

Aware of professional and ethical responsibilities	4.83 (1.50)	1-6	-.60	-1.40
Acknowledges and is comfortable with culture	4.52 (1.50)	1-6	-.15	-1.69
Composite Total Score	83.04 (18.72)	20-120	-.25	.55

*MEIM.* The mean score for the racial identity of the participant was 41.52, with a total score range from 28 to 48. The standard deviation was 5.29; skewness was  $-.75$ ; kurtosis was  $-.34$ . This indicated a slightly flat but normal distribution.

The original measure has 14 questions, however two of the questions were duplicates of questions from another measure and were not included. With the two questions removed, the scores can range from 12-48 (see Table 8 for descriptive statistics of all items). In this sample, scores ranged from 28-48. This range was restricted and indicated that most participants perceived themselves to be moderately to highly racially identified. Responses were answered on a scale: (4) Strongly agree; (3) Agree; (2) Disagree; and (1) Strongly disagree. This measure can be found in Appendix E. A few of the highest rated items from this measure included the following: “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me” (Mean = 3.58; SD = .55). To the statement “I am happy with my group membership” participants responded with a mean of 3.75 (SD = .44). In response to the item about whether they felt good about their cultural or ethnic background, participants responded with a mean of 3.66 (SD = .51). These three responses all fell between “Agree” and “Strongly Agree.” A lower response occurred for whether they participated in organizations or groups of their own ethnic group. Participants’ responses averaged 2.80 (SD = .98)

Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics from the MEIM (N = 76)*

Variable	Mean (SD)	Composite and (Observed Score Range)	Skewness	Kurtosis
Spent time trying to find out more	3.54 (.55)	1-4 (2-4)	-.65	-.67
Active in organizations	2.80 (.98)	1-4 (1-4)	-.37	-.84
Sense of ethnic background	3.58 (.55)	1-4 (2-4)	-.82	-.40
Thinking about effect on life	3.43 (.68)	1-4 (2-4)	-.79	-.48
Happy with ethnic group	3.75 (.44)	1-4 (3-4)	-1.18	-.63
Strong sense of belonging	3.41 (.72)	1-4 (2-4)	-1.01	.57
Understand ethnic membership	3.55 (.53)	1-4 (2-4)	-.50	-1.15
Learning and talking	3.29 (.73)	1-4 (1-4)	-.72	.03
Pride in ethnic group	3.59 (.55)	1-4 (2-4)	-.88	-.28
Participate in practices	3.45 (.66)	1-4 (2-4)	-.80	-.43
Strong attachment	3.48 (.72)	1-4 (1-4)	-1.26	.99
Feel good about ethnicity	3.66 (.51)	1-4 (2-4)	-.99	-.29
Total composite score	41.52 (5.29)	12-48 (28-48)	-.75	-.34

*SMCI*. When asking participants about their supervisor's multicultural competence, the mean was 127.67, with a possible and observed range of 34 to 204. These scores indicate great variability in how participants perceived their supervisor's multicultural competency levels. The standard deviation was 44.76; skewness was -.16; and kurtosis was -.95. The distribution was normal with a flattened curve.

The 34-items of the measure were questions using a 6-point rating scale. The anchors for this scale were: (1) Never; (2) Rarely; (3) Sometimes; (4) Often; (5) Very Often; and (6) Always. This measure can be found in Appendix C. Most responses fell between the scale options of (3) “Sometimes” and (4) “Very often.” Descriptive statistics for all of the questions on the measure and the total composite score are listed in Table 9.

In describing their supervisors’ knowledge about their supervisors’ cultural background, participants averaged 4.36 (SD = 1.46) suggesting that supervisees saw their supervisors as often to very often having awareness of their own (supervisors’) cultural background. Participants averaged 4.39 (SD = 1.51) on the extent to which their supervisors encouraged collaboration with clients, which fell between (4) “Often” and (5) “Very often.” On the extent to which supervisors use power constructively, participants’ mean scores were 4.29 (SD = 1.66), which fell between the scale options of (4) “Often” and (5) “Very often.”

There were also some questions that had lower means than the others. In rating their supervisor’s discussion of reliance on cultural explanations for psychological difficulties, participants had a mean of 3.07 (SD = 1.56), which fell between (3) “Sometimes” and (4) “Often.” In response to the extent to which supervisors were familiar with instruments assessing multicultural competence, participants had a mean of 2.93 (SD = 1.55), which fell between the scale options of (2) “Rarely” and (3) “Sometimes.” In response to whether supervisors recommended appropriate remedial training for those with lower competence, participants averaged 2.81 (SD = 1.55), which fell between (2) “Rarely” and (3) “Sometimes.”

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics of the SMCI (N = 76)*

Variable	Mean (SD)	Composite and Observed Score Range	Skewness	Kurtosis
Explores own beliefs	3.75 (1.50)	1-6	-.15	-1.05
Knowledgeable about own culture	4.36 (1.46)	1-6	-.78	-.29
Knowledge of diverse groups	4.19 (1.45)	1-6	-.42	-.71
Knowledgeable about alternative approaches	3.63 (1.55)	1-6	-.10	-1.13
Knowledge of empirical literature	3.93 (1.64)	1-6	-.17	-1.23
Knowledgeable about limitations of therapies	4.17 (1.47)	1-6	-.49	-.66
Facilitates exploration of identity development	3.74 (1.68)	1-6	-.21	-1.20
Facilitates exploration of values	3.88 (1.67)	1-6	-.31	-1.10
Help to understand impact on social structure	3.95 (1.74)	1-6	-.43	-1.12
Encourage participation in cultural activities	3.70 (1.71)	1-6	-.17	-1.23
Facilitate understanding of racism	3.76 (1.75)	1-6	-.23	-1.21
Facilitate understanding of individual factors	4.04 (1.65)	1-6	-.48	-.94
Facilitate understanding culture-specific norms	3.86 (1.66)	1-6	-.25	-1.14
Encourage discussion of identity towards conceptualization	3.99 (1.63)	1-6	-.43	-.96
Promote understanding of stereotyping	3.67 (1.65)	1-6	-.20	-1.21
Discuss cultural explanations of psychological difficulties	3.07 (1.56)	1-6	.21	-1.18
Explore alternative explanations	3.31 (1.63)	1-6	.10	-1.12

Explore limitations of assessment	3.36 (1.66)	1-6	.02	-1.25
Training in multiple assessments	3.31 (1.62)	1-6	.18	-1.10
Model Responses	3.67 (1.72)	1-6	-.06	-1.29
Encourage flexibility	3.32 (1.63)	1-6	.10	-1.19
Encourage community resources	4.08 (1.56)	1-6	-.41	-.84
Develop client advocacy skills	3.72 (1.50)	1-6	-.12	-.86
Encourage collaboration	4.39 (1.51)	1-6	-.87	-.04
Referrals	4.07 (1.54)	1-6	-.40	-.87
Honest with own biases	3.47 (1.77)	1-6	.12	-1.36
Effectively work with diverse supervisees	4.04 (1.52)	1-6	-.42	-.88
Foster climate to discuss	3.88 (1.73)	1-6	-.21	-1.28
Model respect	4.32 (1.72)	1-6	-.70	-.81
Use power constructively	4.29 (1.66)	1-6	-.64	-.85
Attend to issues related to power	3.64 (1.64)	1-6	-.14	-1.13
Provide evaluation	3.39 (1.66)	1-6	.06	-1.22
Familiarity with assessing multicultural competence	2.93 (1.55)	1-6	.56	-.67
Recommend appropriate training	2.81 (1.55)	1-6	.53	-.76
Total Composite Score	127.67 (44.76)	34-204	-.16	-.95

*Background Questionnaire.* Participants provided demographic information regarding their degree held, their current year in graduate school, the number of graduate courses taken in multicultural issues, the number of multicultural trainings they have

attended, the number of ethnic clients they have worked with, and the category and approximate number of hours they have worked with ethnically diverse clients (see Table 10). Eighteen participants (23.7 %) had obtained Bachelor's degrees, 51 (67.1%) had Master's degrees, and 7 (9.2%) indicated Other. The majority of participants were in their third (n = 18; 23.7%), or fifth year (n = 17; 22.4%) of graduate school. The responses ranged from first to sixth year or more. The majority of participants had taken one graduate course in multiculturalism (n=38; 50%). A few persons did not respond to this question and it was assumed that these responses would have been zero, if zero had been an option. Yet, it was decided to not report results for these 3 participants. Responses ranged from one to five or more courses. Most participants reported attending five or more multicultural trainings (n = 34; 44.7%). Three persons did not respond to this question, and again they were excluded from the analyses. Responses ranged from one to five or more trainings. Participants reported the number of hours they had worked with ethnically diverse clients. Responses ranged from 0 to 10 hours up to 101 or more hours. The largest percentage of participants (n=39; 51.3%) marked working 101 or more hours with ethnically diverse clients.

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics of Other Variables of the Background Questionnaire*

Variable	N	%
<u>Highest Degree Obtained</u>		
Bachelor's	18	23.7
Master's	51	67.1
Other	7	9.2
<u>Year in Graduate School</u>		
1 <sup>st</sup> Year	2	2.6
2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	11	14.5
3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	18	23.7
4 <sup>th</sup> Year	13	17.1
5 <sup>th</sup> Year	17	22.4
6 <sup>th</sup> Year or more	15	19.7
<u>Graduate Courses in Multiculturalism</u>		
1	38	50.0
2	17	22.4
3	8	10.5
4	2	2.6
5 or more	8	10.5
<u>Multicultural Trainings</u>		
1	14	18.4
2	14	18.4
3	7	9.2
4	5	6.6
5 or more	34	44.7
<u>Hours worked with ethnic minority clients</u>		
0-10	4	5.3
11-20	11	14.5
21-30	5	6.6
31-40	3	3.9
41-50	4	5.3
51-60	2	2.6
61-70	4	5.3
71-80	1	1.3
81-90	2	2.6
91-100	1	1.3
101 or more	39	51.3

Variability in responses was much larger when participants were asked the number of clients they had worked with of specific ethnic groups (see Table 11). More than half of the participants indicated that they had worked with between 0-10 of each of the following: American Indian (66.8%); Asian American (72.9%); African American (53.9%); Hispanic (57.8%); and Multiple Ethnic Identity (65.9%) (Table 11). This suggests that a large number of participants had relatively little experience with certain ethnic/racial groups.

Table 11

*Descriptive Data for Ethnic Minority Clients (N=76)*

Variable	N	%
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>		
0-10	50	66.8
11-20	5	6.6
21-30	1	1.3
31-100	2	2.6
Missing values	18	23.7
<b>Asian American</b>		
0-10	55	72.9
11-20	3	3.9
21-50	2	2.6
51-70	1	1.3
Missing values	15	19.7
<b>African American</b>		
0-10	41	53.9
11-20	8	10.5
21-30	8	10.5
31-40	3	3.9
41-50	1	1.3
51-100	4	5.3
101-250	3	3.9
Missing values	6	7.9

<b>Hispanic</b>		
0-10	44	57.8
11-20	10	13.1
21-30	6	7.8
31-40	3	3.9
41-100	2	2.6
101-300	4	5.2
Missing values	7	9.2
<b>Caucasian</b>		
0-10	20	26.2
11-20	12	15.7
21-30	10	13.2
31-40	7	9.1
41-50	4	5.2
51-100	13	17.5
101-150	4	5.2
151-300	2	2.6
Missing values	4	5.3
<b>Non-United States resident</b>		
0-10	48	63.0
11-20	2	2.6
21-30	2	2.6
31-80	2	2.6
Missing values	22	28.9
<b>Multiple Ethnic Identity</b>		
0-10	50	65.9
11-20	6	7.8
21-30	4	5.2
31-40	3	3.9
50-100	3	3.9
Missing values	10	13.2

\* Categories are based on participant's data as question was self-report.

*Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire.* Sixty-two (81.6%) of the 76 participants stated that they had experienced a multicultural event in their group supervision (see Table 12). Of these 62 persons, 42 (67.7%) participants stated that the multicultural event was positive for them, 13 (21.0%) stated it was negative, and 7 (11.3%) stated that it was neither positive nor negative. Of the 62 participants who had a

multicultural event, 38 (61.3%) stated it was a positive event for the group, 14 (22.6%) stated it was negative for the group, and 10 (16.1%) stated that it was neither positive nor negative for the group.

Participants identified the ethnicity of their group supervisors. Ten (13.2%) supervisors were identified as African American; 4 (5.3%) were Hispanic; 42 (55.3%) were White, non-Hispanic, and 6 (7.9%) were Multiple Ethnic. The mean number of members in the participants' group supervision was 4.43 (SD = 1.02), which fell between the options of (4) "4 members," and (5) "5 or more members." Responses ranged from one other member to five or more members.

Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics of the Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire*

Variable	N	N	%
Multicultural Events	76		
Yes		62	81.6
No		14	18.4
Event Positive for Participant	62		
Yes		42	67.7
No		13	21.0
Neither		7	11.3
Event Positive for Group	62		
Yes		38	61.3
No		14	22.6
Neither		10	16.1
Number of Group Members	61		
1		2	2.6
2		3	3.9
3		4	5.3
4		10	13.2
5 or more		42	55.3

Supervisor's Ethnicity	76		
African American		10	13.2
Hispanic		4	5.3
White, non Hispanic		42	55.3
Multiple Ethnic Groups		6	7.9

*Analyses of Hypotheses*

*Results for Hypothesis 1.* Hypothesis 1 stated “there will be a significant positive relationship between Supervisee Multicultural Competence and Group Supervision Satisfaction.” The total scores for CCCI-R and SQ were analyzed using a Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient. This one-tailed correlation was not significant,  $r(74) = .17$ , n.s. (Table 13), and therefore this hypothesis was not supported. In other words, there was no relationship found between the self-reported multicultural competence of supervisees and their group supervision satisfaction.

*Results for Hypothesis 2.* Hypothesis 2 stated “there will be a significant positive relationship between Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence and Group Supervision Satisfaction. A Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient was used to analyze this relationship. Using a one-tailed test, the correlation was statistically and positively significant,  $r(74) = .69$ ,  $p < .01$ . This hypothesis was supported and suggests that as supervisees’ report of their supervisors’ multicultural competence increases, supervisees’ satisfaction also increases.

*Results for Hypothesis 3.* Hypothesis 3 stated that “there will be a significant positive relationship between Supervisee Racial Identity Development and their Group Supervision Satisfaction. A Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient was used to analyze this relationship. The one-tailed correlation was not significant,  $r(74) = .002$ , n.s..

This hypothesis was not supported and suggests that no relationship was found between participants' self-rated racial identity development and their group supervision satisfaction.

*Results for Hypothesis 4.* Hypothesis 4 stated “there will be a significant relationship between Supervisee Multicultural Competence and Supervisee Racial Identity Development.” A Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient was used to assess this relationship. Using a one-tailed test, the correlation was statistically and positively significant,  $r(74) = .24, p < .05$ . This hypothesis was supported and suggests that as participants' perceptions of their own multicultural competence increases, their perceptions of their own racial identity also increases.

Table 13

*Correlations of Composite Scores of Assessments for the SQ, MEIM, CCCI-R and SMCI*

Composite Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Group Supervision Satisfaction (SQ)	--	.00	.17	.69**
2. Participant Racial Identity (MEIM)		--	.24*	-.12
3. Participant Multicultural Competence (CCCI-R)			--	.32**
4. Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence (SMCI)				--

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

*Additional Findings*

Other variables were examined that were not specifically hypothesized. In addition, other research questions arose as the data were examined and were explored further. A significant correlation was found for the relationship between participant multicultural competence and perceived supervisor multicultural competence  $r(74) = .32, p < .01$ . This suggested that as participants self-reported multicultural competence levels

increased, their ratings of perceived supervisors' multicultural competence also increased.

Some subsamples of the participants were investigated in more depth. Although there is limited research on group supervision in general, there are some data that suggest that males and females respond differently to multicultural events (Enyedy et al., 2003). Therefore, a t-test was conducted for gender to assess whether males and females responded differently on the measure of satisfaction. No significant difference was found [ $t(74) = -.93, p = .34$ ].

*Identification of a multicultural event.* Another consideration was whether there was a difference between those who identified a multicultural event or those who did not and overall group supervision satisfaction (SQ score). No significant difference was found [ $t(74) = .54, p = .59$ ] between these two groups. For those who did and did not report a multicultural event, it was wondered whether they would differ on a specific item on the SQ (item 7), that asked specifically about overall satisfaction with a particular group supervision experience. Results from the independent samples *t*-test demonstrated no significant difference in overall satisfaction between these two groups,  $t(74) = .59, p = .56$  on this question. Those participants that experienced a multicultural event in group supervision were not significantly more satisfied overall with their supervision group experience than those that had not experienced a multicultural event.

