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DEDICATION

“It is the mark of an educated mind to be able to entertain a thought without accepting it.”             - Aristotle

“Spiritual maturity is a life-long process of replacing lies with truth.”         - Kurt Burner

“The significant problems we have cannot be solved at the same level of thinking with which we created them.” - Albert Einstein

To the divine lights emanating through the darkness in search of truth and love, I dedicate this document in hopes of adding to the illuminated journey towards peace and understanding.
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ABSTRACT

This study is an investigation of the relationship between the cultural competency of counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their supervisees. This study is a quantitative analysis of the correlations between the variables of cultural competency, satisfaction with supervision, and supervisee ethnicity and supervisee gender. The chapters of this dissertation present an introduction to the study, a review of the relevant and related literature, and the research methodology that was utilized to conduct the study, together with results and discussions.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is an investigation of the relationship between the cultural competency of counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their supervisees. This study is a quantitative analysis of the correlations between the variables of cultural competency, satisfaction with supervision, and supervisee ethnicity and supervisee gender. The chapters of this dissertation present an introduction to the study, a review of the relevant and related literature, and the research methodology that was utilized to conduct the study, together with results and discussions.

In Chapter One, a general overview and introduction of the study’s purpose, conceptual framework, limitations and delimitations, and definition of terms are presented. The researcher’s assumptions and research question are introduced in this chapter.

Background

The importance of training counselors in the area of cultural competence in order to meet the needs of clients from diverse cultures has been highlighted in the literature (Cook, 1994; Constantine, 2001; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996). Researchers have concluded that cultural competence is an imperative component of effective supervision. The supervisory relationship, along with classroom instruction, is the primary source for development of a counselor identity which includes cultural competence (Cook, 1994). Within the supervisory relationship,
supervisors should help counselors-in-training develop personal awareness in both multicultural and general counseling skills (Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001).

The literature suggests that a competent supervisor lays the foundation for the supervisee to develop competence in the profession. The supervisory relationship is the basis for much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor (Muratori, 2000; Norrie, Eggleston, & Ringer, 2003). Counseling supervisors need to have the skills of cultural awareness and competency (Gatmon et al., 2001). Parallel process theory suggests that dynamics of the supervisor, which include cultural competence, are taught to the supervisee who in turn counsels the client. It is through the supervisory relationship that issues of culture can begin to be addressed (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Personal insight and growth in a supervisor often lead to more effective practitioners for the counseling profession as the supervisors transfer these skills to their supervisees (Constantine, 2001). Supervision that does not include a cultural context is inadequate at best, or is simply ineffective (Constantine, 1997).

Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) reported that supervisees who were "instructed" by their supervisors to focus on cross-cultural issues with clients were better equipped to empathize and connect with clients of different cultural backgrounds than supervisees who did not receive such instruction. Hilton, Russell, and Salmi (1995) found that level of supervisor support significantly influenced supervisees' evaluations of supervision. Teaching supervisees to look at culture as an integral, non-defining part of the whole client may be challenging when the terms culture, race, and ethnicity seem to be interchangeable (Cook, 1994).
Cook and Helms (1988) found that perceived liking by the supervisor accounted for 70% of supervisee satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision. Supervisors who discuss cross-cultural issues with their supervisees model appropriate and competent behavior for their supervisees to emulate in their work with their clients. Supervisors’ cultural competence is evidenced by their ability to effectively and professionally address issues of culture within the supervisory relationship (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) found that supervisees who were supervised by a person of Color reported higher levels of perceived multicultural counseling competence than did supervisees with a White supervisor. It has been suggested that the White counselor is likely to inherit the racial and cultural biases of his or her forebears (Corvin & Wiggins, 1989). According to Breaux (2004), White male supervisors find it difficult to discuss differences in personal culture due to lack of awareness and social obligation to define their cultural values.

Culture extends beyond race and ethnicity. Cultural competence includes other many variables including gender. Researchers have found that supervisees are treated differently based on various traits including gender (Gatmon et al., 2001; Granello, Beamish, & Davis, 1997; Jeanquart-Barone, 1996). Usually, males receive more opportunities for autonomous experience during their training (Jeanquart-Barone, 1996). The supervisor may continue to encourage certain behaviors that fulfill gender expectations in Western society. Nelson and Holloway (2000) suggested that supervisors ought to develop awareness of their own biases concerning gender and expectations of supervisees.
Breaux (2004) conducted a qualitative analysis of White male supervisors’ perceptions of culture within the supervisory relationship. Major themes that emerged from this study were the cultural variables of values and experiences. Culture, as reported by the study participants, can be defined as an individual characteristic that is employed to interact with other individuals as one navigates through society. This unique definition may be attributable to the fact that White male supervisors have long been excluded from the discussion of culture. This study was designed to further examine the roles that cultural competency, ethnicity, and gender play in supervisee satisfaction with supervision.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their supervisees. Minimal research has been published addressing the cultural dynamics of White males as counselor supervisors. Competency is fundamental to effective counseling, and this competency is fostered through supervision. This study investigated the extent to which White males, who have traditionally been excluded from the cultural discussion, are culturally competent in the supervisory relationship and also explored the relationship between supervisor cultural competency and supervisee satisfaction with supervision.

In the field of counseling, supervision is a very important means of monitoring, instructing, and facilitating professional skill development in supervisees. The quality of the supervisory relationship is largely dependent on the knowledge base and professional
skills of the supervisor. This relationship is the basis for much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor. This study was intended to address the gap in the literature regarding the impact of supervisors’ cultural awareness and competence levels on their supervisee’s development of these normative skills.

**Conceptual Framework**

*Multicultural Counseling Competencies*

Cultural competency in counseling has been a rapidly developing area for the past 25 years. Multicultural counseling competence refers to preparation and practices that integrate multicultural and culture-specific awareness, knowledge, and skills into counseling interactions (Arredondo, et al., 1996). In 1991, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) developed a document outlining the need and rationale for a multicultural perspective in counseling (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Using the AMCD’s document as a guideline, Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis developed the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCC) as a standard by which the counseling profession could evaluate, train, and conduct research.

The Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCC) provide three areas of competency that counselors are encouraged to develop increase their cultural awareness. According to the American Counseling Association (1992), these competency areas are *Counselor Awareness of Own Cultural Values and Biases, Counselor Awareness of Clients’ Worldview, and Culturally Appropriate Intervention Strategies*. Each of the competency areas is divided into specific recommendations to improve counselor *Attitudes and Beliefs, Knowledge, and Skills*. It is believed that by gaining cultural
awareness, counselors will become more competent practitioners with clients from diverse and similar backgrounds (Arredondo et al., 1996).

Sue et al. (1992) published a call to the counseling profession that outlined the Multicultural Counseling Competences (MCC) and encouraged implementation of the MCC and standards. Sue et al. proposed that AMCD and other professional counseling organizations immediately set up a plan to advocate for the adoption of the MCC in accreditation criteria and for the competencies to eventually become a standard for curriculum reform in graduate schools of counseling and other helping professions. In developing the MCC, Sue et al. relied heavily upon the works of the 1982 Division of Counseling Psychology - Position Paper: Cross-cultural Counseling Competencies (Sue et al.). The counseling profession heeded the challenge presented in this publication to increase sensitivity and professional development in the area of multicultural training and research: AMCD revised the MCC and in 1995 provided additional clarification to the revised competencies and specified enabling criteria for compliance (Arredondo et al., 1996).

**Research Question**

The research question for this study is:

Does a relationship exist between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees?

Specific hypotheses associated with this question are presented in Chapter Three.
Assumptions of the Study

The basic assumptions of the study were:

1. The participants of this study would respond honestly to items on the survey instruments and demographic questionnaire.

2. The instruments used, the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003) and The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996) are valid and measure what they purport to measure.

Limitations and Delimitations

Potential limitations of this study were:

1. White male supervisors and the supervisees who participate in this study may be different from those who chose not to participate. This would limit the generalizability of the results of the study.

2. Supervisees are asked to rate their satisfaction with supervision. Other factors in addition to supervisor cultural competence may affect the supervisees’ satisfaction with supervision.

The delimitations of this study were:

1. This study was delimited to White male counseling supervisors in doctoral level programs and their master’s-level supervisees.

2. The participants in this study were selected from CACREP-accredited programs. Thus, the results are not generalizable to non-CACREP-accredited programs.
Definition of Terms

Cross-cultural

For the purposes of this study, cross-cultural was defined as an interaction between individuals with different cultural variables (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001)

Culture

For the purposes of this study, culture was defined as a standard by which members of a particular group who share ethnicity, age, race, gender, socio-economic status, political membership, family constellation, sexual orientation, regional residence, professional identity, or other characteristics conduct themselves.

Cultural Competence

For the purposes of this study, cultural competence was defined as the knowledge and understanding of a specific culture that enables an individual to effectively communicate and function within that culture. This usually entails details regarding language and metalanguage, values and customs, symbols and worldviews (Mio, Trimble, Arredondo, Cheatham, & Sue, 1999).

Multicultural

For the purposes of this study, the term multicultural encompasses a recognition that all people are members of various cultural groups and simultaneously share values and beliefs inherent to certain ethnic, age, racial, gender, socio-economic, political, familial, sexual orientation, regional, and professional groups.
Multicultural Counseling Competencies

For the purposes of this study, multicultural counseling competencies were defined as the awareness, knowledge, and skills of various cultural traits and values a counseling professional or supervisor appropriately utilizes to provide services to a client or supervisee.

Parallel Process

For the purposes of this study, parallel process was defined as the phenomenon of the client or of the client-therapist relationship being mirrored in the supervisee or in the supervisee-supervisor relationship, or vice versa.

Racial Identity Development

For the purposes of this study, racial identity development was the nonlinear process of social self-actualization experienced by members of a society when the social construct of race is used to prescribe specific values and traits for members who share certain biological traits.

Satisfaction with Supervision

For the purposes of this study, satisfaction with supervision was defined as the approval of supervisees with the overall management and guidance they have received from their supervisor as a function of the professional relationship of supervision.

Supervision

For the purposes of this study, supervision was defined as an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member of that same profession. It is a relationship that is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior
member, monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the client(s) seen, and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In Chapter Two, the literature is reviewed in the areas of cultural competence, supervision, and supervisee satisfaction with counseling supervision. This chapter also provides an overview of the impact of gender and ethnicity on satisfaction with culturally competent supervision. White racial identity development theory is reviewed to provide a context for an examination of the literature on the role of White male supervisors in counseling. The chapter concludes with a critique of the literature.

Cultural Competence in Counseling

Our society is growing into a multiracial, multilingual, and multicultural civilization (Sue & Sue, 1999). This is a shift in reality for a society that was founded on and has functioned through monocultural values of its dominant members. According to Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992), by the year 2010, racial and ethnic minorities will become a numerical majority, with White Americans constituting less than half of the population. Because of the increasing cultural diversity of the U.S. population, supervisors who have not been trained to address cultural issues in supervision must develop appropriate competencies in this area (Constantine, 2001).

Cultural competence is an explicit awareness of one’s cultural values and beliefs (Sue & Sue, 1999). Counselors have an ethical responsibility to be trained and competent
in their work with various racial and ethnic groups (Herlihy & Watson, 2004). The effective training of counselors includes the development of cultural competence and insight. Counselor training is the means by which culture is taught to be valued or ignored within the counseling relationship (Sue & Sue, 1999). “To conceptualize clients from within a multicultural framework, a multiculturally competent counselor would presumably be adept at understanding and integrating the impact of racial factors on clients' presenting problems and would know how to provide relevant treatment for these problems” (Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997, p.285). It is very difficult, if not impossible, for a supervisor to teach a supervisee a concept that the supervisor does not know or understand, or has not experienced directly. The impact of the supervisory relationship on the cultural awareness and social conscience of the supervisee is influenced by the attitudes modeled by the supervisor (Cook & Helms, 1988). Cultural competency is imperative for effective counseling and training.

