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Abstract

Societies and cultures become more diverse and globalized. Changing demographics of the U.S. population draws increasing attention to issues of diversity and multicultural competence. In the mental health field, a growing body of research focuses on multicultural counseling and training. As supervision is a critical component of counselor training, including counselor development of cultural competence, culturally competent supervision has been studied in some previous studies. To date, however, little research has been conducted to comprehensively describe specific supervisor behaviors that constitute multicultural competence. In particular counselor trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors, including supervisor provision of feedback, have received little research attention. Thus, three major research questions were investigated in the present study: (1) What supervisor behaviors (including feedback behaviors) do counseling trainees regard as culturally competent? (2) Do expectations of culturally competent supervisor behaviors differ between 1st year and 2nd year trainees? and (3) Do perceptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors differ from perceptions of behaviors that comprise general supervisor competencies? Participants consisted of first and second year students enrolled either in a psychological counseling masters program or second year students enrolled in a genetic counseling masters program at the University of Minnesota (N = 51; 11 males and 40 females). A focus group design was used for this qualitative research. Participants in eight focus groups viewed a DVD containing two hypothetical supervision situations involving supervisor provision of feedback to a supervisee regarding the supervisee’s apparent cultural
insensitivity towards a client. One scenario portrayed a psychological counseling supervision relationship and one scenario portrayed a genetic counseling supervision relationship. Focus group participants responded to a series of questions regarding supervisor multicultural competence and general competence. They provided written responses prior to and after viewing the scenarios, and they gave verbal responses during focus group interviews. The focus group discussions were audiorecorded and transcribed by the researcher. Qualitative analysis of both written and verbal responses yielded four overarching themes reflecting supervisor culturally-relevant: Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes. Some supervisor behaviors identified as culturally competent in this study are congruent with findings of previous studies (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Dressel, Consoli, Kim, & Atkinson, 2007; Falender & Shafranske, 2004). Although most responses from the first year and the second year counseling students were similar and generally consistent, there were some notable differences particularly regarding expectations about supervisor provision of direction/guidance. Provision of guidance as a culturally competent supervisor behavior was a more prevalent theme for first year students. The findings of this study also show considerable overlap between behaviors associated with general supervisor competence and cultural competence (e.g., supervisor empathy, non-judgmentalness, self-disclosure). Major findings, study strengths and limitations, and clinical and research implications are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

We live in globally-connected societies. Globalization brought about by telecommunications, technological developments, and economic changes has made us more attuned to issues of diversity and multicultural competency. In addition, the changing demographics of the U.S. population has brought increased recognition of the importance of multicultural issues. According to a recent report, ethnic minorities comprise about 30% of the population in the U.S., and they will become the majority by the year 2050, based on current demographic trends (Kripalani, Bussey-Jones, Katz, & Genao, 2006). Another recent study shows the Latino population, the nation's largest minority group, will triple in size and will account for most of the nation's population growth from 2005 through 2050 (Passel & Cohn, 2008).

As racial and cultural diversity increase, the importance of multicultural competence is also growing in mental health fields (Butler, 2003; Kim & Lyons, 2003). The American Psychological Association (APA) adopted the Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists as policy, in 2003 (APA, 2003) in order to promote relevant multicultural work among educators, researchers, and clinicians. These guidelines also can be understood as relevant to supervisors and supervisees because effective supervision is based in part on both supervisor and supervisee awareness of multicultural issues (Miville, Rosa, & Constantine, 2005).
Societal changes and changes in the counseling and mental health field, have led to increased research attention on multicultural counseling competency and its applications, including counselor training (Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Ottavi, 1994). Supervision is a vital and critical component of counselor training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Supervision simultaneously monitors and reflects human behaviors including prejudice, bias, inequality, and values (Rapp, 2000) because supervisors, supervisees, and clients are all prone to ethnocentric bias. Indeed, being a culturally competent supervisor or counselor is extremely difficult.

This difficulty is due in part to conflicting views about what constitutes multicultural competence. For instance, there are many approaches including these two: one approach advocates global solutions through the development of guidelines for working with diverse ethnic clients (Speight, 1991); the other approach suggests that practitioners need to guard against becoming “culture-blind,” that is, ignoring cultural difference, and avoid stereotyping (Fernando, 1991; Rapp, 2000).

Supervisors play a critical in helping supervisees develop an overall professional identity (Bernard and Goodyear, 2004), and they are also pivotal in their supervisees’ development of cultural competence (Rapp, 2000). Some research indicates that supervision comprises an effective venue for fostering supervisee multicultural counseling competence (Constantine, 2001; Pope-Davis et al., 1995). Considerable bodies of research have focused on the cultural competency of counselors (cf. Reynolds, 2001; Sue, 2001; Sue et al., 1992) and on the provision of feedback in supervision (cf. Hoffman et al., 2005; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Ladany & Melincoff, 1999).
However, relatively little empirical research to date has been conducted that investigates multiculturally competent supervision, particularly the provision of culturally competent feedback in supervision and culturally competent supervisor behaviors.

**Definition of Multicultural Competence**

*Multicultural competence* refers to the skills necessary to work effectively and sensitively with clients from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999; Wang, 1994). Multicultural competence appears to be multidimensional, consisting of an appreciation and recognition of other cultural groups and an ability to effectively work with them (Sue, 1998). Arredondo and colleagues (Arredondo et al., 1996) identify three domains of multicultural counseling competency: awareness, knowledge, and skills.

**Multicultural Competence in Supervision**

As theory and research regarding multicultural competence advance, there is growing recognition that supervision comprises a primary vehicle for increasing mental health professionals’ multicultural knowledge, skills, and awareness (Priest, 1994). Priest asserts that at the most basic level, supervisors can help supervisees focus on how multicultural issues are relevant when conceptualizing clients’ problems. He further asserts when supervisors have the expectation that supervisees will keep multicultural issues in mind and discuss them in supervision, supervisees are able to demonstrate their potential in that regard.

There are many studies which indicate that multicultural counseling competence and supervision are closely related. For instance, supervisees who experience a strong
multicultural emphasis in supervision tend to perceive themselves as possessing higher levels of multicultural counseling competence (Constantine, 2001; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Nielson 1995), and they report greater satisfaction with supervision when they perceive their supervisors to be culturally competent (Pope-Davis et al., 1995). Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, and Ho (2001) found that discussions of multicultural issues in supervision helped supervisees identify and understand how culture influences their clinical practice. Constantine (1997) concluded that supervisee therapeutic competence is incomplete until multiculturalism is fully incorporated into the supervision process.

Pope-Davis, Toporek, and Ortega (2003) surveyed 74 mental health supervisors and 86 supervisees and found that higher levels of self-perceived multicultural counseling competence by both parties were related to higher ratings of supervisor effectiveness in providing a multicultural emphasis. They also found that supervisors who had received multicultural training were evaluated as more multiculturally competent, regardless of their overall counseling and supervision experience levels. The researchers concluded that multicultural training enhances supervisors’ influence in multicultural supervision.

Fukuyama (1994) surveyed 10 ethnic minority advanced doctoral students, asking them to identify positive and negative critical incidents that had affected their views of themselves as counselors. The study obtained three categories of positive incidents: openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and opportunities to work in multicultural activities; and two categories of negative incidents: lack of supervisor cultural awareness, and questioning supervisee abilities. She recommended
that supervisors initiate discussion of multicultural issues, regardless of ethnic or cultural backgrounds of the supervisor, supervisee, or client.

As Bernard and Goodyear (2004) describe, supervisors play a critical role in helping counselor trainees translate theories into real practice and develop their professional identity (Benard & Goodyear, 2004; Bradley & Kottler, 2001). Multicultural competence, which is defined by one’s awareness of, knowledge about, and skills in working with culturally diverse groups and clients (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992), is considered an important factor in counselor competence. Thus, it is essential to attend to multicultural issues in supervision (American Psychological Association, 2003; Ancis & Ladany, 2001). However, relatively little research to date has been conducted that investigates multiculturally competent supervision, particularly from the perception of counselor trainees about culturally competent supervisor’s behaviors and feedback.
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Definitions of Multicultural Competence and Multicultural Supervision

*Multicultural competence* refers to the skills necessary to work effectively and sensitively with clients from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999). Multicultural competence appears to be multi-dimensional, consisting of an appreciation and recognition of other cultural groups and an ability to effectively work with them (Sue, 1998). Multicultural competence is defined as one’s: (a) cultural awareness and beliefs, (b) cultural knowledge, and (c) cultural skills in working with culturally diverse groups and settings (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). In fact, virtually all counseling can be considered as multicultural because it is a cultural incorporation of all human aspects such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, class, age and so forth (Pedersen, 1991), and all supervision can be considered as multicultural supervision according to Pedersen’s assertion.

*Multicultural supervision* refers to supervisory situations in which supervisors and supervisees examine a variety of cultural issues pertinent to effectively counseling diverse clients (Leong & Wagner, 1994); multicultural supervision can also be involved with activities such as developing cultural awareness among supervisees, exploring cultural dynamics of the supervisory relationship, and discussing and exploring counseling theories through cultural lenses (Robinson, Bradley, & Hendricks, 2000). Thus, multicultural supervision is defined and applied as “situations in which supervisor and supervisees are involved in examining a variety of cultural and ethnic differences
between supervisors, supervisees, and clients” (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997, p. 291) in this study.

**Multicultural Issues in Supervision**

Supervision has been considered as a critical and essential vehicle for increasing counselors’ multicultural knowledge, skills, and awareness (Priest, 1994); most empirical studies of multicultural supervision have focused on sex (Goodyear, 1990; Ladany, Friedlander, & Nelson, 2005; Nelson & Holloway, 1999;) or race (Constantine et al., 2001; Fukuyama, 1994; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). Some studies suggest that supervisors’ multicultural focus and development influence supervisees’ cultural or clinical development (Fukuyama, 1994; Ladany et al., 1997). Constantine (1997) contends that supervisee therapeutic competence is incomplete until multiculturalism is fully incorporated into the supervision process. Priest (1994) asserts that supervisors can help supervisees focus on how multicultural issues are relevant when conceptualizing clients’ problems.

Discussions of multicultural issues in supervision help supervisees identify and understand how culture influences their clinical practice (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). Supervisees who experience a strong multicultural emphasis in supervision tend to perceive themselves as possessing higher levels of multicultural counseling competence (Constantine, 2001). Also, supervisees report greater satisfaction with supervision when they perceive their supervisors to be multiculturally competent (Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Nielsen, 1995).
Although multiculturally competent supervision and/or culturally competent supervisors are important, as many studies suggest, some research indicates supervisors vary in the extent to which they manifest sensitivity to cultural issues with their supervisees or their supervisees’ clients (Fukuyama, 1994; Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). Moreover, some supervisees perceive themselves as more multiculturally adept than their supervisors (Constantine, 1997). For instance, Duan and Roehlke (2001) investigated cross-racial supervision dyads and found that supervisees may have been more sensitive to cultural and racial issues than their supervisors, the supervisors reported making more efforts to address cultural issues than their supervisees perceived, and satisfaction with supervision was related to supervisees’ comfort level of self-disclosure and to dyad members’ perceived positive attitudes toward each other. The researchers concluded that positive attitudes from supervisors seem to be especially critical for minority counseling students.

**Culturally Competent Supervision**

Some researchers have attempted to explore the question of what constitutes culturally competent supervision. Dressel, Consoli, Kim, and Atkinson (2007) identified culturally successful and unsuccessful supervisor behaviors using a Delphi method. They identified 35 successful multicultural supervision behaviors and 33 unsuccessful multicultural supervision behaviors. Important elements of successful multicultural supervision included the supervisor: (a) creating a safe environment to discuss multicultural issues, (b) demonstrating self-awareness about one’s own cultural and ethnic identity, and (c) promoting supervisee ethnic identity development. Their expert
panelists’ rankings further suggest that in addition to these supervisor behaviors, specific multicultural topics must be discussed in order for successful multicultural supervision to occur. Finally, these researchers identified supervisors’ lack of awareness of their own racial, ethnic, and cultural biases as the most detrimental behaviors with respect to multicultural supervision.

Hird and colleagues (Hird et al., 2001) suggested that a conversation about multiculturalism should occur early in supervision and that supervisors may need to initiate such conversation because they typically have more power in the supervision relationship. Further, they concluded that supervisees who have experienced a history of oppression (e.g., due to race or sex) may be even more reluctant to engage in supervision or initiate cultural conversation. These authors argued that discussing multiculturalism helps supervisees understand how culture generally affects their counseling, including their theoretical orientation, case conceptualization, and treatment planning. They further advocated the use of self-disclosure by supervisors as a behavior that helps supervisees understand and integrate multiculturalism concepts.

Lawless, Gale, and Bacigalupe (2001) identified factors that pose challenges for increasing cultural competence in marriage and family therapy supervision, including: complexity of supervision process, a lack of literature, and a lack of diverse faculty or students in training programs. According to their findings, although discussion of the contextual markers of race, ethnicity, or cultural issues in supervision does not necessarily bring an extended dialogue, there is potential for an extended discussion to occur, which could be very beneficial for increasing supervisees’ cultural awareness.
Two major findings are apparent in the studies just reviewed. Specifically, multicultural competence begins with supervisors: (a) developing awareness of their own biases, stereotypes, and misinformation regarding culturally diverse people, and (b) encouraging discussion of cultural issues in supervision (Dressel et al., 2007; Hird et al., 2001; Lawless et al., 2001).

In a number of studies, a good supervision relationship has been found to be an important factor in culturally competent supervision (Dressel et al., 2007; Fukuyama, 1994; Hird et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2006) because a good relationship appears to provide sufficient trust to allow the supervisor and supervisee to be open with each other and to discuss culturally sensitive or difficult issues. According to Wehrly (1995), a supervisee’s multicultural competence increases when the supervisory relationship evolves to one where both parties begin to work together as colleagues. Wehrly suggests that culturally competent supervisors should display the following qualities: (a) flexibility, (b) critical thinking, (c) ability to work across cultures, (d) ability to manage own anxiety, (e) having a well-established sense of identity, and (f) using humor, humility, and patience effectively.

Knox and colleagues (Knox et al., 2006) also found the supervision relationship is important for culturally responsive supervision. They investigated supervisees’ experiences of cross-cultural supervision when their supervisors were responsive or unresponsive to cultural issues. Thirteen participants were European American supervisees (EASEs), and thirteen participants were Supervisees of Color (SECs; 6 African American, 6 Asian American, and 1 Latina). In the culturally responsive
supervision cases, both EASEs and SECs reported they had a productive and helpful supervision relationship prior to the culturally responsive event. Both EASEs and SECs indicated their supervision relationships improved and their satisfaction with supervision increased after their culturally responsive event. In addition, supervisees reported the culturally responsive event positively affected their clinical work. Within culturally unresponsive events, the EASEs described experiencing passive dismissal of cultural discussion during supervision with their supervisors of color. In contrast, SECs experienced their supervisors as actively working to discredit or discount the importance of cultural issues in supervision. The culturally unresponsive events evoked negative reactions from both EASEs and SECs, including anger, frustration, and disappointment.

**Multicultural Education for Supervisors**

The results of some studies indicate that supervisor or supervisee’s cultural education and training influence cultural competence. Pope-Davis, Toporek, & Ortega (2003) surveyed 74 mental health supervisors and 86 supervisees and found that higher levels of self-perceived multicultural counseling competence by both parties were related to higher ratings of supervisor effectiveness in providing a multicultural emphasis. They also found that supervisors who had received multicultural training were evaluated as more multiculturally competent, regardless of their overall counseling and supervision experience levels. The researchers concluded that multicultural training enhances supervisors’ influence in multicultural supervision.

Lee, McCarthy Veach, and LeRoy (2008) investigated relationships among genetic counselor supervisors’ perceived multicultural counseling competence, their development
as supervisors, and their ability to evaluate a supervisee’s multicultural skills. Based on their findings, the researchers concluded that continuing multicultural education and training are important for culturally competent supervision. They also found an apparent tension between not stereotyping patients based on their culture and needing to know the typical cultural expectations. Lee et al. emphasized that it is important for counselors and supervisors to be flexible because it allows them to avoid stereotyping members of a certain ethnic group, while still understanding prevalent aspects of their culture.