A t-test also was conducted for these same two groups and perceived supervisor's multicultural competence. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in perceived supervisor multicultural competence between individuals who reported a multicultural event and those that did not,  $t(74) = 2.01, p = .05$ . This demonstrated that

supervisor multicultural competence was significantly higher for the group that reported a multicultural event ( $M = 132.49$ ,  $SD = 45.93$ ). A t-test also assessed whether perceived racial identity of the participants (measured by the total score of the MEIM) was different in these two groups. No significant differences were found on this variable [ $t(74) = .39$ ,  $p = .67$ ]. The independent samples t-tests conducted for supervisee's perception of their own multicultural competence and those that did/did not report an event was not significant [ $t(74) = 1.22$ ,  $p = .23$ ].

*Positive versus negative events.* Several independent samples t-tests were conducted between those who reported a positive multicultural event in group supervision and those who considered the multicultural event to be negative on the following variables: total composite scores for Group Supervision Satisfaction, Supervisee Multicultural Competence, Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, and Supervisee Racial Identity. It was believed that there might be significant differences between these two groups on these variables, yet no literature has addressed them previously. A Levene's test for equality of variances demonstrated significant differences between the variances of these two groups for supervisee multicultural competence, but not for any other variable. However, the results for the independent samples t-test were not significant between the two groups [ $t(60) = -.08$ ,  $p = .92$ ]. A significant difference in Group Supervision Satisfaction between these two groups [ $t(60) = 3.05$ ,  $p = .003$ ] was found. This suggests that participants who reported a positive multicultural event were more satisfied with their group supervision experience than those that reported negative experiences. An independent samples t-test demonstrated a significant difference between these two groups on Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence [ $t(60) = 2.02$ ,  $p =$

.05]. This result suggests that the group that described the multicultural event as positive perceived their supervisors' multicultural competence to be higher. The group that reported a negative event viewed their supervisors' multicultural competence as lower. An independent samples *t*-test was also conducted for Supervisee Racial Identity (MEIM score) and there were no significant differences found between the two groups [ $t(60) = -.08, p = .92$ ].

Simultaneous multiple regression was conducted to investigate which variables were the best predictors of group supervision satisfaction. In this multiple regression analysis, group supervision satisfaction served as the dependent variable, and was operationalized by the SQ score. When the variables of age and ethnicity (entered as indicator variables), gender, identification of a multicultural event, perceived supervisor's multicultural competence (SMCI score), supervisee racial identity (MEIM score), and supervisee multicultural competence (CCCI-R score) were combined to predict group supervision satisfaction, the regression was significant [ $F(7, 68) = 10.38, p < .001$ ]. The beta coefficients are presented in Table 14. Perceived supervisor multicultural competence significantly predicted group supervision satisfaction when all seven variables were included. The adjusted *R* squared value was .467. This indicates that 47% of the variance in group supervision satisfaction was explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988) this is a large effect.

Table 14

*Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Multicultural Competence, Racial Identity, Perceived Supervisor Multicultural Competence, Age Gender, Ethnicity, and Event Predicting Group Supervision Satisfaction (N=76)*

Variable	$\beta$	SEB	B
MEIM Total Score	.11	.10	.10
CCCI-R Total Score	-.03	.03	-.09
SMCI Total Score	.10	.01	.76**
Age	-.07	1.29	-.01
Gender	-1.93	1.48	-.11
Race	1.45	4.67	.03
Event	-1.29	1.41	-.08
Constant	9.40	4.59	

Note.  $R^2 = .52$ ;  $F(7,68) = 10.38$ ,  $p < .001$ . \*\*  $p < .001$ .

*Qualitative results from Phase I*

Some of the data obtained from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Events Questionnaire* were qualitative. These data were analyzed using a modified version of grounded theory and categorized using a modified version of CQR. These questions asked information about helpful and unhelpful events in group processes in general.

Participants also responded to the following:

- Describe the most influential aspect of your group supervision experience in which a multicultural event occurred or was the main theme. Please be succinct but clear in your descriptions.
- What was your reaction to this event? A reaction can be both internal and external. Please describe your cognitive/emotional/physical reaction to this event.
- How did your group leader react to this event? What did he/she do to facilitate/not facilitate resolution of the issues?
- How did other members of the group react, both internally and externally, to this event?

- If this group supervision experience was negative, what variables of this experience made it negative and how could it be changed? How could the group leader have helped to facilitate the resolution of this event?
- If this group supervision experience was a positive event, what variables of this experience made it a positive one for you?
- What suggestions would you give for group leaders or group supervision members in handling multicultural issues or events in order to make them positive experiences for the group?

This information is described by domains in Table 15. In order to maintain confidentiality of the participants, the examples stated from the qualitative data have been changed slightly in areas that could identify them or their group leader such as, gender, race, or ethnicity.

*Helpful Factors in Group Supervision.* Participants described what in general, has been most helpful to them in their group supervision, including meaningful emotional or behavioral interpersonal experiences (n = 76). In their descriptions of helpful factors, participants indicated identifying and practicing certain techniques from theories, including case presentations, role-playing, and visualization exercises as a typical response (n=45). For example, one participant stated:

Next, during my group process we had to turn in transcripts of our sessions with clients (only our responses). Although our supervisor could not observe the sessions and did not know what the client said, the supervisor was able to provide feedback on our behavior in the session. It was great to get that feedback from what we were actually doing. I always knew where to improve my skills. Finally, during one session our supervisor checked in on how we were doing and talked to us about who we are and why we are in the field. Our supervisor made us feel more comfortable with our decisions and helped us to talk more freely about our fears.

The most frequent response, one in the Variant category, was that the discussion of multicultural issues and diversity was a helpful factor in group supervision (n=28).

One participant stated:

1) gathering information about various conceptualizations of client problems, 2) receiving useful feedback from other students and senior staff members about appropriate treatment recommendations, 3) exploration of how culture/race/ethnicity/gender/sexual orientation/etc. influences conceptualization

In addition, participants listed giving and receiving feedback (n = 16), allowing for professional and personal development (n = 13), and support (n = 9) as helpful factors for group supervision. For instance, in their descriptions, participants stated:

There is great peer feedback in group supervision. There is also a great amount of support from peers. We also get a large number of perspectives on therapy.

Discussion of the intersection of ethnic identity development and professional identity development, discussion of race within the training cohort, sharing of cultural narrative (with relevance/impact on clinical work)

*Unhelpful Factors in Group Supervision.* Participants (n = 76) described unhelpful factors that they have experienced in their group supervision experiences. All responses were Variant. The most often stated unhelpful factor was not acknowledging diversity/cultural issues (n = 15). For example, one participant stated:

When a supervisor doesn't spend the time to process a case with the therapist (e.g., uses supervision as a time to check in & does not provide feedback). When supervisor doesn't provide a safe space to discuss cultural issues. When supervisor doesn't provide a place to constructively analyze mistakes.

In addition, other frequently described responses included the use of didactic [material] (n = 13) and when supervisors shared personal stories or gave advice to supervisees (n = 11). One participant wrote, "the supervisor continued to give his personal experience when it did not seem helpful." Other unhelpful factors were: the use of time (n = 9);

content versus process focus (n = 9); assumptions of race (n = 8); quiet or dominating members (n = 8); and no established comfort/safety/trust (n = 7). Responses that exemplified a few of these responses are:

The only thing I can think of is that at times, there was not enough time allotted for each person. At times, one person would have a really pressing issue, so of course, they would get more time, but that left the rest of us to feel rushed.

being made to "represent", having to step in to protect another person being discriminated against by others, having to deal with assumptions about me based on my cultural background

*Description of multicultural events.* In their descriptions of the multicultural event, participants clearly stated whether the experience was positive or negative for them (n = 62). A typical description of a multicultural event was whether race/ethnicity was addressed or not (n = 38). A participant stated:

We watched an emotionally charged video of a multicultural group discussing racial difficulties. Afterwards, the two other interns (white) didn't have comments. It felt as if they were dismissing the importance of the video by not commenting. Additionally, one of the white interns habitually did not comment on multicultural readings or video, so on this day it was just a reminder that he repeatedly dismissed multicultural concerns. I told him that I would like to hear what he had to say. He ended up invalidating the participants in the video by saying that they should have expressed their feelings in a way that would make it easier to hear.

A Variant response of the multicultural event described involved sexual orientation (n=7). Additionally, a response in the descriptions of multicultural events included multicultural awareness (n=9). A few examples are:

A willingness on the part of students and supervisors to acknowledge personal biases and how they have impacted their clinical work.

We did this game called "Walk the Line" that helped the supervisees explore their multicultural identities and notice the stigma associated with being an ethnic minority member.

*Participant reactions to event.* Participants described their own person reactions to the multicultural event (n=62). An emotional reaction (n=32) to the multicultural event was a Typical response, including anger, frustration, sadness, disappointment, anxiety and discomfort, shock and surprise. For example, participants stated:

Anger, surprise, feeling challenged, acceptance.

My heart was beating when she invalidated their experience. I was angry and upset. I also felt anxious when I asked her to express her viewpoint because I was scared about what she would say about the video.

Participants also felt the event led them to become multiculturally aware (n=9), which was a Variant response. An example of this that combined an emotional reaction as well as a level of multicultural awareness that was learned is:

I have experienced a variety of emotions: shock, anger, surprise, and admiration. Sometimes the close-mindedness of others has been shocking and anger-provoking but at other times when students and supervisors have been courageous enough to be honest about biases and also show a desire to gain more understanding about other cultures, there have been feelings of admiration, respect, and comfort. I felt supported because as the only minority in the group they were respectful of my disclosure and were comfortable in speaking their reactions and advice. I no longer feel hesitant to discuss multicultural issues because I feel like we can handle it.

Participants also listed a Variant response as their reaction to the event being a positive one (n = 7). This example was:

I was struck by feelings of both sadness and of being grateful that we could discuss difficult issues in a safe environment. I felt both internal and external responses to the event and felt that while I was able to consider it in a psychological and socioeconomic lens, I also had a personal reaction to the event that was presented. It was meaningful to be able to discuss it in supervision and hear how others reacted.

*Group leaders' reactions to event.* Participants described their group leaders' reactions to the multicultural event (n = 59). The most frequent Variant response was

how and whether the group supervisor provided direction in the group, such as facilitating the group discussion or including all group members in the discussion (n=27).

Qualitative descriptions included:

The group leader encouraged exploration of the issue including examining culture.

My supervisor recognized that I was feeling frustrated and encouraged me to discuss my feelings in detail, letting me know that it was okay to be angry.

I have experienced positive and negative reactions on the part of supervisors. I believe that any time a supervisor is willing to focus on these sensitive topics and does not try to brush them under the rug it is beneficial to all involved.

Another Variant response included supervisors doing nothing or that they acted passive by being avoidant, ambivalent, not addressing multicultural issues, or being unresponsive to the participant (n=12). Examples of such descriptions are as follows:

They let the conversation take itself, instead of trying to change it

The group leader did not intervene in the moment and attempted to revive the conversation at a later date. The issue was not resolved and many felt even more isolated after the second incident.

*Group members' reactions to event.* Participants also described group members' reactions to this multicultural event (n=60). All responses were Variant and the most frequent description was that members did not react (n = 10). An example of this was:

Everyone appeared unaffected by this, as if this would never happen to them; or as if cultural differences don't affect their therapy.

Additional reactions included emotional responses (n = 9), members were attentive (n = 8), others contributed to the discussion (n = 7), and others were in agreement (n = 7). A few examples of these descriptions are:

The group talked about how they thought they were aware of how race/ethnicity affected their clients. However, after the discussion the group began to reevaluate how they worked with their clients with regards to race/ethnicity.

People really appeared to be thinking out of the box and were very tolerant of alternative views.

Some resisted looking at sociocultural contributions to client difficulties and insinuated that I focus on it too much in therapy. Others agreed completely with my approach. This is fairly representative in our program overall; some people can easily identify cultural contributions, others seem to feel we should focus on it less.

*Changes if event was negative.* Participants listed what changes they would have suggested for their group supervision when a negative experience occurred (n = 30). All responses were Variant, and the most common item was that they wanted more direction from the group supervisor (n = 11). An example of this is:

This issue was not discussed in group supervision. I think if it were discussed in the open, it would have been better. The facilitator could have asked for perspectives from all group members and how they felt about the statements the trainee was making.

Additional Variant responses indicated that participants felt that different actions from the supervisor could have contributed to the outcome of the event (n = 8). They also requested more openness in the group (n = 7), and wanted group members or group supervisors to be more multiculturally aware (n = 7). The following are examples:

Discuss how to use cultural considerations but be open to individuality and the complexity of each group.

More open communication would have helped facilitate the resolution; also increased conscientiousness about the possibility of this event occurring with minority therapists.

*Contributions to positive event.* Participants were asked what factors helped make the group supervision experience a positive one when multicultural events were discussed

(n = 49). The themes that were organized into domains were Variant. The most frequent responses that were described as contributions to positive events were openness (n = 16), the supervisor contributing to the outcome of the event (n = 14), and a level of focus placed on multicultural issues (n = 10). A few examples are as follows:

It was positive to have cultural differences/biases explicitly examined.

Allowing me the freedom to express anger with my clients. Allowing me to say that I was ashamed and frustrated. I also really appreciated that he helped me to see the other side of what they were going through and helped me to understand what the reasoning behind their behaviors may have been (i.e., self-hate, internalized homophobia, religious crises in which they felt they were probably going to Hell anyway, feeling as if they didn't deserve to be in loving, monogamous relationships).

Leader's response and facilitation, leader's ability to establish a sense of safety in the group, openness among some of the trainees.

*Suggestions.* Participants listed suggestions for group members and group leaders to effectively process multicultural events in group supervision (n = 57). All responses were Variant. The theme with the most responses was for group members or group supervisors to be more open in group supervision (n = 14). For example, one participant stated:

Supervisors need to be open from the very beginning about their own experiences (training or otherwise) with multicultural issues and provide a safe place for all students to be able to discuss issues that may arise.

Some participants also felt that the supervisor should provide more direction in the group (n = 13). A participant described this as:

Talk about them directly, have group leaders bring them up instead of relying on supervisees to bring up racial/cultural bias.

The group needs to be aware of their biases and how they affect their interactions with each other and their clients. The group supervisor needs to be able to talk about race/ethnicity and help the group identify how it is impacting their

relationship with their clients and how it impacts their clients' lives. The supervisor needs to be able to work with the counselor where they are in their identity development and help them with their transitions.

Another Variant response was for supervisors or group members to create a safe environment that would encourage discussion of delicate topics including race and ethnicity (n=8). One participant stated:

I think it's imperative to talk about the scary stuff in supervision. Not just multicultural issues, but anything that may feel uncomfortable to bring up. This means that group supervision must be a safe place to be vulnerable, to make mistakes, to hear different perspectives. There needs to be peer support; no competition between students who may want to "one-up" each other.

Table 15

*Domains and Categories and Frequencies of Qualitative Data from Group Supervision  
Multicultural Events Questionnaire*

Domains/Categories	N	Frequency
Most helpful	76	
Techniques (e.g., role playing, modeling, etc.)	45	Typical
Description of multicultural issues	28	Variant
Feedback (giving and receiving)	16	Variant
Personal/professional development	13	Variant
Support	9	Variant
Team building activities/norm setting	3	Variant
Use of humor	2	Variant
Most unhelpful	76	
No acknowledgement of diversity/cultural issues	15	Variant
Didactics	13	Variant
Supervisor sharing personal stories/giving advice	11	Variant
Time	9	Variant
Content versus process focus	9	Variant
Assumptions of race	8	Variant
Quiet/dominating members	8	Variant
No comfort/safety/trust	7	Variant
Multicultural competence of group supervisor	4	Variant
No support	2	Variant
Lack of norm-setting	2	Variant
Multicultural Event Description	62	
Race/ethnicity	38	Typical
Multicultural awareness	9	Variant
Sexual orientation	7	Variant
Supervisor contributed to outcome	4	Variant
Consideration of individual perspectives	4	Variant
Discussing/being honest about biases	4	Variant
Religion	3	Variant
Safety	2	Variant
Supervisor imposing own values	2	Variant
SES	2	Variant

---

Participant's reaction to event	62	
Emotional	32	Typical
Multiculturally aware	9	Variant
Positive	7	Variant
Became quiet/silenced	5	Variant
Contributed	5	Variant
Reflect	4	Variant
Concerned	4	Variant
Felt supported	3	Variant
Members' Reactions	60	
No reaction	10	Variant
Emotional	9	Variant
Attentive	8	Variant
Contributed to discussion	7	Variant
Agreed	7	Variant
Positive	6	Variant
Supportive	6	Variant
Open	3	Variant
Shocked/surprised	3	Variant
Nonverbals	3	Variant
Focus on race	2	Variant
Minimized the issue	2	Variant
Leaders' Reactions	59	
Provided direction	27	Variant
Nothing/acted passive	12	Variant
Acted supportive	6	Variant
Encouraging	4	Variant
Multicultural focus	4	Variant
Positive	4	Variant
Acted interested	2	Variant
Angry	2	Variant
Acknowledged event/validated	2	Variant
Changes if event was negative	30	
More direction from group leader	11	Variant
Supervisor contributed to outcome	8	Variant
Openness	7	Variant
Multicultural awareness	7	Variant
Group leader multicultural competence	3	Variant
Consideration of individual perspectives	2	Variant

---

Contributions to positive event	49	
Openness	16	Variant
Supervisor contributed to outcome	14	Variant
Multicultural focus	10	Variant
Multicultural awareness	5	Variant
Group leader multicultural competence	4	Variant
Acceptance/validation	3	Variant
Respect	2	Variant
Support	2	Variant
Group relationship	2	Variant
Suggestions	57	
Be open	14	Variant
Supervisor provide direction	13	Variant
Create safety	8	Variant
Honesty	7	Variant
Consider individual perspectives	6	Variant
Multicultural awareness	5	Variant
Multicultural focus	5	Variant
Supervisor training/peer supervision	4	Variant
Respect	4	Variant
Provide feedback	4	Variant
Racial identity development	3	Variant
Be non-judgmental	3	Variant
Provide support	2	Variant
Humor	2	Variant
Focus on power dynamics	2	Variant
Focus on the group process	2	Variant

### *Phase II Results*

#### *Reliability and Validity Analysis*

The five categories used to assess validity of qualitative research include: descriptive validity, interpretive validity, theoretical validity, generalizability, and evaluative validity (Maxwell, 1992). For descriptive validity, the researcher assessed whether the data accurately reflected what the participants stated. The data regarding the multicultural event experienced in group supervision described in the online survey, were reviewed with the telephone interviewees. The information was discussed and validated.