**Multicultural Counseling Competencies**

Cultural competency in counseling has been the focus of increasing attention over the past 12 years. Multicultural counseling competence refers to preparation and practices that integrate multicultural and culture-specific awareness, knowledge, and skills into counseling interactions (Arredondo et al., 1996). In 1991, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) developed a document outlining the need and rationale for a multicultural perspective in counseling (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Using the AMCD’s document as a guideline, Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis developed the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCC) as a set of standards by which the counseling profession could evaluate, train, and conduct research.
Sue et al. (1992) published a call to the counseling profession that outlined the Multicultural Counseling Competences (MCC) and encouraged implementation of the MCC and standards. They proposed that AMCD and other professional counseling organizations immediately set up a plan to advocate for the adoption of the MCC in accreditation criteria and that the MCC eventually become the standard for curriculum reform in graduate schools of counseling and other helping professions. In developing the MCC, Sue et al. relied heavily upon the 1982 Division of Counseling Psychology - Position Paper: Cross-cultural Counseling Competencies. The counseling profession has begun to heed the challenge to increase sensitivity and professional development in the area of multicultural training and research. In 1995, the AMCD revised the MCC, provided additional clarification to the revised competencies, and specified enabling criteria for compliance (Arredondo et al., 1996).

The MCC are considered a standard of conduct in the counseling profession (Arredondo et al., 1996). Organizations such as the American Counseling Association (ACA) and AMCD have begun the process of incorporating the competencies into a framework for effective counseling. Herlihy and Watson (2004) stated that cultural competence is a requirement for counselors to work ethically with clients from culturally diverse backgrounds. Counselors who fail to attend to culture as an aspect of counseling are unable to truly empower the client (Vontress & Jackson, 2004).

**Supervision**

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) defined supervision as an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member of that same profession. Supervision is a professional relationship that is evaluative, extends over time, and has
the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior
member, monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the client(s) seen, and
serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession (Bernard &
Goodyear). In the counseling profession, supervision is a critical means of monitoring,
instructing, and facilitating the professional skill development of prospective counselors.
Successful outcomes of supervision are dependent in large measure on the knowledge
base and professional skills of the supervisor. Supervisees, who are developing their
counselor identity, do not place the same value on skills and sound therapeutic techniques
for which the profession of counseling has been noted (Furr & Carroll, 2003). Much of
what it means to be a counselor is modeled and directly taught by the supervisor. A
competent supervisor often lays the foundation for the supervisee to develop competence
in the profession. The supervisory relationship is the basis, to a significant extent, for
much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor (Muratori, 2000;
Norrie, Eggleston, & Ringer, 2003).

Priest (1994) clearly stated that the supervisory relationship is affected by the
competency level of the supervisor. However, there is a lack of research that investigates
whether and how supervisee satisfaction and supervisor cultural competence are related.
Counseling supervisors need to have cultural awareness and competency (Gatmon et al.,
2001). Counselor supervisors may be crucial catalysts in encouraging attention to cultural
issues in their supervisees’ counseling relationships. The values shared within the
supervisory relationship are usually the same values that counselors share with their
clients in the counseling relationship. This parallel process in supervision is the training
ground for effective counseling interactions in the counseling relationship.
A major concern expressed throughout the literature is that many supervisors have not had training to identify culturally relevant issues within the supervision process (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). Opening a dialogue about racial-ethnic issues, for instance, initially may be somewhat uncomfortable for the participants in the supervisory relationship. However, supervision that does not include a cultural context is inadequate at best, or is simply ineffective (Constantine, 1997). Such supervision does not take into account the whole of the supervisee, supervisor, or their unshared and shared phenomenology. Failing to discuss cultural issues in supervision may lead to miscommunications, misunderstandings, "hidden" agendas, assumptions, and disconnections between supervisors and supervisees (Constantine, 2001). Neglecting cross-cultural issues within the supervisory relationship may lead to the supervisor being perceived by the supervisee as culturally insensitive and professionally ineffective (Helms & Cook, 1999).

Within the supervisory relationship, supervisors should help counselors-in-training develop personal awareness in both multicultural and general counseling skills (Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001). It is the supervisor who models within the supervisory relationship the attitudes, beliefs, and values a professional counselor should have. Personal insight and growth in supervisors often lead to more effective practitioners for the counseling profession as the supervisors transfer these skills to their supervisees (Constantine, 2001). Cook (1994) reported that the supervisor who does not address culture as a reality of the supervisory relationship often inhibits the development of the supervisee’s cultural competency.
**Parallel Process**

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) defined parallel process as the phenomenon of the client-therapist relationship being mirrored in the supervisee-supervisor relationship or vice versa. Parallel process is unique to clinical supervision. Supervisees bring the impasse of their counseling relationships to the supervisory relationship through their lack of awareness, knowledge, or skill. Parallel process also accounts for supervision dynamics that are emulated in the counseling session. Parallel process theory suggests that dynamics of the supervisor, which include cultural competence, are taught to the supervisee who in turn counsels the client. It is through the supervisory relationship that issues of culture can begin to be addressed (Bernard & Goodyear). Bernard and Goodyear emphasized the need to explore the impact of racial diversity/similarity in the supervisory dyad as well as "the willingness of the supervisor to open the cultural door and walk through it with the supervisee" (Gatmon et al.).

**Satisfaction with Supervision**

Cook and Helms (1988) reported that racial and ethnic minority supervisees' perceptions of their supervisors' liking and positive feelings for them were significant predictors of supervisees' satisfaction with supervision. This satisfaction is important in determining how open the supervisee will be to learning from the supervisor. Cook and Helms (1988) found that perceived liking by the supervisor accounted for 70% of supervisee satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision. Supervisors, discussing cross-cultural issues with their supervisees, model appropriate and competent behavior for supervisees to emulate in their work with their clients. Supervisors who fail to address
culture within the supervision process may create a situation of resentment, resistance, and frustration for their supervisees (Constantine, 2001; Hilton, et al., 1995).

Cook (1994) reported that most supervisees withhold information from their supervisors and censor what they bring to supervision when they feel there is a lack of open communication in the supervisory relationship. Ladany, Hill, Corbett, and Nutt (1996) found that supervisees who were less satisfied with their supervisory experience tended to be less open with corrective feedback towards their supervisors. Low satisfaction rating also correlated to the supervisee reporting a poor supervisory alliance, supervisor incompetence, and political suicide as reasons for nondisclosure. The researchers stated that supervisees' nondisclosures seemed to be directly related to the supervisees' perception of the quality of supervision and the extent to which supervision fit their needs and facilitated their development as counselors. Nondisclosures may have negative consequences for clients because supervisees whose supervision needs are not met tend to have a more difficult time working with challenging client issues (Ladany et al.).

Pederson (2000) offered practical suggestions for training and opening a dialogue about cultural based differences between supervisor and supervisee in his Triad Model for Multicultural Counselor Training. In this model, there is a three-way interaction among the client, the counselor, and the problem. When used as a training tool, the model suggests that supervisors teach supervisees four strategies to conceptualize the problem from the client’s worldview. First, supervisees must learn to articulate the therapeutic issues from the client’s cultural perspective, not from their own worldviews. Identification and confrontation of any resistance in the therapeutic relationship is the
next step, which leads to greater understanding as defenses are torn down, allowing for
greater growth and development of the supervisee’s counselor identity. Supervisees must
learn how to decrease their own defensiveness towards cultural differences and
expression. Although the discussion of culture should begin with the supervisor, it is not
the supervisor’s sole responsibility to be open in this dialogue (Duan & Roehlke, 2001).
A very important strategy used throughout this training model is for counselors to be
open to discussing and working through any mistakes they make that may hinder rapport
building or the therapeutic safety of the client (Pederson).

Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) reported that supervisees who
were "instructed" by their supervisors to focus on cross-cultural issues in their case
conceptualizations of a client's presenting problem were better equipped to empathize and
connect with clients of different cultural backgrounds than supervisees who did not
receive such instruction. Hilton, Russell, and Salmi (1995) found that level of supervisor
support significantly influenced supervisees' evaluations of supervision. Teaching
supervisees to look at culture as an integral, non-defining part of the whole client may be
challenging when the terms culture, race, and ethnicity seem to be interchangeable
(Cook, 1994).

Anderson, Schlossberg, Rigazio-DiGilio (2000) found that supervisees reported
greater satisfaction with their supervisor when they felt supported and valued. The
researchers were interested to find that supervisees reported positive and negative
experiences in supervision based on the same common elements of the relationship.
Communication and encouragement were reported to be major factors in determining
whether supervisees enjoyed their supervisory experience or not. Supervisors who
facilitated the personal growth of the supervisee were also considered favorably.

Anderson et al. concluded that the themes of communication, guidance, and an ability to create a supervisory environment where the supervisee could grow were elements to which supervisees responded in the supervisory relationship.

**Gender and Supervision**

Researchers have found that supervisees are treated differently based on various traits including gender (Gatmon et al., 2001; Granello, Beamish, & Davis, 1997; Jeanquart-Barone, 1996). Usually, males receive more opportunities for autonomous experience during their training (Gatmon et al.). This allowance for autonomy is not only a cultural value of Western society, but considered a trait of a sound supervisor in the mental health professions (Breaux, 2004; Pearson, 2000). Female supervisees have reported less satisfaction with their supervisors than their male cohorts (Jeanquart-Barone). Differences in satisfaction ratings by gender have been correlated to supervisory styles, theoretical orientations, and more recently the gender and ethnicity of the supervisor. There is little research beyond social theory on the direct effects of such favorable treatment towards male supervisees.

An interesting phenomenon of supervisory dyads when gender is considered is that male supervisors tend to be more task-oriented than female supervisors, who are more relationship-oriented. Sells, Goodyear, Lichtenberg, and Polkinghorne (1997) found that supervisory dyads consisting of males tend to have more discourse when working to complete task-oriented goals. They also found that female supervisors paired with male supervisees were equally relationship-oriented as when paired with female supervisees.
Nelson and Holloway found that both female and male supervisors encouraged male supervisees to be assertive more frequently than female trainees. They also found female supervisees were less likely than male supervisees to assert themselves within the supervisory relationship. These differences may be best attributed to gender role socialization. Males receive many social rewards for being goal-driven and task-oriented in their interactions. Males also have been socialized and maybe even trained to focus more on the results or goals of therapy than on empathy for the client’s dilemma (Wester, Vogel, & Archer, 2004). Females are socialized to be more collaborative and work with rather than in competition with other people (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

Nelson and Holloway (1990) audiotaped the sessions of 40 supervision dyads in a study of the relationship of supervisor and supervisee gender to supervisory discourse. They found that male and female supervisors reinforced female supervisees' self assured messages with less assuring, encouraging messages significantly less often than for male supervisees. The subtle or overt bias towards male supervisee autonomy is problematic for the empowerment of female supervisees. Female supervisees responded to supervisor less assuring, encouraging messages with self assured messages significantly less often than male supervisees. Nelson and Holloway (1990) suggested that both male and female supervisors be encouraged to develop awareness of their own biases concerning gender and expectation of supervisees.

Consistent with the findings in Nelson and Holloway’s study, Granello, Beamish, and Davis (1997) found that supervisors in their study on supervisee empowerment asked for significantly more input from male supervisees than from female supervisees. They studied of gender diverse dyads and through this pairing, they found that male
supervisees experienced greater autonomy in supervision as the supervisory relationship developed. However, female supervisees received less autonomy as the supervisory relationship progressed. Granello et al. concluded from their findings that current developmental models of supervisee development did not accurately describe female supervisee development and such a discrepancy may be cause for greater awareness of supervisory style variations and gender biases among supervisors.

Granello (2003) found that both male and female supervisors were significantly more likely to accept or build upon the ideas generated by female supervisees and asked for more opinions from male supervisees. Male supervisees gave significantly more suggestions than did female supervisees and female supervisees praised their supervisors more often than did male supervisees. This difference in social interactions of supervisees may be an effect of socialization. The supervisor, being a product of society, may continue to encourage certain behaviors that fulfill gender expectations. Granello also found that age differences between supervisor and supervisee interacted with gender to effect influence strategies used in the supervisory dyad. There were no significant differences found between race and gender as factors in influence strategies in Granello’s study.

Chung, Marshall, and Gordon (2001) found that male supervisors rated female supervisees significantly lower than male supervisees, even when given identical case studies with the only variant being gender. Female supervisors were found to be non-biased in their ratings of supervisee cases. There was no significant difference found for supervisee race. Chung et al. stated that their findings were indicative of the need for greater awareness of biases and prejudice of supervisors in clinical supervision.
Much of the literature pertaining to gender and supervision discusses negative outcomes for female supervisees. Wester, Vogel, & Archer (2004) found that male supervisees are negatively impacted by societal pressure to restrict their emotionality. When the social expectation to be emotionally distant is reinforced through the supervisory relationship, male supervisees tend to utilize defense styles to transfer their emotions onto others or themselves (Wester et al.). The male supervisees in this study were found to have poorer insight into the supervisory working alliance when matched with a male supervisor. Male supervisees who rated higher in restricted emotionality were also more self-defeating in their perceptions of their counselor self-efficacy. Wester et al. suggested further research into effects of traditional male gender role expectations and gender role identity development in counselor training and development.