Wieling and Marshall (1999) suggested that a cross-cultural training experience through cross-cultural supervision or association with diverse colleagues is important for increasing trainees’ multicultural competence. They surveyed 50 members of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) about cross-cultural supervision. They identified barriers to the promotion of culturally competent supervision and training such as a lack of opportunity to discuss multicultural issues, or to be supervised by, or associate with, colleagues that have a different race and/or ethnicity than the majority culture. They also suggested that although having a cross-cultural supervision relationship itself does not guarantee increased multicultural competence, supervisees can have more opportunities for growth and self-awareness of cultural issues in cross-cultural supervisory relationships (Wieling & Marshall, 1999).

Coleman (2006) also found that experience with culturally diverse groups is important for culturally competent counselor training. A cluster analysis of narrative responses illuminated three types of influential process components in multicultural counselor training. Specifically, trainees identified various: (a) experiences with
colleagues from diverse cultural backgrounds in their training, (b) didactic and experiencial courses, and (c) experiences with culturally diverse people in their personal lives.

In addition to continuing cultural education or exposure to culturally diverse people, Dyche and Zayas (2001) emphasized the importance of including training in cultural empathy in supervisees’ education. They provided a definition of empathy in counseling and offered a rationale for including empathy skills in cross-cultural counseling training. Ethnotherapeutic empathy was defined as the cross-cultural therapists’ capacity for introspection and willingness to disclose information about themselves when it is helpful (Parson, 1993) particularly working with clients whose cultural backgrounds differ from that of the therapists (Parson, 1993). In counseling with culturally diverse clients, knowledge about a client’s cultural background is necessary, but not sufficient (Dyche & Zayas, 2001; Parson, 1993).

A recent trend in cultural competence training, recommended in some studies (Kim & Lyons, 2003; Pedersen, 2000; Rabinowitz, 1997), involves the use of experiential activities in conjunction with didactic methods to increase multicultural counseling competence in supervision and counselor training. Arkin (1999) studied culturally competent supervision in clinical social work in Israel. Field work supervisors in an Israeli School of Social Work who were supervising students from Ethiopia were invited to participate. Supervisors’ reactions toward this supervision situation and their approaches were recorded and analyzed. Two major stylistic approaches were identified: one that minimizes cultural differences in supervision, and the other that magnifies these
differences. The supervisors who minimized cultural diversity in supervision were individuals who adopted a universal outlook (Fukuyama, 1990; Pedersen, 1991), that is, a belief that there are general concepts shared by all cultures. In this approach, difficulties faced by ethnic minority supervisees were minimized, and the supervisors demanded that supervisees follow the mainstream culture. Another approach, based on Arkin’s (1999) findings, is magnifying cultural differences in supervision. Supervisors who magnified cultural differences usually adopted a relative outlook (Pedersen, 1991). In this case, the emphasis was on cultural differences, while common factors were neglected. Supervisors with this approach were likely to overlook supervisees’ strengths and undermine their self-confidence. Furthermore, this approach might be more likely to pressure and isolate the supervisee by turning the supervisee into a “cultural expert.”

Arkin concluded that supervisors should use an integrated approach to multicultural supervision, based both on universal aspects and cultural uniqueness. Supervisors need to continue to examine both cultural and individual issue with supervisees, rather than attributing virtually all behaviors either to cultural dilemmas or to a lack of counseling skills. Arkin also recommended that supervisors be trained for multicultural competency in the following dimensions: (1) Awareness dimension- supervisors should be aware of their own cultural values and stereotypes, as well as differences between themselves and supervisees, (2) Knowledge dimension- cultural knowledge and information must be acquired, (3) Relationship dimension- the supervisor needs to examine the supervisory relationship in cultural terms, (4) Skills dimension- the supervisor must continue to work on developing skills, which include intervening in
culturally sensitive ways, facilitating cultural issues with empathy, and encouraging cultural dialogues in which one takes risks by being flexible.

**Trainee Perceptions of Supervisor Cultural Competencies**

Ancis and Ladany (2001) proposed 5 domains of multicultural supervision competencies including domains of supervisor-focused personal development, supervisee-focused development, skills and interventions, process, and evaluation. Later, Ancis and Marshall (2010) used those 5 domains and explored counseling trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervision. Ancis and Marshall (2010) interviewed four graduate students in counseling psychology who indicated a high degree of interest in multicultural issues and explored their supervisory experiences. According to their findings, counseling trainees perceived their supervisors as “actively exploring multicultural issues with the goal of increased understanding of clients and of themselves” (web). They also found supervisees reported their supervisors’ disclosure of the limits of their multicultural knowledge was critical in multicultural supervision. In addition, the study revealed that supervisees indicated their supervisors who were culturally competent were open about their own cultural background and biases and used self-disclosure in supervision. The supervisors also were described as being interested in the supervisees’ perspectives on cultural issues but also in the clients’ perspectives (Ancis & Marshall, 2010).

Some studies have investigated relationships between supervisees’ and supervisors’ multicultural competence and racial identity development and perceptions of supervisors/supervision. Duan and Roehlke (2001) surveyed 60 cross-racial supervision
dyads. They found that supervisees were more sensitive to cultural and racial issues than were supervisors whether they were White or racial minority supervisors. Also, supervisors reported making greater efforts to provide multiculturally sensitive supervision interventions than supervisees perceived.

Other studies also suggest that supervisors may not have the same level of multicultural competency as their supervisees (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994; Norton & Coleman, 2003; Priest, 1994). Moreover, Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) found that racial identity development was related to multicultural competence for both White supervisees and supervisees of color. White supervisees at the pseudo-independence stage and supervisees of color at the dissonance and awareness stages reported higher levels of multicultural competence. However, there has been little research to answer how exactly supervisees’ multicultural competence level is related to their perceptions of and reactions to supervisors’ multicultural competence.

Feedback in Supervision

Although feedback could be defined broadly as any information one person gives another about the person, feedback in supervision was defined in the present study as “information that supervisors communicate to their supervisees about aspects of their skills, attitudes, behavior, and appearance that may influence their performance with clients or affect the supervisory relationship” (Hoffman, Hill, Holmes, & Freitas, 2005, p. 3). Feedback consists of formative feedback and summative feedback (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Formative feedback occurs throughout ongoing supervisory relationships (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004) in order to provide supervisees with
opportunities to reflect upon their performance or progress and to make changes, accordingly. *Summative feedback*, in the other hand, is a more formal type of feedback in regularly scheduled intervals such as at the middle or end of semester evaluation (Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001). For summative feedback, a supervisor reviews a supervisee’s work against pre-established standards for performance and provides feedback (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Both formative and summative feedback are a lynchpin of clinical supervision (McCarthy Veach, Willaert, & LeRoy, 2009), promoting counselor development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; McCarthy Veach et al., 2009).

Feedback in supervision should be timely, expected, and specifically linked to clinical behaviors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Farnill, Gordon, & Sansom, 1997). Also, feedback should be provided within a supportive and trusting relationship (Farnill et al., 1997). There are two types of feedback: positive (or affirming) feedback and corrective (or constructive) feedback. Corrective feedback often is used synonymously with the term *negative feedback*, and it is a type of feedback that is intended to encourage the recipient to examine and change some aspect of her or his behavior (Kivlighan, 1985; Morran, Stockton, & Bond, 1991).

Morran and colleagues (Morran et al., 1991) examined factors related to the difficulty of delivering positive feedback, as compared with delivering corrective feedback, in 6-week personal growth groups. They found that group members were more reluctant to give corrective feedback than positive feedback. Also, they suggested that the feedback givers’ feared their corrective feedback would be regarded as harmful by the recipient and other group members. The feedback givers were further concerned that they
would be rejected by other group members as a result of having delivered corrective feedback. Similarly, feedback from supervisors can be important and appreciated, but supervisors may be reluctant to give corrective feedback because of perceived negative consequences (cf. Hoffman et al., 2005). In fact, some research suggests as many as 98% of supervisors of graduate student counselors tend to withhold some feedback from their supervisees (Ladany & Melinoff, 1999).

McCarthy Veach, LeRoy, and Bartels (2003) suggest that effective feedback focuses on the person’s observable and specific behavior and not on the person’s character. Also, it is good to provide feedback in a personal and non-threatening manner, avoiding moral or value judgments. Supervisors and supervisees need to discuss and understand each other’s perspectives in order to give and receive feedback effectively. Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) also suggest some characteristics of effective feedback. They report that effective feedback is impartial, understandable, based upon direct observation, and directly related to mutually-established goals.

Hoffman and colleagues (Hoffman et al., 2005) interviewed 15 supervisors of 15 predoctoral interns and found that it was easier for supervisors to give feedback about clinical issues (e.g., clinical skills, client welfare) than to give feedback about issues such as the supervision relationship, the supervisee's personality, or the supervisee’s professional behavior. They also reported that supervisors withheld negative reactions because they were concerned the feedback was based on their own issues, they anticipated a negative reaction from supervisees, and/or they were not sure how the
feedback was relevant to supervision. They suggested that the content, openness, and context of supervision are closely connected to feedback.

Feedback is one of the essential ingredients of supervision because it is also directly or indirectly related to client care, supervisees’ skill development, supervisees’ clinical competence and professional and personal development. Since feedback consists of communication between supervisors and supervisees about aspects of their skills, attitudes, behavior, and appearance that may influence their performance with clients or affect the supervisory relationship (Hoffman, et al., 2005), feedback on cultural aspects of clients, supervisors, and/or supervisees would be also considered as an important component of culturally competent supervision. Furthermore, feedback is most effective when both supervisors and supervisees discuss and understand each other’s perspectives (McCarthy Veach et al., 2003), which may also include cultural perspectives and aspects. Although there is little empirical research concerning culturally competent feedback in supervision, some studies suggest that raising issues of race and diversity in supervision with open and forthcoming dialogue is a preliminary step for culturally competent supervision (Constantine, 1997; Fukuyama, 1994; Hird et al., 2001). According to Dressel et al.’s (2007) findings, culturally successful supervisor’ behaviors also include some features of culturally sensitive feedback and communication: “communicating acceptance of supervisee’s culture and perspective,” “addressing a broad range of difference in culture,” and “inviting supervisees to give supervisor feedback about culture and supervision” (p.57).
Purpose of the Present Study

In sum, numerous studies suggest the importance of multicultural competency (Sue, 2001; Sue et al., 1992), multicultural supervision (Dressel et al., 2007; Hird et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2008), and feedback in supervision (Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Morran et al., 1991). However, relatively little empirical research has been conducted on the provision of culturally competent feedback or behavior in supervision. Particularly no study specifically examined the relationships among supervisor provision of feedback in multiculturally competent supervision and supervisee perceptions of the supervisor’s multicultural competence. Therefore, investigating counselor trainees’ perceptions of supervisor multicultural competence, including in particular, their perceptions of supervisor multicultural feedback would be an important initial step toward multicultural competencies that have implications for supervisor training and practice.

Therefore, the purpose of the study was to understand counseling trainees’ perceptions of supervisor culturally competent behaviors and feedback in a hypothetical supervision situation. Three major research questions were investigated: (1) What supervisor behaviors (including feedback behaviors) do counseling trainees regard as culturally competent? (2) Do expectations of culturally competent supervisor behaviors differ between 1st year and 2nd year trainees? and (3) Do perceptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors differ from perceptions of behaviors that typify general supervisor competencies?
Investigator Expectations

Prior to data collection this investigator identified her expectations regarding the findings of her study. She engaged in this activity in order to identify potential bias and/or personal values. She identified the following expectations:

1) Participants that have more counseling and supervision experience and cultural training will be able to describe more specific examples of culturally competent supervisors and supervision.

2) Participants that have less counseling and supervision experience will be more likely to perceive supervisors who are more emotionally supportive in supervision as more culturally competent.
Chapter 3: Method

Preliminary Study: DVD Validation Pilot Study

Participants and Procedures. Before conducting the primary research, this investigator sought expert validation of the two DVD scenarios, DVD scenario A (psychological counseling) and DVD scenario B (generic counseling). Three experienced counseling psychologists who work with culturally diverse clients and supervisees watched and rated each DVD scenario. These experts: (1) were currently working as counselors, training director, and/or professors in the counseling field, (2) had been working with diverse clients and supervisees for over five years, and (3) had demonstrated their interest in cultural competency through their counseling work.

These experts ranged in age from 40 to 65, and two were female and one was male. Two identified themselves as Caucasians and one as Asian American. The researcher individually met with each individual for one hour. During the meeting, she reviewed the Expert Rating Consent Information form (Appendix A) and explained the Expert Rating process to them. Each expert received a copy of the Consent Information form. The researcher provided a brief verbal description of the content of the scenarios. Following her explanation, the experts watched each DVD scenario. After viewing each scenario, they completed a DVD rating form (Appendix B). This form includes questions about their perceptions of the supervisor’s general competence as a supervisor and her cultural competence as a supervisor (Scale: 1 = Little or not at all competent, 2 = Somewhat competent, 3 = Competent, 4 = Very competent). Question 1 is: “How generally competent was the supervisor in Scenario A?” Question 2 is: “How culturally
competent was the supervisor in Scenario A?” Questions 3 and 4 are the same as Questions 1 and 2 except, but they refer to Scenario B. Question 5 and 6 ask raters to describe their views about supervisors’ cultural competence and general competence, and to provide examples of what they regard as culturally competent supervisor behavior. The order of presentation of the DVD scenarios was randomly determined for each expert.

**Results of Expert Rating Pilot.** The three expert raters indicated the supervisor in Scenario A (psychological counseling) was both culturally and generally competent (Mean rating = 3.8 for questions 1 and 2; Range: 3 to 4 for question 1, and 3 to 4 for question 2). They also indicated the supervisor in Scenario B was both culturally generally competent (Mean rating = 3.8 for both questions; Range: 3 to 4 for question 3, and 3 to 4 for question 4). Thus, the validity of the two scenarios was supported by their expert ratings. Their responses to Question 5 indicate that two of the experts regarded cultural competence and general competence as separate types of competence, and one expert reported that cultural competence is a part of general competence.

In their written responses for Question 6, the three experts described the types of behaviors they generally would expect culturally competent supervisors to use during clinical supervision. Their responses reflect nine different categories (reported in no particular order):

(a) Sensitive to cultural issues as they arise – notice, name them and raise for discussion

(b) Non-shaming approach – Let supervisees know that it is okay to make an error but also expectation them to rectify it and learn what they need to learn
(c) Use open-ended questions to help supervisees explore their experiences
(d) Suggest ways to develop or learn culturally sensitive approaches in counseling
(e) Model how the trainees could have done it differently in sessions (e.g., suggestions for alternative language or approaches)
(f) Role play with trainees who may not know how to approach culturally diverse clients
(g) Explore trainee biases or prejudices regarding certain cultures
(h) Discuss and confront resistance to or difficulty with learning about different cultures
(i) Help trainees find and learn specific techniques they can use with clients from different cultures

**Primary Study**

**Participants and Procedures.** The sample consisted of first and second year students enrolled in either the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology (CSPP) masters program or the Genetic Counseling masters program at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus ($N = 51$; 11 males and 40 females). Some students (1st year students and 2nd year genetic counseling students) were recruited from the EPsy 8501: Counseling Pre-practicum course. They were offered 6 points towards their course grade for participating in the study. Second year students ($n = 10$) were invited to participate during a classroom visit by this researcher and via an email invitation; they received no compensation for their participation. The CSPP participants were either in
their 1st year \( (n = 35) \) or 2nd year \( (n = 10) \) of master’s coursework, and the genetic counseling students \( (n = 6) \) were in the second year of their master program.

Through the email announcements and/or the classroom visits, the researcher described the study as an investigation of culturally competent supervisor behaviors in supervision. She further explained that study participation was voluntary, and any decision regarding participation would not affect their current or future relations with the researcher, the CSPP program or faculty, or the University. The participants were also informed that identifying information would not be accessible to the researcher unless they volunteered that information.

**Design**

A focus group design was developed for this qualitative research, using design principles described by Krueger (1998). The focus group method has been used in social science fields for a long time because it allows for exploration of the participants’ experiences and opinions through group interactions. Focus groups have been found to effectively capture some information which is relatively unknown or less explored (Krueger, 1994; Seal, Bogart, & Ehrhardt, 1998).

The ideal number within each focus group ranges from 4-12 people (Seal et al., 1998). There were a total of 8 focus groups in the present study. Each focus group involved a 1.5-2 hour-meeting, dependent upon the number of participants in each group members (group size ranged from 5-8 members). First year CSPP students and the genetic counseling students met in separate groups from CSPP second year students in order to explore possible differences due to counseling experience (second year CSPP
students have completed more counseling coursework and have probably received more hours of individual and small group clinical supervision).