Interpretive validity ensures that the researcher captures the meaning of events and behaviors based on the participants' perspectives. To assess for interpretive validity, the researcher, who is a person of color, hired a Caucasian graduate student assistant to help analyze the qualitative data so that any bias from the researcher could be diminished. Theoretical validity addresses the theoretical constructions that are developed during the study (Maxwell, 1992). The theoretical constructions were established from the reported multicultural events, including what factors contributed to a beneficial experience in group supervision when multicultural issues were discussed. Generalizability includes both internal and external generalizability. The results for this study possibly can be applied to other types of group supervision experiences, for both people of color and majority persons. Evaluative validity attempts to review assessments drawn by the researcher and answers all possible research questions. In phone interviews the researcher attempted to ask all possible questions regarding the multicultural event, how it could be changed, in what ways it was positive, and suggestions for group leaders and group members.

### *Themes*

The results from the qualitative analysis of the telephone interviews (n = 20) in Phase II are discussed by domains and categories (see Table 16).

*Overall attitude of multicultural event.* Participants either reported that the incident was positive (n = 13) or negative (n = 7). Positive experiences were Typical and negative experiences were Variant. The following is an example of a positive experience. "T" denotes the Interviewer and "P" denotes the Participant.

I: Would you say it was a positive experience or a negative experience for you?

P: I would say that it was a positive experience in that I was able to learn kind of what people are thinking when we don't discuss these kinds of things. And when the topic is brought up of race and culture and ethnicity, etc., kind of multicultural issues. In different individuals that was eye-opening to me. I can find a specific experience from pretty much anything. So I would say that it was a positive experience.....

One participant described the following negative event.

P: There has been so many but there are a few that stand out in my mind. It was during a holiday time and my supervisor would have us do activities with our group of kids that were basically his religious beliefs. Where he brought in a holiday book that had a lot to do with Christianity and the whole moral story about that. And that was a common theme throughout our plans and stuff.

I: Did you ever talk to the group supervisor about your worries or concerns about that?

P: No I spoke with the other interns about it. You know it was really uncomfortable for us to bring something like that up. It almost seemed disrespectful because we were in a supervisee role.

I: Did the supervisor ever create that sort of climate where you could talk about these sorts of issues or no?

P: No.

*Attribution of the incident.* One domain that emerged from the interviews is

Attribution of the Multicultural Incident. Participants reported that their group supervisor was responsible for the outcome (n = 13), a Typical response, or that power dynamics led to the outcome (n = 5), which was a Variant response. The supervisor's actions, either active or passive, led to either positive or negative experiences for these multicultural events. An example of the group supervisor contributing to the outcome was:

I: In your multicultural event you wrote that feedback from the supervisor was always helpful. She gave insightful feedback acknowledging the possible backgrounds from your diverse clients....and you said she was really helpful.

P: Well I think the supervisor was really positive. She had more experience in the real world with real clients, in the multicultural world. And had different kinds of diversity experiences, socioeconomics, color, gender. I felt that always, my interactions were with the supervisor and her interactions with me were always positive. You know how when you're out there, there are going to be some people

who just hadn't been exposed or just weren't educated enough. .... So that's where I am I think with my own experience. It was difficult. Even religious beliefs are very strong. Our supervisor always had that awareness and that self-awareness. My interactions with the supervisor were always processed. What can I do? How can I understand? I would say, "What can I do?" She was never judgmental. It was never anything bad. Always really, really good from the supervisor.

Another participant gave an example of how power dynamics contributed to the outcome of the event.

I: What changes would you have made for the outcome of the situation to be different?

P: Changes to any of it?

I: Yes.

P: Well first of all I think it would be helpful to have a person of color lead the group. I think right off the bat, I think that would be, for my own kind of comfort and sense of belonging, and unspoken kind of, just the unspoken level of comfort, that they get it. I think it would have been helpful to have somebody else in the group who was aware of multicultural issues in the room. So I think that would have been helpful. For her (supervisor) to kind of have owned up to the power dynamic and the power differential I think would have been helpful. I just think that if she recognized that not only was she in the position of power over me but that she would have recognized that she messed up and that maybe she should have apologized. Or thought that maybe the way she said it was hurtful. And maybe I should have said my expectations at the beginning of the quarter. And I think even more so it just made me realize in terms of professional development. I think I kind of went into this and it was a big turning point for me professionally in my development because not everyone in this field has done their work. And not that I have but at least I've started it. And I feel that at least I was able to own my stuff in the room and she really wasn't. And so I kind of felt that I had to compensate for both of us. And own it all.

*Types of multicultural incidents.* Participants also discussed the types of multicultural events involved in their experiences. These involved issues of race/ethnicity (n = 18) which was a Typical response, and religion (n = 2) which was Variant.

Participants stated that they were the only person of color in the group and this contributed to whether or not they felt comfortable discussing cultural issues. In the following example, one participant was speaking to his group about a client he was

working with from the same ethnic background. He was questioning whether these similarities were affecting the therapeutic relationship through transference or countertransference issues.

Talking about that experience in the group made me a little bit uneasy because I think having nobody else that looks like me in the group and so I didn't know how it was going to be received. And at the same time I really wanted to understand this phenomenon and figure out you know what can I do to make these sessions more comfortable with my client. So there was kind of a struggle trying to deal with that and do what I'm supposed to do as a therapist and at the same time get supervision and get peer consultation in supervision and get supervision from my supervisor.

A participant described a religious/spiritual cultural event in which the discussion had previously been brought up in her group supervision, yet she indicated that she did not participate in the initial discussion. However, she later returned to her group and initiated another discussion regarding the religious/spiritual issue.

P: Well it was brought up by one of my peers. I thought that it was an interesting topic but at the moment I wasn't prepared for such a topic to come up. Especially with such young people that I work with in middle school. So like I mentioned before, the topic that came up was kind of difficult to understand what the reason why was that this topic was hard to understand. And what it was was that my colleagues were talking about spirituality and sharing their own personal experiences. And my spirituality had changed somewhat over the years. And with it having occurred in our supervision. It did turn out to be a big conversation. I think it might have been most of the other counselors and like I said I had a hard time figuring out how it would impact my practice.

I: What was your response to this conversation?

P: Well my initial response was no response. For one I guess I hadn't really focused too much on spirituality because it seemed to be I guess kind of bad. I'm not sure how to explain that. After the fact, after our supervision, it was stuck in my mind. And at that time I was practicing a little bit of meditation and Buddhist practices. I was thinking a lot about how spirituality was affecting me, and thinking about how it might affect my practice with young people, in middle school. So that was my reaction. And the following week when I came back for supervision, I actually apologized to the group for not really contributing to the conversation the previous week. And telling them what was my experience as far

as what it meant for me and what kinds of, posing the question where are we going with this? Is this going to contribute to our practice?

Some participants discussed more than one multicultural event during the interviews. These events were all Variant, and involved racial/ethnic issues (n=2), gender issues (n=4) and socioeconomic status (n = 3). One participant stated that she felt responsible for all clients of lower SES status:

I felt that I needed to speak up for those that are disadvantaged and underrepresented. I felt more that I would speak up for more people that are from a different class than I did for color. There were people there who were privileged and don't understand working class sometimes or disadvantaged and color plays a lot into that too. I felt more pressure to speak up for that mostly. So when they would have questions about that I would feel pressure to have the right answer, for my people. For everyone that is on welfare. You know what I'm saying? That part was hard. And the supervisor I felt almost never put that pressure on me. He was always very supportive and wouldn't put that pressure on me one way or another. It was more from letting others know that don't have that experience [being financially disadvantaged] or, including myself around that, or those that don't understand class and stuff like that.

One participant stated that he was the only male in the group and talked about his difficulty with that. He was asked what the experience was like for him.

Well I actually did bring it up with the group at one point as well, but I can't say that anything did come up with the issue. They just kind of said oh okay, and just disregarded it. And at the point it was a little difficult to kind of put in the male perspective and being a minority within the group. It was stressful sometimes.

The participant was then asked whether he had mentioned this to the group.

I did not disclose how I really felt about it in that sense. So actually I really didn't bring it up. There probably is a better way of handling it.

*Support level.* Another domain that contributed to multicultural events was the support that was experienced in group supervision, either from other group members or from the group leader (n = 4). Participants stated that when they experienced support, a Variant response, it was helpful for them to process the cultural event they were

discussing. One person remarked:

P: Well we would talk through the process of culture and color and being in a different environment. We would talk about the group process and working with multicultural clients. They tried to help me in working with those students that questioned their ethnicity.

I: How did the group leader participate?

P: She was generally supportive. I think she handled herself pretty well. She challenged me and the group. She was supportive in helping us explore that within ourselves.

*Identification of cultural identity.* Some participants were very specific in their interview about identifying the race or ethnicity of their group leader (n = 8; Variant), before the researcher had asked what the group supervisor's ethnicity was, or without discussion of any identification information that was given online.

I: And how did the group leader participate in the discussion or facilitate the group?

P: My supervisor, she is Hispanic and she understood this [the situation] and also supported my idea in that it was a cultural experience.

Additional participants also identified their own ethnicity, feeling that this contributed to the event processed (n = 8; Variant). One participant was asked a question about the reactions of other group members and in his answer, he spoke about his own ethnicity.

They were supportive as well. Although I was the only African American and we were talking about African American issues and I was a little hesitant about bringing that up but they were very supportive.

Others identified themselves as the only person of color, or one of a few members of color in the group. This either led to a helpful or unhelpful event (n = 8; Variant). In the following example, the participant was reporting about an event in which another member in her group talked about her experiences with a certain ethnic group. A third member of the group self identified with this particular ethnicity. The manner in which

the second group member discussed her experience was almost demeaning for the third member, and the experience was viewed as negative.

In the past she said that she has had a hard time working with Hispanic females for whatever reason. And that was one of the first experiences she had where it was positive. And she felt like she had learned a great deal culturally. And just the way she said it, she was talking about it during a supervision session, and she wasn't talking about a therapy case in particular but it happened during the supervision session and the way it played out. And I thought that it could have been handled different. She went to this weekend retreat and there was one Hispanic female in our supervision group and there was me, an African American and 2 other Caucasian students. And she was saying how she was so into this Hispanic culture and how it was eye-opening and she wasn't aware of how it was coming out. From one stance I can understand how positive it would be for her and for her experience and it was very positive for her. And at the same time just the way she was, and she hadn't had other experience around other cultures and Hispanic women and it just came out sort of negative.

*Concern about reactions to multicultural event.* This category was raised by half of the interviewees (n = 10). Some participants indicated that they had concerns about how others in the group would react to the multicultural event they needed to discuss (n = 4; Variant). One participant was speaking about the work she was doing with a client and bringing the issues to group supervision. Her concern was in regards to an ethnic minority client who had been raped and had concerns about judgments being placed on the client and was worried about how group members would react.

Well for me I was a very young therapist at this point. It might have been my very first semester of therapy ever. And it was nice to have my peers really reinforce what I was doing and that I was going about it the right way. So you know not only was the supervisor supervising me in this direction in looking at the extrinsics and empowerment, my classmates were doing the same thing. So it kind of made me feel safer and more confident in that yes, this is the way we want to go with this client. And it wasn't just my decision. It was, you know I had support. And I had a lot of it.

At times, supervisees of color were concerned with others' reactions to their rapport with their clients, issues with clients of the same ethnic group, and oftentimes, this concern led

to concerns about how other group members perceived them (n = 6; Variant). For example, one participant became concerned with other members in his supervision group. The multicultural event he reported was a group exercise about stereotypes and assumptions of cultural groups. He reported the event as a positive experience for the group but felt that because the group supervisor addressed cultural issues with every client, some of the other members felt it was overwhelming.

We would [talk about multicultural issues] but because I know that my other two classmates were feeling that it was overkill towards the end of the quarter I felt that they didn't care about it as much. I would see them roll their eyes about it. And they would joke about it too. I know that so and so is going to talk about the minority issue. And they are somehow going to tie it into the supervision so I knew that they were talking about that outside of supervision so I felt unsure about sharing my own views about it because I didn't want them to get annoyed or something like that. But towards the end of the experience we would talk about what it was like for us or in counseling or in therapy with clients and the differences and what that was like.....

*Level of focus placed on multicultural issues.* Another main theme that was identified in the telephone interviews was the amount of attention paid to multicultural issues within the group supervision. Some participants stated that the amount was adequate (n = 5; Variant), while others felt it was inadequate (n = 8; Variant). If participants felt it was inadequate, they stated that it was either completely ignored or under-addressed. In some experiences, participants indicated that both the group leader and group members were attentive to multicultural issues and the topic was freely addressed. One participant described the amount that his supervisor placed on cultural issues.

She asked us to bring up issues of culture and multiculturalism into our supervision discussion. And what was actually happening and if there were any questions and if anything was actually happening during the session we would

have. She would let us have, she would talk about how we perceived things and what might be our biases. And we had a chance to actually respond to each other and to talk about what we kind of saw and each other's biases. Whenever we started talking about a client we always had to talk about it starting with our countertransference and how we felt. Our supervisor would talk that out. It felt really good in that our supervisor would bring up culture and talk about how what turned out to be just the cultural aspects and our own biases.....She brought culture into every single aspect of counseling and supervision and that was good.

The participants described a group leader that played an inactive role in the group and did not push the issue, or even ignored it, often putting the onus on the group members to address cultural issues (n=8). Participants felt that it should not be their responsibility to address this in group, and that norms should have been enforced from the beginning of the group. For example, one participant stated,

The situation left the group tense for the rest of the summer. And there was a lot of talking about it outside of the group. And the other ethnic minority group female member talked to her about it after supervision and they had a better understanding. It was one of those things that it could have been really different if it had been dealt with. And I felt very bad about it and what happened. And even to this day she is very on edge about how, with racial issues with other groups. I think it was good because it helped to raise her awareness about it but at the same time I think during the supervision session perhaps the supervisor could have asked the group about what it was like for all of us after talking about this experience and how it might affect our therapy when we have clients like that when we interact with people that are different than us. Perhaps a different race or a different culture, different viewpoint. And to me it seemed very relevant to therapy. I've experienced a lot of other times in supervision where it was uncomfortable and there was tension but this time really stuck out to me because one it happened early on, and two the way that it happened or was handled seemed typical for the way that it is often handled, very behind closed-door. Both parties don't talk about it. And it was unique in that they talked about it eventually but it evoked very strong emotions about other racial experiences. It was uncomfortable for both of them and myself, and I think for other people as well.

*Perceived safety/comfort level within group supervision.* An issue closely tied with the previous domain of multicultural focus includes the safety or comfort level within group supervision. Seven participants felt that the level of safety/comfort was

adequate (Variant). Participants indicated that the safety/comfort was usually established at the beginning of group, and that if it wasn't created soon enough, it was usually not felt. The safety and comfort level was an indicator of whether multicultural issues were discussed. An example of this is:

I would say that it was a safe environment. It was a small group. It was a very diverse group...my group was pretty diverse and that's what made it safer. And my supervisor was African American and she set the gold standard for multiculturalism in general. And she was personable and was willing to share her experiences and everyone else was also very candid and talked about their experiences in relation to mine. It brought up a lot in me and I had to talk to my individual clinical supervisor about my racial biases and inherent racism and really had to do a lot of work with it in therapy.

Other participants did not feel that safety and comfort were created in the group.

One participant stated that she had addressed this in her group, but did not feel safe, even after addressing it (n = 5; Variant).