Worthington and Stern’s (1985) study produced results that did not support their hypotheses that female supervisors and supervisees formed stronger supervisory relationships than male supervisors and supervisees. They based their hypotheses on Marecek and Johnson’s (1980) theory that women tend to be more relationship-orientated than men and men tend to be more task-oriented than women. They found that male supervisors reported having better supervisory relationships with their supervisees, regardless of gender, than female supervisors. The researchers also found that male supervisees reported a stronger supervisory alliance with their supervisors, regardless of gender, than female supervisees. Another aspect of Worthington et al.’s study looked at gender matching in supervisory dyads. The researchers found that supervisees found greater satisfaction with supervision when paired with same-gendered supervisors. The
researchers suggested that further research is needed into gender role attributes and
gender interactions.

Putney, Worthington, and McCollough (1992) reported findings that indicated
supervisors’ sex role stereotypes influence supervision. The researchers found that
supervisory dyad pairs that were matched for gender allowed for less supervisee
autonomy than those dyads that were not matched. “Socialization may encourage
supervisors to allow supervisees of the other sex to conduct therapy as the supervisees see
fit, hence allowing greater autonomy” (p. 263). Putney et al. suggested further research
into this dynamic with concern for the areas of gender identification, sex role beliefs and
behaviors of supervisor and supervisee, and gender interaction.

The literature reviewed in this section addressed the issue of variance in gender
reaction to satisfaction with supervision. There is cause for concern regarding the quality
of supervision being provided to supervisees. Whether female supervisees are not
empowered or male supervisees are not given consistent direction, the result is that the
supervisee is receiving inadequate supervision. Many researchers have suggested further
research into supervisor biases in relation to gender role assumptions. This study was
initially designed to further such research and be used to develop a clearer understanding
of the relationship among gender, cultural competence, and supervisee satisfaction.

**Ethnicity and Supervision**

The term multicultural recently has begun to be applied to the individual, as all
individuals are members of several cultural groups based on their ethnicity, age, race,
gender, socioeconomic status, political membership, family constellation, sexual
orientation, regional residence, and other characteristics. It is the term cross-cultural
which identifies an interaction between individuals with different cultural variables (Hird,
Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). The term cross-cultural generally is used to
address the differences between individuals along all of the aforementioned variables.
More modern definitions of culture consider the themes of values and experiences to
explain the similarities and uniqueness of individuals that have been traditionally defined
by the social constructs of race, class, and social empowerment issues (Torres-Rivera,
Phan, Maddux, Wilbur & Garrett, 2001). Culture is often defined as normative in that it
provides a standard by which members of a particular group conduct themselves.
Counselors make up a cultural group in the fundamental definition of the term.

According to Cook (1994), cross-cultural supervision has received increased
attention over the last 25 years. From the late 1970s through present day the areas of
culture and cross-cultural counseling and supervision have been redefined, broadened,
simplified, and more seriously addressed. In the early 1980s, many counseling
organizations began to construct training guidelines for cross-cultural counseling. The
AMCD and American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD); now
ACA, began to make adjustments to their codes to include multicultural concerns (Sue et
al., 1992). Since then, the need for culture to be integrated and discussed in supervision
has gained steady emphasis through research exploring the general training perspectives
of supervisees. The supervisory relationship, along with classroom instruction, is the
primary source for development of a counselor identity which includes cultural
competence (Cook, 1994).
Cultural self awareness is dependent on supervisors’ ability to recognize shared or personal aspects of their own culture and their significance when working with members of another cultural group. Supervisors can help supervisees focus on how multicultural issues are relevant when conceptualizing clients' problems (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, Pannu, 1997). A supervisee's inattention to racial issues may have more to do with a supervisor's lack of expectations than with the supervisee's lack of ability. Thus, when supervisors have the expectation that supervisees will consider multicultural issues when conceptualizing their clients' issues, supervisees may be able to demonstrate their potential (Ladany et al.).

Developing cultural awareness takes authentic insight and may prove a task for more acculturated supervisors (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). The task of increasing cultural self awareness becomes even more difficult if the supervisor was not trained in multicultural theory as a supervisee and never had to acknowledge her or his cultural identity (Pannu, 1997). Counselors must become acquainted with their values and beliefs surrounding culture and cultural interaction. Supervisors’ cultural self competence is evidenced by their ability to effectively and professionally address issues of culture within the supervisory relationship (Duan & Roehlke).

Priest (1994) stated that supervisors have a responsibility to increase supervisees' cultural knowledge. Researchers such as Derald Wing Sue (1999) and Ivey and Authier (1978) have done substantial work to promote the effective training of supervisees on the topic of culture. Sue conducted research on the effect of culture on counseling interactions. Sue’s Cultural/Racial Identity Development Model (1999) is designed to address the experiences of cultural minorities. Sue’s model is used today as a training
tool in multicultural courses. Ivey and Authier’s Taxonomy of the Effective Individual (1978) is also used by supervisors to train their supervisees to be more culturally sensitive and competent when working in a cross-cultural counseling relationship.

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) discussed the need for supervisors to develop an understanding of their own culture and values. They have argued that many supervisors and counselors approach cross-cultural interactions unaware of or ignoring the unique identity of their supervisee or client. This “myth of sameness” arises out of supervisors’ tendency to view their supervisees as an extension of themselves, regardless of the cross-cultural variables (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Bernard and Goodyear argue that it is imperative that the supervisor be trained from a multicultural perspective. Several studies have supported the belief that supervision is most effective when the supervisor is culturally competent and trained (Arbour et al., 2004; Duan & Roeklke, 2001; Fong & Lease, 1996; Priest, 1994). An inherent requirement of cross-cultural supervision is that the supervisor has a high level of cultural awareness and cross-cultural competency.

Helms (1990) examined the relationship between counselors and clients based on racial identity stages. Based on parallel process these interactions can also be applied to the supervisory relationship (Cook, 1994). Helms described three types of supervisory relationships based on interactions that occur within supervision. The first interaction is the regressive relationship, in which the supervisee is at a more advanced racial identity status than the supervisor. This interaction tends to be considered problematic due to the inability of the supervisors to train their supervisees in an area of competence which they are lacking (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). Second are progressive relationships, in which the supervisee is at a less advanced racial identity status than the
supervisor. This is an ideal interaction in that the supervisory relationship is designed to work with the supervisor having greater competence. Helms' third type of racial identity interaction, parallel interactions, occurs when both the supervisee and supervisor are of comparable racial identity statuses.

Constantine (1997), in her study of multicultural competency in counseling supervision, found that supervision dyads spent an average of 15% of their supervision sessions discussing multicultural issues. She also found that some supervisees believed that their supervisory experience and relationship would have been enhanced if they had spent more time discussing multicultural issues. Constantine also found that 70% of the supervisors she surveyed had never taken an academic course related to multicultural counseling, although 70% of the supervisees in the study had completed at least one multicultural course. She suggested that this finding might support the disturbing fact that supervisors, in general, are less aware of multicultural counseling issues than their supervisees. She concluded that supervisors who attend to cultural issues in supervision and who encourage supervisees' cultural competence in counseling relationships may be successful in training students who are effective in working with culturally diverse clients.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, Pannu (1997) examined the relationship between the racial identity ratings of Black and White supervisees on their self-reports of multicultural competence. They found that high levels in the Dissonance and Awareness stage for ethnic minority participants were related to high self-reported multicultural competence. Although supervisees rated themselves high in cultural competence, their scores on multicultural conceptualization were significantly low, suggesting an
unrealistic perception of their own competence. Ladany et al. suggested that supervisors may need to use more objective methods of assessing multicultural competence, rather than relying solely on self reports from supervisees. Supervisors may need to be aware of the tendency for supervisees to overestimate or be overconfident of their competency levels, so that they can assist these supervisees in recognizing growth points (Ladany et al.).

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) found that supervisees who were supervised by a person of Color reported higher levels of perceived multicultural counseling competence than did supervisees with a White supervisor. The underlying theory of their study was Helms’ (1990) racial identity interactions (progressive, regressive, parallel). Participants were master’s-level and doctoral students who were currently receiving supervision. They also found that when supervisees share similar racial identity stages with their supervisor, they are more likely to agree about the supervision process and goals. A finding particularly relevant to my study was that supervisors who were in a higher racial identity stage were able to empathize with supervisees who were at lower levels of racial identity and who exhibited sensitivity to the supervisee's racial identity status. These supervisors communicated to the supervisees an acceptance that may facilitate the development of a working alliance and greater reports of liking, and thus satisfaction with supervision.

**White Racial Identity Development**

The White Racial Identity Development (WRID) Model, first published by Helms (1984), was developed to address the ego statuses that members of the central
racial/ethnic group may undergo as they gain awareness of their own racial identity. This model addressed the need for a systematic explanation of racial identity development for this understudied cultural group. In the WRID model, there are seven levels of development. Individuals may not move through each stage in the theorized order and they can operate in more than one ego status at a time. The levels are based on the development of central group members’ ability to express their racial identity as related to other racial/ethnic groups (Helms & Cook, 1999).

Contact is the first phase of WRID, in which members are unaware of their racial/ethnic identities and the privileges and benefits their membership provides to them socially. In this phase, individuals have minimal comprehension of racial dynamics and interactions that may take place cross-racially.

The ego status of Disintegration evolves out of contact when Whites are forced to acknowledge their membership within the dominant culture. This acknowledgement can be uncomfortable in that individuals may begin to experience feelings of guilt and cognitions of responsibility about the privilege their skin has provided socially.

Helms (1996) suggested that, in the Reintegration phase, individuals reject the responsibility that the development of racial identity carries with it. This phase is often characterized by racist ideologies toward Visible Racial Ethnic Groups (VREG) and supremacist attitudes regarding one’s own group.

Pseudo-independence differs from the previous phase as individuals begin to identify with their central group based on cognitive appreciation for being White. Persons in this phase also reject openly discriminatory practices and racist members of their group as they attempt to “help” VREG members to be more like the central group.
Immersion takes places as members of the central group began to reflect on their racial/ethnic group membership. The Emersion phase is a natural progression of WRID as members in this stage find an awareness of what it means to be a member of the central group. In this phase membership in the White racial/ethnic group is sincerely enjoyed devoid of guilt or acceptance of the proverbial “white man’s burden.”

The last phase of the WRID model is Autonomy. Persons experiencing autonomy are able to feel comfortable being White, reject the social conformity of racially oppressive dynamics, and develop appreciative knowledge of other racial/ethnic groups. Helms’ model is a complete developmental model of White racial identity expression (Helms & Cook, 1999).

**White Male Supervisors**

In the United States, men of European background have held and continue to hold economic, political, and educational power. As the normative cultural group in the United States, Euro-Americans have been the yardstick by which individuals of other cultural groups and women have been measured (Arredondo et al., 1996). Bradshaw (1982) was one of the first researchers to observe the dynamic of White male power in supervision. He reported that the White supervisor-counselor dyads with clients of Color were the most common cross-cultural occurrences in therapy (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). White supervisors have an extra responsibility to learn more about their skin privilege and the benefits they receive from being a member of the dominant culture (Fong & Lease, 1997). The White counselor is likely to inherit the racial and cultural biases of his or her forebears (Corvin & Wiggins, 1989). Ladany et al. (1997) found that White participants...
self reported in the Pseudo-independence stage on the WRID scale and were the only participants who also self-reported multicultural competence.

Supervisors need to be willing to self-explore and educate themselves so that they may talk openly with supervisees about potentially uncomfortable issues like the ‘isms’ of oppression, prejudices, and discrimination (Sue & Sue, 1999). Attending workshops and reading current multicultural literature are some sound suggestions for staying abreast of the theoretical developments taking place in the area of multiculturalism (Arbour, Bain, & Rubio, 2004). By making a concerted effort to understand and engage the phenomenology of their cross-cultural supervisees, supervisors can help to develop and strengthen their cultural awareness and that of their supervisees. With the advent of greater program application of multicultural competencies in counselor training programs such as those accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), White supervisees are being exposed to greater opportunities to develop their cultural awareness (Utsey & Gernat, 2002).