All focus group discussions were moderated by this researcher who followed a semi-structured interview protocol. She asked a series of questions in approximately the same order in each group, using prompts as appropriate to elicit participants’ elaboration of a topic. In order to help the participants respond to the questions freely and in-depth, all questions were open-ended. The beginning and ending questions were designed to help the participants “warm up” to the conversations and to bring closure to the focus group activity, respectively. The focus group discussions were audiorecorded and transcribed by the researcher.

Participants were asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire (Appendix C), to provide a written description of their perceptions of culturally competent supervisors (Appendix D), and to view two hypothetical counseling supervision scenarios (each approximately 5 minutes in length). The actual focus group discussion questions were developed before the focus group (Appendix E). Before the focus group, a consent form (Appendix F) was provided and explained. Participants were given some time to read the consent form and ask questions before signing it. The scenarios depict supervisor culturally sensitive provision of feedback to the student supervisee (Appendix G). One scenario involves a mental health counseling supervisor and student supervisee and the other involves a genetic counseling supervisor and genetic counseling student supervisee. Presentation of scenarios was randomized across focus groups in order to control for order effects.
Focus group participants were asked to write down their observations immediately after viewing each scenario, and then to discuss their perceptions of the scenarios, with particular attention to their perceptions of what constitutes culturally competent supervisor behaviors. Their written answers and responses to the demographic questionnaire were collected at the end of the focus group meeting.

**Instrumentation.**

*Demographic questionnaire.* The researcher developed a demographic information form (Appendix C). Eleven items ask participants to provide information regarding their sex, age, ethnicity, number of course taken focusing on multicultural issues, undergraduate major, number of semesters of supervised practica, year in their current graduate program, and number of client contact hours completed.

*Supervision DVD’s.* Portions of a DVD and workbook developed by McCarthy Veach, Willaert, and LeRoy (2009) were used in the study. These materials provide guidelines and education about giving and receiving feedback in clinical supervision for mental health counseling and genetic counseling practitioners. The DVD contains 5 scenarios for general mental health counseling supervision and 5 scenarios for genetic counseling supervision. The DVD portrays common clinical situations which would prompt supervisor feedback. The workbook (McCarthy Veach et al., 2009) contains *Stimulus Questions* for discussion of the scenarios, exercises that promote practice and self-reflection regarding effective feedback provision and receipt, and theoretical content and empirical findings regarding feedback. Each scenario on the DVD
is followed by a set of Stimulus Questions, some of which were adapted for use in the present study.

For this study, two supervision scenarios (Appendix G) involving “Cultural sensitivity” were used. One scenario involves a mental health (psychological) counseling supervision situation, and the other scenario involves a genetic counseling supervision situation. Each hypothetical scenario begins with a brief description of the clinical situation that prompted supervisor feedback, followed by a 4-5 minute feedback discussion between a supervisor and student supervisee. The supervisors are portrayed by an advanced doctoral student in counseling psychology (in the psychological counseling scenario) and an experienced genetic counselor and supervisor (in the Genetic counseling scenario). The supervisees in both scenarios are portrayed by a less advanced student trainee in counseling psychology (in the Mental health counseling scenario) or in genetic counseling (in the Genetic counseling scenario).

In the Mental health counseling scenario, both supervisor and supervisee are White Caucasians, and the supervisor is female and the supervisee is male. The supervisor is confronting the supervisee regarding culturally insensitive comments he made during a counseling session. During the counseling session, the supervisee was counseling a Hmong woman. When the woman described the ritual marriage she entered into when she was 14, the supervisee openly voiced his shock that she was married at “such a young age.”

In the Genetic counseling scenario, the supervisor is an Asian female and the supervisee is a White female. The supervisor is confronting the supervisee regarding
culturally insensitive comments the supervisee made during the counseling session. During the session the supervisee was counseling a Somali patient regarding abnormalities seen on an ultrasound. In response to the information the supervisee gave, the client replied “All children are a gift from God; I do not want to do anything differently with [i.e., terminate] this pregnancy.” The supervisee failed to acknowledge her comment and continued talking about pregnancy termination.

Focus Group Interview Protocol. This researcher designed a series of questions intended to elicit focus group participants’ perceptions of the DVD scenarios (See Appendices D and E). After brief opening questions (Question 1 and 2), the participants were asked to provide written responses to one question (Question 3): “Imagine your past, current, or future supervision. What do you consider a supervisor’s culturally competent behaviors to be?” They responded to this question before they watched the two DVD scenarios in order to identify their original ideas about culturally competent supervisor behaviors before there was any group influence. After watching the two DVD scenarios, they were asked to provide written responses to questions (Question 4 though 7) for each scenario: “Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?” “If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.” Then, the participants only provided oral responses during the focus group discussions for another four questions (Question 8 through 12).
Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, ranges, percentages) were calculated for demographic variables (Table 1).

Qualitative research methods were used to understand the participants’ discussions and written responses. All written and oral responses regarding supervisor cultural competence and perceptions of the supervisors in the two hypothetical supervision scenarios were analyzed by this researcher. All transcribed data were first reviewed by this researcher and an undergraduate research assistant for their accuracy. Then, the researcher analyzed responses inductively. Constant comparative methodology (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was used to develop themes and domains to describe data. Responses were grouped based on their conceptual similarity. For written responses, individual answers were the unit for analysis. For the oral responses of Question 4 through 12, the group was the unit for analysis. After grouping all responses, the researcher reviewed each grouping and gave it a name to describe the themes and domains (specific topics within themes) reflected in the responses. The results of her analysis were reviewed independently by a faculty member who is a licensed psychologist and experienced supervisor. Disagreements were resolved by discussion to reach consensus.
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Sample Demographics

The total sample consisted of 51 master level students enrolled in either a counseling and student psychology program (CSPP) or genetic counseling program at a large, public Midwestern university. As shown in Table 1, their mean age was 24 years (Male SD= 2.06, Female SD=1.9; Range: 21-29). The CSPP participants were either in their 1st year (n = 35) or 2nd year (n = 10) of master’s coursework, and the genetic counseling students (n = 6) were in the second year of their master program. The participants variously identified themselves as: Caucasian/White (n = 37), Asian American/ Pacific Islander (n = 9), African American/Black (n = 2), Biracial/multiracial (n = 2), and Chicano/Hispanic/Latino (n = 1). Among Asian students, there were three international students and one student from a Middle Asia country. Table 1 and 2 show the participants’ clinical and supervision hours. The overall average number of hours of clinical supervision was 28.9 hours (SD: 73.4; Range: 0-200) with 1st year students (M=13.1, SD=42.8), 2nd year students (M=48.3, SD=53.6). The overall average number of direct counseling hours of the participants was 73.8 hours (SD=169.9; Range: 0-420).

Clinical Impressions of Focus Group Participants’ Interactions

This researcher formed several clinical impressions of focus group participants, based on their non-verbal and verbal interactions. In particular, she noted the first year MA students, who have a little or no prior supervision experience, made a connection and comparison between the two supervisors in the DVD scenarios, although there were not any instructions or questions asking for a comparison. They also reported learning the
Table 1. Participant Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>22-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native/American Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track in program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Counseling</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of undergraduate credits</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of graduate credits</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of semesters of supervised counseling practicum</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hours of individual clinical supervision</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>0-200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of client contact hours</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>169.9</td>
<td>0-420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note. *Six second year students were genetic counseling students)
Table 2. Professional Experiences Accrued by 1st Year and 2nd Year Psychological Counseling Participants and 2nd Year Genetic Counseling Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1st year Psych</th>
<th>2nd year Psych</th>
<th>Genetic counseling students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of graduate credits on multicultural issues</td>
<td>0.025 0.2</td>
<td>1.5 1.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of semesters of supervised counseling practicum</td>
<td>0.3 0.6</td>
<td>0.7 0.7</td>
<td>1.3 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of hours of individual clinical supervision</td>
<td>13.1 42.8</td>
<td>48.3 53.6</td>
<td>25.7 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of hours of client contact hours</td>
<td>52.5 110.3</td>
<td>178.5 59</td>
<td>86.7 66.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Analysis of Written Responses and Responses to Focus Group Questions

Analysis of the participants’ written and oral responses resulted in four themes: Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude. Three of these themes, Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills, have been identified as important cultural competence factors when working with culturally diverse clients and groups (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). These four themes are used as base themes throughout this chapter.
Primary Analysis

Participants were asked to provide written responses to one question (Question 3) prior to watching the two DVD scenarios. This question was designed to assess their ideas about culturally competent supervisor behaviors prior to any influence from either the DVD scenarios or the group interaction. Participants responded to similar questions (Questions 4 and 5, and Questions 6 and 7) after watching DVD Scenario A (psychological counseling) and DVD Scenario B (genetic counseling), respectively. They were asked to write their answers for each question first before discussing them with other group members in the focus group (Question 4 to Question 7). They provided oral responses only for Question 8-12.

After separate analyses of the written responses and the oral responses, it was noticed that the results were similar. Specifically, the overarching themes were the same and there was substantial overlap in the domains extracted for written and oral responses. Thus, the results of the analyses of written and oral responses were combined and they are presented together in this study.

Although the results of analyses of the written responses and the oral responses were combined and presented together, it should be noted that the unit of the analysis differs. For written responses, the unit of analysis is the individual participant; while the group is the unit of analysis for the oral responses. Four overarching themes were extracted from the analysis of all written and oral responses obtained in this study: Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude. The results of this study are organized within these four overarching themes.
In the following sections, the domains within each theme are described and illustrative verbatim quotations are provided. Within each theme, the n’s for each domain are provided. These n’s refer to the number of individual participants whose written responses were included in the domain. The n’s also are reported for the number of focus groups in which the domain occurred. Responses were often complex, resulting in their being classified into multiple themes and/or domains. Thus, the total n for the domains within a given theme may be greater than the total sample of participants and/or the total number of focus groups. The results for analyses of the written responses from the first year master students and the second year master students are combined. Since there were no apparent thematic differences due to year in program (1st or 2nd year student) or supervision scenario (psychological counseling or genetic counseling), results were combined and they are reported together in the following sections. For the handful of domains for which there were differences for year or scenario, these differences are described. Themes extracted from responses are summarized in Table 3 to Table 8.
Table 3. Question 3-Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

“Imagine your past, current, or future supervision. What do you consider a supervisor’s culturally competent behaviors to be?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Written $n^a$</th>
<th>Discussion $n^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Awareness</td>
<td>- Covert behaviors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overt behaviors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Knowledge</td>
<td>- Covert behaviors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overt behaviors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Skills</td>
<td>- Initiate cultural discussions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback and guidance (in culturally sensitive issues)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Verbal and non-verbal attending skills (in culturally appropriate way)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Attitude</td>
<td>- Openness and respect</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-judgmental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Open to cultural learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n^a$ refers to number of participants that provided a written response classified within the domain. $n^b$ refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.
Table 4. Question 4 & 6-Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

“Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Written n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Discussion n&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1: Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt behaviors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert behaviors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 2: Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt behaviors</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 3: Skills</strong></td>
<td>Evocative questioning</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of client’s culture and background</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage cultural discussion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and guidance (in culturally sensitive issues)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend to both client’s and supervisee’s cultural background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss supervisory styles that both supervisor and supervisee culturally expect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow supervisees to ask their clients about the clients’ cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 4: Attitude</strong></td>
<td>Non-judgmental and respect</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster supervisee empathy for culturally different clients</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n<sup>a</sup> refers to number of participants that provided a written response classified within the domain. n<sup>b</sup> refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.
Table 5. Question 5 & 7-Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

“If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Written $n^a$</th>
<th>Discussion $n^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt behaviors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert behaviors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt behaviors</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert behaviors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor self-disclosure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evocative questioning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and guidance (in culturally sensitive issues)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize limitations in understanding different cultures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-judgmental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n^a$ refers to number of participants that provided a written response classified within the domain. $n^b$ refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.
Table 6. Question 8 - Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

“Were there any supervisor behaviors that demonstrated her general competence in the DVD? If yes, what do you think they are?” (n=number of groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Discussion n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonally Skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate Supervisee Self-Reflection</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Guidance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate Supervisee Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate Empathy for Supervisee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Other Theoretical Orientations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Support and Guidance in Supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.)

Table 7. Question 9-10 - Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

- Question 9 - “Do you think a supervisor’s cultural competence and general competence are different? If so, how?”

- Question 10. “Let’s imagine that you are working with a client who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to help you work with the client. Any examples?” (n=number of groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Discussion n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend to Supervisor and Supervisee Cultural Differences</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Direct, Honest Feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory Guidance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Cultural Information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.)

Table 8. Question 11 - Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors

- Question 11. “Let’s imagine that you are working with a supervisor who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to make supervision successful? What would they do and say? Any examples?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Discussion n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Initiated Discussion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Avoids Stereotyping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n refers to the number of focus groups in which the domain was extracted.)
Table 9. Question 12-Participant Perceptions of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors (Q12-Closing Question) “We are coming to the end of our discussion. I would like to go around the group and ask each of you to share at least one major point which occurs to you from this discussion.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned the importance of supervisor’s cultural competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory relationship is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural application is more important than theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between supervisor and supervisee has to be open and direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to discuss cultural difference between supervisor and supervisee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to have balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency is a continuing learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of self-reflection on cultural issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is critical to create an environment where supervisees can reflect and talk about their cultural issues and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a mistake (re: cultural issues) is not the end of the world. Supervisees can learn and change from mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a good opportunity to think of general and cultural competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to consider client, supervisee, supervisor, and their dynamics in supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned we define things differently based on different cultural and personal experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be more pro-active in supervision regarding cultural issues and discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Participants’ Responses: Question 3

Question 3 asked: “Imagine your past or future supervision. What do you consider a supervisor’s culturally competent behaviors to be?” For Question 3, the participants were asked to provide only written responses. Analysis of responses to this question, led to the extraction of the same two domains for the Awareness and Knowledge themes: Covert behaviors, and Overt behaviors. Four domains were extracted for the Skills theme: Initiate cultural discussions, Feedback and guidance, Verbal and non-verbal attending skills, and Miscellaneous. Four domains were extracted for the Attitude theme: Non-judgmental, Openness and respect, Open to cultural learning, and Miscellaneous.

Theme 1: Awareness

The Awareness theme refers to sensitivity about, and conscious recognition of “culture.” Two domains, Covert behaviors and Overt behaviors, pertain to supervisors’ appreciation of their own culture, their supervisees’ cultures, clients’ cultures, and interactions among the three.

Domain 1: Covert behaviors (n = 22). A number of participants described behaviors suggesting a supervisor’s internal, cognitive processes of personal self-reflection, and/or processing of others’ experiences, in order to understand cultural differences:

“Supervisors have self awareness about their own cultural/racial identity and its influence”

“Supervisors are aware of the limits of their own cultural awareness”
“Supervisors recognize cultural differences among supervisor, supervisee, and client.”

**Domain 2: Overt behaviors (n = 22).** A number of participants mentioned observable supervisor behaviors intended to increase cultural awareness among themselves, supervisees, and clients:

“Supervisors acknowledge the different cultures and accept people’s differences.”

“Supervisors ask supervisees’ cultural perspective and do not use generalized expectations/assumptions of supervisor/supervisee.”

“Supervisors speak about the difference between supervisor, supervisee, and clients in a sensitive manner.”

**Theme 2: Knowledge**

The Knowledge theme refers to supervisors’ possession of general information about various cultures such as ethnicity, religion, SES, gender, sexual orientation, age, etc. There are two domains, Covert behaviors and Overt behaviors. Most responses refer to supervisors’ general knowledge, but a few identify specific pieces of information (e.g., “Being aware that not all cultures find it respectful to shake hands”).

**Domain 1: Covert behaviors (n = 10).** These responses describe supervisors’ possession of cultural knowledge and information:

“Supervisor’s knowledge of cultural values-influences thinking pattern.”

“Supervisor is knowledgeable about cultural differences and the impact they have.”

“[Supervisor is] familiar with cultural diversity and knowledgeable about supervisee and client cultures.”
Domain 2: Overt behaviors \((n = 6)\). These responses mention observable behaviors indicative of supervisors’ existing knowledge and attempts to increase their knowledge:

“Supervisor has cultural knowledge and act[s] accordingly.”