And my experience kind of started, in that I had mentioned in one of the group supervisions that I didn't really. I had kind of, recently complimented/was impressed with the other members that they had been able to share so much in our supervision because sometimes I felt uncomfortable and I felt that I couldn't really share. And I didn't really feel that it was a safe place. One of the supervisors, the other supervisor had kind of explored it with me for a while about why I didn't feel safe and if anyone else didn't feel safe. And for the most part I was the only one who really spoke up, even though I know that other people had told me one on one that they didn't really feel safe. So I brought it up once about how it made me feel and how I thought we could make it more comfortable for everybody and nothing ever really changed. And then a few weeks later, the supervisor stopped us in the middle of our group supervision and asked one group member to kind of, pretty much said that she talked a lot. And the other two women in the group aren't, or that we don't really talk very much. And so I think we didn't really get into it then. But the following week, the other female that was an intern with me had mentioned that that really made her feel uncomfortable and she said that we didn't really know what the expectations were so we just felt like it was kind of unfair that we potentially weren't meeting her unspoken expectations and I had commented during that time, that I had already tried once to talk about feeling safe in there and that nothing was ever done. And kind of said why would I bring it up again? And she said sometimes you just really need to work through things, you need to push through it, and kind of kept saying that

sort of thing that I just needed to work through it, push through it. I felt, I wasn't feeling validated and I also felt like, there was a situation where I was the person of color in the room and I didn't want to come off as the angry person of color, the one that was always causing the problems in the room or you know making it kind of uncomfortable for the group. And she kept pushing me to think that sometimes in my career I'm going to need to push through it. And I just felt that it was really insensitive and she wasn't really hearing me any of the time that I said I was uncomfortable.

*Perceived openness within group supervision.* Some participants stated that there was an openness that was felt within the group supervision (n = 5; Variant), and some participants stated that this openness was inadequate (n = 3; Variant). For example, one participant who stated her group was open, indicated that the openness experienced in her group was about hearing differing opinions and being open to learning.

You know I think that the group supervisor did a pretty good job of trying to validate how I felt and at the same time exploring what my classmates were saying as well. So I didn't feel like she was dismissing my thoughts as well. So I think she did a better job of being more open to different types of explanations that could have been going on.

Others felt that the openness within group supervision was inadequate. This participant felt that her supervisor was not open to other ideas or suggestions, and generally did not create an open environment in which to discuss cultural issues.

It was less. It was this overall absence, it's not ignorance, but narrow-minded and not open to other people's beliefs and how that really affects people. She wasn't self-reflecting or self-aware and it consistent, not only through her lessons and directions, but also through her counseling service delivery or what we were expected to do.

*Reaction to multicultural event.* Four categories fell within this domain. First, one-fourth of the participants stated that in reaction to a multicultural event that occurred within group supervision, group members would discuss the event outside of the group (n = 5). For example, one participant stated:

It started boiling up. Like it was really nice that it happened in group supervision. Because then you had people that could validate your experience. Sometimes you wonder that if it had taken place in individual supervision would it have taken longer to sort of come to the understanding. At first it was like, ok this is really bizarre. Or you would notice the comments that people would make to each other outside of supervision. People would sort of...when it started people would make probing comments. Someone would say, well that was sort of a unique thing that the supervisor said. Or I felt a little uncomfortable with what the supervisor said. And sort of wait to see what other people did. And most of the time we'd say yeah, are you kidding me? That was horrible. So over time it went from probing things to that sort of enabled direct conversations about it.

Participants stated they felt the reason for this was because it was not comfortable enough to bring the issue up in group with the group leader. Other participants stated that in response to the supervisor's actions, the participant, or group members confronted the group supervisor (n = 4). For example:

So eventually it really helped in a group because we finally just decided...like I said this happened throughout the year that this happened, but 2-3 times we were like, okay something needs to be said or this needs to be addressed. And we don't care how particularly hurt you are. But that's the other thing. That you have to take care of the psychological well-being of your supervisor? After confronting him on something he did wrong. You know what I mean? I feel like it takes so much of your resources to confront someone in power. And then that person in power sort of needing you to tell them that it's okay. Which is what we did but it just felt very bizarre. Those 2 or 3 times that we just absolutely had to confront him, then next 2 or 3 times we met it was just a very weird supervision. I think what was even worse about it was that it was even more demoralizing. It was demoralizing enough with your supervisor and the stance that he took on many things. Umm...and it was more demoralizing that he couldn't respect that he had been confronted, acknowledge, and move on. That we needed to take control of the supervision almost, and repair him and repair the relationship is sort of an odd thing. I think supervision should be collaborative and sort of partnered but this was almost like...It was almost like we were doing counseling on the supervisor. I don't know what APA requirement that met.

Another participant described her group experience and stated that group members had confronted their supervisor about not having addressed certain issues that arose in group after reading an article on multiculturalism, and how the conversation was

dominated by “majority group members.” The issue was revisited later, but this led to disappointment because the issue was not properly handled. In the following example, this participant described this type of reaction, and also described another reaction, division within the group (n = 6; Variant). In reaction to an issue regarding race or ethnicity, some sort of division between members would occur, either by ethnicity or viewpoints, and subgrouping would occur. For example, the participant stated:

So what happened was our group, in terms of group formation, we hadn't necessarily formed as a group. This was in the Fall and we had known each other for awhile, but we weren't very cohesive or anything. And we started having this conversation about the experiences of people of color as therapists. And a couple of the, there were 2 Caucasian women in our group that from the onset of the conversation kind of, how would you describe it, other than it being like a kind of like a white guilt. Like I understand what you are going through. Kind of like a paternalistic perspective on other people's experiences in the group. It felt like, for me, it felt like my voice was being silenced. Like what I said wasn't valid. What I said was kind of like usurped by these white people who had a view of the world, that was like, well it's okay. Things are going to get better. And this is what I've experienced with my clients of color you know. It felt like I don't know. It just felt like voices were being silenced and people's experiences were actually being taken away from them. Their experiences as therapists of color, which I don't know, it felt like hierarchy of power and racism that was replicating itself in the room. It's kind of like, it's not very specific in terms of what was said. But from how I remember it that's kind of like the overall feelings or like what we ended up talking about later when we debriefed with conversation. I think she did..... I think she kind of just let it go though. And didn't necessarily intervene during that particular conversation. We came back to this conversation. It might have even been during the Winter term, to kind of readdress this article and conversation. And that conversation went even worse than the previous one. I think she had been approached about a few of the students after the conversation. And after our first conversation there was some big fracturing that had happened kind of in the group anyway. And certain people had conversations with other people in the group and other conversations with others, and it was obvious fracturing that happened. And she I think [didn't approach the supervisor], I didn't approach the supervisor. But I think some other people probably did. And I know that she knew the conversation didn't end well and didn't go well. She was trying to do a little damage control. And even when she reintroduced the topic it was like, we are going to reintroduce that article that we read and we didn't have full closure from that conversation. Because this kind of thing went [on] over time. It was pretty immature [to not say anything] but I

was pretty angry.

At times, if the participant was the only person of color, these events led to isolation (n = 4; Variant), and led to a “shutdown.” For example, one participant described his reaction to cultural issues not being discussed in his group.

P: Like once I get angry I kind of shutdown in the particular conversation. I’m not going to go there with you. I don’t even feel like it’s worth me being more vulnerable when I don’t feel like you actually understand me and my experience as a beginning therapist. That’s what I did. I just kind of shut down. And some others shut down.

I: Did you express that? Did you feel safe enough to go there or did you remain silent?

P: The silent shutdown. This conversation was one that emerged, from my point of view, a little bit differently. But I still stayed along the silent and wasn’t vocal. There are things I would have done differently reflecting on it now. I think my conditioned response for so long has been, you know people are talking shit about stuff that they don’t understand, that it’s like such a defense mechanism. To say I am going to emotionally disengage from this, even though I didn’t necessarily view anything particularly positive in this situation. I just went back to core defenses in the moment.

*Perception of multicultural awareness level in group supervision.* An additional domain was the perception of the multicultural awareness level within the group.

Some participants identified the multicultural awareness as adequate (n = 4; Variant). The following participant was asked about her supervisor and considerations of why this supervisor was multiculturally aware.

Well I think it was that that’s who she was as a person and as a counselor...And the truth is we were learning not only about multiculturalism but learning about yourself and everybody even from the White students who are multicultural beings. When she brought it up in our supervision it was more talked about in terms of who you are as a person and not only who we are as a counselor. And looking more at ourselves as people and not just looking at it more as okay. To be aware of different cultures, she had it more of being aware of ourselves and our culture. It was really beneficial and great I feel. I think in the way they approached it and I’ve talked to a lot of the white students in our program, they would say they don’t have a culture. She was able to model for us, and for the

group, to model as a professional in supervision, where to feel comfortable in discussing these multicultural issues.

Other participants stated that multicultural awareness in the group was inadequate (n = 7; Variant). Participants perceived either low levels of multicultural awareness from other group members, or the group supervisor. In the following description, a participant was asked about the multicultural event and described an example of low levels of multicultural awareness of group members. In her example, she spoke about supervision dyads between a student supervisor and student supervisee, in which the supervisees met in group supervision, and the student supervisors met in a different group supervision. After these supervision groups, both groups would meet in the larger group supervision.

Okay. It was between a (student) supervisor and a supervisee. The supervisee was African American. And the supervisor was questioning his ability. The first session, the first week when they worked together, the supervisor had made a comment to him about, I guess she brought up a question and I don't remember exactly what the supervisor asked but it was to the extent where the supervisor would say, "I don't know if you hear me because you're Black and I'm white and when I say something I'm not sure that you hear it." And that immediately became a problem for the supervisee and he felt that the supervisor was being prejudiced toward him. He didn't know if she was culturally aware and the statement was very color-blind. ....So it became a big issue and they had broken up that supervisor and supervisee relationship the following week. It was very unacceptable for the supervisee to be in this relationship. So basically what it boiled down to was one person's lack of cultural sensitivity about racial differences had basically cost her this supervisory relationship and during the sessions it was apparent that this relationship couldn't continue because she showed a lack of flexibility and understanding in her relationship with her supervisee. And so we discussed that, and the supervisor told us that she was ending that [student supervisory] relationship.

*Perception of acceptance/validation.* Another domain was acceptance and validation. Participants described the acceptance and validation in the group as either adequate (n = 5; Variant) or inadequate (n = 4; Variant). The acceptance or validation was experienced when an event was discussed, or when the participant had brought up a

cultural issue within the group and felt accepted, or their feelings and thoughts were validated by other group members or the group supervisor. For instance, in the following example, the participant discussed the internal biases and stereotypes she unconsciously had towards a particular ethnic group. When she discussed this in group supervision this was the reaction:

I would say positive. It helped that I was able to hear others' perspectives and it kind of normalized how I was feeling. Knowing that I'm not the only one with these biases and feeling this way.

An individual described an experience in which he wished that he had received more acceptance and validation concerning racial issues. He described his program as being very culturally aware, but during times of supervision, cultural issues were not discussed by the supervisor.

Racial issues are different here, where there is a more racial separation between the black and white students. And I think that although racism is everywhere, it seems more like in your face here. I don't know a better way to put it.....I don't know if it's just the environment. And I don't know if it's the first time in an academic setting where this has actually been addressed for me. In my program we talked about culture and race through articles that we read. And for therapy (and supervision) I would say there are zero times where we talked about culture. It was more through didactics and trainings.

*Suggestions.* The telephone interview concluded by asking participants what suggestions they had for group members or group leaders to effectively process multicultural issues within group supervision. Six categories were generated: consideration of individual perspectives (n = 9; Variant), training (n = 8; Variant), racial identity development (n = 7; Variant), direction from the supervisor (n = 5; Variant), norm-setting (n = 4; Variant), and honesty (n = 3; Variant).

The participants thought that additional training was important in areas such as cultural issues, cultural competence, racial identity, and group supervision. Participants stated that oftentimes they felt that their supervisor's training was "antiquated." Participants also stated that they felt that group supervisors should be honest about their levels of multicultural competence, or experience with diversity, and also identify their racial identity development. A few individuals stated that if this honesty and identification was stated by their supervisors at the beginning of group, this could lead to safety and openness for group members. For example, one participant stated:

When a supervisor comes in and shares the details of what their training is and a lot of us said that same thing that it's more comfortable and knowing that they are open to talking about those things. A lot of it is not knowing what their diversity level is or what their competency level is, not knowing their comfort level. So going in and making it comfortable to talk about these issues and going in and opening it that way from the very first session.....I think also if the supervisor is not open about their own training and experiences than the group members aren't sure and the open environment isn't there for them to feel comfortable to bring up multicultural issues regarding clients or themselves. I think for supervisors to put it on the table and to talk about their own multicultural training and limitations and also state what they are doing to be multiculturally competent. I think it creates a safer environment where students will feel comfortable bringing up those issues. When it goes unsaid that it leaves room for students to feel uncomfortable and leaving those multicultural issues to go unaddressed.

A significant theme during the interviews was the ability of group supervisors to consider individual perspectives instead of offering their own perspectives and expecting group members to follow these. Others stated that group supervisors be more active in the group and provide direction for the group supervision. Four participants stated that their supervisors were not active contributors to the group process itself, or did not address certain issues. They felt that this could significantly impact group supervision satisfaction. Norm-setting also was a suggestion. This relates to group supervisors taking

a more active approach and understanding that group supervision is considered a “group” and there are “group norms that should be discussed and set at the beginning of group so that all members understand the goals, objectives, and expectations.”

Table 16

*Domain/Categories of Qualitative Data in Telephone Interviews (General = all 20 cases; Typical = 10-19 cases; Variant = 2-9 cases)*

Domain/Category	n	Frequencies
Experience of multicultural incident in group supervision	20	General
Overall attitude of multicultural incident		
Positive	13	Typical
Negative	7	Variant
Additional incident views		
Negative	2	Variant
Attribution of multicultural incident		
Supervisor responsible for outcome	12	Typical
Power dynamics responsible for outcome	6	Variant
Other	2	Variant
Type of multicultural event		
Racial/ethnic	18	Typical
Religion	2	Variant
Additional multicultural events discussed		
Gender/Sexual orientation	4	Variant
SES	3	Variant
Racial/ethnic	2	Variant
Support level within group supervision		
Adequate/helpful	4	Variant
Identification of ethnic identity		
Of self	8	Variant
Self as one of few/the only member of color	8	Variant
Of supervisor	7	Variant

---

Concern about reactions to multicultural event		
Self-perception	6	Variant
Others' perceptions	4	Variant
Level of focus placed on multicultural issues		
Inadequate (issue ignored or under-addressed)	8	Variant
Adequate	5	Variant
Perceived safety/comfort level within group supervision		
Adequate	7	Variant
Inadequate	5	Variant
Perceived openness within group supervision		
Adequate	5	Variant
Inadequate	2	Variant
Participants' reactions to multicultural incident		
Division within group	6	Variant
Offsite discussion by some group members	5	Variant
Confrontation of supervisor	4	Variant
Isolation	3	Variant
Perception of multicultural awareness level in group		
Inadequate	7	Variant
Adequate	4	Variant
Perception of acceptance/validation level in group		
Adequate	5	Variant
Inadequate	3	Variant
Suggestions for future group supervisions		
Consideration of individual perspectives	9	Variant
Training of group leader/members	8	Variant
Racial identity development	6	Variant
Direction from supervisor	4	Variant
Norm-setting	4	Variant
Honesty of group leader/members	3	Variant

---

*Multicultural Supervision Competencies' Ratings.*

The telephone interview also included questions related to the *Model of Multicultural Supervision Competencies* (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). The variables from this

model included self-awareness, general knowledge about multicultural issues, multicultural counseling efficacy, understanding of unique client variables, building an effective working alliance, and addressing multicultural counseling skills. Participants were asked to rate how important these variables are in group supervision in order to effectively process multicultural issues for both group members and group leaders. The variables were rated on a seven-point scale, with 1 = not important at all, to 7 = extremely important. These variables were entered into a spreadsheet of SPSS and means and standard deviations were assessed. The twenty participants in the telephone interviews rated five areas and are listed in descending order as follows: self-awareness (M = 6.80; SD = .41); building an effective working alliance (M = 6.55; SD = .76); understanding of unique client variables (M = 6.40; SD = .75); addressing multicultural counseling skills (M = 6.25; SD = .91); general knowledge about multicultural issues (M = 5.75; SD = .72); and multicultural counseling efficacy (M = 5.65; SD = .88). These responses suggest that participants felt that all variables were important to effectively process multicultural events in group supervision. The variability between the most important and least important is rather small and these data are similar to the other qualitative data obtained from the online survey and telephone interviews. Participants seemed to feel that building an effective working alliance is essential for group supervision. They also felt that group supervisors and group members should have a general knowledge of multicultural issues, but it is more important to have awareness, to not overgeneralize about cultural groups, and individual differences should be considered for all clients and group members.