Fong and Lease (1997) reported that White supervisors have the extra responsibility to develop themselves culturally due to the social privilege they experience based on race. This holds true for men as well, based on the social privileges they receive based on gender. The researchers also stated that White supervisors must be aware of the biases and unintentional prejudices they carry with them into the supervisory session. Fong and Lease encouraged White supervisors to identify issues with trust and communication that may arise due to assumptions between supervisor and supervisee (1997).
Breaux (2004) conducted a qualitative analysis of White male supervisors’ perceptions of culture within the supervisory relationship. Two rounds of personal interviews and a focus group were utilized to examine the supervisors’ experiences and thoughts about the role of culture in their supervisory sessions. Based on the three components of Multicultural Counseling Competence (MCC) outlined by Sue et al. (1992), the participants were interviewed on their perceptions of culture in supervision. Participants were asked three main questions to address the MCC: “How do you define culture?” (Knowledge), “How is culture a factor in your role as supervisor?” (Awareness), and “How do you address culture in supervision?” (Skills).

The themes that emerged from this study were the cultural variables of values and experiences. Other variables that emerged included power, personal culture, and social privilege. These variables are more closely related to the shared culture of the participants in the study who were White male doctoral students. Culture, as reported by the study participants, can be defined as an individual characteristic that is employed to interact with other individuals as one navigates through society. Defining culture as personal values and experiences is a definition that varies from the generally accepted group-focused explanation of culture. This unique definition may be attributable to the fact that White male supervisors have long been excluded from the discussion of culture. The voices of people of Color, women, and more recently homosexuals have all been heard in the multicultural discussion, and White males may have been seen as the default cultural group.

From a qualitative standpoint, White male supervisors’ cultural values are based in independence and power (Breaux, 2004; Utsey & Gernat, 2002). White male
supervisors see culture as the integration of personal values and experiences into their
daily lives (Breaux). According to Breaux, this population of supervisors found it
difficult to discuss differences in personal culture due to lack of awareness and social
obligation to define their cultural values. Supervisors in this study consistently stated that
they were not comfortable with the power that they had in the hierarchical structure of
supervision. Another problem for this population was a lack of opportunities to express
individual or shared values with others within a multicultural setting. It appears from the
results of this qualitative analysis and the absence of literature that White males have
been a marginalized population in the multicultural discussion.

This study was designed to further examine the role that ethnicity plays in
effective supervision. With consideration of social-racial stratification, the researcher
plans to focus an empirical lens on the cultural population of White male supervisors who
hold considerable influence in the counseling profession but who have had a minimal
voice in the cultural conversation.

Critique of the Literature

There is much conceptual research regarding cross-cultural supervisory
interactions, yet there are few empirically based studies to support the concepts presented
by the various training and developmental models (Leong & Wagner, 1994). While the
reality of greater understanding of culture may exist in the classroom courses and
practicum, there is still a need for research and study of the application of this learning
within the supervisory relationship (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997). We still need to
understand how the discussion of and openness to cultural differences within the
supervisory relationship impacts the supervision process. There is a need for a clearer understanding of the experiences of supervisees in cross-cultural supervision relationships as it relates to their perceptions of their supervisors’ competency level (Constantine, 2001).
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In Chapter Three, the research questions and hypotheses, participants, instrumentation, and research design are discussed. The data collection methods and data analysis plan are also presented in this chapter.

This study examined the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their masters’ level intern supervisees. Minimal research has been published on the cultural dynamics of White male counseling supervisors. This study examined whether supervisee satisfaction with supervision is related to the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors. Additionally, the study examined whether supervisee satisfaction with supervision varies according to supervisee gender and ethnicity.

In the field of counseling, competency is fundamental to effective counseling. This competency is fostered through supervision. The study looked at the relationship between the cultural competency of White male supervisors, who traditionally have been excluded from the cultural discussion, and their supervisees’ satisfaction with supervision.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research question is presented in this section along with the associated hypotheses.

**Research Question:**

Does a relationship exist between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees?

Research Hypothesis 1:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees.

Research Hypothesis 2:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees.

**Ancillary Hypothesis 2a:**

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.
Ancillary Hypothesis 2b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

Research Hypothesis 3:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees.

Ancillary Hypothesis 3a:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.

Ancillary Hypothesis 3b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.
Research Hypothesis 4:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color.

Ancillary Hypothesis 4a:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.

Ancillary Hypothesis 4b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

Research Hypothesis 5:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern supervisees.

Ancillary Hypothesis 5a:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and
the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.

Ancillary Hypothesis 5b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

Participants

The population of interest for this study was the supervisory dyad consisting of White male doctoral-level counseling supervisors and their master’s-level supervisees. From this population, a sample of White male doctoral student supervisors in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States was selected. Each doctoral student selected one of his current supervisees to participate in the study, thus creating supervisory dyads. The sample size was to be 80 dyad pairs, each consisting of a White male supervisor and one of his supervisees. Criterion sampling was to be used to maximize ethnic and gender diversity for the study. Programs were selected from the population of counselor education programs in the United States. Using the CACREP website, the researcher reviewed the Directory of CACREP-Accredited Programs. From the directory, colleges and universities that had significant gender and ethnic variance were contacted and requested to participate in the study.
Participation in the study was voluntary and to be delimited to White male supervisors. Supervisees of both genders and all ethnicities were included in this study. Participants did not receive any compensation for participation.

**Research Design**

**Correlational Research**

Correlational research is used to describe relationships between two or more variables. The variables that are studied are chosen due to their relevance to previous research, theory, or observation (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). In this study, the relationship between the variables of supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction were examined to determine whether they varied according to the gender and ethnicity of the supervisee. Sue et al.’s (1982) Multicultural Counseling Competencies provide the conceptual framework for the study.

**Survey Research**

Survey research is used to collect information by asking questions of a group of individuals from a specific population of interest (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Surveys are based in quantitative research and produce statistical data from which the researcher can make inferences about the larger population that the sample represents. For the purposes of this study, two surveys and a demographic questionnaire were used to determine if there is a relationship between supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction.
Table 1: Research Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Cultural Competence</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Satisfaction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Research Hypotheses 2 & 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Cultural Competence</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Cultural Competence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (H2)</td>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>H2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (H3)</td>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>H3b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Research Hypotheses 4 & 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Cultural Competence</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Cultural Competence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color (H4)</td>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>H4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (H5)</td>
<td>H5a</td>
<td>H5b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentation

The following instruments were used in this study: a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire; the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea,
Demographic Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire was used to collect information about the supervisors’ and supervisees’ sex, ethnicity, annual household income, number of courses completed in multicultural counseling, number of supervisory sessions held to date between current dyad, amount of supervisory experience (supervisor), and amount of counseling experience (supervisor and supervisee).

Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised

The Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003; See Appendix) is a revision of the 60-item Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey developed by D’Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991). The MAKSS-CE-R is designed to rate an individual’s multicultural competence in the areas of knowledge, awareness, and skills. It is based on Sue et al.’s (1982) model of cross-cultural counseling competence. Responses to the items on the MAKSS-CE-R are measured using three different 4-point Likert-type scales (1 = very limited, 4 = very aware; 1 = very limited, 4 = very good; 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) respective to the subscale areas. Higher scores are typical of greater multicultural competence.

This 33-item survey is divided into three subscales. Ten (10) items, numbers 1-10, measure the individual’s multicultural counseling awareness. (Example item: Racial and
ethnic persons are under-represented in clinical and counseling psychology.) Thirteen (13) items, numbers 11-23, measure the individual’s multicultural counseling knowledge. (Example item: At the present time, how would you rate your understanding of the following term: “Transcultural”). Ten (10) items, numbers 24-33, measure the individual’s multicultural counseling skills. (Example items: How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of gay men?). There are six (6) reverse scored items in the MAKSS-CE-R, items 1-4, 6, and 9, all of which are all in the Awareness subscale. Possible scores for the MAKSS-CE-R range from 33 to 132, with 132 representing the highest level of multicultural competence.

Kim et al. (2003) reported an internal reliability for the MAKSS-CE-R of .81. The coefficient alphas for the subscales are .80, .87, and .85 for Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills, respectively. Construct validity was established for the MAKSS-CE-R by correlating the scores of this survey with the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 2002). The results yielded correlation coefficients on the Awareness and Knowledge subscales of .67 and .48, respectively. To assess criterion-related validity the scores were compared between participants who had taken a multicultural course and those who had not taken the course. Also, participants’ scores were correlated based on their years of experience working with culturally different clients (Kim et al.).

Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany et al., 1996; See Appendix) is an adapted version of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ; Larsen,
Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979). To construct the SSQ, Ladany et al. substituted the term “supervision” for the terms “counseling” and “services” on the original instrument. The SSQ is an eight (8) item instrument with total scores ranging from 8 to 32. Responses to the items on the SSQ are measured using a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = low, 4 = high) to measure supervisees’ satisfaction with supervision. The scores on the SSQ can range from 8 to 32. A score of 8 to 20 suggest low satisfaction with supervision, with a range of 21 to 26 suggest medium satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction. Ladany et al. (1996) reported that the original CSQ’s internal reliability has been measured at .84 to .93 in various studies. The internal reliability of the SSQ is .96 (Ladany et al.).

Data Collection

A letter requesting permission to conduct the study was submitted to the University of New Orleans’ All-University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects. After permission was granted by the University of New Orleans’ All-University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects (See Appendix), the researcher emailed a letter to the internship coordinators (See Appendix) of counselor education programs that were identified as potential sites to gain participants for this study. The letter informed the coordinators that this study had been proposed to look at the relationship between supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction through an anonymous electronic survey packets one for supervisors and another for supervisees. The internship coordinators were asked to forward the website of the survey packets to supervisors and supervisees currently in internship supervisory relationships.
The sample size was to be 80 dyad pairs, each consisting of a White male supervisor and one of his supervisees. After contacting the internship coordinators at the identified programs, emails were to be sent to the listserves of these programs, giving the electronic survey’s links to www.surveymonkey.com and asking all current supervisors and supervisees enrolled in internship to complete the survey packet. Participants were able to complete the survey via an electronic link to the survey site. To maintain confidentiality and match dyads, the supervisors were asked to create a three digit alpha numeric code and record it on the demographic questionnaire. The supervisors were asked to share this code with their supervisee. The supervisees in turn recorded the same code on the demographic questionnaire.

**Data Analysis**

*Planned Statistical Analysis*

The demographic questionnaire, MAKSS-CE-R, and SSQ were administered online through SurveyMonkey.com. The data collected through these surveys were entered into SPSS 10.0 statistical software for analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the characteristics of the sample. Inferential statistics were used to test the proposed hypotheses.

*Descriptive Analysis*

*Sample characteristics.* Descriptive statistics were used to discuss the two demographic variables of this study, ethnicity and gender of supervisees. Frequency distributions were reported.
Survey results. The mean scores and standard deviations of the responses on the MAKSS-CE-R and SSQ of the total sample were reported.

Inferential Analysis

Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation (Pearson r). The Pearson r is a measurement of statistical correlation between two variables (Avy, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). The relationship between White male supervisors’ ratings of their own cultural competency and their supervisees’ ratings of satisfaction with the supervisory relationship was measured. The Pearson r procedure assumes a linear relationship between the supervisors’ rating of cultural competency and the supervisees’ rating of satisfaction.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA). According to Ary et al. (1996), analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a statistical operation used to determine whether there is significant variance between two groups. For this study, a factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare congruence between White male supervisors’ and their supervisees’ ratings of cultural competency and the supervisee’s rating of satisfaction with the supervisory relationship. The ANOVA procedure was also to be used to assess variance between these groups based on supervisee gender and ethnicity. Post-hoc comparisons were to be performed to determine whether there were differences between groups. The outcome of the ANOVA was to be used to determine whether the proposed hypotheses are accepted or rejected.
Data Analysis

Research Hypothesis 1:
There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees.

Data Analysis 1:
The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees.

Research Hypothesis 2:
There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees.

Data Analysis 2:
The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees.

Ancillary Hypothesis 2a:
There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern
supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.

Data Analysis 2a:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.