“Supervisor is culturally knowledgeable and provides information and suggestions that are culturally relevant and sensitive.”

“Supervisors have continuing education and learning about [the] population they are serving and their supervisee[s] are serving.”

Theme 3: Skills

The Skills theme refers to various methods, strategies, tactics, and/or behaviors supervisors engage in with supervisees. Four domains describe supervisor actions that are culturally focused and/or culturally appropriate.

Domain 1: Initiate cultural discussions \((n = 11)\). Responses in this domain describe supervisor strategies for starting conversations about culture and addressing specific cultural issues in the supervision dyad:

“Ask questions about client’s cultures”

“Explore cultural differences and initiate discussion”

“Check regularly if supervisors understand supervisee[s]’ cultures”

Domain 2: Feedback and guidance \((n = 10)\). Responses in this domain describe supervisor provision of culturally appropriate feedback and suggestions for supervisees:

“Supervisor’s candid, timely, and actionable feedback regarding culturally different clients would be appreciated”
“Sensitively point out ways in which supervisee needs to be more culturally aware of”

“Provide concrete and culturally relevant feedback”

**Domain 3: Verbal and non-verbal attending skills** ($n = 10$). Responses in this domain describe the use of culturally appropriate verbal and non-verbal attending skills:

“Use space, touch, and eye contact in a way that is comfortable for the person you are working with.”

“Be sensitive to the pronunciation of people [sic] and how they would like to be called.”

“Be careful of their language such as not using gender specific language”

**Domain 4: Miscellaneous** ($n = 4$). Four written responses could not otherwise be classified. They appear to be indicative of skills reflecting general supervision competence, but they do not specifically refer to multicultural issues:

“Supervisors understand supervisee’s needs, ask about supervisee’s goals, and process giving feedback”

“Ask many open-ended questions”

**Theme 4: Attitude**

The Attitude theme refers to supervisors’ perspectives about supervisees’ culture and/or about clients’ cultures in general. Four domains contain responses referring to the apparent intentions behind supervisors’ actions, as opposed to describing their specific behaviors:
Domain 1: Openness and respect \((n = 26)\). A number of participants mentioned supervisors being open and respectful regarding other cultures, people from other cultures, and their values. In some responses, this respect is described as creating a supportive and safe supervision environment:

“Supervisor behaviors that are culturally competent that I imagine in my future would be that being open and aware of different people. This is done by simply respecting people’s opinions, thoughts, behaviors, etc., and finding ways to be the best counselor by incorporating these ways in people’s life [sic].”

“Open mindedness and patience to cultural differences or multi-cultural issues that may come up; Being sensitive to cultural issues in general; Valuing diversity and striving to accommodate to the needs of clients or supervisees of different cultural backgrounds.”

“I think culturally competent supervisor is demonstrating to supervisee that the supervisor is interested in understanding their perspective, values, and cultural identities.”

“Supervisor is sensitive and direct with issues, understanding cultural values and beliefs to the extent that facilitates a warm and welcoming supervision environment.”

Domain 2: Non-judgmental \((n = 20)\). Many participants variously mentioned that culturally competent supervisors would avoid stereotyping and refrain from making judgments about clients’ and supervisees’ cultures:

“Culturally competent supervisors don’t assume things about people or ‘define’ their beliefs.”

“Acknowledging difference, not judging clients and supervisees based on their own cultural beliefs and standards.”

Domain 3: Open to cultural learning \((n = 7)\). A few participants describe supervisors’ openness to learning about new or different cultures:
“Understand that the supervisor doesn’t understand everything about a culture and have a desire to learn other cultures. This sets up a situation where the supervisor can discuss these issues and be sensitive to the supervisee.”

“Culturally competent supervisor would have a lot of exposure to diverse settings and cultures, and have knowledge on various cultures.”

**Domain 4: Miscellaneous** \((n = 2)\). Two responses could not otherwise be classified. One participant described an attitude reflecting general supervision competence rather than a culturally-related attitude:

“Tolerance for ambiguity”

The other participant (an international supervisee) described being concerned that U.S. supervisors are unable to apply their “theoretical knowledge of culture” to actual situations:

“As a non-resident of U.S., I certainly care about the cultural competence of my supervisor. I know many supervisors have theoretical base of the multicultural issues, but what concerns me most is when they face certain real situation that they have some serious differences between what they know and how they react.”

**Analysis of Individual and Focus Group Participants’ Responses: Questions 4 -7**

Participants’ responses subsequent to viewing each supervision vignette were analyzed, and findings are organized within the same four themes extracted from responses to Question 3 (Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude). Participants responded to Questions 4 and 5 after they watched Scenario A (Psychological Counseling Supervision; PCS); the same participants responded to Questions 6 and 7 after they watched Scenario B (Genetic Counseling Supervision; GCS). Questions 4 and 5 are identical to Questions 6 and 7, and the order of watching the Scenarios was randomly
determined to control for any order effects (as described in the Method section of Chapter 3).

**Questions 4 and 6.** Both Questions 4 and 6 asked the following: “Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?” Initially responses to Question 4 and Question 6 were analyzed separately. As there were relatively few apparent differences in domains for responses to Question 4 and Question 6, the results are combined in the following report.

The Awareness theme contains three domains: Covert behaviors, Overt behaviors, and Miscellaneous. The Knowledge theme consists of two domains: Covert Behaviors and Overt behaviors. Nine domains were extracted for the Skills theme: Evocative questioning, Consideration of client’s culture and background, Encourage cultural discussion, Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures, Feedback and guidance, Attend to both client’s and supervisee’s cultural background, Allow supervisees to ask their clients about the clients’ cultures, Discuss supervisory styles that both supervisor and supervisee culturally expect, and Miscellaneous. The Attitude theme contains three domains: Non-judgmental, Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency, and Foster supervisee empathy for culturally different clients. In this section, illustrative quotations from responses to the PCS (Psychological Counseling Supervision) scenario and to the GCS (Genetic Counseling Supervision) scenario are provided.

**Theme 1: Awareness**
The Awareness theme refers to the supervisors’ sensitivity about and conscious recognition of “culture.” Two domains, Covert behaviors and Overt behaviors, pertain to each supervisor’s appreciation of her own culture, her supervisee’s culture, the client’s culture, and interactions among the three. Participants described each supervisor of the scenario as being aware of her supervisee’s culturally competent and/or incompetent comments and behaviors, and as being able to discuss them in supervision.

Acknowledging the cultural differences between/among supervisor, supervisee, and client and encouraging supervisee self-reflection about cultural issues were also identified as culturally competent supervisor behaviors in the Awareness theme.

**Domain 1: Overt behaviors.** This domain refers to observable supervisor behaviors intended to increase supervisee cultural awareness. A great majority of participants described each supervisor as being able to assist her supervisee to consider the cultural minority client’s values and feelings result in increased cultural awareness by the supervisees:

*Written responses (n = 62):*

“Once the supervisor was aware of the supervisee’s culturally inappropriate behavior, she discussed it with the supervisee and offered constructive feedback.” (PCS)

“The supervisor asked the supervisee to take the client’s perspective. The supervisor asked the supervisee to reflect on what was happening in the session and highlighted his goals, which was to learn more about the client’s culture.” (PCS)

“I think the supervisor did a good job of acknowledging a cultural difference between counselor [supervisee] and client without assuming she knew how either one of them would feel about it. Then, she [supervisor] also addressed the difficulties a counselor [supervisee] may face and provided her with constructive, but positive feedback.” (GCS)
“The supervisor offered good examples of questions to ask client to gain greater understanding of culture. She offered that she may not know much about her [client’s] specific beliefs that created an open space for them to discuss. She talked about being sensitive to religious beliefs and still being able to give the client all options. She also stressed the importance of having conversation with the client instead of just talking to her.” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n = 8):

“She [supervisor] emphasized that the counselor should focus on the big picture of the cultures, not just one aspect to view it, which is more comprehensive.” (PCS)

“Also, her [supervisor’s] suggestion to look at it from the Hmong woman’s perspective is inviting him [supervisee] to maybe take an action which is culturally competent as well.” (PCS)

“The supervisor directly said there seemed to be cultural issues that were causing a gap between the student [supervisee] and the client.” (GCS)

Domain 2: Covert behaviors. Many participants described internal, cognitive processes related to each supervisor’s reflection upon and/or processing of experiences to understand cultural differences. Particularly, participants mentioned how the supervisors were aware of culturally competent and/or incompetent behaviors of their supervisee.

Written responses (n = 39):

“The supervisor was very aware of how the supervisee’s comments might have been offensive to the client.” (PCS)

“The supervisor recognized the differences between the client and supervisee and how they might view each other.” (PCS)

“The supervisor was aware that religion plays a large part in the client’s culture and was willing to discuss. She didn’t assume that the client and the supervisee had the same feelings on the issue.” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n = 5):
“She [supervisor] was trying to increase his [supervisee’s] cultural awareness. It is like, not necessarily to take a side but this is kind of, promote the idea that we need to have a greater understanding [of culture].” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] recognized that there were important things to be aware of. Recognizing there were religious issues as well as cultural/ethnic issues was another half of the battle.” (GCS)

**Theme 2: Knowledge**

This theme refers to the supervisors’ possession of general information about various cultures including facts, history, values, communication styles, etc. There are two domains: Overt behaviors and Covert behaviors. Participants perceived culturally competent supervisor behaviors in both scenarios as the supervisor providing effective suggestions and future guidance for the supervisee regarding culturally sensitive issues and encouraging the supervisees to learn more about the client’s culture.

**Domain 1: Overt behaviors.** Many participants identified observable supervisor behaviors that either encourage the supervisee to acquire knowledge of cultures or indicate the supervisors’ possession of cultural knowledge.

*Written responses (n = 32):*

“The supervisor recommended having some background information of the client and educating himself [supervisee].” (PCS)

“The supervisor asked how he [supervisee] educates himself to feel more comfortable with his client. She encouraged him to think how he might be more comfortable with this [culturally sensitive] issue.” (PCS)

“She offered suggestions that might allow the supervisee to learn more about client’s cultural aspect.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n = 3)*
“I also think that urging supervisee even just to remember to take her [client] culture into account and educate himself [supervisee] on the Hmong cultures was a good step.” (PCS)

“The supervisor was knowledgeable about the client’s cultures and used the specific terms to the situation.” (PCS)

“I think the supervisor also planned out how to give suggestions and information about the client’s cultures. So the counselor [supervisee] can get a lot of cultural information that she was not familiar with.” (GCS)

**Domain 2: Covert behaviors.** Three participants identified what they perceived to be the supervisors’ possession of cultural knowledge and information.

*Written responses (n = 3):*

“The supervisor was already familiar with the culture that the supervisee wanted to talk about.” (PCS)

“Comprehensive view about culture: not only about the client’s marriage, but also about educating other aspect of culture, showing respect and intention to view her culture.” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] seemed to be very sensitive and knowledgeable about recognizing the cultural gap.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =2):*

“I know I would appreciate something like educational insights too, if they [supervisees] are new and don’t know how to work with specific populations.” (PCS)

“You know, I mean my supervisor is my source of knowledge and I would like to have more feedback and cultural knowledge. But then also reflecting on me thinking of how it [counseling] could have gone better would be helpful.” (GCS)

**Theme 3: Skills**
The Skills theme refers to the supervisors’ competent use of approaches, strategies, tactics, and/or behaviors regarding cultural issues during the supervision scenarios. A total of nine domains were extracted, including one Miscellaneous domain. Eight domains describe supervisor skills that are culturally focused and/or culturally appropriate: Evocative questioning, Consideration of client’s culture and background, Encourage cultural discussion, Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures, Feedback and guidance, Attend to both client’s and supervisee’s cultural background, Allow supervisees to ask their clients about the clients’ cultures, and Discuss supervisory styles that both supervisor and supervisee culturally expect. One Miscellaneous domain, containing responses describing skills indicative of general supervision competence, was also identified.

**Domain 1: Evocative questioning.** Many participants mentioned the supervisors helped their supervisees realize how they could improve their cultural competency instead of directly telling them what they did “wrong.”

*Written responses (n = 33):*

“She, instead of telling him what he did wrong, asked questions that led him to realize it himself. This shows compassion for his cultural background that influenced him to take the misstep with his client in the first place. She also showed cultural competence by acknowledging his feeling of shock at the client’s young marriage without expressing her own opinions or judgments about the marriage.” (PCS)

“She asked lots of questions about how he felt in the situation which allowed him to reflect culturally.” (PCS)

“Sensitivity to the supervisee and asking questions rather than telling the supervisee “Don’t do that.” She explored the supervisee’s reaction to the situation and encouraged her to come up with a different response. (GCS)”
“I think the supervisor’s manner of asking questions of the student [supervisee] and gently helping her see alternative options in her responses to the client, modeled culturally competent behaviors.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =7):*

“It seems, you know, she [supervisor] used a lot of questions which were all helping him think about the issues of cultures. So it seems like that was really a focus of theirs. Debriefing the session was to discuss those issues.” (PCS)

“Yes, I thought she[supervisor] did a good job of just asking a question like ‘What do you think of it?’ and then just let her supervisee say how she thought, how she understood, and what she was confused about, and how she approached it. Just to be more sensitive, maybe just ask questions of ‘What was her religion?’ and ‘What are your religious beliefs?’ and just kind of get to know the patient’s view of abortion or pregnancy before making a decision would be important.” (GCS)

**Domain 2: Consideration of client’s culture and background.** Some participants identified that the supervisors helped their supervisees focus more on the client than on themselves and encouraged the supervisees to consider their client's culture and experiences:

*Written responses (n = 10):*

“The supervisor reminded him that the focus should be on the client during the next session.” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] recognized that the counseling session should be more focused on the client than the counselor’s interest.” (PCS)

“The supervisor knew that when he became a cultural tourist, it stopped being about the client.” (PCS)

*Focus group responses (n =8):*

“I think the big thing for me was that the guy was interested in the whole marriage at 14 thing and his supervisor is more interested in how the client felt. She was like ‘How do you think she felt you guys were only talking about that [early marriage]?’ It made him more focused on the client and really opened the guy’s eyes [about] what he has done previously in a cultural context.” (PCS)
“I think I mentioned that cultural tourism too, that it is nice to acknowledge that he did try, but he just needs to go further trying to understand the client’s culture. It was a nice way of saying ‘Good job, but you can’t be a tourist’.” (PCS)

“It is just kind of a reminder for a supervisee that the most important thing to make sure is that the client is comfortable when there were cultural differences. It is kind of like tailoring to what the client’s needs [are].” (GCS)

**Domain 3: Encourage cultural discussion.** Some participants described the supervisors’ encouragement of their supervisees to discuss cultural issues with their clients:

*Written responses (n = 13):*

“The supervisor encouraged the supervisee to address the cultural issues/concerns with the client.” (PCS)

“She recognized that there could be the tension filled moments when the supervisee discussed the issue, but still encouraged him to focus on the client.” (PCS)

“She validated the supervisee’s feelings of uncertainty and let her know that it is okay to ask [the client] for more information.” (GCS)

“The supervisor asked the supervisee questions to understand context and to let the supervisee to reflect on her reactions. She encouraged the supervisee to have a follow-up dialogue with the client regarding the religious, cultural issues.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =1):*

“She didn’t realize it was coming from the fact that there was [a] cultural issue she wasn’t sure how to handle, so the fact that the supervisor even pointed that out to her and encouraged her to discuss was helpful.” (GCS only)

**Domain 4: Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures.** A few participants mentioned the supervisors invited the supervisees to reflect upon their personal reactions to different cultures or values and to their interaction with their client:

*Written responses (n = 7):*
“She opened the session by asking the supervisee what he thought about his last counseling session. She helped him work through his emotions and reactions concerning the client.” (PCS)

“She was very good at helping her supervisee tell how he felt about the session and asked ways that he thought might have worked better to get the session focused back to the client.” (PCS)

“The supervisor let the supervisee process her discomfort with the client.” (GCS)

“She acknowledged that it was a difficult session and encouraged the supervisee to process her reactions.” (GCS)

**Focus group responses (n =5):**

“I like how she acknowledges that she understood why the supervisee went to what he did. It was not like ‘Oh my gosh, it was the worst idea ever’!” She just talked about the cultural tourism which was the interesting term. I think she helped him process his feelings about the other culture and learn from what he did without making him feel what he did was entirely wrong.” (PCS)

“I like the fact that she really let the supervisee process the discomfort with the situation and didn’t let that be a part of the discussion and not what she did or didn’t do right or not in this situation, because I think it is part of it when we work with culture not your own, there is discomfort there, and the supervisor did a good job of acknowledging this discomfort and processing it with the supervisee.” (GCS)

“The supervisor also pointed out when the supervisee felt like uncomfortable, she didn’t know how to respond to the situation, to maybe recognize those times and learn from it and learn how to respond better and react to the situation.” (GCS)

**Domain 5: Feedback and guidance.** A few participants commented that the supervisors provided concrete, specific, and culturally-appropriate suggestions and/or advice to their supervisee regarding cultural diversity issues and cases.