## *Analysis of the Research Question for Phase II*

*Results for Research Question 1.* This research question asked “what are the variables that help to create a positive environment for group supervision in order to process multicultural events?” Also, “what variables will lead to a negative experience of group supervision?” In order to answer this question, the qualitative data from the *Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire* and the *Semi-Structured Telephone Interview* were analyzed using a modified version of grounded theory and CQR, a discovery-oriented approach. The questions are organized in a domain-by-domain basis. As described before, the domains were categorized as follows: General, if cases were represented by all participants; Typical, if at least half or more of the cases were represented by participants; and Variant, if at least two to just less than half of the cases were represented by participants (Hill, et al., 1997). For this particular research question, data were analyzed from the GSMCEQ and the telephone interview to see what particular domains related to positive experiences, and what domains related to negative experiences (N = 62) (see Table 17). Participants were asked on the GSMCEQ about what factors in their group supervision made the multicultural event a negative experience and what contributed to making it a positive experience. An additional question of the GSMCEQ asked whether the event was positive for the group. The data indicated that 38 individuals stated it was positive for the group, 14 stated it was negative, and 10 stated it was neither. The 10 individuals who indicated it was neither were further explored to determine whether it was positive or negative for them. Another question asked whether the event was positive or negative for the person. The 10 individuals were then assigned a positive or negative response based on this answer. The

telephone interview data generated themes that applied to positive and negative experiences in response to a multicultural event. Participants described the multicultural event as a positive event (n = 44) more often than a negative event (n = 18). Examples of the qualitative data from these particular themes are listed previously in Phase II results. The themes that were discovered when positive events were described included: participant is one of a few members of color in the group or the only person of color; safety/comfort; group relationship; support; openness; and supervisor's actions or attitude perceived as responsible for the outcome of the incident. Additional themes include: division within group regarding visibility of ethnicity; supervisor confronted with the multicultural issue; supervisor's multicultural competence level; the critical incident involved issues of race/ethnicity or gender; and training of leaders or group members. Other themes included in positive events included: participant identified group leader's cultural identity; participant was concerned with others' perceptions of his or her reaction to the critical incident; diversity within the group; awareness; acceptance/validation; and the suggestion of norm-setting. In addition, themes were identified as: a multicultural focus/acknowledgment; group leader was directive or it was suggested they should be; participant identified their own ethnic identity; learning from others' perspectives; expectations about relationships based on multicultural status; and racial identity development/awareness.

There were several themes that were addressed when negative experiences were described including: the participant being one of the few or the only member of color in the group; the multicultural issues was not addressed or under-addressed; lack of respect, isolation, lack of openness, and lack of acceptance/validation. Other themes included: the

supervisor's actions or attitude was perceived as responsible for the outcome of the incident; the incident involved issues of race or ethnicity; lack of awareness; norm-setting was suggested; power dynamics; and offsite discussion regarding the multicultural incident amongst group members. Additional themes included: the group supervisor was confronted regarding the multicultural issues; the supervisor's multicultural competence level; the incident involved SES; lack of safety/comfort; the incident involved religious issues; and the participant identified their leader's cultural identity as well as their own cultural identity. Finally, additional themes identified with negative experiences included: division within group regarding visibility of ethnicity; racial identity development/awareness; participant was concerned with his or her own response to the incident; training of leaders or other group members was recommended or suggested; the incident involved gender issues; the group relationship; and the participant was concerned with others' perceptions of his or her reaction to the incident.

Table 17

*Domains/Categories and Frequencies Regarding Positive (n = 44) and Negative (N =*

*18) Experiences when Reporting Multicultural Events in Group Supervision*

Domain/Category	Frequency and Positive Cases* N = 44	Number of Negative Cases** n = 18
Attribution of multicultural incident		
Supervisor responsible for outcome	Typical	Typical
Power dynamics responsible for Outcome		Variant
Type of presenting multicultural incident		
Racial/ethnic	Typical	Typical
Religion		Variant
Additional multicultural incidents discussed		
Racial/ethnic		Variant
Gender	Variant	
SES		Variant
Support level within supervision group		
Adequate	Variant	
Identification of cultural identity		
Of supervisor	Variant	Variant
Of self	Typical	Variant
Self as one of few/only POC in supervision group	Variant	Variant
Concern about participant's reaction to multicultural event		
Others' perceptions	Variant	Variant
Self-perception		Typical
Level of focus placed on multicultural issues		
Adequate	Variant	
Inadequate		General
Supervisor's multicultural competence level		
Adequate	Variant	

Inadequate		Variant
Perceived safety/comfort level within supervision group		
Adequate	Variant	
Inadequate		Variant
Perceived openness within supervision group		
Adequate	Typical	
Inadequate		Variant
Reaction to multicultural incident		
Offsite discussion		Typical
Confrontation of supervisor		Variant
Division within group	Variant	Variant
Isolation		Variant
Perception of multicultural awareness level in supervision group		
Adequate	Variant	
Inadequate		Variant
Perception of acceptance/validation level in group		
Adequate	Variant	
Inadequate		Variant
Suggestions for future group supervisors/members		
Training	Typical	
Honesty	Variant	
Racial identity development	Variant	Variant
Consideration of individual perspectives	Variant	Variant
Direction from supervisor	Variant	Typical
Norm-setting	Variant	Variant

\*For the positive cases category, General: all cases; Typical: 22-43; Variant: 2-21.

\*\*For the negative cases category, General: all cases; Typical 9-17; Variant: 2-8.

The data from the survey and the telephone interviews were combined for this table.

### *Summary*

The purpose of this chapter was to present the study findings addressing four hypotheses and one research question presented in this dissertation. In summary, Hypotheses 1 and 3 were not supported, indicating that there was not a significant relationship between supervisee multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction, or supervisee racial identity and supervision satisfaction. However, Hypothesis 2 was supported, indicating a statistically significant positive strong relationship in which higher levels of perceived supervisor multicultural competence was related to greater group supervision satisfaction. Hypothesis 4 was also supported indicating a significant moderately strong positive relationship between supervisee multicultural competence and supervisee racial identity.

Regarding the research question, several factors were found that contributed to positive experiences when multicultural events occurred in group supervision, and several factors were found that led to negative experiences. The positive factors included the supervisor taking on a more active role, discussing racial/ethnic issues, providing adequate support, a focus on multicultural issues, supervisor's multicultural competence, safety and comfort in the group, group supervisors and members being open, and a higher level of multicultural awareness for both group leaders and group members. The factors that led to negative experiences in group supervision included the supervisor not taking on a more active role in supervision, the power dynamics between leaders and members impacting the group, being the only person of color or one of a few members of color in the group, an inadequate level of focus placed on cultural issues, inadequate supervisors' multicultural competence level, lack of safety or comfort, lack of openness within the

group, offsite discussion of incident by members, confrontation of supervision, division within group and isolation, inadequate multicultural awareness of leader and members, and inadequate acceptance and validation of issues discussed. Other findings were discussed including suggestions for group supervision leaders and members to effectively process multicultural issues in group supervision, including training for supervisors, consideration of individual perspectives, racial identity development, norm-setting, and more direction from the group supervisor. The next chapter presents a discussion of the results and the implications for practice and future research.

## CHAPTER V

### Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore multicultural events that occurred in group supervision and what variables led ethnic minority supervisees to describe them as positive or negative. More broadly, another goal was to assess the participants' general perceptions of helpful and unhelpful factors of group supervision. In addition, the study examined several variables individually: supervisees' racial identity, supervisees' multicultural competence, and perceived supervisor's multicultural competence to determine whether they were related to group supervision satisfaction. The relationship between supervisees' multicultural competence and their racial identity was also examined. This study was a mixed-method design that combined both quantitative and qualitative methods. This study was the first to investigate the impact of multicultural issues in group supervision from the perspectives of ethnic minority supervisees.

#### *Specific Findings and Implications*

*Multicultural competence.* One important finding in this study was the positive relationship between perceived supervisor multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction. This result points to the vital nature of the cultural competence of group leaders. Previous studies have indicated a positive relationship between these variables in individual supervision (Inman, 2006; Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009). Group supervisors can and do influence the type of discussion of multicultural issues that occur

in the supervision group, whether it relates to the dynamics between group supervisees in the room or their work with clients. Satisfaction seemed related to if and how multicultural discussions unfolded. Supervisors who are multiculturally competent were described in many examples of multicultural events. Supervisees appreciated the direct nature of their supervisors who encouraged cultural discussions as well as those who showed their cultural awareness. There were also many supervisees who described their frustrations or anger with supervisors who showed little awareness of the need for or the lack of ability to encourage multicultural discussions in group supervision.

Support for the connection between supervisor multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction was also found in the multiple regression analysis that combined the variables of age, gender, ethnicity, identification of a multicultural event, perceived supervisor multicultural competence, supervisees' multicultural competence and racial identity. This regression was significant when predicting group supervision satisfaction. In this model, perceived supervisor multicultural competence was the best predictor of group supervision satisfaction, supporting the strong relationship that has been found between supervisor multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction.

This finding underscores the need for multiculturally competent group supervisors who can model open communication and cultural sensitivity, not only about the differences between group supervisees but also their work with clients. Group supervisors have a responsibility to facilitate the professional development of group supervisees and to manage the client's welfare. Multicultural awareness can begin early in training programs and be reinforced in all aspects of training. Multicultural issues often are seen as a sensitive topic to discuss. In recent years, more emphasis has been placed on

multicultural competence in providing counseling with clients, as well as multicultural competence within supervision. Special issues in academic journals, including the *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (Moradi, Mohr, Worthington, & Fassinger, 2009) and *The Counseling Psychologist* (Miller, Forrest, & Elman, 2009; Miville, Duan, Nutt, Waehler, Suzuki, Pistole, et al., 2009; Alberta & Wood, 2009), have published issues dedicated to topics of multiculturalism. Additionally, during the graduate course in clinical supervision, multiculturalism is a major focus. Currently, it is rare that any education and training program focuses on conducting group supervision. In fact, few supervision classes include group supervision as a topic, and if it is covered, it is oftentimes covered in one class or one week of the course. Another important aspect of group supervision that needs to be considered in training programs is the dynamics that occur within group supervision. It is important to not only train graduate students to be group supervisors because it is very likely that these students will be involved in facilitating group supervision at some point in their professional careers, but to also focus on multicultural issues in every course. In order to prepare psychologists to help their group supervisees discuss multicultural issues openly and with sensitivity, group supervisors will need to demonstrate the same.

An interesting finding that was not hypothesized was the positive relationship found between supervisee multicultural competence and perceived supervisor multicultural competence. Inman (2006) did not find this relationship in her study of marriage and family therapy supervisees. She reported that supervisor's multicultural competence was not related to supervisee multicultural competence, and that there might be other variables that influence this. This study did find this relationship to be significant

and a possible variable that may have contributed to this is the ethnicity of the participants. Participants may have already developed a complex perspective on the impact of cultural issues. They may have an increased cultural awareness and were better able to recognize other individuals, including supervisors, with developed cultural competence. It is possible that if supervisors have a higher level of multicultural competence, they may be able to address cultural issues within group supervision and contribute to the multicultural competence of their supervisees. As Killian (2001) found, supervisors that were culturally aware were better able to create a safe environment in which cultural differences could be discussed. In turn, these cultural discussions can help to increase supervisees' multicultural competence (Killian; Constantine, 1997). Helms (1989) also described interactions that can contribute to moving an individual from a lower status of racial identity to a higher one (progressive interaction). If a supervisor has a higher racial identity status and is working with supervisees with lower statuses, the opportunity is there to move these individuals along by addressing cultural issues and increasing their racial identity.

It is interesting to note that significant differences were found between participants that reported/did not report a cultural event and perceived supervisor multicultural competence. This finding suggests that participants reported higher supervisor multicultural competence when events occurred. It may imply that supervisors with supervisee-reported high multicultural competence may be more inclined to address multicultural issues in group supervision, thus creating multicultural events. Although the sample size was small, further research could replicate this finding with a larger sample size.

Significant differences were also found between participants that described the multicultural event as positive and those that described the event as negative and perceived supervisor multicultural competence. The data indicated that positive events included themes of supervisors being more involved and a focus placed on multicultural issues. In earlier research, Kennard et al. (1987) found that trainees experienced positive events when supervisors were supportive, instructional, and interpretive. These findings point to the importance of positive multicultural events occurring in group supervision and the possibility that group supervisor's ability to address multicultural issues may increase group supervisees' skill in this area. Again, the sample size was small and this is an area for future research.

Although this study hypothesized there would be a positive relationship between participants' multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction, this relationship was not supported. Gainor and Constantine (2002) found a relationship between multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction in individual supervision. In their study, trainees with limited counseling experience were assessed and the majority (62%) of participants were Caucasian. In the current study the sample included advanced trainees and all participants were people of color. It may be that the relationship between multicultural competence of group members and supervision satisfaction is supported in individual supervision, but it may not be as important for satisfaction in group supervision as some other variables. Group supervisees are allowed to explore topics of race and culture, and at times group supervisors may actively facilitate this discussion. This particular sample may have been more multiculturally competent than those in the previous study. It is possible that there was less variability in the multicultural

competence scores or the advanced cultural competence may be due to the ethnic backgrounds of participants.

Even though the relationship between participants' own perceptions of their multicultural competence and their satisfaction with group supervision was not supported, what was very clear from the qualitative descriptions from the survey and interviews was that multicultural competence levels of supervisees and supervisors is critical in promoting discussions of culture. A similar relationship previously has been studied in individual supervision, where it was found that exploration of cultural issues helped to promote growth in supervisees' multicultural competence (Killian, 2001). The current study did not find any differences between those that reported/did not report a multicultural event and supervisees' multicultural competence. However, participants stated in telephone interviews that multicultural awareness, a component of multicultural competence, is important in order to promote the discussion of cultural issues in group supervision. For instance, participants stated that their supervisors consistently promoted multiculturalism, even among majority students by helping them to feel comfortable in talking about their own ethnicities and cultures. It has been stated that "supervisors are ultimately responsible for creating an environment that facilitates supervisee cultural awareness and competence" (Inman, 2006, p. 75). The qualitative data from the online surveys and telephone interviews support this view. Participants felt that the cultural events led them to become culturally aware and no longer hesitant to address multicultural issues. They also indicated that supervisors who were "willing to focus on these sensitive topics benefited all those involved," and when "group leaders did nothing, supervisees felt more isolated." Duan and Roehlke (2001) and Gatmon et al. (2001)

found that if supervisors do not bring up multicultural issues in supervision, then they are not discussed. Hird et al. (2001) also found that the lack of discussion of cultural issues led to negative experiences in individual supervision. The findings from the current study support these results and thus signify the importance of group supervisors who are culturally competent. When participants were asked in telephone interviews about the variables of Ancis and Ladany's (2001) Multicultural Supervision Competencies' Model, the variables that were rated as most important were self-awareness, building an effective working alliance, and understanding unique client variables. Cultural awareness continued to be supported in the research as an important variable that contributes to the development of a trusting environment where multicultural topics can be discussed.

One way in which these trusting environments can be created is by setting norms at the beginning of group supervision. Participants indicated that it should not be their responsibility to address cultural issues in group and that norms should be delineated. Several participants suggested the use of norm-setting in order to create beneficial experiences in group supervision when multicultural events occur. Norm-setting was also suggested by Riva and Cornish (2008) as a way to create safety in group supervision.

*Racial identity.* Contrary to the expected finding, the results for this study did not find a relationship between racial identity of supervisee and group supervision satisfaction. Previous studies in individual supervision have shown that racial identity is related to other variables including multicultural competence (as found in this study), supervisory alliance, and supervisor's multicultural competence (Inman, 2006). Ladany, Brittan-Powell, et al. (1997) found that high racial identity levels of both supervisees and supervisors in individual supervision influenced cultural discussions in supervision, and

thus led to stronger supervisory alliances. It is expected that these stronger alliances are thought to be a factor that contributes to increased supervision satisfaction. However, this study did not find this. The data from this study indicates group supervisor variables that are important for satisfaction, but what is still unknown is what supervisee variables contribute to greater supervision satisfaction.

This study found a significant positive relationship between self-reported supervisee multicultural competence and racial identity. Previous studies on individual supervision also have found a positive relationship between these two variables. In their study, Ladany, Inman, et al. (1997) found that advanced levels of racial identity were related to self-reported multicultural competence and multicultural case conceptualization ability. They studied Persons of Color (35%) and Caucasians (65%) and used a different measure than the current study used to assess racial identity. It is possible that a different measure of racial identity can assess differing aspects than the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. Although this study did not assess any Caucasian trainees, the relationship between these variables was significant. The current study did not directly measure case conceptualization ability, although some of the qualitative descriptions supported the view that racial identity of group members is an important variable to consider. Group supervision is more complex than individual supervision and it is not clear how these two variables are influenced by other group members. It seems clear that multicultural competence and racial identity are related, and as an individual is more racially identified with their ethnic group, they may have developed higher levels of multicultural competence. Previous studies have not focused solely on ethnic minority supervisees in group supervision as this study did. For ethnic minority individuals, these two variables

may oftentimes go hand in hand. As one becomes more comfortable with his/her own culture, she or he may feel more at ease in understanding and being aware of other cultures.