Ancillary Hypothesis 2b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

Data Analysis 2b:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.
Research Hypothesis 3:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees.

Data Analysis 3:

The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees.

Ancillary Hypothesis 3a:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.

Data Analysis 3a:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.

Ancillary Hypothesis 3b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and
the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

**Data Analysis 3b:**

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their male master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.

**Research Hypothesis 4:**

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color.

**Data Analysis 4:**

The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color.

**Ancillary Hypothesis 4a:**

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are similar.
Data Analysis 4a:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color and their ratings of cultural competency.

Ancillary Hypothesis 4b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and supervisee are dissimilar.

Data Analysis 4b:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color and their ratings of cultural competency.

Research Hypothesis 5:

There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern supervisees.
Data Analysis 5:

The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated to
determine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male
doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of
their White master’s-level intern supervisees.

Ancillary Hypothesis 5a:

There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural
competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and
the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern
supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and
supervisee are similar.

Data Analysis 5a:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence
between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student
counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White
master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.

Ancillary Hypothesis 5b:

There is a significant negative relationship between the cultural
competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and
the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern
supervisees when the cultural competency ratings of the supervisor and
supervisee are dissimilar.
Data Analysis 5b:

A factorial ANOVA was to be conducted to compare the congruence between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s-level intern supervisees and their ratings of cultural competency.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

In Chapter Four, the results of the descriptive and inferential statistical analyses of the data collected for the study are presented. This study examined whether a relationship exists between master’s level intern supervisees’ satisfaction with supervision and the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors. Additionally, the study examined whether supervisee satisfaction with supervision varies according to supervisee gender and ethnicity.

Demographics of the Sample

The participants in this study were drawn from the population of doctoral students and master’s level interns currently in supervisory relationships at CACREP-accredited counseling programs within the United States. The CACREP-accredited programs that have both doctoral and master’s level counseling programs total 43. Of these programs, two programs reported that doctoral students do not provide supervision of their master’s students. The coordinators or chairpersons of the remaining 41 programs were contacted via email requesting the dissemination of the survey links to their students currently in doctoral/master’s student supervisory dyads.

This study utilized two electronic survey packets, one designed for doctoral supervisors and the other for master’s level supervisees. The electronic survey packets
included a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire and the Multicultural
Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-
R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003). The same instruments, plus the
Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996), were
included in the supervisee survey packet.

A total of 122 surveys were used in the analysis of this study: 61 supervisor
survey packets and 61 supervisee survey packets. Of the 133 surveys electronically
submitted to potential participants, 92% (n = 122) of these could be used in the study.
Eleven surveys were discarded either because they were incomplete or they could not be
matched with a supervisor or supervisee survey packet. Descriptive data related to the
survey packets are offered in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Packet</th>
<th># Returned</th>
<th># Usable</th>
<th>% Used in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Characteristics

Demographic information pertaining to participants’ gender, ethnic background,
amount of experience as a counselor, and number of completed courses in multicultural
counseling were obtained from both supervisor and supervisee demographic
questionnaires. Demographic data concerning supervisee enrollment in multicultural
counseling courses and supervisors’ number of previous supervisees were also collected through the respective demographic questionnaires. Categorical identification of frequencies and percentages of the demographic information are reported along with narrative summations of the results.

**Participant Gender**

Participants reported their gender. Female supervisors represented more than 31% (n = 38) of the total participant population. Male supervisors represented almost 19% (n = 23) of the total participant population. Female supervisees comprised almost 38% (n = 46) of the total participant population. Male supervisees had the smallest representation with slightly more than 12% (n = 15). Total female participants represented almost 70% (n = 84) of the respondents, while total male participants represented slightly over 31% (n = 38). Descriptive data of the participants’ gender are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

**Frequency Distribution of Participants by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participant Ethnicity**

Study participants reported their ethnicity. Almost 60% (n = 73) of the total participants identified their ethnic origin as European-American. For the purposes of the study European-Americans were considered White. The remaining 40% (n = 49) of the participants in this study were considered non-white. White supervisors comprised 30.3% (n = 37) of the participants with non-white supervisors representing 19.7% (n = 24). White supervisees represented 29.5% (n = 36) of the participants. Non-white supervisees represented 20.5% (n = 25) of the total participants. Descriptive data of the participants’ ethnicity are reported in Table 6.
Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab-American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin-American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-racial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Supervisee | African-American  | 13        | 21.3%         | 10.7%         |
|            | Arab-American     | 1         | 1.6%          | 0.1%          |
|            | Asian-American    | 4         | 6.6%          | 0.3%          |
|            | European-American | 36        | 59.0%         | 29.5%         |
|            | Latin-American    | 4         | 6.6%          | 0.3%          |
|            | Native-American   | 2         | 3.3%          | 0.2%          |
|            | Bi-racial         | 1         | 1.6%          | 0.1%          |
|            | **Total**         | **61**    | **100.0%**    | **50.0%**     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-racial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Experience as a Counselor

Participants reported their amount of experience as a counselor (full-time or equivalent). The majority of supervisors reported having a year or more of experience as a counselor (n = 50, 82.0%). Most supervisees reported having less than 6 months of experience as a counselor (n = 37, 60.7%). Demographic data of the participants’ experience as a counselor are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Amount of Experience as a Counselor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Amount of Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or more</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed Courses in Multicultural Counseling

Participants reported the total number of multicultural counseling courses that they have completed. The majority of participants reported completing one multicultural counseling course (n = 71, 58.2%). Completion of one multicultural counseling course was the major response among supervisors (n = 32, 52.5%) and supervisees (n = 38, 62.3%). Descriptive data of the participants’ number of completed courses in multicultural counseling are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Courses in Multicultural Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisees’ Current Enrollment

Supervisees who participated in this study reported if they are currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course. Fifty-nine percent (n = 36) of the supervisees in this study were not currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course. The remaining 41% (n = 25) of supervisees in the study were currently enrolled in multicultural counseling courses. Descriptive data of the supervisee participants’ current enrollment in multicultural counseling courses are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors’ Previous Supervisees

Supervisors in this study reported the number of supervisees they have previously supervised, besides their current supervisee. Supervisors reported whether they had no previous supervisees (n = 12, 19.6%), one to two (n = 18, 29.6%), three to four (n = 13, 21.4%), five to six (n = 7, 11.4%), or seven or more (n = 11, 18.0%). Most (over 80%) of the supervisors reported some previous experience as a supervisor. Descriptive data related to supervisors’ previous supervisees are reported in Table 10.
Table 10

Frequency Distribution of Supervisors by Previous Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Supervisees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or Two</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or Four</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or Six</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven or More</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Participants’ Characteristics

One-hundred and twenty-two (122) total participants completed this study. Of this total, most were female (n = 84, 68.9%) with 38 (31.1%) males. The majority of the study’s participants were White (n = 73, 59.8%). The remaining 49 (41.2%) participants were non-white and reported their ethnicity as African-American (n = 26, 21.3%), Arab-American (n = 1, 0.8%), Asian-American (n = 8, 6.6%), Native-American (n = 3, 2.5%), Latin-American (n = 8, 6.6%), and Bi-racial (n = 3, 2.5%). The majority of supervisors reported having a year or more of experience as a counselor (n = 50, 82.0%). Most supervisees reported having less than 6 months of experience as a counselor (n = 37, 60.7%). The majority of participants reported completing one multicultural counseling course (n = 71, 58.2%).

62
Survey Results

*Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey*

All participants in this study completed the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R). The mean scores and standard deviations of the participants’ responses on the MAKSS-CE-R are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Participant Responses to the MAKSS-CE-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Subscale</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Subscale</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Subscale</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 11 suggest minimal variance among the participants’ responses to items on the MAKSS-CE-R. The central tendency of the responses on the MAKSS-CE-R suggested an average to moderate competency level in each subscale and throughout the total survey. In summary, the scores show little variability and skewed responses toward the positive in cultural competency.
Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire

Master's level supervisees who participated in this study responded to items on the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). The mean score and standard deviation of the responses suggest high satisfaction with supervision. The scores on the SSQ can range from 8 to 32. A score of 8 to 20 suggest low satisfaction with supervision, with a range of 21 to 26 suggest medium satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction. The mean score of the participants’ responses to the SSQ was 26.54 and the standard deviation of the participants’ responses was 5.54.

Research Question

This study was designed to answer the research question: Does a relationship exist between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees?

Correlation Coefficient Analysis

Correlation coefficient analysis was used to answer the aforementioned research question. Due to low variability among the variables of supervisor ethnicity and gender and the low response rate from participants (n = 122), the data analysis was changed from the originally proposed analysis of variance to bivariate correlation analysis. Both doctoral supervisors and master's level's supervisees who participated in this study took the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R). The individual participants’ subscores in the areas of Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills were averaged for a total score. The total score from the MAKSS-CE-R of supervisors and supervisees in matching dyads were differentiated
by the use of difference scores. The greater the difference score, the greater the variance between the cultural competence rating of the supervisor and their supervisee. The resulting difference scores were then correlated to the supervisees’ scores on the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). A scatterplot graphic representation of the correlation between the difference scores of the dyads’ responses on the MAKSS-CE-R and the supervisees’ scores on the SSQ is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Scatterplot of the Correlation between Difference Scores on the MAKSS-CE-R and Scores on the SSQ
Based on Figure 1, there is no correlation between the variables of supervisor cultural competency and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. The Pearson correlation between the variables of supervisor cultural competency and supervisee satisfaction with supervision showed an r = .079.

Test of Hypotheses

Due to limited participants who reported being White male doctoral supervisors, all participating supervisors were utilized in the analysis of the hypotheses.

Test of Hypothesis 1

Research Hypothesis 1 stated: There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees. This hypothesis was modified as aforementioned and tested by correlating the difference scores between the responses of doctoral supervisors and masters level supervisee’s in matched dyads on the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R) and the supervisees’ responses on the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ).

The revised Research Hypothesis 1 stated: There is a relationship between the difference in cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and their master’s level supervisees and the satisfaction with supervision of the supervisee. Correlation coefficient analysis was used to establish a whether a relationship between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction
with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees. The results from the
correlational coefficient analysis are presented in Table 12.

Table 12
Correlational Coefficients for Difference Scores and SSQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSQ</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the correlational coefficient analysis suggest that no relationship
exists between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and
the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees. The
correlation coefficient ($r = .079, p = .545$) is representative of a very weak, non-
significant relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient is not
statistically significant; thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Test of Hypotheses 2 & 3

Research Hypothesis 2 stated: There is a significant relationship between the
cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the
satisfaction with supervision of their female master’s-level intern supervisees. Research
Hypothesis 3 stated: There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency
of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with
supervision of their male master’s level intern supervisees. Both hypotheses were
modified as aforementioned and tested by correlating the difference scores between the
responses of doctoral supervisors and masters level supervisee’s in matched dyads on the MAKSS-CE-R and the supervisee’s responses on SSQ.

The revised Research Hypothesis 2 stated: There is a relationship between the difference in cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and their master’s level supervisees and the satisfaction with supervision of the supervisee based on supervisor and supervisee gender. Correlation coefficient analysis was used to establish whether a relationship between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees based on supervisee gender. The results from the correlational coefficient analysis are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Correlational Coefficients for Difference Scores and SSQ Scores by Supervisee Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>SSQ by Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the correlational coefficient analysis suggest that no relationship exists between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees based on supervisee gender. The correlational coefficient ($r = -.101$) is representative of a very weak relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient is not statistically significant; thus, the null hypothesis for both hypotheses is accepted.
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Test of Hypotheses 4 & 5

Research Hypothesis 4 stated: There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees of Color. Research Hypothesis 5 stated: There is a significant relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their White master’s level intern supervisees. Both hypotheses were modified as aforementioned and tested by correlating the difference scores between the responses of doctoral supervisors and master’s level supervisees in matched dyads on the MAKSS-CE-R and the supervisee’s responses on SSQ.