**Written responses (n = 6):**

“[Supervisor] Allowed and guided the supervisee to explore his own concerns and come up with his own responses to learn” (PCS)
“She [supervisor] came up with specific ideas with how to discuss the cultural issues with the client.” (GCS)

“Discuss and provide suggestions to ask the client to share information about their cultures and different values.” (GCS)

**Focus group responses (n = 4):**

“I like what she just suggested, you know, she just asked what he has planned on doing for the next session to prepare, and kind of, in that way, made him more culturally confident.” (PCS)

“Not only she recognized cultural differences, but then offered how to work through it and helped her [supervisee] how she didn’t do it and revise her in the better direction. Not only directing, but she [supervisor] had tools to work though that and addressed it and offered those tools. I will say that main tools, she directly said that, ‘If this things happen in the future, you could ask more focused questions’ and then she gave more examples of focused questions. She also said that why this difference comes up and how you are going to continue.” (GCS)

**Domain 6: Attend to both client’s and supervisee’s cultural background.**

A few participants described how the genetic counseling supervisor respected and attended both to her supervisee’s and the client’s cultural values and backgrounds. This domain does not include any responses about the personal counseling supervisor.

**Written responses (n = 5):**

“She seemed to be both acknowledging the client and student’s [supervisee’s] cultural background, and validating each party’s, and suggesting possible responses.” (GCS)

“She was non-judgmental of both the supervisee and the client.” (GCS)

“She saw both [supervisee’s and client’s] sides of the situation and was open to the supervisee’s comments. She emphasized on how it’s important to discuss the Somali [client’s] culture if the counselor [supervisee] is not knowledgeable of it.” (GCS)

**Focus group responses (n = 3):**
“…I was more focusing on the supervisee because he [supervisee] came in, and I felt like he even changed his idea of the whole situation. When he first came in, those like ‘I can’t believe she was fourteen when she was married.’ Like it was the worst news he ever heard and then towards the end, he came more and more accepting of it. So he was just curious about it, but before he was almost disgusted that she [client] was fourteen. But I thought the supervisor just, she didn’t, she [supervisor] tried to really understand the both parties, why he had that reaction and then maybe why culturally she married at fourteen.” (PCS)

“I thought she did a good job acknowledging cultural differences between the counselor and the client without assuming she knows exactly how either one of them really felt about the situation. I felt like she was very impartial to both parties.” (GCS)

**Domain 7: Discuss supervisory styles that both supervisor and supervisee culturally expect.** This domain was only identified in the focus group responses of Question 6 (GCS).

*Focus group responses (n =3):*

“I think it sounds like, one of the biggest problems in this situation is we have different supervision styles. So I think one of the biggest and almost important things supervisors can do to be culturally competent with supervisees is just sit down and talk about [supervision style] before their supervision starts. ‘What kinds of styles of supervision do you like? What kinds of approach do you want to have in session? Do you want to be directly told?’ This is what I have done,’ and agree upon before they feel disconnected.” (GCS)

**Domain 8: Allow supervisees to ask their clients about the clients’ cultures.** This domain was only identified in the focus group responses to Question 6 (GCS).

*Focus group responses (n =2):*

“She kind of made intuitive questions, but I thought that it was the point she was almost giving her [supervisee] permission to ask which shows her cultural competence, that acknowledgment we don’t know much about other cultures.” (GCS)
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“…one other thing she did was she encouraged the supervisee to, she was like ‘Oh, you can ask about the culture if you are not familiar with, you can do that if you need to,’ I thought that was cool. She said, you know, ‘You don’t have to know it all, but if you feel comfortable, you know, you can ask your client’.” (GCS)

**Domain 9: Miscellaneous.** Some responses described more general supervisor competencies rather than explicit cultural competencies. These responses were identified only from the written responses.

*Written responses (n = 6):*

“It would be more helpful if the supervisor provided positive feedback.” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] did not use any judgments on language that would give off a message that she was taking a stance.” (GCS)

“The supervisor acknowledged both strengths and areas of growth of the supervisee while asking questions about supervisee’s concerns.” (GCS)

**Theme 4: Attitude**

The Attitude theme refers to the supervisors’ approach or stance regarding their supervisee’s culture and/or about clients’ cultures in general. There are three domains: Non-judgment and respect, Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency, and Foster supervisee empathy for culturally different clients. In Domain 1, the participants identified a non-judgmental attitude and respect as culturally competent qualities of both the psychological counseling supervisor (PCS) and the genetic counseling supervisor (GCS). In Domain 2, they identified empathy for the GCS only in the written responses, but they discussed empathy for both for the PCS and the GCS in
the focus group discussion. In Domain 3, they identified building the supervisee’s empathy for the PCS only in both written responses and oral responses.

**Domain 1: Non-judgment and respect.** A number of participants described the supervisors as non-judgmental about their supervisee and/or the client who comes from a different culture.

*Written responses (n = 19):*

“[Supervisor’s] seemingly non-judgmental questions and responses-neutral voice tones, facial expression, and body language when the supervisee brings up concerns related to cultural issues.” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] talked openly about cultural differences in a way that was non-judgmental. She had terms that seemed to fit the situation.” (PCS)

“The supervisor appeared culturally competent. She showed non-verbal behaviors that didn’t seem judgmental.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n = 4):*

“She [supervisor] shows, I thought, compassion for both perspectives. Like making him [supervisee] feel comfortable and helping him realize himself what might have gone wrong without passing judgment on that. But also she [supervisor] showed no particular opinions, judgment, reactions, when he was like ‘I couldn’t believe that’.” (PCS)

“One thing I noticed was that she [supervisor] had really neutral facial expressions. She [supervisor] maintained very professional composure and posture. I thought that both those things helped and made a comfortable and professional environment. I think that it is cultural competence because it allows the supervisee to express her own cultural perspectives without feeling judged, and also I think that the professional atmosphere is sort of forcing the supervisee to think really professionally and helped her to analyze her own cultural background.” (GCS)

**Domain 2: Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency.**

A few written responses mentioned the GCS showed her empathy for her supervisee and validated and normalized her difficulties when she was struggling with cultural
competency. In the focus groups participants discussed the importance of the supervisor’s empathy for supervisee who has difficulty with cultural competency.

Written responses (n =6):

“Empathizing with the counselor trainee when she said ‘Sometimes it throws us off when there is a cultural difference like that’.” (GCS)

“She acknowledged that it was a difficult situation, and she asked the supervisee how she felt about it.” (GCS)

“The supervisor validated that this was a difficult circumstance which validates the trainee’s difficulties. The supervisor asked how trainee thought with sensitivity. The supervisor clarified the trainee’s values and ideas which helped to have something to compare the client’s ideas to. The supervisor had openness.” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n =4):

“I thought she was compassionate for both perspectives. Like making him feel comfortable and helping him realize what might have gone wrong without passing judgment on that.” (PCS)

Domain 3: Foster supervisee empathy for culturally different clients.

Some participants mentioned the PCS supervisor helped her supervisee develop empathy for clients who come from different cultures by reflective questions and discussion.

Written responses (n =4):

“The supervisor asked him ‘What it would have been like for the client?’ and it gave the supervisee a chance to empathize with his client.” (PCS)

“[Supervisor] encouraged the supervisee not to make a judgment about the client’s culture.” (PCS)

Focus group responses (n =1):

“I thought it was good. She asked her supervisee to try to put himself in the client’s shoes and think about how she [client] felt and look at her [client’s] perspectives. (PCS)
Questions 5 and 7. “If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific."

The participants answered Question 5 after they watched the Psychological Counseling Supervision video (PCS). They answered Question 7 after watching the Genetic Counseling Supervision video (GCS). Participants wrote their answers after they watched each video and before they discussed them in the focus group. Again, the order of watching the scenarios was randomized for each focus group.

Initially participant responses to Question 5 and Question 7 were analyzed separately. As there were relatively few apparent differences in domains for responses to Question 5 and Question 7, the results are combined for the following report. Analysis of responses to these questions, lead to the extraction of two domains for the Awareness and Knowledge themes: Covert Behaviors, and Overt Behaviors. Seven domains were extracted for the Skills theme: Supervisor self-disclosure, Evocative questioning, Feedback and guidance, Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures, Recognize limitations in understanding different cultures, Balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues, and Miscellaneous. Three domains were extracted for the Attitude theme: Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency, Non-judgmental, and Miscellaneous.

Theme 1: Awareness

This theme consists of two domains, Overt and Covert behaviors. Awareness refers to a supervisor’s sensitivity, appreciation, and conscious recognition of “culture.”
The participants indicated that they would like their supervisor to possess cultural self-awareness and to help them increase their cultural awareness and competence. The participants described a desire for their supervisor to be aware of their (supervisee’s) culturally competent or incompetent behaviors and to directly discuss them in their supervision. Some participants also wanted their supervisor to make an effort to increase their cultural awareness by helping them understand how their own cultural background may influence counseling and by encouraging their self-reflection. Some participants, particularly 1st year counseling students, wanted to receive “direct” advice or guidance from their supervisor regarding cultural issues.

**Domain 1: Overt behaviors.** A number of participants mentioned observable supervisor behaviors which are related to cultural awareness:

*Written responses (n =26):*

“Have a discussion about how the client may have felt and also understand of why I [supervisee] may be feeling a certain way—understanding my own cultural background to understand my reaction to the situation.” (PCS)

“Supervisor can help me consider my own culture, and appropriately compartmentalize my worldview, and identify client’s specific needs while acknowledging the client’s cultural background.” (PCS)

“Supervisor provides a chance to reflect my own cultural values compared to my client’s values.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =4):*

“…it is good…to think about…the client’s perspectives, and also explore my values or my own experiences as well. So yeah… to see both sides by asking questions… If my supervisor asked me and gives me a chance to think about [it] if I haven’t thought about it before, it would be helpful.” (PCS)
“I guess I thought that she [supervisor] did a good job of advising her [supervisee] and helping her learn more about cultural awareness. I would want one more thing from my supervisor though. She could say ‘You know, not every client is going to react within their cultures, every time there could be some exceptions. So just because someone walks in and maybe they present certain religious beliefs or cultural beliefs, they might not be like a full package of those, they might be kind different from others’.” (GCS)

**Domain 2: Covert behaviors.** A number of responses described the supervisors’ internal cognitive processes that indicate reflection and understanding of cultural differences. While covert behaviors of supervisors were identified in written responses for both the PCS and GCS scenarios, focus groups discussed only pertained to the PCS scenario.

*Written responses (n =8):*

“[Supervisor can] understand how to use cultural differences to build the client-therapist relationship” (PCS)

“[Supervisor] knows how to deal with cultural practices and issues that go against my [supervisee] values” (PCS)

“I like how the supervisor gave feedback about the situation. She didn’t make the supervisee feel bad about she handled the situation. Instead, she treated it as a learning experience and asked the supervisee about how to handle the situation better next time. I’m not sure what the supervisor could have done differently to make me feel better if I were the supervisee in the scenario.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =4): in Q5 (PCS) only*

“She [supervisor] showed cultural competence in both sides; she [supervisor] understood his [supervisee] culture like what he might do at 14 years old, and what she [client] did at 14 years old which could be very normal in her [client] culture.”(PCS)

**Theme 2: Knowledge**
The Knowledge theme refers to a supervisor’s general knowledge of various cultures and/or effort to increase the supervisee’s cultural knowledge. There were two domains, Overt behaviors and Covert behaviors. Many participants reported they would want to receive more information about cultural issues or cultural minority clients. Particularly, some participants reported that when they make a mistake in a culturally sensitive situation, as the supervisees in the scenarios did, they would want to know what to do and to receive advice from their supervisor. Also, some participants wanted their supervisor to provide them with multicultural readings, resources, and/or cultural training opportunities. A few participants wanted their supervisors to educate them about specific populations with which the supervisees are working. There were Miscellaneous responses- a few participants wanted their supervisor to provide an accepted protocol or stance from the counseling center, and another participant asked for the supervisor to teach communication strategies when the supervisee works with clients from different cultures. No Covert behaviors were discussed in the focus group.

**Domain 1: Overt behaviors.** Many participants mentioned observable supervisor behaviors that would impart cultural knowledge:

*Written responses (n = 49):*

“It would be helpful to know some key strategies, phrases, or ways to ask a client to clarify a cultural practice without deflecting attention away from the client’s presenting concern in therapy. It would be also helpful to know pertinent resources to use to become more familiar with the culture such as what to read and where to find it, etc.” (PCS)

“I feel there needs to be a balance between processing and advice giving. It is very helpful to be able to process the session, but also is helpful to receive some direct advice and information of client’s culture from the supervisor.” (PCS)
“Discuss information about specific things the supervisee can do to show the client that his or her beliefs are being taken into consideration in counseling” (GCS)

“Maybe doing some research on the client’s cultures and the type of practices they are from upon [sic]. Maybe not extensive but getting a general idea.” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n = 8):

“I would like specific tips of how to prepare for the next session, like what kinds of things she thinks would help me like specific readings or authors that would help in that.” (PCS)

“[Supervisors]…educate supervisees [regarding] some background before they go to clients, then supervisors should educate supervisees on what they are getting into and what kinds of clients they are dealing with or just generally speaking, we could educate ourselves about different cultures, different people, views, religions and culture. So we can have some kinds of cultural perceptions before [a] counseling session. So just educate ourselves or supervisors educate us before going into session. If it wasn’t done beforehand, even afterword.” (GCS)

Domain 2: Covert behaviors. Some participants expressed a desire for supervisors to possess knowledge and understanding of other cultures. No covert behaviors were discussed in the focus groups.

Written responses (n = 14):

“Supervisor’s knowledge about the client’s cultures” (PCS)

“She [supervisor] knows what other questions to ask, how to acknowledge and understand client beliefs.” (GCS)

Theme 3: Skills

This Skills theme refers to desired supervisor approaches, strategies, tactics, and/or behaviors pertinent to working with cultural issues. Seven domains, including Miscellaneous, describe supervisor actions participants regarded as culturally-focused and/or culturally-appropriate: Six domains were extracted for the Skills theme:
Supervisor self-disclosure, Evocative questioning, Feedback and guidance, Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures, Recognize limitations in understanding different cultures, Balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues, and Miscellaneous.

**Domain 1: Supervisor self-disclosure.** A number of participants expressed interest in the supervisors sharing personal experiences of working with culturally diverse populations.

*Written responses (n =18):*

“I felt like personal disclosure from a supervisor about some of her experiences and mistakes related to cultural competence would have been useful.” (PCS)

“Offer examples of similar scenarios where the supervisor had to deal with cases like this one.” (PCS)

“Personal story of [when] the supervisor encountered the same situation and how they coped or handled it.” (GCS)

“Specific examples from the supervisor’s life (ex. how she dealt with similar situations) would help me feel more connected with a supervisor and I can know I am not alone.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =7):*

“I was like picking up on self-disclosure piece like last time. I do, I would want to know, but not just what they [supervisors] have done in a similar situation, but what other people have done in a similar situation. Then I can pick one that is most like me, you know.” (PCS)

“It has to do it with self-disclosure. I think if I were the supervisee and did not have a lot of experiences of working with other cultures, it would be really nice to hear from a supervisor about how she had dealt with some situations in the past. I don’t know… I think that would help me feel connected with a supervisor, yeah, just get some, just hear that perspectives of how she dealt with it. It depends on how much the supervisor is willing to disclose, but I think it would be helpful.” (GCS)
Domain 2: Evocative questioning. A few participants expressed a desire for the supervisors to ask them questions to help them realize how they might improve their cultural competency, rather than directly telling them what they did “wrong.”