*Beneficial factors.* This study points to certain variables that relate to positive experiences in group supervision when a multicultural event occurs. For those participants who described a multicultural event, one theme that was apparent throughout the survey and interview data was that supervisors play a critical role in the outcome of the incident, especially when racial or ethnic issues are discussed. When cultural issues were discussed and not ignored, a positive experience seemed to follow, especially if the group supervisor played an active role in facilitating the discussion of these issues, by providing direction, addressing the situation, asking questions, or helping to create an environment that is conducive for cultural issues to be addressed. Kennard et al. (1987) found that trainees in individual supervision experienced positive events when supervisors were supportive, instructional, and interpretive. Dressel et al. (2007) identified successful supervisory behaviors in multicultural supervision and found that the most important behavior was to create a safe and supportive environment for discussion of multicultural issues, values, and ideas. This finding underscores the belief that supervisors are vital in the outcome of group supervision. Group supervisors need to be competent in conducting supervision, understanding and facilitating group dynamics, addressing multicultural issues, and being aware of their own biases/cultural awareness. Several participants noted that even when group supervisors were less multiculturally competent, they were able to facilitate an effective group if the leader was open and honest about their own experiences and biases. In the qualitative data, participants

suggested that supervisors should be honest about their multicultural competence or awareness, including their specific biases. Considering racial identity development of all members including the group supervisor, as well as considering all individuals' perspectives and not making assumptions based on race were additional suggestions.

An additional implication for conducting group supervision and for training is the focus on group leadership skills that include norm-setting and creating a safe environment for group members. Riva and Cornish (2008) reported that 45% of group supervisors state they set norms in their supervision groups. The process of norm-setting sets the tone for the rest of the group supervision experience, with the discussion of multicultural biases and issues. Riva and Cornish also found that 91% of group supervisors reported discussing multicultural issues in group supervision, although it is unclear how and how often these discussions occur and if they are related to the discussions of clients or whether these discussions include material raised between group members and the leader. Defining boundaries and setting clear norms was suggested by participants who had reported both positive and negative multicultural events. One participant stated it best, when she said that her group supervisor came into the first group and was honest about her biases and limited multicultural competence, but suggested that she felt it was important to address cultural issues. This group supervisor opened the group, set the agenda, and provided a safe environment for supervisees to feel comfortable with discussing cultural issues. Group leaders should pay attention to norms including the confidentiality of client material, how supervisee behaviors in group supervision will be evaluated, with whom the group leader will discuss what happens in the group supervision, and expectations for group supervision. Group supervisors that

play an active, supporting, and engaging role in group, while paying needed attention to group dynamics, will often produce positive and beneficial experiences for group supervisees. Therefore, it is important to follow the same guidelines in setting up any therapeutic group. Setting norms is one of these components that supervisees need in order for them to understand what is expected of them. The subject of multicultural issues must be raised at the norm-setting phase in group so that group members are aware that this important topic will be discussed. Supervision has begun to focus on multicultural issues and competency and group supervisors will need to follow this lead.

An additional important theme that arose in the qualitative data was the importance of open communication and a safe environment. Dressel et al. (2007) reported that the most important supervisory behavior was to create a safe environment to discuss culturally sensitive topics. Fukuyama (1994) suggested that supervisors should create an environment that facilitates cultural awareness. Respondents typically stated that the openness felt within the group contributed to the positive experience. This openness can either be created by the group leader or other group members. The openness that is created in group supervision can lead to participants understanding the impact of their own ethnicity or group members'/leaders' ethnic backgrounds on the group process and being able to explore those issues within group supervision. In this study, it appeared that the two variables of openness and support were essential for a supervisee to feel safe and experience a positive multicultural event. These particular variables can be modeled in many areas of training programs. It is important for group supervisors to model openness and support for group members so that group supervisees can learn how to lead an open and supportive group.

Other findings that were supported by the literature were Variant responses that were endorsed by less than half of the participants. However, these findings are important for group supervision and have been discussed by Carter et al. (2009). These authors found helpful variables in group supervision that included supervisor impact, support and safety, specific instruction, and validation of experience. Similarly in this study, some participants felt that when support, safety, and comfort were present in the group, this led to positive events, as well as when participants felt accepted and validated by their group.

Participants were asked about factors that are generally helpful for group supervision. They indicated that helpful behaviors included practicing certain techniques (i.e., case presentations, role-playing, and visualization exercises). Other responses by participants included discussing multicultural issues, giving and receiving feedback, the allowance for professional and personal development, and support. Linton (2003) identified giving and receiving feedback as an important theme in group process.

*Non-beneficial factors.* Several variables were discussed by group supervisees who had a negative multicultural experience. In this study, participants indicated that when they perceived supervisors as having little multicultural competence or awareness, or when supervisors did not address multicultural issues, they experienced negative multicultural events and were less satisfied with group supervision. This finding supported the results in a previous study exploring critical incidents in individual multicultural supervision in which lack of supervisor cultural awareness was a category of negative events (Fukuyama, 1994). The group supervisor's lack of responsibility or direction, and multicultural awareness can contribute to negative outcomes, particularly

when multicultural issues are not discussed. The results also supported findings from other studies (Dressel et al., 2007; Hird et al., 2001).

Other negative behaviors included failing to establish a working alliance and safe environment, and not understanding the effects of power dynamics. Participants in this study raised many suggestions for group supervision and the processing of multicultural events. It was suggested that group supervisors receive additional training in several areas: leading group supervision, addressing multicultural issues, and supervisors receiving peer supervision with other group supervisors. Peer supervision would allow group supervisors to stay current, and continue to learn from others' experiences and develop added skills in conducting group supervision.

Multicultural discussions can be anxiety provoking for supervision groups. Participants were concerned about how others would perceive them when they brought up certain topics. Participants explicitly stated how intimidating multicultural issues in group supervision can be for individuals, especially if they are the only ethnic minority in the group or one of a few. Similarly, Enyedy et al. (2003) found that often, a negative response occurred when an individual was the only representative of an ethnic group. Similarly, group members had different ideas about how much time should be devoted to multicultural discussions. Some participants stated that their group members felt overwhelmed by the amount of multicultural discussion, and had obvious reactions in group. This provides another area of discussion that coincides with the issue of safety and comfort.

Group supervisors should maintain a safe and open group in which all viewpoints are heard and not discriminated against based on assumptions due to culture/ethnicity.

This can be difficult due to the complex nature of group supervision because of individual differences around multicultural issues. This complexity makes the focus on training group supervisors so important in graduate training programs. One way to increase multicultural competence is to infuse diversity across the curriculum in graduate programs. There needs to be clear competency standards that students are required to meet in order to graduate. In group supervision, there are three major areas that should receive greater attention: cultural competency, a clear understanding of group dynamics and how to facilitate them, and knowledge and skill as a supervisor.

The way in which participants dealt with negative experiences in group supervision was also an important theme. At times, group members felt the need to discuss their experiences outside of the supervision group. Sometimes the reason was to check out their perceptions of an event. Groups that are not safe may have members who do not feel safe enough to check out these perceptions in the group environment, which could lead to much more out-of-group processing. An additional unsuccessful behavior identified by Dressel et al. (2007) was the group supervisor becoming defensive around racial/ethnic/cultural issues. In these instances, if the group supervisor is not open or supportive enough for these issues to be fully discussed in group supervision, then some group members may discuss the issues outside of the group. For many respondents, these out-of-group discussions did not resolve their concern and may have left members with negative feelings. Group supervisors will want to notice the group process and facilitate a discussion about how the group members are feeling, the purpose of group supervision, and the norms, expectations, and format of group supervision.

If norms are not discussed, an area that can be of impact is the power dynamics that occur between a group leader and group members. Dressel et al. (2007) identified the lack of recognition of the power of the supervisory role as an unsuccessful behavior in multicultural supervision. Additionally, some participants offered that some group supervisors had their own idea of what they wanted to discuss. These personal agendas were regularly seen as a negative aspect of group supervision. For instance participants described supervisors that pushed their own spirituality onto group members, and other supervisors that never explicitly stated what was expected of them in group supervision, and then members were later questioned or given negative evaluations based on these experiences. A conversation at the beginning of group about mutual goals may help prevent these negative feelings from group members. In many situations, in order to understand what resulted in negative events, the positive situations mentioned earlier could just be reversed.

Participants also reported negative behaviors that they had experienced in group supervision in general. Participants indicated that the extensive use of didactics and group supervisors sharing too much of their personal stories were unhelpful. Group supervisors may be more content-focused versus process-focused and at times trainees may want to use the time to discuss issues related to cases or between-member problems, versus learning a new topic that might be unrelated to the clinical work they are doing with clients. The general use of time is a factor, and the lack of safety, comfort, and trust will lead to negative experiences in group supervision. Again, it is important for group supervisors to create an environment that is safe so that supervisees are comfortable in bringing up a variety of issues.

### *Limitations*

Several limitations of this study should be noted. First, this study examined the experiences of ethnic minority individuals in group supervision, limiting its generalizability to all graduate students in psychology or counseling programs. The experiences of ethnic minorities may differ from those of the majority culture. Also, this study did not assess different perspectives from specific cultural subgroups. The sample size was too small to investigate ethnic groups as separate subsamples. A study done at a later time with a larger sample size could examine various ethnic minority groups' perspectives of multicultural incidents in group supervision.

The qualitative descriptions on multicultural events were retrospective in nature and self-reported. Participants each had their own individual perceptions and therefore reporting themes that occurred frequently was more of the goal than reporting lower frequency comments. There may have been considerations of social desirability and discrepancy in interpretation in the coding process, as the events can be interpreted in many ways. Also, the multicultural events were diverse in nature. To assess for main themes, the investigator asked a graduate student volunteer to assist in the coding process and a consensus was reached between the two individuals on main themes that emerged. It is possible that some of the descriptions may have included several distinct emphases, which could have been coded differently.

The measures assessing multicultural competence and racial identity were also self-report and social desirability may also affect responses. The interpretation of the items in the measures may have been unlike what the authors intended them to be, as

subjects may have interpreted the items in various ways due to unique cultural backgrounds.

Although supervisor multicultural competency was assessed, it was from the viewpoint of the supervisee. It will be helpful to have the group supervisor and other group members participate in future studies to gain multiple perspectives and match responses. Other group members and the group supervisor were not approached to participate in this study because of confidentiality concerns.

The study was based on correlational analyses and on qualitative interviews. Such designs prevent drawing a cause-effect relationship. Despite the limitations, this study is important because it is the first of its kind to study multicultural critical incidents within group supervision from an ethnic minority's perspective.

#### *Suggestions for Future Research*

The sample for this study included 76 participants. Future studies could incorporate a larger sample, and look at specific ethnic groups separately, as well as type of graduate programs. It is important to acknowledge that cultural values of people of color are not homogenous and that persons from different cultures may respond in group supervision from very different perspectives. Although graduate students in psychology and counseling are predominately female, it would be beneficial to study gender differences in response to multicultural events.

Future research studies could compare Caucasian participants to ethnic minority participants on variables such as self-reported multicultural competence, perceived supervisor multicultural competence, racial identity, and group supervision satisfaction. The types of multicultural events that are reported by majority and minority cultures may

be similar or quite different. Also, no research has attempted to understand how all supervisees within a group view the same multicultural event and the role of ethnicity, level of experience, and other variables relate to these descriptions.

Group supervision is a dynamic process and most studies only look at events occurring at one point in time. Future studies could observe group supervision over time to determine how member anxiety, group norms, openness, group structure, etc. changes across the life of supervision groups. Other variables for future investigation are aspects of group process dynamics including, group cohesion, supervisory alliance, how transference and countertransference issues are handled, and conflict. Group process variables such as group supervisor behavior can contribute to the outcome of group supervision, including supervision satisfaction, multicultural competence, and learning.

One other area ripe for future research is to begin to assess how group supervision contributes to skill development. This area is complicated by the fact that the purpose and focus of group supervision is not always clear. It makes sense that group supervision could increase multicultural case conceptualization, the ability to provide high quality feedback to peers, and gaining an increased awareness of the importance of group dynamics within a supervision group.

Group supervision is used across many other disciplines, including social work, school psychology, nursing, and speech and language therapy. The results of this study may be valuable for group supervision in many different contexts. It makes sense that the findings of group dynamics, cultural sensitivity, and the need for group supervisors to provide direction can be useful to group supervisors in these particular areas. What is also unknown is how group supervision differs around the world. It would be interesting to

develop a multidisciplinary view of group supervision, understanding the similarities and differences for diverse populations and countries.

### *Summary*

Group supervision is a widely used format in the training of future psychologists/counselors. Supervision literature in a group format has not specifically focused on multicultural issues. This study expanded the group supervision literature, especially in the exploration of multicultural events that occur within group supervision from the perspectives of ethnic minority supervisees. It is the first of its kind to focus on People of Color and their perceptions of their supervisor's multicultural competence, their own multicultural competence, and racial identity, and the relationships of these variables to group supervision satisfaction. Previous studies have found strong relationships between supervisee multicultural competence and racial identity (Ladany, Inman, et al., 1997), supervisee multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction (Gainor & Constantine, 2002), and supervisor multicultural competence and supervision satisfaction (Inman, 2006). Other findings indicated that not discussing cultural issues led to negative experiences for supervisees (Hird et al., 2001), and detrimental effects of not addressing multicultural issues in individual supervision (Fukuyama, 1994) as well as in group supervision (Enyedy et al., 2003).

The purpose of this study was to fill in some gaps in the existing literature of group supervision and multiculturalism. The findings supported the positive relationship between perceived supervisor multicultural competence and group supervision satisfaction and the relationship between supervisee multicultural competence and supervisee racial identity development. Although not hypothesized, the relationship

between supervisee multicultural competence and perceived supervisor multicultural competence was significant.

Although there were limitations to this study (i.e., qualitative methods of analysis), there were many strengths. This study was the first of its kind to focus on ethnic minority graduate students that have been involved in group supervision. As more ethnic minority individuals enter graduate programs in psychology and counseling, it is important to identify and understand the implications of working with such individuals, and understand the effects of discussions of multicultural issues that are not competently handled. As group supervision is becoming a more popular training method for counselors and psychology trainees, it is important as well, to understand the implications of group process, dynamics, and outcome. As Dressel et al. (2007) recently listed successful and unsuccessful behaviors in multicultural supervision, several themes and suggestions were described by participants in this study that matched some of the most frequently reported behaviors.

Future research studies can continue to expand the findings and fill in gaps in the supervision literature. Group supervision is a major component in training. The supervision literature is helpful, yet the complexity of group supervision requires additional considerations. Replications of this study with a larger sample size, equal numbers of the various ethnic group members, and additional group process variables can offer further information about multicultural events in group supervision. Other approaches, such as a field study may inform group supervisors or extend the literature to understand ways to make group supervision more effective when multicultural events occur.

## References

- Alberta, A. & Wood, A. (2009). A practical skills model for effectively engaging clients in multicultural settings. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*, 564-579.
- American Counseling Association. (1995). *Code of ethics and standards of practice*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American Psychological Association (1999). Doctorate employment survey.
- American Psychological Association (2000). Student Affiliate Survey.
- American Psychological Association (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060-1073.
- American Psychological Association (2002). *Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organization change for psychologists*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- American Psychological Association (2003). Guidelines for multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377-402.
- American Psychological Association Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs. (1993). Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations. *American Psychologist, 48*, 45-48.
- Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2001). A multicultural framework for counselor supervision. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 63-90). Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.
- Arredondo, P., & Perez, P. (2006). Historical perspectives on the multicultural guidelines and contemporary applications. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*(1), 1-5.
- Bernard, J. M. (1997). The discrimination model. In C.E. Watkins (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 310-327). New York: Wiley.
- Bernard, J.M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2008). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision, 4<sup>th</sup> edition*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Beutler, L. E., Crago, M. & Arizmendi, T. G. (1986). Therapist variables in psychotherapy process and emotions. In A.E. Bergin and S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior changes* (pp. 257-310). New York: John Wiley.
- Brown, M. T., & Landrum-Brown, J. (1995). Counselor supervision: Cross-cultural perspective. In J. G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 263-286). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burkard, A.W., Johnson, A.J., Madson, M., Pruitt, N., Tadych-Contreras, D., Kozlowski, J.M., Hess, S.A., & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 288-301.
- Carifino, M.S., & Hess, A.K. (1987). Who is the ideal supervisor? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 244-250.
- Carney, C. G., & Kahn, K. B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 111-119.
- Carter, J.W., Enyedy, K.C., Goodyear, R.K., Arcinue, F., & Puri, N.N. (2009). Concept mapping of the events supervisees find helpful in group supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3*(1), 1-9.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 310-324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Constantine, M. G., & Ladany, N. (2001). New visions for defining and assessing multicultural counseling competence. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, and C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 482-498). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Cook, D. A., & Helms, J. E. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 268-274.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cuellar, I., Nyberg, B., Maldonado, R., & Roberts, R. (1997). Ethnic identity and acculturation in a young adult Mexican-origin population. *Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 535-549.
- D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1997). Multicultural counseling supervision: Central issues, theoretical considerations, and practical strategies. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (Vol. 7, pp. 290-309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dressel, J.L., Consoli, A.J., Kim, B., & Atkinson, D.R. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful multicultural supervisory behaviors: A Delphi Poll. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35*(1), 51-64.
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive "snapshot" of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 131-146.
- Enyedy, K. C., Arcinue, F., Puri, N. N., Carter, J. W., Goodyear, R. K., & Getzelman, M. A. (2003). Hindering phenomena in group supervision: implications for practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34*(3), 312-317.
- Esterberg, K. (2002). *Qualitative methods in social research*. Blacklick, OH: McGraw-Hill.
- Falender, C.A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency- based approach*. Washington, D.C.: APA.
- Faul, F., & Erdfelder, E. (1992). GPOWER: A priori, post hoc-, and compromise power analyses for MS-DOS. Bonn University, Bonn, Germany.
- Fink, A. (2002). *How to design survey studies, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.*, (pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fong, M.L., & Lease, S.H. (1996). Cross-cultural supervision: Issues for the White supervisor. In D. Pope-Davis and H. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 387-405). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fukuyama, M. A., (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to supervision research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*(2), 142-151.
- Gainor, K. A., & Constantine, M. G. (2002). Multicultural group supervision: A comparison of in-person versus Web-based formats. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 104-111.
- Garrett, M. T., Border, I. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural supervision: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 147-158.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N. et al., (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 102-113.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A., (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Pub. Co.
- Goodyear, R. K., & Guzzardo, C. R. (2000). Psychotherapy supervision and training. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.). *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 83-108). New York: John Wiley.
- Grigg, G. (2006). Designs and discriminations for clinical group supervision in counseling psychology: An analysis. *Canadian Journal of Counseling, 40*(2), 110-122.
- Gunter, M. (2006). The squaring of the circle in psychoanalytic social work: The unconscious, the refrigerator, the play and the workshop. *Kinderanalyse, 14*(1), 44-62.
- Haboush, K. L. (2003). Group supervision of school psychologists in training. *School Psychology International, 24*(2), 232-255.
- Helms, J. E. (1989). Considering some methodological issues in racial identity counseling research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17*(2), 227-252.

- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hill, C. (1990). Exploratory in-session process research in individual psychotherapy: A review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58*, 288-294.
- Hill, C., Thompson, B.J., & Williams, E. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *Counseling Psychologist, 25*(4), 517-572.
- Hilton, D.B., Russell, R. K., & Salmi, S. W. (1995). The effects of supervisor's race and level of support on perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 559-563.
- Hird, J. S., Cavalieri, C. E., Dulko, J. P., Felice, A. A. D., & Ho, T. A. (2001). Visions and realities: supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 114-130.
- Holloway, E. L. (1987). Developmental models of supervision: Is it supervision? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 209-216.
- Holloway, E. L., & Johnston, R. (1985). Group supervision: Widely practiced but poorly understood. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 24*, 332-340.
- Holloway, E. L., & Neufeld, S. A. (1995). Supervision: Its contributions to treatment efficacy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 207-213.
- Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1983). Patterns of verbal behavior and judgments of satisfaction in the supervision interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 227-234.
- Horton, S., Lourdes Drachler, M., Fuller, A., Carvalho Leite, J. (2008). Development and preliminary validation of a measure for assessing staff perspectives on the quality of clinical group supervision. *International Journal of Language & Communications Disorders, 43*(2), 126-134.
- Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 139-149.

- Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 32(1), 73-85.
- Kennard, B. D., Stewart, S. M., & Gluck, M. R. (1987). The supervision relationship: Variables contributing to positive versus negative experiences. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18(2), 172-175.
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Differences making a difference: Cross-cultural interactions in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 12, 61-103.
- Krause, A. A., & Allen, G. J. (1988). Perceptions of counselor supervision: An examination of Stoltenberg's model from the perspectives of supervisor and supervisee. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35, 77-80.
- Kruger, L.J., Maher, C., Cherniss, C., & Leichtman, H. (1988). Group supervision of paraprofessional counselors. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19(6), 609-616.
- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 36, 284-304.
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77, 447-455.
- Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., Corbett, M. M., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Nature, extent, and importance of what psychotherapy trainees do not disclose to their supervisors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 10-24.
- Ladany, N., Inman, A., Constantine, M., & Hofheinz, E. (1997). Supervisee multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competence as functions of supervisee racial identity and supervisor focus. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, (44), 284-293.
- LaFromboise, H. L. K., Coleman, A., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the cross-cultural counseling inventory – revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 22, 380-388.
- Linton, J. M. (2003). A preliminary qualitative investigation of group processes in group supervision: Perspectives of master's level practicum students. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 28, 215-226.

- Linton, J. M., & Hedstrom, S. M. (2006). An exploratory qualitative investigation of group processes in group supervision: Perceptions of masters-level practicum students. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 31*(1), 51-72.
- Lochner, B., & Phinney, J. (1988). *Ethnic identity in Hispanic and White college students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Burlingame, CA.
- Maxwell, J.A., (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. In A.M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion*, (pp. 37-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McRoy, R. G., Freeman, E. M., Logan, S., & Blackmon (1986). Cross-cultural field supervision: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 22*, 50-56.
- Miller, D., Forrest, L., & Elman, N. (2009). Training directors' conceptualizations of the intersections of diversity and trainee competence problems: A preliminary analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*, 482-518.
- Miville, M., Duan, C., Nutt, R., Waehler, C., Suzuki, L., Pistole, C., Arredondo, P., Duffy, M., Mejia, B., & Corpus, M. (2009). Integrating practice guidelines into professional training: Implications for diversity competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*, 519-563.
- Moradi, B., Mohr, J., Worthington, R., & Fassinger, R. (2009). Counseling psychology research on sexual (orientation) minority issues: Conceptual and methodological challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology 56*(1), 5-22.
- Mori, Y., Inman, A., & Caskie, G. (2009). Supervising international students: Relationship between acculturation, supervisor multicultural competence, cultural discussions, and supervision satisfaction. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, (3)1*, 10-18.
- Moss, E. (2008). The holding/containment function in supervision groups for group therapists. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 58*(2), 185-201.
- Ogren, M. L., Jonsson, C., Sundin, E. (2005). Group supervision in psychotherapy: The relationship between focus, group climate, and perceived attained skill. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(4), 373-388.
- Olk, M. E., & Friedlander, M. L. (1992). Trainees' experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 389-397.

- Pederson, P. B. (1994). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Phinney, J. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156-176.
- Phinney, J. (2000). Ethnic identity. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology*, (pp. 254-259). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ponterotto, J.G., Rieger, B. P., Barrett, A., & Sparks, R. (1994). Assessing multicultural counseling competence: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72, 316-322.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Examining the association between self-reported multicultural counseling competencies and demographic variables among counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72, 651-654.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Multicultural competencies of doctoral interns at university counseling centers: An exploratory investigation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25(4), 466-470.
- Prieto, L. R. (1996). Group supervision: still widely practiced but poorly understood. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 35, 295-307.
- Prieto, L. R. (1997). Separating group supervision from group therapy: avoiding epistemological confusion. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28(4), 405.
- Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33(3), 292-300.
- Ray, D. & Altekruze, M. (2000). Effectiveness of group supervision versus combined group and individual supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 40(1), 19-30.
- Riva, M. T., & Cornish, J. A. E. (1995). Group supervision practices at psychology predoctoral internship programs: A national survey. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26(5), 523-525.
- Riva, M.T. & Cornish, J.A.E. (2008). Group supervision practices at psychology predoctoral internship programs: 15 years later. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2(1), 18-25.

- Saarikoski, M., Warne, T., Aunio, R., & Leino-Kilpi, H. (2006). Group supervision in facilitating learning and teaching in mental health clinical placements: A case example of one student group. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 27*(3), 272-285.
- Sabnani, H. B. & Ponterotto, J. G. (1992). Racial/ethnic minority specific instrumentation in counseling research: A review, critique, and recommendations. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 24*, 161-187.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Ronnestad, M. H. (1992). Themes in therapist and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 505-515.
- Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor-complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychologists, 28*, 59-65.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 20*, 64-88.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the Culturally Diverse, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thompson, R. H. (1989). *Theories of ethnicity: A critical appraisal*. New York: Greenwood.
- Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 66-83.
- Torres-Rivera, E., Phan, L. T., Maddux, C., Wilbur, M. P., & Garrett, M. T. (2001). Process versus content: Integrating personal awareness and counseling skills to meet the multicultural challenge of the twenty-first century. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*, 28-40.
- Trimble, J. E., Helms, J. E., & Root, M. P. P. (2003). Social and psychological perspectives on ethnic and racial identity. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of Racial and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, (pp. 239-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

U.S. Department of State (2005). 7 FAM 1120 Acquisition of U.S. nationality in U.S. territories and possessions. *U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual Volume 7- Consular Affairs*.

Vander Kolk, C. (1974). The relationship of personality, values, and race to anticipation of the supervisory relationship. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 18(1)*, 41-46.

Vasquez, M. (1992). Psychologist as clinical supervisor: promoting ethical practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 23(3)*, 196-202.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision of counselors as they gain experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 63-75.

## Appendix A

### Background Questionnaire

1. My age is:
  - 22 – 25
  - 26 – 29
  - 30 – 33
  - 34 – 37
  - 38 – 41
  - 42 – 45
  - 46 – 49
  - 50 and above
  
2. My gender is:
  - Male
  - Female
  
3. Please indicate your status:
  - United States Citizen
  - International Student
  
4. My race/ethnicity is:
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Asian or Pacific Islander
  - Black or Non-Hispanic
  - Hispanic
  - White, non Hispanic
  - Non-Resident Alien
  - Multiple Racial Ethnic Groups (Please indicate what groups): \_\_\_\_\_
  
5. The highest degree completed:
  - Bachelor's Degree
  - Master's Degree

6. My year in graduate school is
- 1<sup>st</sup> Year Graduate School
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Graduate School
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Graduate School
  - 4<sup>th</sup> Year Graduate School
  - 5<sup>th</sup> Year Graduate School
  - 6<sup>th</sup> or more
7. The number of graduate courses in my graduate program/s I have taken in multiculturalism or diversity is:
- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5 or more
8. The number of trainings, seminars, or workshops on multiculturalism or diversity that I have attended is:
- 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5 or more
9. Please indicate the number of clients you have clinical experience with by ethnic groups.
- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaskan Native                           | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Pacific Islander                                   | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or Non-Hispanic                                       | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic  | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> White, non Hispanic   | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Resident Alien  | Number:_____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Ethnic Groups (Please indicate which groups):_____ | Number:_____ |

10. Approximately how many hours have you spent delivering therapeutic services to ethnic minority clients?

- 0-10
- 11-20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61-70
- 71-80
- 81-90
- 91-100
- 101 or more

## Appendix B

### Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire

Please take a moment to reflect on your experiences in group supervision, as a group member in which you were supervised by a group leader. Please keep in mind that group supervision, is supervision that is held in a group format, in which you and other externs/interns at a practicum site or internship meet with a group supervisor, typically a staff psychologist or therapist.

1. Have you participated in group supervision in a practicum or internship site within the past two years? (Please indicate yes or no.)
2. Please list three events or processes that you experienced as most helpful in your group supervision experience.
3. Please list three events or processes that you experienced as least helpful in your group supervision experience.

Now, please take a moment to reflect on your experiences in group supervision, specifically those experiences in which a multicultural event occurred. The multicultural issue should include events or discussions regarding race, ethnicity, language, gender, or sexual orientation. Please identify one group supervision experience, and keep this group in mind as you answer the following questions.

4. Did a multicultural issue/event occur in this particular group supervision experience?

Please circle:

YES

NO

**NOTE: IF YOU ANSWERED NO TO QUESTION 4, YOU MAY PROCEED TO PAGE 8. IF YOU ANSWERED YES, PLEASE CONTINUE TO QUESTION 5.**

5. Describe the most influential aspect of your group supervision experience in which a multicultural event occurred or was the main theme. Please be succinct but clear in your description.

6. What was your reaction to this event?

7. Do you feel that this specific multicultural event was a negative or positive event for yourself? (Please circle whether it was negative or positive)

POSITIVE

NEGATIVE

8. Do you feel that this specific multicultural event was a negative or positive event for the group?

POSITIVE

NEGATIVE

9. How did your group leader react to this event?

10. How did other members of the group react to this event?

11. If this was a negative event, do you have suggestions as to how this situation could have been more positive?

12. If this was a positive event, what variables of this particular group supervision experience made it a positive one for you?

13. What suggestions would you give for group leaders or supervision groups in handling multicultural issues or events in order to make them positive experiences for the group?

14. The ethnicity of my group supervisor is/was:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black or Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- White, non Hispanic
- Non-Resident Alien
- Multiple Ethnic Groups (please indicate which groups): \_\_\_\_\_

15. The number of group members, including myself, in my group supervision is/was:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more (Please indicate how many \_\_\_\_\_)

16. The ethnicity of group members is/was (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY AND INDICATE THE NUMBER OF SUPERVISEES FOR THAT ETHNIC GROUP)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native                      Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- Asian or Pacific Islander                                      Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- Black or Non-Hispanic    Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- Hispanic    Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- White, non Hispanic    Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- Non-Resident Alien    Number:\_\_\_\_\_
- Multiple Ethnic Groups (Please indicate which groups):\_\_\_\_\_                      Number:\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

### Supervisor Multicultural Competence Inventory (SMCI)

The purpose of this inventory is to measure your perceptions of your **SUPERVISOR'S** multicultural supervision competencies. For the purpose of this scale, multicultural supervision competencies refer to supervisor's awareness, knowledge, and skills related to multicultural/cross-cultural issues in supervision. For the purposes of this study, please rate your most recent primary supervisor. Please try to answer all questions to the best of your ability, even if your supervisor has not dealt directly with the issues covered in this inventory.

---

1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Always

---

**Please indicate the extent to which you believe that your supervisor:**

1. actively explores and challenges his/her own biases, values and worldview and how these issues relate to conducting supervision. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. is knowledgeable about his/her own cultural background and its influence on his/her own attitudes, values, and behaviors. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. possesses knowledge about the backgrounds, experiences, worldviews, and histories of culturally diverse groups. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. is knowledgeable about alternative helping approaches other than those based in North American and North European contexts. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. possesses knowledge and keeps informed of the theoretical and empirical literature on multicultural counseling and multicultural supervision. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. is knowledgeable about the limitations of traditional therapies with diverse clientele, such as women, racial/ethnic minorities and gay and lesbian clients. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. facilitates the exploration of supervisees' identity development (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation). 1 2 3 4 5 6

1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Very Often	6 Always
8.	facilitates supervisees' exploration of values, attitudes, biases and behaviors and their impact on working with diverse clients.				1 2 3 4 5 6
9.	helps supervisees' understand the impact of social structures on supervisee and client behavior, including how class, gender, sexual orientation and racial privilege may benefit the supervisee.				1 2 3 4 5 6
10.	encourages supervisees' to participate in activities (e.g., support groups, reading groups, attendance at conferences and professional organizations) that foster multicultural competencies.				1 2 3 4 5 6
11.	facilitates supervisee's understanding of the impact of racism, oppression, and discrimination on client's lives in order to minimize client victimization and the pathologizing of client issues.				1 2 3 4 5 6
12.	facilitates supervisees' understanding of both individual and contextual factors in clients' lives.				1 2 3 4 5 6
13.	facilitates supervisees' understanding of culture-specific norms, as well as heterogeneity within groups.				1 2 3 4 5 6
14.	encourages supervisees' to discuss clients' individual, group, and universal identities in case conceptualizations.				1 2 3 4 5 6
15.	promotes supervisees' understanding of how stereotyping influences case conceptualizations, treatment objectives, and choice of interventions.				1 2 3 4 5 6
16.	discusses with supervisees' the implications of an over-reliance or under-reliance on cultural explanations for psychological difficulties.				1 2 3 4 5 6
17.	helps supervisees' explore alternative explanations to traditional theoretical perspectives.				1 2 3 4 5 6

1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Very Often	6 Always
18. explores with supervisees' the limitations and cultural biases of traditional psychological assessment.					1 2 3 4 5 6
19. trains supervisees' in multiple methods of assessment.					1 2 3 4 5 6
20. models and trains supervisees' in a variety of verbal and nonverbal helping responses.					1 2 3 4 5 6
21. encourages supervisee's flexibility with regard to traditional interventions and the use of alternative therapeutic interventions (e.g., group participation, indigenous helping networks).					1 2 3 4 5 6
22. encourages supervisees' to gain knowledge of community resources that may benefit clients.					1 2 3 4 5 6
23. assists in helping supervisees' develop client advocacy skills.					1 2 3 4 5 6
24. encourages supervisees' to collaborate with clients in the identification of therapeutic goals and objectives.					1 2 3 4 5 6
25. assists supervisees' in identifying when an appropriate referral to an outside resource or to another counselor may be necessary.					1 2 3 4 5 6
26. is honest about his/her own biases and struggles to achieve cultural competence.					1 2 3 4 5 6
27. is able to competently and effectively work with culturally diverse supervisees.					1 2 3 4 5 6
28. fosters a climate that facilitates discussion of diversity issues related to counseling.					1 2 3 4 5 6
29. models respect for diversity with supervisee's and clients.					1 2 3 4 5 6
30. uses power constructively in supervision (e.g., jointly establishes objectives and criteria for supervisee performance; develops mechanisms for feedback regarding performance of supervisees' and self; handles supervisees' self-disclosure with respect and sensitivity).					1 2 3 4 5 6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Always
31. attends to and processes issues related to power dynamics between self and supervisee and supervisee and client.					1 2 3 4 5 6
32. provides ongoing evaluation of supervisees' strengths and weaknesses in the area of multicultural counseling.					1 2 3 4 5 6
33. is familiar with instruments that assess multicultural counseling competence.					1 2 3 4 5 6
34. recommends appropriate remedial training to supervisees' who do not demonstrate multicultural counseling competence.					1 2 3 4 5 6

## Appendix D

### The Supervision Questionnaire

(IN THESE QUESTIONS, PLEASE THINK OF THE GROUP SUPERVISION EXPERIENCE YOU WERE THINKING ABOUT WHILE ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS FROM THE *GROUP SUPERVISION MULTICULTURAL CRITICAL EVENTS QUESTIONNAIRE*.)