The revised Research Hypothesis stated: There is a relationship between the difference in cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and their master’s level supervisees and the satisfaction with supervision of the supervisee based on supervisor and supervisee ethnicity. Correlation coefficient analysis was used to establish a whether a relationship existed between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees based on supervisee ethnicity. The results from the correlational coefficient analysis are presented in Table 14.
The results of the correlational coefficient analysis suggest that a relationship exists between the cultural competency of doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees based on supervisee ethnicity. This correlation suggests that there is a greater relationship between the cultural competency scores supervisors and supervisees when the dyad varies based on the supervisees’ ethnicity. The correlational coefficient \( r = -.273 \) is representative of a weak relationship between the two variables. Further investigation into the significance of the relationship between the two variables found that the significance could be accounted for by the lack of significant ethnic representation among non-white supervisees in this study. Non-white supervisees represented 20.5\% (n = 25) of the total participants. Therefore, the correlation coefficient is not statistically significant and the null hypothesis is accepted.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In Chapter Five, the results of the study are summarized and the findings are discussed. The findings of the study are summarized, including the descriptive data and results of the correlational analyses. The limitations of the study are discussed and recommendations are offered for future researchers, and for counselor educators and supervisors.

Synopsis of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between the cultural competence of doctoral counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level supervisees. This study was a quantitative inquiry into the correlation between these variables. The study was designed to investigate the research question: Does a relationship exist between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees?

Participants

The population of interest for this proposed study was the supervisory dyads that existed during the Spring 2005 semester at CACREP-accredited universities in the United States. These supervisory dyads were comprised of doctoral-level counseling supervisors and their master’s-level supervisees. From this population, doctoral student supervisors
and their supervisees from 41 of 43 CACREP-accredited counselor education doctoral and master’s programs were invited to participate. The coordinators or chairpersons of these 41 programs were contacted via email requesting the dissemination of the electronic survey links to their students currently in doctoral/master’s student supervisory dyads. The total number of participants in this study was 122: 61 supervisors and 61 supervisees.

Two electronic survey packets were disseminated, one designed for doctoral supervisors and the other for master’s-level supervisees. The electronic survey packets sent to supervisors included a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire and the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003). The demographic questionnaire and the MAKSS-CE-R, plus the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996), were included in the supervisee survey packet.

Results

Response Rate

Of the 133 surveys received from potential participants, 92% were utilized in the study. Eleven surveys were discarded either because they were incomplete or because they could not be matched with a supervisor or supervisee survey packet. A total of 122 surveys were used in the analysis of this study: 61 supervisor survey packets and 61 supervisee survey packets.
Gender

Female participants represented almost 70% of the total respondents, while male participants represented slightly over 30% (See Table 5, page 56). The proportion of males was slightly higher among supervisors (38%) than among supervisees (25%) who participated in this study. This proportion of females to males is representative of the ratio of females to males in counseling programs across the United States.

Ethnicity

Almost 60% of the total participants were White. The remaining 40% of the participants in this study were non-White. The ethnic background of the participants was as follows: African-American 21%, Arab-American 1%, Asian-American 7%, European-American 60%, Latin-American 7%, Native-American 3%, and Bi-racial 3%. The ratio of White respondents to non-White respondents was similar for supervisors (61% White; 39% non-White) and supervisees (59% White; 41% non-White).

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and bivariate correlational analysis. Due to limited variance in the variables of supervisor ethnicity and gender, the data analysis was changed from the originally proposed analysis of variance to bivariate correlation. There were five primary research hypotheses in this study that explored the relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees. Each of the hypotheses was worded to examine the variables of ethnicity (White and non-White) and gender (male and female). The identifier “White male” was omitted from these hypotheses for the analysis of the data collected due to the low
response rate from White males. It was anticipated that the sample of supervisors would be comprised of a larger number of White males than was actually obtained. Overall, no statistically significant results were found with respect to the relationship between the cultural competence of doctoral counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s level supervisees.

**Discussion of the Findings**

The results of the study revealed no statistically significant relationships between the variables of supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. No statistically significant difference was found between the variables supervisor ethnicity, supervisor gender, supervisee ethnicity, supervisee gender. Trait-factor matched dyads did not differ from dyads in which supervisor and supervisee were of differing genders or ethnicities. The lack of statistically significant findings may be due to several factors including the lack of variance in the outcome measures of the MAKSS-CE-R and the SSQ, and small sample size.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) found that supervisees who were supervised by a person of color reported higher levels of perceived multicultural counseling competence than did supervisees with a White supervisor. Jeanquart-Barone (1996) found that female supervisees have reported less satisfaction with their supervisor than their male cohorts. The results of the present study did not support previous findings of significant relationships between supervisor ethnicity and supervisee cultural competence and between supervisor gender and supervisee satisfaction.
Ladany, Hill, Corbett, and Nutt (1996) found that ratings of low satisfaction with supervision correlated to the supervisee reporting a poor supervisory alliance and to supervisor incompetence. Priest (1994) clearly stated that the supervisory relationship is affected by the competency level of the supervisor. The findings of this study did not support results of previous studies that found supervisor competence effected supervisee satisfaction.

It was expected by the researcher that the ethnic representation found in the study would be mostly comprised of White respondents. Greater participation from males was expected, in particular White male doctoral counseling supervisors who were the original population of interest.

The lack of statistically significant variance on the MAKSS-CE-R and the SSQ may be due partially to volunteer effect. Participation in this research study was voluntary. Respondents who chose to participate may have felt more comfortable with or confident about their cultural competence. Additionally, supervisees who were more satisfied with supervision may have been more likely to respond to the survey.

The results of the MAKSS-CE-R suggested that the participants in this study generally scored high in their cultural competence. The mean score of the respondents for the MAKSS-CE-R was 2.9 with 4.0 being the highest possible rating of cultural competence. Participation in this study was delimited to CACREP-accredited counseling programs. A standard of compliance for CACREP-accredited counseling programs is that students complete a multicultural counseling course as a requirement of their programs of study. All participants in this study reported that they either had taken or were currently
enrolled in a multicultural counseling course, which may have contributed to the relatively high self-ratings of cultural competence.

Supervisee scores on the SSQ were indicative of generally high satisfaction with supervision. This result supports previous research which found that master’s level supervisees tend to report high satisfaction scores when being supervised by doctoral counseling students (Fernando, 2003).

Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, the number of participants (n = 122) was relatively small. Due to small sample size, adequate power was lacking to assess with confidence a relationship among variables.

The anonymous nature of this study and of the SurveyMonkey.com survey links prevented tracking of the programs in which student respondents were enrolled. The ability to know which programs participated would have allowed for more specific follow-up requests that might have increased participation in this study. The relative recency of the phenomenon of electronic survey technology may have served as a deterrent for possible participants who are more accustomed to paper-based surveys.

Another limitation that may have affected the number of responses was reliance on program coordinators and chairs to disseminate the survey links via their programs’ listserves and student email addresses. The actual dissemination of the links could not be verified.

The self-report nature of the MAKSS-CE-R allows respondents to report socially appropriate responses that may not reflect their actual cultural competency level. With
the increasing attention to cultural competence in the counseling profession, respondents may have known which responses are more acceptable and even expected of them. Social desirability may also have affected responses to the SSQ.

**Recommendations**

Although statistically significant results did not emerge from this study, it should not be assumed that no relationship exists between the variables of supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. By taking into consideration the following recommendations, future researchers, counselor educators, and supervisors may be able to produce significant findings in the areas of cultural competence and satisfaction with supervision.

*Recommendations for Future Researchers*

It is recommended that future researchers extend the present study with a larger sample of respondents from CACREP-accredited doctoral/master’s level programs. The inclusion of non-accredited counseling programs might also increase the number of participants and allow for greater representation of cultural competency levels and satisfaction with supervision attitudes across counseling programs.

Future researchers might consider utilizing qualitative methods along with quantitative analysis. Mixed methods would provide breath and depth to data analysis in this area of inquiry.

Future researchers are advised to search for or develop an instrument that, unlike the MAKSS-CE-R, measures actual rather than self-perceived cultural competency. The self report nature, minimal reverse scoring, and direct items allow study participants to
give socially appropriate responses that may not be representative of their true beliefs and experiences. Finally, trait factor matching may be a concern for future researchers utilizing dyads in their study. It is advised that researchers explore whether or not programs are matching supervisors and supervisees based upon their ethnicity and/or gender.

**Recommendations for Counselor Educators and Supervisors**

It is suggested that counselor educators and supervisors consider what cultural competency level a doctoral supervisor needs to be able to demonstrate, in order to supervise master’s-level interns. A major concern mentioned throughout the literature is that many supervisors have not had training to identify culturally relevant issues within the supervision process (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Ladany,Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). Previous researchers have demonstrated that the supervisory relationship is the basis for much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor (Muratori, 2000; Norrie, Eggleston, & Ringer, 2003). Only one third of supervisors who participated in this study indicated that they had taken more than one multicultural counseling course. Helms (1990) has argued that supervisors need to be more culturally competent than their supervisees in order to facilitate the supervisees’ progression towards greater competence. Counselor education programs might consider requiring an advanced multicultural counseling and supervision course for doctoral students who will supervise master’s-level interns. Counselor educators might also consider the question of what competency level master’s students need to be able to demonstrate, before they start their internships. Of the supervisees who participated in this study, 41% were currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course.
Multicultural competence of interns might be increased if master’s-level students were required to complete a multicultural counseling course before they begin their internship experiences.
The literature has emphasized the importance of training counselors to be culturally competent in order to meet the needs of clients from diverse cultures (Cook, 1994; Constantine, 2001; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996). Researchers have concluded that cultural competence is an integral component of effective supervision. The supervisory relationship is a primary source for development of a counselor identity which includes cultural competence (Cook, 1994). Within the supervisory relationship, supervisors should help counselors-in-training develop personal awareness in both multicultural and general counseling skills (Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur & Garrett, 2001).

The literature suggests that a competent supervisor lays the foundation for the supervisee to develop competence in the profession. The supervisory relationship is the basis for much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor (Muratori, 2000; Norrie, Eggleston, & Ringer, 2003). Counseling supervisors need to have the skills of cultural awareness and competency (Gatmon et al., 2001). Parallel process theory suggests that dynamics of the supervisor, which include cultural competence, are taught to the supervisee who in turn counsels the client. It is through the supervisory relationship that issues of culture can begin to be addressed (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Personal insight and growth in a supervisor often lead to more effective practitioners for the counseling profession as the supervisors transfer these skills to their supervisees (Constantine, 2001). Supervision that does not include a cultural context is inadequate at best, or is simply ineffective (Constantine, 1997).
Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) reported that supervisees who were "instructed" by their supervisors to focus on cross-cultural issues with clients were better equipped to empathize and connect with clients of different cultural backgrounds than supervisees who did not receive such instruction. Hilton, Russell, and Salmi (1995) found that level of supervisor support significantly influenced supervisees' evaluations of supervision. Teaching supervisees to look at culture as an integral, non-defining part of the whole client may be challenging when the terms culture, race, and ethnicity seem to be interchangeable (Cook, 1994).

Cook and Helms (1988) found that perceived liking by the supervisor accounted for 70% of supervisee satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision. Supervisors who discuss cross-cultural issues with their supervisees model appropriate and competent behavior for their supervisees to emulate in their work with their clients. Supervisors’ cultural competence is evidenced by their ability to effectively and professionally address issues of culture within the supervisory relationship (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) found that supervisees who were supervised by a person of Color reported higher levels of perceived multicultural counseling competence than did supervisees with a White supervisor. The White counselor is likely to inherit the racial and cultural biases of his or her forebears (Corvin & Wiggins, 1989). According to Breaux (2004), White male supervisors find it difficult to discuss differences in personal culture due to lack of awareness and social obligation to define their cultural values.

Culture extends beyond race and ethnicity. Cultural competence includes other many variables including gender. Researchers have found that supervisees are treated differently based on various traits including gender (Gatmon et al., 2001; Granello,

Breaux (2004) conducted a qualitative analysis of White male supervisors’ perceptions of culture within the supervisory relationship. Major themes that emerged from this study were the cultural variables of values and experiences. Culture, as reported by the study participants, can be defined as an individual characteristic that is employed to interact with other individuals as one navigates through society. This unique definition may be attributable to the fact that White male supervisors have long been excluded from the discussion of culture.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the cultural competency of White male counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their supervisees. Minimal research has been published addressing the cultural dynamics of White males as counselor supervisors. The research question for the study was: Does a relationship exist between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees?