Written responses (n =15):

“Bring up the issue about my insensitive comments in a way that doesn’t feel judgmental in order to get me to reflect and become aware of the issue. In the Scenario, the supervisor asked a question instead of making a statement.” (PCS)

“Feedback and questions that let me reflect on what I did in the session and also allow me to come up with my own solution.” (PCS)

“I like how the supervisor gave feedback about the situation. She didn’t make the supervisee feel bad about how she [supervisee] handled the situation. Instead, she treated it as a learning experience and asked the supervisee on how to handle the situation better next time.” (GCS)

“I think the questions the supervisor posed to encourage reflection and awareness and how I [supervisee] could have done things differently were helpful.” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n =3):

“It would be very helpful for me. … if I am making a judgment about, let’s say a culture, I think it would be helpful to have reflection questions from my supervisor. You know, [questions about] how am I remaining non-judgmental; it really should be all about my clients.” (PCS)

“Yes, it was good that she [supervisor] pointed it out…But sometimes you don’t even know if you are doing something wrong. If my supervisor said ‘How do you feel like it is going? Did you notice any?’ Then I may have an obligation to say ‘You know I notice this and that.’ Obviously, having someone who can bring up issues you may not recognize on your own, is helpful.” (GCS)

Domain 3: Feedback and guidance. A number of participants expressed interest in receiving feedback and guidance from their supervisors in working with culturally diverse populations. Some participants wanted more directive feedback, particularly the first year master students. Some participants indicated they wanted more
examples of how to bring up cultural issues in counseling. Some wanted the supervisors
to provide concrete, specific, and culturally-appropriate feedback and suggestions.

Written responses (n =12):

“It would be helpful to know some specific key strategies, phrases, or ways to ask a
client to clarify a cultural practice without deflecting attention away from the
client’s presenting concern in therapy.” (PCS)

“Comments and suggestions on how to ask clients when the counselor is not sure
about the client’s culture or when the counselor makes a mistake in cultural
aspects.” (PCS)

“The supervisor could have given more guidance on how to correctly approach the
situation, maybe role play of what should have been said.” (PCS)

“Tips on how to approach the important, sensitive topics that are unknown (i.e. the
supervisee in the Scenario B didn’t know/doesn’t have much knowledge on
religion and Somali culture).” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n =7):

“I think maybe she could have given a few more examples, not only how to
apologize for his [supervisee] statement, but also how to get the conversation back
on track. Just some questions he could ask next session so they don’t end up the
same track I guess. That is what I want from her if I were him.” (PCS)

“Also, I want my supervisor can give me some comparison between what I just did
and what I have to do, the right move. I hope she can give me some comparison so
I can know the difference. So I can apply it to the next counseling.” (GCS)

Domain 4: Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures. Some participants
expressed a desire for the supervisors to invite them to process their personal reactions to
different cultures or values.

Written responses (n =6):

“Discuss how you [supervisee] deal with cultural practice that goes against your
values.” (PCS)
“I might want to talk about how to deal with views from the client that I don’t necessarily agree with.” (GCS)

“I want my supervisor asks [sic] me what to do when I encounter cultural issues and values that are different from my own.” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =3):*

“I agree actually. That was the one thing I thought was missing from the discussion. She [supervisor] did a great job helping him [supervisee] to figure out how it affects the client, how to repair damage. I didn’t think there was a discussion on his [supervisee’s] feelings. This might happen a lot and I want to know what to do when I feel shocked with some cultural differences. I didn’t feel like they really explored what to do with that.” (PCS)

“Not only she [supervisor] said, ‘What kinds of questions could you [supervisee] ask? What could you do in the session?’ she [supervisor] said ‘Tell me a little bit more about your culture. What would you do with that information?’ So it’s kind of taking it further and redirects the session and gives the new facts.” (GCS)

**Domain 5: Recognize limitations in understanding different cultures.**

Some participants indicated a desire for the supervisors to be aware of limitations regarding cultural understanding and to also be able to help their supervisees acknowledge their cultural limitations. This topic was identified only in the written responses, not in the focus group responses.

*Written responses (n =4):*

“A recognition that even if he [supervisee] understands a culture better by reading about it, he will still be an outsider and needs a basic ability to counsel the individual client in a respectful way.” (PCS)

“Addressing the issues of being direct and honest with clients and telling them you don’t know as much about their personal/cultural values and would like to learn more.” (GCS)

**Domain 6: Balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues.** Some participants discussed that they want supervisors who can help them
balance between the cultural issue and the client’s presenting issue. This topic occurred only in focus group discussions.

Focus group responses (n =3):

“...I thought it would be helpful for my supervisor to maybe even offer some ways or strategies to maybe address or clarify cultural practice without fully deflecting the attention from the client’s presenting concerns.” (PCS)

“I would want to know how I could express the interest in the certain cultural facts without making it the focus of the conversation like the example, like what if I genuinely found some aspects of some cultures and I want to learn about it and have them tell me about it, but I wouldn’t also want them to feel that is all I care about. So kind of meeting somewhere in middle of the two. I would ask my supervisor how to balance culture and the client’s reason for coming to counseling.” (PCS)

Domain 7: Miscellaneous. Some responses were not culture-specific, rather they described skills reflecting general supervisor competencies. For example, some participants wanted supervisors to help them be independent and to give them more autonomy. There were some discussions about positive feedback for supervisees and more “role plays” in supervision.

Written responses (n =6):

“Noting both positive and negative behaviors so that I can reinforce my strengths during counseling” (GCS)

Focus group responses (n =3):

“I think it is always helpful when the supervisor can get you to come up with your own solutions. She [supervisor] can recognize what went wrong and what not quite as well as the session could go. He [supervisee] tried to ask her what he should do, you know, and she really brought that back to him, like what to think and what to do next time. I think it is always better if you can come up with your own solutions and then get more feedback.” (PCS)
“Another thing I would like to hear from my supervisor would be some positive feedback like ‘That is good to be aware of.’” (GCS)

**Theme 4: Attitude**

The Attitude theme refers to supervisors’ perspectives about supervisees’ culture and/or about clients’ cultures in general. Three domains were extracted, including a Miscellaneous domain. A number of participants considered supervisor empathy to be a culturally competent behavior they would like to experience if they were the supervisee in the scenarios.

**Domain 1: Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency.**

A number of participants expressed a desire for the supervisors to show empathy towards them as they struggled with cultural competency, and to validate their experiences.

*Written responses (n =15):*

“Acknowledge difficulty and complications surrounding cultural issues” (PCS)

“For the supervisor not to come off on confrontation or judgmental if I [supervisee] had not been culturally confident in a situation.” (PCS)

“More emotionally supportive about the supervisee having panicked during the session, maybe saying that it must have been really hard for the supervisee to encounter a client with such different cultural background.” (GCS)

“Support-acknowledgement that these types of situations (culturally charged ones) are difficult especially for beginning counselors” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =5):*

“Maybe some empathy for supervisees. A little more empathy for a supervisee, if I were the supervisee in the same situation.” (PCS)

“I actually thought she [supervisor] could have provided more emotional support. Maybe I expect that from my supervisor. She [supervisor] could have said at least ‘Oh it could been really hard’ and shared more experience on what is culturally
different, what she encountered as a counselor, and how the supervisee can emotionally take care of [herself] when that kind of thing happen.” (GCS)

**Domain 2: Non-judgmental.** Some participants discussed a desire to have their supervisor be non-judgmental about them and their clients. This topic was only identified in the focus group discussion.

*Focus group responses (n =2):*

“I think in some situations beginning with the supervisor’s concerns could be helpful, also to assist the conversation, I think is very good to be neutral and non-judgmental while the supervisee gets to that point on their own.” (PCS)

“Knowing that my supervisor wasn’t judging me for making those comments would probably make the [supervisory] environment more open and safe.” (GCS)

**Domain 3: Miscellaneous.** Some responses were not directly related to cultural aspects but rather reflected general attitudes about their supervisors.

*Written responses (n =2):*

“Very conversation manner- supervisor was not patronizing and made supervisee feel comfortable enough to express her thoughts and feelings” (GCS)

*Focus group responses (n =3):*

“I think that it would be helpful to recognize maybe the non-verbal cues that he [supervisee] demonstrates in session because when he started talking about how he reacted – ‘She [client] was fourteen when she married!’ - it was such a physical response, and had that response also [occurred] in the session that the client might clearly see. So if I were the supervisee, I hope she [supervisor] is able to provide [feedback about] how I reacted to the client in the session.” (PCS)

**Analysis of Participants’ Responses: Questions 8-12**
After watching both supervision DVDs, participants provided oral responses to questions 8 through 12.

**Question 8:** “Were there any supervisor behaviors that demonstrated her general competence in the DVD? If yes, what do you think they are?”

Participants discussed their perceptions of both supervisors. Seven domains were extracted from the focus group discussions. There were no major thematic differences in responses for either supervisor. There were also no apparent differences in responses given by first year versus second year students, with the exception of one domain (“Balance between support and guidance in supervision”) which was discussed only in the both second year students’ focus groups.

**Domain 1: Interpersonally Skilled (Focus group responses n = 6)**

Participants in all but one focus group mentioned the supervisors possessed and modeling good listening skills, attending behaviors, and communication skills for supervisees.

“I agree with everybody. I think that, hmm, kind of going with what makes sense like basic physical attending skills, and empathy, and good questions. They are all good things as supervisors…”

**Domain 2: Facilitate Supervisee Self-Reflection (Focus group responses n = 5)**

Participants in most groups mentioned the supervisors encouraging the supervisees to process their case and allowing them to do so in a safe environment.

“I think that it is important, as mentioned earlier, sometimes you just come out of the session and you are overwhelmed with the information and trying to get everything right, you talk about it and at the same time you are processing. It is good to see the summary of your process because sometimes you might not fully realize issues. It should be a safe environment [supervision] to have reflections.”
Domain 3: Provide Guidance (Focus group responses n = 4)

Participants in several groups mentioned the supervisors providing examples, suggestions, about counseling interventions.

“I guess specifically if there is something with a client now, you [supervisor] can discuss what to bring and how to explore that. Some strategies you can apply with any clients. It doesn’t have to be for someone who is only coming from different cultures. Regardless who he is, [pregnancy] termination is very a touchy topic whether you consider or not consider. It is not a fun session to have…”

Domain 4: Facilitate Supervisee Autonomy (Focus group responses n = 3)

Participants in a few groups mentioned supervisors allowing supervisees the freedom to experiment and learn from their own mistakes during supervision.

“I know I don’t like to be micro-managed. So I want a supervisor that would let me know what I learn and let me make a mistake, and then try to correct later on. Just provide skills and maybe just let me learn myself…”

Domain 5: Demonstrate Empathy for Supervisee (Focus group responses n = 2)

Participants in a couple of groups referenced supervisor empathy.

“…it goes back to acknowledging that a certain situation is tough, but I think that almost all counseling situations are tough. It really helps to have a supervisor who shows some empathy [for supervisee] just like in a counseling session, you know, true empathy.”

Domain 6: Openness to Other Theoretical Orientations

(Focus group responses n = 2)

Participants in a couple of groups identified supervisor openness.

“I am not sure if it is called qualities or skills [of a supervisor]. Hmm, supervisors with sort of eclectic backgrounds in theory is important because if you are going to work with a supervisor who is only into CBT and you are coming in and telling him that you want to use EMDR with your client. Then your supervisor might start laughing at you and tell you ‘Why do you use that? You should be using this.’ General competency of a supervisor is being available for a supervisee and talking about all the theoretical aspects that you would approach with clients.”
Participants in the second year groups mentioned supervisor ability to balance counseling (support) and teaching (guidance) components in supervision.

“Yeah, I agree. I think both [teaching and counseling components of supervision] are important. I mean, I think my initial reaction would be saying that experiencing a counseling component [in supervision] is important, but I also feel like the teaching part is important. But I think if you [supervisor] are teaching in a way that, you know, I guess that [teaching] should include some empathy and some invitation for the student [supervisee]. I don’t know, I do feel like I approach my supervision sessions as I am like a sponge, and I want to learn a lot.”

**Question 9:** “Do you think a supervisor’s cultural competence and general competence are different? If so, how?”

Participants’ responses to this question varied widely within and across the focus groups and thus no apparent themes could be extracted. Some group members stated a belief that a supervisor’s general competency of a supervisor includes cultural competency. Others voiced the opposite opinion, that is, cultural competency subsumes a supervisor’s general competency. Some participants stated that supervisor cultural competency differs from general competency because it is “above and beyond” general competency. The following quotations illustrate the variety of opinions expressed.

“For some people, ‘general’ means empathy, attending behaviors, or actual basic counseling behaviors everybody has to have. I think that cultural competency is different. Non judgment based on cultures, but also, needing to be aware that there are the differences for specific cultures and that has to be taken into account.”

“I guess my feeling is that they are more similar than they are different. Hmm, counselors can’t be truly culturally competent until they are generally competent if
that makes sense. And I think cultural competence is kind of higher level of general competence. I think general competence is kind of, I guess a fertile ground for cultural competence. And I see the biggest difference between them involves additional learning on specific cultures like ethnic, sexual, racial etc. But general competence includes elements of what we consider as cultural competence. Understanding that people have their own cultures and choosing what cultures they are most identified with are more important than being like ‘Oh you are a Hmong, so you are going to behave as a Hmong.”

“I feel like you can be culturally competent, you can be well educated about different kinds of people, and not be clinically or generally competent. But I feel like you can’t be, you can’t be generally competent without being culturally competent.”

“I think that they [general competency and cultural competency] are different, they go together well though. I think general competence in my mind is kind of like counselor’s common sense. You know, like things you should learn on your way to become a counselor. Cultural competency, I feel like it is just a more specific part of general competency, but requires extra experiences, education, knowledge, and like exposure to different cultures.”

“I think if you are generally competent, you are going to focus on other persons, so I think, you will be able to focus on their culture, and understand how they are experiencing through their lens of culture. So if you are truly generally competent, you are culturally competent.”

**Question 10:** “Let’s imagine that you are working with a client who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to help you work with the client. Any examples?”

Participants’ responses to this were similar to previous responses for Questions 3-7. Similar domains were extracted from the analysis of responses to Question 10, although they are fewer in number.
Domain 1: Attend to Supervisor and Supervisee Cultural Differences (Focus group responses n =7)

Participants in every group mentioned attending to and discussing supervisor and supervisee cultural differences.

“I agree with what both of you said. I mean again we are all culturally different even if we were born in the same country. I think a lot of things make a good supervisor. They are able to communicate with you clearly saying that ‘These are my values and perspectives.’ It is important to discuss with you how your own values and their values are culturally matched or not matched because they may be different. Discuss how you are going to negotiate when you’re working with clients and with each other. I think that is something that explicitly has to be discussed. Again I think those things happen between every counseling relationship and every supervision relationship.”

Domain 2: Provide Direct, Honest Feedback (Focus group responses n =5)

Participants in most groups mentioned supervisor provision of specific, honest cultural feedback.

“I want my supervisor to be honest and be straight to tell me what I did wrong. I prefer my supervisor being directive and don’t beat around [the bush]. Don’t ask me ten questions to get one answer.”

Domain 3: Anticipatory Guidance (Focus group responses n = 4)

Participants in a few groups mentioned supervisor provision of hypothetical examples of culturally sensitive situations and discussion of these situations with supervisees before they occur.

“Yeah, maybe do examples with your supervisee, like put them in the difficult situations before they are in difficult situations. Just go through what might be appropriate because it would be better to be stuck with your supervisors and have them help you go through it than being thrown out there without really knowing what to do.”

Domain 4: Provide Cultural Information (Focus group responses n = 2)
Participants in a couple of groups mentioned supervisors teaching supervisees cultural information about their clients. Educate and teach supervisees cultural knowledge about their clients.

“Maybe some knowledge that I don’t have about my client’s culture or ethnicity. If my supervisor was aware of things that I wasn’t aware of, I want my supervisor to educate and inform me more.”

**Question 11:** “Let’s imagine that you are working with a supervisor who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to make supervision successful? What would they do and say? Any examples?”

Participants’ responses were categorized into three domains:

**Domain 1: Supervisor Initiated Discussion (Focus group responses n = 6)**

Participants in all but one focus group mentioned the supervisor beginning conversations about the supervisee’s culture and how each of their cultures might influence counseling and supervision. Many participants mentioned that it would be important for supervisors initiate this discussion due to supervisor’s and supervisee’s power differences, even with cultural minority supervisors.