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

1	2	3	4
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor

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

1	2	4	4
No, definitely not	No, not really	Yes, generally	Yes, definitely

3. To what extent did this group supervision fit your needs?

4	3	2	1
Almost all my needs have been met	Most of my needs have been met	Only a few of my needs have been met	None of my needs have been met

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

1	2	3	4
No, definitely not	No, I don't think so	Yes, I think so	Yes, definitely

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

1	2	3	4
Quite satisfied	Indifferent or Mildly satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Very satisfied

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

4	3	2	1
Yes, definitely	Yes, generally	No, not really	No, definitely

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

4	3	2	1
Very satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Indifferent or mildly dissatisfied	Quite dissatisfied

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

1	2	3	4
No, definitely not	No, I don't think so	Yes, I think so	Yes, definitely

## Appendix E

### The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

**(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree**

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

8. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

10. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

Appendix F

The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R)

Rating Scale: 1 = strongly disagree      4 = slightly agree  
                  2 = disagree                      5 = agree  
                  3 = slightly disagree        6 = strongly agree

PLEASE NOTE: ON THIS SURVEY, SUPERVISEE REFERS TO YOU. PLEASE  
FILL OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT YOURSELF.

1. Supervisee is aware of his or her own cultural heritage.

1      2      3      4      5      6

2. Supervisee values and respects cultural differences.

1      2      3      4      5      6

3. Supervisee is aware of how own values might affect this client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

4. Supervisee is comfortable with differences between counselor and client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

5. Supervisee is willing to suggest referral when cultural differences are extensive.

1      2      3      4      5      6

6. Supervisee understands the current sociopolitical system and its impact on the client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

7. Supervisee demonstrates knowledge about client's culture.

1      2      3      4      5      6

8. Supervisee has a clear understanding of counseling and therapy process.

1      2      3      4      5      6

Rating Scale: 1 = strongly disagree      4 = slightly agree  
                  2 = disagree                      5 = agree  
                  3 = slightly disagree            6 = strongly agree

9. Supervisee is aware of institutional barriers which might affect client's circumstances.

1      2      3      4      5      6

10. Supervisee elicits a variety of verbal and nonverbal responses from the client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

11. Supervisee accurately sends and receives a variety of verbal and nonverbal messages.

1      2      3      4      5      6

12. Supervisee is able to suggest institutional intervention skills that favor the client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

13. Supervisee sends messages that are appropriate to the communication of the client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

14. Supervisee attempts to perceive the presenting problem within the context of the client's cultural experience, values, and/or lifestyle.

1      2      3      4      5      6

15. Supervisee presents his or her own values to the client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

16. Supervisee is at ease talking with this client.

1      2      3      4      5      6

Rating Scale: 1 = strongly disagree      4 = slightly agree  
                  2 = disagree                      5 = agree  
                  3 = slightly disagree         6 = strongly agree

17. Supervisee recognizes those limits determined by the cultural differences between client and counselor.

1      2      3      4      5      6

18. Supervisee appreciates the client's social status as an ethnic minority.

1      2      3      4      5      6

19. Supervisee is aware of the professional and ethical responsibilities of a counselor.

1      2      3      4      5      6

20. Supervisee acknowledges and is comfortable with cultural differences.

1      2      3      4      5      6

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

## Appendix G

### Semi-Structured Telephone Interview

The following questions will be asked during the qualitative telephone interviews:

1. For the particular group supervision experience that you discussed in the questionnaire that pertained to a multicultural critical event: in what type of setting did this group supervision take place?
2. In your description, you stated that (will summarize their helpful/unhelpful experiences in group supervision/the multicultural event that occurred). Can you tell me more about this event?
3. If the event that occurred was not discussed, why do you think it wasn't?
4. What made it a positive experience (if positive)?
5. What would you have suggested for your group leader or group members to make this a positive experience?
6. In your opinion what kinds of suggestions would you make to effectively process multicultural issues in group supervision?
7. An issue that has come up in other phone interviews is that of training of supervisors. There is a possibility that when supervisors were trained, diversity issues weren't as prevalent as they are now. What are your thoughts? \*\*
8. How important are these variables to effectively process multicultural issues on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being not important at all to 7 being extremely important:  
self-awareness \_\_\_\_\_  
general knowledge about multicultural issues \_\_\_\_\_  
multicultural counseling efficacy \_\_\_\_\_  
understanding of unique client variables \_\_\_\_\_  
building an effective working alliance \_\_\_\_\_  
addressing multicultural counseling skills \_\_\_\_\_

\*\* Added to telephone interview after preliminary analysis of interviews.

## Appendix H

### Participant Informed Consent for Surveys

You are invited to participate in a study that will explore the multicultural critical incidents that may occur in group supervision. The title of this study is “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” The study is being conducted by Jacqueline Moreno, M.A., who can be reached by phone at 512-751-5102 or email [jmoreno2@du.edu](mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu). This project is being done to fulfill the dissertation requirement for the Ph.D. program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Denver. This project is supervised by Dr. Maria Riva, Counseling Psychology Program, University of Denver, 303-871-2484, [mriva@du.edu](mailto:mriva@du.edu).

Participation in this study should take no longer than approximately 60 minutes of your time. Participation will involve completing a demographic information form, a questionnaire regarding your experience with group supervision, 34 items about your supervisor’s multicultural competence, 8 items regarding supervision satisfaction, 15 items regarding your racial identity, and 20 items about your own multicultural competence. There is also an opportunity for you to discuss the group supervision you will describe in the questionnaires. Please see the following Informed Consent Form for information regarding this. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue your participation at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate in this study, anonymity and confidentiality is promised. By signing this consent form, you are complying with the following statement:

“I understand that there are two exceptions to the promise of confidentiality. If information is revealed concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities. In addition, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order of subpoena.”

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the process, please contact Dr. Dennis Whitmore, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-2496, or Sylk Sotto, Office of Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052, or write a letter to either the University of Denver, Office of Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO, 80208-2121. (Attached is a copy of this consent form for your records)

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language

that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form. By participating in the online survey at SurveyMonkey.com or by returning the completed survey, I am agreeing to participation in this study.

If you would like to be entered into a drawing for a \$50 gift certificate to Best Buy please email the researcher at [jmoreno2@du.edu](mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu) with the title of the email being "Survey Drawing". Please include your name and address for the gift certificate to be mailed to.

## Appendix I

### Informed Consent for Telephone Interviews

You are invited to participate in a study that will explore the multicultural critical incidents that may occur in group supervision. The title of this study is “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” The study is being conducted by Jacqueline Moreno, M.A., who can be reached by phone at 512-751-5102 or email [jmoreno2@du.edu](mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu). This project is being done to fulfill the dissertation requirement for the Ph.D. program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Denver. This project is supervised by Dr. Maria Riva, Counseling Psychology Program, University of Denver, 303-871-2484, [mriva@du.edu](mailto:mriva@du.edu).

The second part of this study involves a qualitative, semi-structured telephone interview to discuss more in depth about the multicultural critical event you have experienced in group supervision. If you are willing to be interviewed by telephone, please include your information at the end of this form. If more than the number of people needed for interviews respond, participants will be chosen randomly from the group of individuals that have agreed to participate in the interview. The telephone interview will take no longer than 60 minutes. If you are interested, please complete your name, telephone number, and email at the end of this consent form.

The risks associated with this project are minimal. If however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue your participation at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate in this study, anonymity and confidentiality is promised. By signing this consent form, you are complying with the following statement:

“I understand that there are two exceptions to the promise of confidentiality. If information is revealed concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities. In addition, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order of subpoena.”

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the process, please contact Dr. Dennis Whitmore, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-2496, or Sylk Sotto, Office of Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052, or write a letter to either the University of Denver, Office of Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO, 80208-2121. (Attached is a copy of this consent form for your records)

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this interview and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

All participants that complete the telephone interview will receive a \$20 gift certificate to Barnes and Noble Bookstores.

I am willing \_\_\_\_\_ / I am not willing \_\_\_\_\_, to volunteer to participate in a qualitative telephone interview to further discuss the multicultural critical event experienced in group supervision that I have written about.

Please print your name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please write the best telephone number to contact you at: \_\_\_\_\_

Please write your email address to contact you to set up an interview time:

---

## Appendix J

### Participant Informed Consent for Pilot Study

You are invited to participate in a pilot study that will explore the multicultural critical incidents that may occur in group supervision. The title of this study is “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” The study is being conducted by Jacqueline Moreno, M.A., who can be reached by phone at 512-751-5102 or email [jmoreno2@du.edu](mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu). This project is being done to fulfill the dissertation requirement for the Ph.D. program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Denver. This project is supervised by Dr. Maria Riva, Counseling Psychology Program, University of Denver, 303-871-2484, [mriva@du.edu](mailto:mriva@du.edu).

Participation in this study should take no longer than approximately 60 minutes of your time. Participation will involve reading and responding to a questionnaire regarding your experience with group supervision, and reading and responding to a list of questions that will be used for a telephone interview. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue your participation at any time. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate in this study, confidentiality is promised. By signing this consent form, you are complying with the following statement:

“I understand that there are two exceptions to the promise of confidentiality. If information is revealed concerning suicide, homicide, or child abuse and neglect, it is required by law that this be reported to the proper authorities. In addition, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order of subpoena.”

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the process, please contact Dr. Dennis Whitmore, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at 303-871-2496, or Sylk Sotto, Office of Sponsored Programs at 303-871-4052, or write a letter to either the University of Denver, Office of Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO, 80208-2121. (Attached is a copy of this consent form for your records)

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called “Multicultural Events Within Group Supervision: Minority Supervisees’ Experiences and Overall Satisfaction.” I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

## Appendix K

### Letter to Participants

Jacqueline R. Moreno  
2300 Town Gate  
San Antonio, TX 78238  
Telephone: (512) 751-5102  
Email: [jmoreno2@du.edu](mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu)

August 20, 2007

Dear Participant,

My name is Jackie Moreno and I am a doctoral student in the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Denver. I am interested in studying group supervision, particularly the manner in which multicultural events occur. A multicultural event is a critical event that inferred a meaningful emotional or behavioral interpersonal experience impacting group satisfaction. This study has been designed with the objective to determine, with your help, the effective practices of discussing multicultural issues in group supervision, from the perspectives of ethnically diverse individuals. Research looking at group supervision has increased in the past decade, yet there is very little information regarding how multicultural issues are discussed. Even less is information regarding ethnically diverse individuals involved in group supervision. Many graduate students are involved in group supervision as part of their training. As minority participation in graduate programs increases, there is an amplified need to understand multicultural group supervision.

Participation in this anonymous questionnaire is optional. There is no penalty or negative consequence if you choose not to complete the questionnaires. However, if you do choose to participate, your responses will help training directors and group supervision leaders to better understand the process of discussing multicultural issues in group and working with ethnic minority supervisees within group supervision.

It will take you approximately thirty minutes to one hour to fill out all questionnaires. At the completion of the last questionnaire, you will be asked to volunteer to participate in a confidential telephone interview. Again, your participation in this telephone interview is strictly voluntary and you will not be penalized for not volunteering. The information gathered from these telephone interviews will be used to design a theoretical model for group leaders to use in discussing multicultural issues in group supervision of practicum/internship students.

The individuals that will have access to my raw data include myself, the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Maria Riva, and a graduate student assistant.

Thank you for your time and participation,

Jacqueline Moreno, M.A.  
Doctoral Candidate  
University of Denver

## Appendix L

### Updated Email to Program Directors

Dear Training Director,

Please excuse me as this is my second request for research participants. I need additional students in order to complete my dissertation study. Please consider sending this to students/interns of color, who are U.S. Citizens, and have participated in supervision in a group format in the last two years. Your help is greatly appreciated. If you have students that meet these criteria, please send the following to them.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jackie

(Please see Appendix M for Letter to Students that followed this letter to Training Directors)

## Appendix M

### Revised Recruitment Letter to Students

Dear Student,

My name is Jackie Moreno and I am a doctoral student in the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Denver. I need your help. I am looking for graduate students who are:

- **Ethnic Minority Students who are U.S. Citizens; and**
- **Have participated in supervision in a group format in the last two years.**

**If you meet these criteria, please consider following this link to complete my online survey:**

[http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=GhWzO3jpec\\_2f\\_2fuZN2rBJxkw\\_3d\\_3d](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=GhWzO3jpec_2f_2fuZN2rBJxkw_3d_3d)

If you have already completed this survey, thank you so much. I am collecting data on an important topic on multicultural group supervision. The results of this study may help training directors and group supervisors understand effective practices of discussing multicultural issues in group supervision, from the perspectives of ethnic minority individuals.

It will take you approximately 30 to 40 minutes to fill out all questionnaires. At the end of the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter yourself in a drawing for the chance to win a **\$50 gift card to Best Buy** (2 will be given out).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jacqueline R. Moreno, M.A.  
Doctoral Candidate- Counseling Psychology  
University of Denver  
512.751.5102  
jmoreno2@du.edu

This study was approved by the University of Denver's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research on November 12, 2007.

## Appendix N

### IRB Letter of Approval

From	<a href="mailto:ssottosa@du.edu">ssottosa@du.edu</a>
Sent	Monday, November 12, 2007 8:48 am
To	<a href="mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu">jmoreno2@du.edu</a>
Cc	
Bcc	
Subject	Protocol approved, Jacqueline Moreno 2007-0340

The following human subjects protocol application has been approved by the IRB, effective 11/12/2007.

Protocol Director: Jacqueline Moreno

Protocol Title: Multicultural Events in Group Supervision: Minority Experiences and Supervision Satisfaction

Protocol Number: 2007-0340

Submission include Letter to Participants, References, Background Questionnaire, Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire, Semi-Structured Phone Interview, The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised, The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, The Supervision Questionnaire

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has reviewed the above named project. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol for a period of 12 months.

Please add the following information to any consent forms, surveys, questionnaires, invitation letters, etc you will use in your research as follows: This survey (consent, study, etc.) was approved by the University of Denver's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research on (today's date). This information must be updated on a yearly basis, upon continuation of your IRB approval for as long as the research continues. We will be sending you a continuation/renewal email reminder as this expiration date approaches.

The Institutional Review Board appreciates your cooperation in protecting subjects and ensuring that each subject gives a meaningful consent to participate in research projects. If you have any questions regarding your obligations under the Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact Sylk Sotto-Santiago.

## Appendix O

### IRB Renewal Letter of Approval

From	<a href="mailto:ssottosa@du.edu">ssottosa@du.edu</a>
Sent	Monday, November 3, 2008 9:21 am
To	<a href="mailto:jmoreno2@du.edu">jmoreno2@du.edu</a>
Subject	Protocol approved, Jacqueline Moreno 2007-0340

The following human subjects protocol application has been approved by the IRB, effective 11/03/2008.

Protocol Director: Jacqueline Moreno

Protocol Title: Multicultural Events in Group Supervision: Minority Experiences and Supervision Satisfaction

Protocol Number: 2007-0340

Submission include Letter to Participants, References, Background Questionnaire, Group Supervision Multicultural Critical Events Questionnaire, Semi-Structured Phone Interview, The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised, The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, The Supervision Questionnaire

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has reviewed the above named project. The project has been approved for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol for a period of 12 months.

This information must be updated on a yearly basis, upon continuation of your IRB approval for as long as the research continues. Please submit any changes, revisions and unanticipated events reports in a prompt manner. We will be sending you a continuation/renewal email reminder as this expiration date approaches.

The Institutional Review Board appreciates your cooperation in protecting subjects and ensuring that each subject gives a meaningful consent to participate in research projects. If you have any questions regarding your obligations under the Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact Sylk Sotto-Santiago.

#### Approval Letters:

You may find your approval letter on eprotocol as well. Your IRB application will now be listed under protocols approved. Select the protocol ID of interest and open in view mode. On the left menu, please select "Event History", the approval letter link should be available.