Method

Participants and Procedures
The population of interest for this proposed study was the supervisory dyads that existed during the Spring 2005 at CACREP-accredited universities in the United States. These supervisory dyads were comprised of doctoral-level counseling supervisors and their master’s-level supervisees. From this population, a sample of doctoral student supervisors and their supervisees from 41 of 43 CACREP-accredited counselor education doctoral and master’s programs were selected to participate. The coordinators or chairpersons of these 41 programs were contacted via email requesting the dissemination of the electronic survey links to their students currently in doctoral/master’s student supervisory dyads. The total number of participants in this study was 122: 61 supervisors and 61 supervisees.

Two electronic survey packets were disseminated, one designed for doctoral supervisors and the other for master’s level supervisees. The electronic survey packets sent to supervisors included a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire and the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003). The demographic questionnaire and the MAKSS-CE-R, plus the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996), were included in the supervisee survey packet.

Instruments

The following instruments were used in this study: a researcher-developed demographic questionnaire; the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea,
and the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996).

A demographic questionnaire was used to collect information about the supervisors’ and supervisees’ sex, ethnicity, annual household income, number of courses completed in multicultural counseling, number of supervisory sessions held to date between current dyad, amount of supervisory experience (supervisor), and amount of counseling experience (supervisor and supervisee).

The Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003) is a revision of the 60-item Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey developed by D’Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991). The MAKSS-CE-R is designed to rate an individual’s multicultural competence in the areas of knowledge, awareness, and skills. It is based on Sue et al.’s (1982) model of cross-cultural counseling competence. Responses to the items on the MAKSS-CE-R are measured using three different 4-point Likert-type scales (1 = very limited, 4 = very aware; 1 = very limited, 4 = very good; 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) respective to the subscale areas. Higher scores are typical of greater multicultural competence.

This 33-item survey is divided into three subscales. Ten (10) items, numbers 1-10, measure the individual’s multicultural counseling awareness. (Example item: Racial and ethnic persons are under-represented in clinical and counseling psychology.) Thirteen (13) items, numbers 11-23, measure the individual’s multicultural counseling knowledge. (Example item: At the present time, how would you rate your understanding of the following term: “Transcultural”). Ten (10) items, numbers 24-33, measure the
individual’s multicultural counseling skills. (*Example items: How well would you rate your ability to accurately assess the mental health needs of gay men?*). There are six (6) reverse scored items in the MAKSS-CE-R, items 1-4, 6, and 9, all of which are all in the Awareness subscale. Possible scores for the MAKSS-CE-R range from 33 to 132, with 132 representing the highest level of multicultural competence.

Kim et al. (2003) reported an internal reliability for the MAKSS-CE-R of .81. The co-efficient alphas for the subscales are .80, .87, and .85 for Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills, respectively. Construct validity was established for the MAKSS-CE-R by correlating the scores of this survey with the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 2002). The results yielded correlation coefficients on the Awareness and Knowledge subscales of .67 and .48, respectively. To assess criterion-related validity the scores were compared between participants who had taken a multicultural course and those who had not taken the course. Also, participants’ scores were correlated based on their years of experience working with culturally different clients (Kim et al.).

The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany et al., 1996) is an adapted version of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ; Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979). To construct the SSQ, Ladany et al. substituted the term “supervision” for the terms “counseling” and “services” on the original instrument. The SSQ is an eight (8) item instrument with total scores ranging from 8 to 32. Responses to the items on the SSQ are measured using a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = low, 4 = high) to measure supervisees’ satisfaction with supervision. The scores on the SSQ can range from 8 to 32. A score of 8 to 20 suggest low satisfaction with supervision, with a range of
21 to 26 suggest medium satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction. Ladany et al. (1996) reported that the original CSQ’s internal reliability has been measured at .84 to .93 in various studies. The internal reliability of the SSQ is .96 (Ladany et al.).

Results

Participant Characteristics

Demographic information pertaining to participants’ gender, ethnic background, amount of experience as a counselor, and number of completed courses in multicultural counseling were obtained from both supervisor and supervisee demographic questionnaires. Demographic data concerning supervisee enrollment in multicultural counseling courses and supervisors’ number of previous supervisees were also collected through the respective demographic questionnaires. Categorical identification of frequencies and percentages of the demographic information are reported along with narrative summations of the results.

Participant Gender: Participants reported their gender. Female supervisors represented more than 31% (n = 38) of the total participant population. Male supervisors represented almost 19% (n = 23) of the total participant population. Female supervisees comprised almost 38% (n = 46) of the total participant population. Male supervisees had the smallest representation with slightly more than 12% (n = 15). Total female participants represented almost 70% (n = 84) of the respondents, while total male participants represented slightly over 31% (n = 38).
**Participant Ethnicity:** Study participants reported their ethnicity. Almost 60% (n = 73) of the total participants identified their ethnic origin as European-American. For the purposes of the study European-Americans were considered White. The remaining 40% (n = 49) of the participants in this study were considered non-white. White supervisors comprised 30.3% (n = 37) of the participants with non-white supervisors representing 19.7% (n = 24). White supervisees represented 29.5% (n = 36) of the participants. Non-white supervisees represented 20.5% (n = 25) of the total participants.

**Participant Experience as a Counselor:** Participants reported their amount of experience as a counselor (full-time or equivalent). The majority of supervisors reported having a year or more of experience as a counselor (n = 50, 82.0%). Most supervisees reported having less than 6 months of experience as a counselor (n = 37, 60.7%).

**Completed Courses in Multicultural Counseling:** Participants reported the total number of multicultural counseling courses that they have completed. The majority of participants reported completing one multicultural counseling course (n = 71, 58.2%). Completion of one multicultural counseling course was the major response among supervisors (n = 32, 52.5%) and supervisees (n = 38, 62.3%).

**Supervisees’ Current Enrollment:** Supervisees who participated in this study reported if they are currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course. Fifty-nine percent (n = 36) of the supervisees in this study were not currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course. The remaining 41% (n = 25) of supervisees in the study are currently enrolled in multicultural counseling courses.

**Supervisors’ Previous Supervisees:** Supervisors in this study reported the number of supervisees they have previously supervised, besides their current supervisee.
Supervisors reported whether they had no previous supervisees (n = 12, 19.6%), one to two (n = 18, 29.6%), three to four (n = 13, 21.4%), five to six (n = 7, 11.4%), or seven or more (n = 11, 18.0%). Most (over 80%) of the supervisors reported previous experience as a supervisor.

*Instruments*

Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey: All participants in this study completed the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R). The mean scores and standard deviations of the participants’ responses on the MAKSS-CE-R are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Participant Responses to the MAKSS-CE-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results presented in Table 10 suggest minimal variance among the participants’ responses to items on the MAKSS-CE-R. The central tendency of the responses on the MAKSS-CE-R suggested an average to moderate competency level in each subscale and throughout the total survey. In summary, the scores show little variability and skewed responses toward the positive in cultural competency.
Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire: Master's level supervisees who participated in this study responded to items on the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). The mean score and standard deviation of the responses suggest high satisfaction with supervision. The scores on the SSQ can range from 8 to 32. A score of 8 to 20 suggest low satisfaction with supervision, with a range of 21 to 26 suggest medium satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction. The mean score of the participants’ responses to the SSQ was 26.54 and the standard deviation of the participants’ responses was 5.54.

Both doctoral supervisors and master's level's supervisees who participated in this study took the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (MAKSS-CE-R). The individual participants’ subscores in the areas of Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills were averaged for a total score. The total score from the MAKSS-CE-R of supervisors and supervisees in matching dyads were differentiated by the use of difference scores. The greater the difference score, the greater the variance between the cultural competence rating of the supervisor and their supervisee. The resulting difference scores were then correlated to the supervisees’ scores on the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). No correlation was found between the variables of supervisor cultural competency and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. The Pearson correlation between the variables of supervisor cultural competency and supervisee satisfaction with supervision showed an \( r = .079 \).
Discussion

Gender

Female participants represented almost 70% of the total respondents, while male participants represented slightly over 30%. This ratio was consistent among supervisors (62% female; 38% male) and supervisees (75% female; 25% male) who participated in this study. This proportion of females to males is representative of the ratio of females to males in counseling programs across the United States.

Ethnicity

Almost 60% of the total participants were White. The remaining 40% of the participants in this study were non-white. The ethnic background of the participants was as follows: African-American 21%, Arab-American 1%, Asian-American 7%, European-American 60%, Latin-American 7%, Native-American 3%, and Bi-racial 3%. The ratio of white respondents to non-white respondents was similar for supervisors (61% white; 39% non-white) and supervisees (59% white; 41% non-white)

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and bivariate correlational analysis. Due to low variability in the variables of cultural competency and satisfaction with supervision, the data analysis was changed from the originally proposed analysis of variance to bivariate correlation. There were five primary research hypotheses in this study that stated: There is a significant positive relationship between the cultural competency of White male doctoral student counseling supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their master’s-level intern supervisees. Each of the hypotheses was worded to examine the variables of ethnicity (white and non-white) and gender (male and
female). The identifier “White male” was omitted from these hypotheses for the analysis of the data collected due to the low response rate from White males. Overall, no statistically significant results were found with respect to the relationship between the cultural competence of doctoral counselor supervisors and the satisfaction with supervision of their mater’s level supervisees.

The results of the study revealed no statistically significant relationships between the variables of supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. No statistically significant difference was found between the variables supervisor ethnicity, supervisor gender, supervisee ethnicity, supervisee gender, and trait factor matching within dyads. Trait factor matching occurs when supervisors and supervisees are intentionally paired based on shared ethnic and/or gender traits. The lack of statistically significant findings may be due to the lack of variance in the five variables. These findings were not supported by the results of this study that found no statistically significant relationship between supervisor ethnicity and supervisee cultural competence. Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) found that supervisees who were supervised by a person of color reported higher levels of perceived multicultural counseling competence than did supervisees with a White supervisor. Female supervisees have reported less satisfaction with their supervisor than their male cohorts (Jeanquart-Barone, 1996). Again, this study did not produce similar findings due to the lack of statistically significant findings ($r = .063; p = .629$).

Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt (1996) found that low satisfaction rating also correlated to the supervisee reporting a poor supervisory alliance, and supervisor incompetence. The findings of this study are atypical of previous studies which found
supervisor competence effected supervisee satisfaction. It was expected by the researcher that the ethnic representation found in the study would be mostly comprised of White respondents (60%). The researcher was expecting more participation for males, in particular White male doctoral counseling supervisors who were the original population of interest.

Priest (1994) clearly stated that the supervisory relationship is affected by the competency level of the supervisor. The lack of statistically significant variance on the MAKSS-CE-R and the SSQ may also be due to volunteer effect. Participation in this research study was voluntary. Respondents who chose to participate may have felt more comfortable with or confident about their cultural competence. This may also be true for the supervisees in relation to their satisfaction with supervision.

The results of the MAKSS-CE-R suggested that the participants in this study scored high in their cultural competence. The mean score of the respondents for the MAKSS-CE-R was 2.9 with a 4 being the highest possible rating of cultural competence. Participation for this study was requested from CACREP-accredited counseling programs. A standard of compliance for CACREP-accredited counseling programs is that students take a multicultural counseling course as a requirement of their programs study. All participants in this study reported that they have either taken or are currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course.

Supervisee scores on the SSQ were representative of mostly high satisfaction with supervision. This result supports previous research which found that master’s level supervisees tend to report high satisfaction scores when being supervised by doctoral students (Fernando, 2003). It has also been that supervisees do not place the same value
of skills and counseling techniques for which the profession of counseling has been noted for (Furr & Carroll, 2003). This may be a consideration in the evaluation of supervisees concerning their supervisory experience.

**Limitations**

There were several limitations to this study. The number of participants (n = 122) was relatively small. A small sample size prevented the researcher from increasing the power to better assess a relationship among variables. The anonymous nature of this study and of the Surveymonkey.com survey links prevented tracking of which programs had student respondents. The ability to know which programs participated would have allowed for more specific follow-up requests that might have increased participation in this study. The recent development of the phenomenon of electronic survey technology may have served as a deterrent for possible participants who are more accustomed to paper-based surveys. Another limitation that may have affected the number of responses was the researcher’s reliance on program coordinators and chairs to disseminate the survey links via their programs listserves and students’ emails. The actual dissemination of the links was difficult to verify. The self-report nature of the MAKSS-CE-R allows for respondents to report socially appropriate responses that may not reflect their actual cultural competency level. This may have also been of concern for the supervisee response on the SSQ. With the increasing attention to cultural competence through the CACREP standards, respondents may know which responses are more acceptable and even expected of them.
Recommendations

Although statistically significant results did not emerge from this study, it should not be assumed that relationship does not exist between the variables of supervisor cultural competence and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. By taking into consideration the following recommendations future researchers, counselor educators, and supervisors may be able to produce statistically significant findings in the areas of cultural competence and satisfaction with supervision.