“I think if a supervisor is different ethnically or culturally from a supervisee, I think it should be the supervisor, maybe to bring that up and address it, because I think for the supervisee, it would be really hard to bring that up to the supervisor and says ‘I feel really uncomfortable and different from you.’ So I think it would be nicer if the supervisor puts any potential issues out there.”

**Domain 2: Supervisor Avoids Stereotyping (Focus group responses n = 3)**

Participants in some groups mentioned supervisors not using stereotypes regarding the supervisee’s cultural background.
“I hope that they [supervisors] would not necessarily lump you [supervisee] according to your culture, demographic information, or ethnicity, even though they know those things about you. But they are still honest and sensitive enough to realize that you are not going to be their stereotyped person.”

**Domain 3: Supervisor Self-Disclosure (Focus group responses n = 2)**

Participants in a couple of groups mentioned supervisors sharing their own relevant cultural experiences and examples with the supervisee. In addition, some White participants stated that they want to hear more from cultural minority supervisor’s personal and professional experiences with cultures because they might help them understand the clients from other cultures.

“Maybe making sure that the examples they [supervisors] are using are culturally relevant. It could be helpful because sometimes people use their experiences from their own life and we may understand them better [by those examples]. So what would make it [supervision] so successful, I think, is to make sure, there is a basic understanding you know, about how things are, or how they are seeing things based on their cultural background.”

**Question 12 (Closing Question):** “*We are coming to the end of our discussion. I would like to go around the group and ask each of you to share at least one major point which occurs to you from this discussion.*”

Participants responded generally positive experiences from engaging in the focus group discussion. They reported gaining more insight and awareness about the importance of culturally competent supervision and the supervisory relationships. At the same time, some participants reported having developed more questions and curiosity about cultural competency and general competency. The following themes were extracted:
• Learned the importance of supervisor’s cultural competence.
• Supervisory relationship is important.
• Cultural application is more important than theory.
• Communication between supervisor and supervisee has to be open and direct.
• Need to discuss cultural difference between supervisor and supervisee.
• Important to have balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues.
• Cultural competency is a continuing learning process.
• Importance of self-reflection on cultural issues.
• It is critical to create an environment where supervisees can reflect and talk about their cultural issues and concerns.
• Making a mistake (re: cultural issues) is not the end of the world. Supervisees can learn and change from mistakes.
• It was a good opportunity to think of general and cultural competence.
• It is important to consider client, supervisee, supervisor, and their dynamics in supervision.
• Learned we define things differently based on different cultural and personal experiences.
• Want to be more pro-active in supervision regarding cultural issues and discussion.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore counseling trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors, including supervisor provision of feedback. First and second year students (n = 35 and n=10, respectively) enrolled in a psychological counseling program, and second year genetic counseling students (n = 6) viewed two hypothetical supervision situations involving provision of feedback to a supervisee. They responded to a series of questions regarding supervisor multicultural competence and general competence. Participants provided written responses prior to and after viewing the scenarios, and they gave verbal responses during focus group interviews. Qualitative analysis of both written and verbal responses yielded four overarching themes reflecting supervisor: Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes. Major findings are discussed in this section (Figure 1 & Table 3 to 8).

Overall, in the Awareness theme, participants perceived culturally competent supervisors as: recognizing their own and their supervisees’ limitations in understanding different cultures; facilitating supervisee self-reflection; and attending to supervisor, supervisee, and client cultural differences. In the Knowledge theme, participants described culturally competent supervisors as: having cultural knowledge and acting in accordance with that knowledge, providing information and suggestions to supervisees that are culturally relevant and sensitive, and continuing their own education on cultural competency. In the Skills theme, participants identified several culturally competent supervisor strategies and behaviors including: initiating cultural discussions; providing direct, honest feedback and guidance related to cultural issues; using evocative
Figure 1. Some Examples of Supervisor Competencies that Promote Culturally Competent Supervision

- **Awareness**
  - Supervisors have self-awareness about their own cultural/racial identity and its influence.
  - Supervisors recognize cultural differences among supervisor, supervisee, and client.

- **Knowledge**
  - Supervisor is culturally knowledgeable and provides information and suggestions that are culturally relevant and sensitive.
  - Supervisors have continuing education and learn about other cultures.

- **Skills**
  - Initiate/encourage cultural discussions.
  - Process supervisees' reactions to cultures.
  - Provide feedback and guidance.
  - Evocative questioning.
  - Supervisor self-disclosure.

- **Attitude**
  - Non-judgmental and respect diverse cultures.
  - Openness and respect.
  - Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency.
questioning; encouraging cultural discussion; processing supervisees’ reactions to cultures; allowing supervisees to ask clients about their cultures; discussing the supervisory styles both the supervisor and supervisee culturally expect; using self-disclosure related to cultural issues; balancing cultural issues with other presenting issues; and avoiding cultural stereotyping. In the Attitude theme, the participants described culturally competent supervisors as demonstrating in supervision: non-judgmentalness, openness and respect for other cultures, openness to cultural learning, having and demonstrating empathy for supervisee struggles with cultural competency, and fostering supervisee empathy for culturally diverse clients.

Some of the supervisor behaviors identified as culturally competent in this study have been discussed in previous literature. For example, Falender and Shafranske (2004) indicate that culturally competent supervisors “Possess a working knowledge of the factors that affect worldview; Possess self-identity awareness and competence with respect to diversity in the context of self, supervisee, and client or family; Exhibit competence in multimodal assessment of the multicultural competence of trainees, including self-ratings, observational ratings, and supervisor and client ratings; Model diversity and multicultural conceptualizations throughout the supervision process; Model respect, openness, and curiosity toward all aspects of diversity and its impact on behavior, interaction, and the therapy and supervision processes; Initiate discussion of diversity factors in supervision” (p. 149).

Ancis and Ladany (2001) proposed 5 domains of multicultural supervision competencies that overlap with the present results: supervisor-focused personal
development, supervisee-focused development, skills and interventions, process, and evaluation. These authors subsequently used those 5 domains to explore counseling trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervision (Ancis & Marshall, 2010). Based on their participants’ responses, the authors concluded that supervisors who are culturally competent actively explore multicultural issues with the goal of increased understanding of clients and of themselves. The supervisors who are culturally competent also disclose the limits of their multicultural knowledge, are open about their own cultural background, use self-disclosure about other topics in supervision, and are interested in their supervisees’ perspectives on cultural issues as well as the clients’ perspectives.

Dressel, Consoli, Kim, and Atkinson (2007) identified supervisory behaviors in successful multicultural supervision using a Delphi method. Their results also are quite consistent with the present study’s findings. For example, they reported the following supervisor behaviors in multicultural supervision: “creating a safe environment for discussion of multicultural issues, developing supervisor’s own self-awareness about cultural/ethnic identity, biases, and limitations, communicating acceptance of and respect for supervisees’ culture, checking out the supervisory expectations with supervisees, initiating discussions about the importance of culture, self-disclosing aspects of supervisors’ own cultural background, or providing multicultural readings and trainings for supervisees” (p. 57).

Thus, the results of the present study are congruent with extant literature, particularly with respect to the importance of supervisors’ initiating cultural discussions
in supervision, self-disclosing related to cultural issues, paying attention to their own, their supervisees’, and clients’ cultural perspectives, and being open and non-judgmental about different cultures. The present findings further suggest supervisor multicultural competence may be similar across human service professions since there were virtually no differences in participants’ perceptions of a psychological counseling supervisor versus a genetic counseling supervisor.

**Developmental Differences in Perceptions**

Perceptions of first and second year student participants generally were quite consistent. Contrary to this researcher’s expectation that students with less counseling and supervision experiences would prefer more emotionally supportive supervision, there were no discernible differences in their responses about emotionally supportive supervision. For both 1st year and 2nd year psychological counseling students and second year genetic counseling students, “being supportive and showing empathy” for one’s supervisees, particularly when supervisees are struggling with cultural competency, was a prevalent theme in descriptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors.

There were some noteworthy differences, however, concerning their expectations about supervisor provision of direction/guidance. Some participants, particularly 1st year counseling students, expressed a desire to receive more “direct” advice and feedback from their supervisor when they (counseling trainees) work with culturally diverse clients. For example, in focus group discussions, 1st year student groups more frequently and intensely discussed the importance of receiving “direct” guidance and suggestions from their supervisors about cultural issues compared to groups consisting of 2nd year
students. Also, after watching the DVD scenarios, some 1\textsuperscript{st} year students indicated they considered the genetic counseling supervisor’s style as more culturally competent because she provided more directive feedback to her supervisee than the psychological counseling supervisor.

Differences in preference for direction might be explained by differences in clinical experiences and/or developmental level. Most 1\textsuperscript{st} year students had no or very limited supervision experience at the time of the study. In contrast, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year students were engaged in supervised clinical practica/rotations. A number of theorists suggest novices prefer more of a teaching approach, desiring supervisor guidance (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Stoltenberg, 1981); novice supervisees and counseling trainees wish to know the “correct” or “right” approach with their clients and they depend more on their supervisor to direct them towards this approach. For instance, in their Integrated Development Model (IDM), Stoltenberg, McNeill, and Delworth (1998) propose four levels of supervisee development characterized by changes in “three overriding structures that provide markers in assessing professional growth” (p. 16). Supervisees in Level 1 are motivated and anxious, and they depend more on their supervisor. They also need more structure and positive feedback compared to supervisees in the advanced levels. Supervisees in this beginning level want to know the “correct and best” way to work with their clients, which might explain why they often want more directive feedback and a didactic approach from their supervisors.

Ronnestad and Skovholt (1993) discuss supervision of beginning and advanced counseling graduate students. Similar to Stoltenberg et al., (1998), they describe
counseling trainees in a Beginning Student Phase as tending to feel dependent, vulnerable, and anxious. They highly value their supervisor’s feedback and look for the “right way” to work. Both models suggest counseling trainees in their early developmental stages as counselors desire more guidelines or examples. These developmental models might explain the present results regarding students’ desire for supervisor guidance on issues of cultural competency development.

Additional literature (cf. Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1988; Tracey, Ellickson, & Sherry, 1989) suggests counseling trainees desire more structure because of their anxiety. Freeman (1993) argues that supervisors can lessen supervisee anxiety by providing structure, and Bernard and Goodyear (2004) assert that it is more important to provide structure to the inexperienced counselor than to one who is more advanced and experienced. Heppner and Roehlke (1984) conclude that beginning supervisees perceive themselves as needing more structure than those who are more advanced.

Counseling trainees in the early stage of their counselor development may also expect to have more direct, didactic guidelines and feedback from their supervisors when they work with clients who are culturally different from themselves. Although most of literature focuses on supervisees’ general development rather than cultural competency development, the various models and studies may still explain at least partially why the present participants desired more direct, concreitive feedback and guidance from supervisors when they deal with culturally sensitive issues. Dressel et al. (2007) found that discussion of supervisory expectations with supervisees is an essential supervisor behavior in multicultural supervision. The present results suggest such discussions should
take into consideration how supervisees’ expectations are influenced not only by their culture, but also by their developmental level.

**Perceptions of General Supervisor Competence versus Cultural Competence**

The findings of this study show considerable overlap between behaviors associated with general supervisor competence and cultural competence. For example, the present participants identified non-judgmentalness, openness, empathy and respect for supervisees as qualities of culturally competent supervisors. Furthermore, participants suggested all supervisors should create a safe, close supervisory relationship (alliance) as a foundation for effective supervision. These qualities have been identified as aspects of general competence (cf. Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Wampold, 2001). Despite this overlap, when asked specifically whether there are differences between supervisor cultural competency and general competency, focus group participants differed markedly in their perceptions on this matter. Some participants regarded them as separate types of competence, others commented that one type of competence subsumes the other, and some participants expressed uncertainty about their relationship to each other.

Sue (1998) describes three essential characteristics of cultural competency: (a) being scientifically minded, (b) having skills in dynamic sizing, and (c) being proficient with a particular cultural group. *Scientific mindedness* refers to the need for counselors to form hypotheses rather than make premature conclusions about their clients who come from different cultures. Their hypotheses should then be evaluated and tested with evidence and experiences, not pre-judged assumptions. *Dynamic sizing* concerns the need for counselors to develop skills in knowing when to generalize and when to individualize.
In other words, it is important for counselors to be flexible in order to avoid stereotypes about a certain cultural group while still appreciating and understanding the uniqueness of culture. The third characteristic, proficiency, reflects culture-specific expertise. Sue (1998) explains that different cultures may require different culture-specific expertise, skills, and knowledge. Culturally skilled counselors or supervisors should have good understanding of their own worldviews and bias, have specific knowledge of the groups with which they or their supervisees work, be aware of social justice and sociopolitical influences, and have specific skills and interventions that are effective for culturally diverse groups. The importance of having and using culturally based interventions and possessing an ability to work with diverse cultural groups have been discussed as fundamental characteristics of culturally competent mental health professionals in many previous studies and theoretical articles (Constantine, 2001; Hird et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2006; Priest, 1994; Sue et al, 1992).

Supervisor styles, which could be roughly divided into support and guidance/direction (Hart & Nance, 2003), supervisor strategies (e.g., self-disclosure, questioning, feedback), and supervisor self-reflection are universal factors which are present in any competent supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). When conceptualized according to these broad dimensions, general supervisor competence and multicultural competence may appear indistinguishable. Although they are highly correlated and likely overlap to some degree, there are still important differences. A major distinguishing feature is the explicit focus on issues of cultural diversity. Culturally competent supervisors must value cultural influences and look for them, honor those influences by
working with them in the supervisory relationship and in the supervisee’s work with clients, and they must do their best to acquire and impart the types of knowledge they and their supervisee will need to work effectively. Falender and colleagues (Falender et al., 2004) describe supervision as a core competency area in psychology and describe a number of elements of competent supervision which reflect knowledge, skills, and values. They regard “diversity as the broader view of cultural competence” (p. 776) and present 43 competencies in their “supervision competencies framework” (p.778). It is this investigator’s belief that culturally competent supervisors must possess qualities and skills of generally competent supervisors, but these general competencies are not sufficient for multiculturally competent supervision.

Table 9 contains a list of Falendar et al.’s (2004) 43 general supervision competencies. As seen in this table, only three of their 43 competencies explicitly refer to cultural competency. Table 9 also contains behaviors identified by the present participants as indicative of supervisor cultural competence. These data provide a more detailed description of supervisor behaviors that correspond to a number of the Falendar et al. competencies. Figure 2 provides an illustration of the overlap between supervisor general competence and cultural competence. A primary distinction appears to be the need for culturally competent supervisors to possess culture-specific knowledge, skills, and awareness.

Indeed, certain behaviors identified by participants in this study, and also found in Dressel et al. (2007), are unique to cultural competence, particularly those related to supervisor cultural knowledge and cultural awareness. More research is needed to
determine the relationship between general supervision competence and multicultural supervision competence.

**Figure 2. Proposed Overlap in Supervisor Cultural Competencies and General Competencies**

“Overlaps” between General competence in supervision and Cultural competence in supervision
Based on “Comparison of Supervisor Cultural Competencies Identified by Participants in the Present Study with Falender et al.’s (2004) Supervision Competencies Framework”

- Relationship skills-ability to build supervisory relationship/alliance
- Respectful
- Verbal and non-verbal attending skills
- Provide feedback and guidance
- Discuss supervisory styles of both supervisor and supervisee expect
- Balance between support and challenging
- Commitment to knowing one’s own limitations
- Creation of climate in which honest feedback is the norm (both supportive and challenging)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Falender et al. (2004) Competencies</th>
<th>Present Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of area being supervised (psychotherapy, research, assessment, etc)</td>
<td>Supervisor has cultural knowledge and act[s] accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of models, theories, modalities, and research on supervision</td>
<td>Supervisor is culturally knowledgeable and provides information and suggestions that are culturally relevant and sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of professional/supervisee development (how therapists develop, etc)</td>
<td>Supervisors have continuing education and learning about [the] population they are serving and their supervisee[s] are serving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge of ethics and legal issues specific to supervision</td>
<td>[Supervisor is] familiar with cultural diversity and knowledgeable about supervisee and client cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowledge of evaluation, process outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Awareness and knowledge of diversity of all its forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervision modalities</td>
<td>Initiate/encourage cultural discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relationship skills-ability to build supervisory relationship/alliance</td>
<td>Evocative questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sensitivity to multiple roles with supervisee and ability to perform and balance multiple roles</td>
<td>Process supervisees’ reactions to cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to provide effective formative and summative feedback</td>
<td>Provide feedback and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to promote growth and self-assessment in the trainee</td>
<td>Discuss supervisory styles of both supervisor and supervisee expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ability to conduct own self-assessment process</td>
<td>Allow supervisees to ask their clients about the clients’ cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to assess the learning needs and developmental level of the supervisee</td>
<td>Supervisor self-disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ability to encourage and use evaluative feedback from the trainee</td>
<td>Consideration of client’s culture and background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching and didactic skills</td>
<td>Balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ability to set appropriate boundaries and seek consultation when supervisory issues are outside domain of supervisory competence</td>
<td>Supervisor avoids stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Flexibility</td>
<td>Verbal and non-verbal attending skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Scientific thinking and the translation of scientific findings to practice throughout professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsibility for client and supervisee rests with the supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisors have self awareness about their own cultural/racial identity and its influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respectful</td>
<td>Supervisors are aware of the limits of their own cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Responsible for sensitivity to diversity in all its forms</strong></td>
<td>Supervisors recognize cultural differences among supervisor, supervisee, and client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Balance between support and challenging</td>
<td>Supervisors acknowledge the different cultures and accept people’s differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Empowering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commitment to lifelong learning and professional growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Balance between clinical and training needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Value ethical principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Commitment to knowing and utilizing available psychological science related to supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Commitment to knowing one’s own limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Supervisors ask supervisees’ cultural perspective and do not use generalized expectations/assumptions of supervisor/supervisee.
- Supervisors speak about the difference between supervisor, supervisee, and clients in a sensitive manner.