Recommendations for Future Researchers

It is recommended that future researchers extend the study with a larger sample of respondents from CACREP-accredited doctoral/master’s level programs. The inclusion of non-accredited counseling programs might also increase the number of participants and allow for greater representation of cultural competency levels and satisfaction with supervision attitudes across counseling programs. Also, future researchers might consider utilizing qualitative methods along with quantitative analysis. Mixed methods would provide breath and depth to data analysis in this area of inquiry. Future researchers are advised to use an instrument other than the MAKSS-CE-R to rate cultural competency. The self report nature, minimal reverse scoring, and direct items allows for study participants to give socially appropriate responses that may not be representative of their true beliefs and experiences. Finally, trait factor matching may be a concern for future researchers utilizing dyads in their study. It is advised that researchers explore whether or not programs are matching supervisors and supervisees based upon their ethnicity and/or gender.


Recommendations for Counselor Educators and Supervisors

It is suggested that counselor educators and supervisors consider at what cultural competency level a doctoral supervisor needs to be able to demonstrate, in order to supervise master’s level interns. A major concern mentioned throughout the literature is that many supervisors have not had training to identify culturally relevant issues within the supervision process (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). The researcher agrees that with previous researchers that the supervisory relationship is the basis for much of the development of a supervisee’s competence as a counselor (Muratori, 2000; Norrie, Eggleston, & Ringer, 2003). Doctoral supervisors need more than one multicultural counseling course as to be, ideally, more culturally competent then their supervisees and facilitate the supervisees’ progression towards greater competence (Helms, 1990). Also, at what competency level should a supervisee be at before they start their internship? Of the supervisees who participated in this study, 41% were currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course. The researcher advises that a multicultural counseling course be completed before interns began their last year of their programs study. Only one third of supervisors who participated in this study indicated that they have taken more than one multicultural counseling course.
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Appendix A:

Multicultural Counseling Competencies
Multicultural Counseling Competencies (ACA, 1992)

Counselor Awareness of Own Cultural Values and Biases

A. Attitudes and Beliefs

1. Culturally skilled counselors have moved from being culturally unaware to being aware and sensitive to their own cultural heritage and to valuing and respecting differences.

2. Culturally skilled counselors are aware of how their own cultural backgrounds and experiences and attitudes, values, and biases influence psychological processes.

3. Culturally skilled counselors are able to recognize the limits of their competencies and expertise.

4. Culturally skilled counselors are comfortable with differences that exist between themselves and clients in terms of race, ethnicity, culture, and beliefs.

B. Knowledge

1. Culturally skilled counselors have specific knowledge about their own racial and cultural heritage and how it personally and professionally affects their definitions of normality-abnormality and the process of counseling.

2. Culturally skilled counselors possess knowledge and understanding about how oppression, racism, discrimination, and stereotyping affects them personally and in their work. This allows them to acknowledge their own racist attitudes, beliefs, and feelings. Although this standard applies to all groups, for White counselors it may mean that they understand how they may have directly or indirectly benefited
from individual, institutional, and cultural racism (White identity development models).

3. Culturally skilled counselors possess knowledge about their social impact on others. They are knowledgeable about communication style differences, how their style may clash or foster the counseling process with minority clients, and how to anticipate the impact it may have on others.

C. Skills

1. Culturally skilled counselors seek out educational, consultative, and training experience to improve their understanding and effectiveness in working with culturally different populations. Being able to recognize the limits of their competencies, they (a) seek consultation, (b) seek further training or education, (c) refer out to more qualified individuals or resources, or (d) engage in a combination of these.

2. Culturally skilled counselors are constantly seeking to understand themselves as racial and cultural beings and are actively seeking a nonracist identity.

Counselor Awareness of Clients’ Worldview

A. Attitudes and Beliefs

1. Culturally skilled counselors are aware of their negative emotional reactions toward other racial and ethnic groups that may prove detrimental to their clients in counseling. They are willing to contrast their own beliefs and attitudes with those of their culturally different clients in a nonjudgmental fashion.

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

1. Culturally skilled counselors possess specific knowledge and information about the particular group they are working with. They are aware of the life experiences, cultural heritage, and historical background of their culturally different clients. This particular competency is strongly linked to the minority identity development models available in the literature.

2. Culturally skilled counselors understand how race, culture, ethnicity, and so forth may affect personality formation, vocational choices, manifestation of psychological disorders, help-seeking behavior, and the appropriateness or inappropriateness of counseling approaches.

3. Culturally skilled counselors understand and have knowledge about sociopolitical influences that impinge upon the life of racial and ethnic minorities. Immigration issues, poverty, racism, stereotyping, and powerlessness all leave major scars that may influence the counseling process.

C. Skills

1. Culturally skilled counselors should familiarize themselves with relevant research and the latest findings regarding mental health and mental disorders of various ethnic and racial groups. They should actively seek out educational experiences that foster their knowledge, understanding, and cross-cultural skills.

2. Culturally skilled counselors become actively involved with minority individuals outside of the counseling setting (community events, social and political functions, celebrations, friendships, neighborhood groups, and so forth) so that their perspective of minorities is more than an academic or helping exercise.
Culturally Appropriate Intervention Strategies

A. Attitudes and Beliefs

1. Culturally skilled counselors respect clients’ religious and/or spiritual beliefs and values, including attributions and taboos, because they affect worldview, psychosocial functioning, and expressions of distress.

2. Culturally skilled counselors respect indigenous helping practices and respect minority community intrinsic help-giving networks.

3. Culturally skilled counselors value bilingualism and do not view another language as an impediment to counseling (monolingualism may be the culprit).

B. Knowledge

1. Culturally skilled counselors have a clear and explicit knowledge and understanding of the generic characteristics of counseling and therapy (culture bound, class bound, and monolingual) and how they may clash with the cultural values of various minority groups.

2. Culturally skilled counselors are aware of institutional barriers that prevent minorities from using mental health services.

3. Culturally skilled counselors have knowledge of the potential bias in assessment instruments and use procedures and interpret findings keeping in mind the cultural and linguistic characteristics of the clients.

4. Culturally skilled counselors have knowledge of minority family structures, hierarchies, values, and beliefs. They are knowledgeable about the community characteristics and the resources in the community as well as the family.
5. Culturally skilled counselors should be aware of relevant discriminatory practices at the social and community level that may be affecting the psychological welfare of the population being served.

C. Skills

1. Culturally skilled counselors are able to engage in a variety of verbal and nonverbal helping responses. They are able to send and receive both verbal and non-verbal messages accurately and appropriately. They are not tied down to only one method or approach to helping but recognize that helping styles and approaches may be culture bound. When they sense that their helping style is limited and potentially inappropriate, they can anticipate and ameliorate its negative impact.

2. Culturally skilled counselors are able to exercise institutional intervention skills on behalf of their clients. They can help clients determine whether a problem stems from racism or bias in others (the concept of health paranoia) so that clients do not inappropriately personalize problems.

3. Culturally skilled counselors are not averse to seeking consultation with traditional healers and religious and spiritual leaders and practitioners in the treatment of culturally different clients when appropriate.

4. Culturally skilled counselors take responsibility for interacting in the language requested by the client and, if not feasible, make appropriate referral. A serious problem arises when the linguistic skills of a counselor do not match the language of the client. This being the case, counselors should (a) seek a translator with
cultural knowledge and appropriate professional background and (b) refer to a knowledgeable and competent bilingual counselor.

5. Culturally skilled counselors have training and expertise in the use of traditional assessment and testing instruments. They not only understand the technical aspects of the instruments but are also aware of the cultural limitations. This allows them to use test instruments for the welfare of the diverse clients.

6. Culturally skilled counselors should attend to as well as work to eliminate biases, prejudices, and discriminatory practices. They should be cognizant of sociopolitical contexts in conducting evaluation and providing interventions and should develop sensitivity to issues of oppression, sexism, elitism, and racism.

7. Culturally skilled counselors take responsibility in educating their clients to the processes of psychological intervention, such as goals, expectations, legal rights, and the counselor’s orientation.
Appendix B:

Demographics Questionnaire
(Supervisor Form)
Demographic Questionnaire  
(Supervisor Form)

Thank you for your participation in this study.

In order to maintain confidentiality and match supervisor and supervisee dyads, this study will utilize an anonymous code. Please take a moment to create a nondescriptive, three (3) digit alpha numeric code and record it in the space below. Any combination of letter(s) and number(s) is acceptable.

Share this code with your supervisee who will also record this code on their form.

Alpha Numeric Code: _____     _____     _____ (Example Code:  1  A  2  )

Please complete the demographic items below to describe yourself in relation to your current individual supervisee. If you have more than one supervisee please respond concerning the supervisee you have supervised the longest and with whom you will be sharing your code with for matching in this study of supervisory dyads.

Your gender:   _____ Male     _____ Female

Your primary decent group:
   _____ African-American        _____ Arab-American        _____ Asian-American
   _____ European-American     _____ Native-American     _____ Latin-American
   _____ Bi or Multi-racial

Number of completed courses on multicultural counseling: ______  
(include both master’s and doctoral courses)

Number of supervisory sessions held to date with current supervisee:
   _____ None   _____ 1-2       _____ 3-4       _____ 5-6       _____ 7 or more

How many supervisees have you supervised (not including the supervisee participating in this study):
   _____ None   _____ 1-2       _____ 3-4       _____ 5-6       _____ 7 or more

Amount of experience as a counselor (full-time or equivalent):
   _____ Less than 6 months   _____ 6 months to 1 year   _____ 1 year or more
Appendix C:

Demographics Questionnaire
(Supervisee Form)
Thank you for your participation in this study.

In order to maintain confidentiality and match supervisor and supervisee dyads, this study will utilize an anonymous code. Your supervisor has created a nondescriptive, three (3) digit alpha numeric code and recorded it on his/her form. Please record the same code in the space provided below.

Alpha Numeric Code: _____     _____     _____

Your gender:   _____ Male     _____ Female

Your primary decent group:
   _____ African-American     _____ Arab-American     _____ Asian-American
   _____ European-American     _____ Native-American     _____ Latin-American
   _____ Bi or Multi-racial

Are you currently enrolled in a course on multicultural counseling?  ____Yes   ____ No

Number of completed courses on multicultural counseling: ______
(not including a current enrollment)

Number of supervisory sessions held to date with current supervisor:
   _____ None   _____ 1-2   _____ 3-4   _____ 5-6   _____ 7 or more

Amount of experience as a counselor (full-time or equivalent):
   _____ Less than 6 months   _____ 6 months to 1 year   _____ 1 year or more
Appendix D:

Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire
Please indicate your honest opinions regarding your master's degree individual supervision experience, whether they are positive or negative. If you had more than one supervisor while you were receiving master's degree supervision, respond to these items in relation to your current university supervisor. Please answer all of the questions.

SUPERVISION SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How would you rate the quality of the supervision you never see?
   1 Excellent  2 Good  3 Fair  4 Poor

2. Did you get the kind of supervision you wanted?
   1 No, definitely not  2 No, not really  3 Yes, generally  4 Yes, definitely

3. To what extent has the supervision fit your needs?
   1 Almost all of my needs have been met  2 Most of my needs have been met  3 Only a few of my needs have been met  4 None of my needs have been met

4. If a friend were in need of supervision, would you recommend this supervisor to him or her?
   1 No, definitely not  2 No, I don't think so  3 Yes, I think so  4 Yes, definitely

5. How satisfied are you with the amount of supervision you have received?
   1 Quite dissatisfied  2 Indifferent or mildly satisfied  3 Mostly satisfied  4 Very satisfied

6. Has the supervision you received helped you to deal more effectively in your role as a counselor or therapist?
   1 Yes, definitely  2 Yes, generally  3 No, not really  4 No, definitely not

7. In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the supervision you have received?
   1 Very satisfied  2 Mostly satisfied  3 Indifferent or mildly satisfied  4 Quite dissatisfied

8. If you were to seek supervision again, would you come back to this supervisor?
   1 No, definitely not  2 No, I don't think so  3 Yes, I think so  4 Yes, definitely
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