**Social Context Overarching issues**

1. **Diversity**
2. Ethical and legal issues
3. Developmental process
4. Knowledge of the immediate system and expectations within which the supervision is conducted
5. Awareness of the sociopolitical context within with the supervision is conducted
6. Creation of climate in which honest feedback is the norm (both supportive and challenging)

**Attitude**

- Non-judgmental and respect diverse cultures
- Openness and respect
- Open to cultural learning
- Empathy for supervisee struggle with cultural competency
- Foster supervisee empathy for culturally different clients

**Training of Supervision Competencies**

1. Coursework in supervision including knowledge and skill areas listed
2. Has received supervision of supervision including some form of observation (videotape or audiotape) with critical feedback

**Assessment of Supervision Competences**

1. Successful completion of course on supervision
2. Verification of previous supervision of supervision documenting readiness to supervise independently
3. Evidence of direct observation (e.g., videotape)
4. Documentation of supervisory experience reflecting diversity
5. Documented supervisee feedback
6. Self-assessment and awareness of need for consultation when necessary
7. Assessment of supervision outcomes—both individual and group

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

This study has several strengths. The sample consisted of students who either were engaged in clinical supervision at the time of the study or who would be involved in supervision at a later point in time. As such, they are exemplars of the phenomenon of interest (i.e., student trainees). Inclusion of students from two different healthcare fields adds some support for the “universality” of perceptions of multicultural competence. Use of videos allowed participants to react to concrete supervision scenarios, allowed them to focus on common stimuli, and likely elicited more detailed responses about their perceptions. The use of stimulus materials was thought to be particularly important for students that had no previous supervision experience. A focus group format elicited a wider range and depth of beliefs and attitudes than likely would be obtained from individual interviews. In addition, generation of written responses captured the perspectives of all participants, regardless of their level of involvement in the focus group discussions, and provided a modicum of triangulation of the data.

Despite these strengths there are also limitations that suggest caution in drawing definitive conclusions from the data. Qualitative data are not intended to be generalized to the population of interest. Given the relatively small sample size (which is common in qualitative research), it is not possible to make generalizations about the prevalence of themes for students in general. Moreover, “prevalence” of themes does not necessarily equate to their “importance” (Krueger, 1994). Social desirability may have influenced participant responses, particularly during focus group discussions, pressuring some individuals to conform to group norms (Krueger, 1994). Another possible limitation
concerns student recruitment. First year psychological counseling students and second year genetic counseling students received credit toward a course in which they were enrolled, and every student in that course elected to participate (no doubt due to receipt of credit towards their course grade). Second year psychological counseling students were volunteers that received no participation incentives. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether participants differed in meaningful ways from non-participants. Also, the comparison of counseling/supervision experiences between the first year and the second year master students might be different from the comparison of the first year master students and the post-doc counseling supervisees because it might produce different range.

Finally, the supervision scenarios were brief and portrayed two different supervisors who were both females. The psychological supervisor was a White, Caucasian advanced doctoral student, and the genetic counseling supervisor was an Asian American with about 8 years of supervision experience. Both supervisees in the DVD scenarios were White, Caucasian students (one male, one female). Although the actors’ sex, ethnicity, field of specialization, and/or experience level did not seem to have an effect on overall thematic responses, one or more of these factors appears to have been salient for some participants. Specifically, some students commented that the Asian American genetic counseling supervisor was more culturally competent and responsive. Therefore, in future quantitative studies, it would be valuable to study the effects of variables such as supervisor and supervisee sex, ethnicity, experience, and field of specialization on perceptions of multicultural supervisor competence. In addition, cultural
diversity includes various aspects of human values and life such as SES, age, sexual orientation, gender, disability and so on. In this study, only small parts of the cultural variables were covered. Thus, it would be important to explore other cultural variables in a future study.

**Practice and Training Implications**

The present findings have several implications for supervisor training and practice. The findings provide insight into counseling trainees’ perceptions of and expectations about culturally competent supervisor characteristics and behaviors. These insights may be helpful for developing training materials for clinical supervisors. They may also help supervisors anticipate student expectations, initiate discussions about these expectations, and respond to them more effectively.

*Recognizing and employing culturally competent supervisor’s behaviors.* The present sample identified a number of attitudes, behaviors, and skills reflective of supervisor culturally competent behaviors. Their responses reflect the multicultural dimensions identified in the counseling literature – Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills. In particular, counseling trainees expect that culturally competent supervisors understand their own limitations in understanding different cultures, facilitate supervisee self-reflection, attend to supervisor, supervisee, and client’s cultural difference, initiate cultural discussions, provide direct, honest feedback and guidance related to cultural issues, use evocative questioning, process supervisees’ reactions to cultures, use self-disclosure, balance between cultural issues and other presenting issues, avoid cultural stereotyping, and show empathy for supervisee struggles with cultural competency.
Given that supervisor cultural competence behaviors parallel those identified for culturally competent counselors, the findings suggests supervisors have excellent potential to serve as models of the types of skills, attitudes, and knowledge supervisees can develop and use with their clients. Therefore, supervisors should spend time encourage supervisees to make connections between supervision and counseling interactions and help them translates the attitudes, skills, and knowledge they experience in supervision into their counseling sessions. The findings further suggest supervisors should employ their cultural competence within the supervision relationship itself (with supervisees) and bring their cultural competence to bear when helping supervisees with case preparation/conceptualization.

*Understanding supervisee development and corresponding needs.* The results of this study indicate that counseling trainees at different levels of professional development may have different expectations about some supervisor styles they regard as culturally competent. Supervisees at all levels in this study equated psychosocial support with cultural competence. Students in their early development, however, expressed strong sentiments that guidance and structure in supervision equate to cultural competence. Supervisors need to be aware of a possible developmental preference for guidance, especially among novice counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Regardless, at the beginning of supervision relationships, supervisors should initiate discussion about their own and their supervisee’s expectations vis a vis supervision styles as well as explore their unique cultural backgrounds and values, and their general approaches with culturally diverse groups.
Engaging empathically with supervisees. Empathy was one of the most prevalent topics identified in this study. Supervisor empathy was mentioned repeatedly in discussions and written responses. Participants regarded supervisor cultural empathy for supervisees’ clients, supervisees’ cultural backgrounds, and supervisees’ struggles with cultural competency as a critical component of culturally competent supervisor behavior. Ridley and Lingle (1996) describe cultural empathy as the learned ability of counselors to understand accurately the personal experiences of clients from other cultures. They describe two processes essential to cultural empathy: cultural empathic understanding and cultural empathic responsiveness. Cultural empathic understanding is the process through which counselors perceive the meaning of the self-experience of culturally different clients (Ridley & Udipi, 2002). This understanding involves listening attentively and gathering information about how they experience their culture. Cultural empathic responsiveness is “the process through which counselors communicate their understanding of the self-experience of culturally different clients” (p. 320). Ridley and Udipi (2002) suggest several guidelines for using cultural empathy: Respond empathically throughout counseling, Respond to core themes, Recover from misunderstanding, Do not pretend to understand, Use time in ways that reflect empathy, Check yourself for possible cultural biases and hidden prejudices, Do not stereotype, Explore cultural and racial issues early in counseling, Incorporate cultural and racial data into counseling. Their suggestions seem to be highly relevant for supervisors to use with their supervisees.
Conclusion and Research Recommendations

As society evolves, becoming increasingly culturally diverse, the attitudes and skills sets required of clinical supervisors are expanding to include multicultural competence. Clinical supervision is an essential activity for promoting the counselor’s professional and personal development with respect to cultural competence (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bradley & Kottler, 2001). The present study explored counselor trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervisor characteristics and behaviors. Further investigations should be done to assess the effects of specific cultural variables (e.g., sex, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, disability) on supervisees’ expectations and perceptions regarding their supervisors’ culturally competent behaviors. In addition, more research is needed to understand whether different culturally competent supervisor behaviors are needed to work effectively with supervisees at different development levels. Future study may identify whether supervisees at early stages of their counselor development require different types of supervisor behaviors/styles in order to develop cultural competency compared to supervisees at advanced levels.

Studies that identify core versus peripheral culturally competent supervisor characteristics and behaviors are warranted. For instance, the present results suggest empathy may be a “common factor” that is as important to supervision as it is to counseling. Research could be done to determine possible differential effects of supervisor general empathy versus cultural empathy on supervision processes and outcomes. Studies of challenges involved in using cultural competence skills in different supervision modalities also are warranted. Studies could be done using a live supervision
format (common to genetic counseling supervision) versus self-report supervision (more common to psychological counseling). It would be valuable to explore how supervisors’ feedback is similarly or differently employed in such modalities.

Finally, more research is needed to understand perceptions of culturally diverse students. Although the present results did not reveal any noticeable differences between the responses of international student supervisees and non-international, Caucasian student supervisees, the small numbers preclude interpretation of those data. Some studies of international student supervisees’ experiences suggest they encounter unique challenges with respect to supervisor cultural competence (e.g., McClure, 2005; Mittal & Wieling, 2006; Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009). For instance, Mori et al. (2009) concluded that supervisors should understand international trainees’ level of acculturation and their specific needs in order to provide culturally competent supervision. International trainees’ experience of prejudice, acculturation, and the use of English may be a powerful factor in their perceptions and expectations of what culturally competent supervisor behavior entails.
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Appendix A
Expert Rating Consent Information

For Expert Rating DVD Scenarios

The Original Study Title: “An Investigation of Student Counselor Trainees’ Evaluation of Supervisor Culturally Competent Behaviors in Supervision”

The major purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of counselor trainees’ multicultural competence and their perceptions of a supervisor’s multicultural feedback in a hypothetical supervision situation. As a part of the study, we ask you to watch two scenarios and rate them to see if the DVD scenarios are okay to use for the main study.

This study is being conducted by Hyun Kyung Lee, M.A., a doctoral student in the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology program at the University of Minnesota, under the supervision of Patricia McCarthy Veach, Ph.D., Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Minnesota.

Relevant background information: Changing demographics of the U.S. population has brought increased recognition of the importance of multicultural issues, with increased research attention on multicultural counseling competency including counselor training and supervision. Although some studies have explored the question of what constitutes culturally competent supervision and counseling, few studies have identified culturally competent feedback in clinical supervision and culturally competent characteristics of supervision, particularly from the perspectives of counselor trainees. This study can provide a better understanding of those issues and result in practical suggestions for future training and practice.

The records of your rating will be kept private and confidential. In any sort of report this researcher might publish, any information that will identify you as an individual will NOT be included. In any written reports, data will be presented in aggregate (group) form. The records of this study will be kept private, stored in a password protected computer. Only the researcher will have access to the records.

If you have any questions, you may contact Hyun Kyung Lee, MA at leex2357@umn.edu or Hyun Kyung’s advisor, Patricia McCarthy Veach, PhD at veach001@umn.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), contact Research Subjects’ Advocate line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; telephone 612.625.1650. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Sincerely,
Hyun Kyung Lee
Doctoral Candidate, M. A.
Educational Psychology

Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I
consent to participate in the study.

Signature:__________________________________________

Date: ________________
Appendix B

Rating Form for the DVD scenarios

Please answer the following questions about the hypothetical supervision interaction that you just saw. Using the following scale, please rate the interaction based on your impressions.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1. How generally competent was the supervisor in Scenario A?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or not at all competent</td>
<td>Somewhat competent</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY?

2. How culturally competent was the supervisor in Scenario A?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or not at all competent</td>
<td>Somewhat competent</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY?
Please answer the following questions about the hypothetical supervision interaction that you just saw. Using the following scale, please rate the interaction based on your impressions.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. How generally competent was the supervisor in *Scenario B*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little or not at all competent</td>
<td>Somewhat competent</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHY?**

4. How culturally competent was the supervisor in *Scenario B*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little or not at all competent</td>
<td>Somewhat competent</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Very competent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHY?**
5. Do you think the cultural competence and general competence of a supervisor are similar or different? Please explain.

6. Please list the types of behaviors that you generally would expect culturally competent supervisors to use during clinical supervision. What would they do and say?
   a)
   b)
   c)
   d)
   e)
   f)
   etc)

   Thank you very much!
Appendix C

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE (Focus Group)

Instructions: Please fill out each item as instructed.

1. What is your current age? _____________
2. What is your gender?
   _____ Male    _____ Female    _____ Transgendered
3. Please check the racial or ethnic group with which you most strongly identify:
   _____ African American/Black
   _____ Alaskan Native/American Native
   _____ Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
   _____ Caucasian/White
   _____ Chicano/Hispanic/Latino
   _____ Biracial/Multiracial
   _____ Other (Please specify) _______________________________________
4. What degree program are you currently enrolled in?
   _____ Master’s level    _____ Doctorate level
5. What year are you in your current program? _____________________
6. Which track are you in?
   _____ Community Counseling    _____ School Counseling
   _____ Higher Education Counseling    _____ Genetic Counseling
   _____ Undecided
6. What was your undergraduate major(s)? __________________________
7. How many undergraduate credits have you completed focusing on multicultural issues? __________________________
8. How many graduate credits have you completed focusing on multicultural issues? __________________________
9. How many semesters of supervised counseling practicum have you completed? __________________________
10. How many hours of individual clinical supervision have you received until now? _____ hour(s)
11. What is the estimated total number of supervised client contact hours you have accrued? _____ hour(s)
Appendix D

Focus Group Questions (Written Part)

Today’s date: ____________________ Time of Focus group: ____________________

Please write down your answers for the following questions on the sheet in front of you in order to help you reflect upon and organize your thoughts. It is anonymous, and you don’t have to write down your name. Your answers will be analyzed only as a group, not as individuals. Please follow the group facilitator’s instructions before you write your answers. Then, we will discuss your ideas further after you respond in writing.

A. Before watching the Scenario A & B:

1) Imagine your past, current, or future supervision. What do you consider a supervisor’s culturally competent behaviors to be?
B. After watching the first Scenario

1) Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?

2) If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.
C. After watching the second Scenario

1) Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?

2) If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.

*Please turn in your answer sheet before you leave. Thank you.*
Appendix E

Focus Group Discussion Questions (For Researcher)

1-2. Introduction Questions: “Tell us your name and your track.” “Tell us your name and where you are doing your practicum/clinical rotation.”

3. “Imagine your past, current, or future supervision. What do you consider a supervisor’s culturally competent behaviors to be?”

4. “Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?”

5. “If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.”

6. “Which, if any of the supervisor’s behaviors demonstrated her cultural competence in the scenario? If there are any, what do you think they are?”

7. “If you were the supervisee in the scenario, what kinds of feedback or behaviors do you think would be helpful to get from your supervisor when you work with that client? Please be specific.”

8. “Were there any supervisor behaviors that demonstrated her general competence in the DVD? If yes, what do you think they are?”

9. “Do you think a supervisor’s cultural competence and general competence are different? If so, how?”

10. “Let’s imagine that you are working with a client who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to help you work with the client. Any examples?”

11. “Let’s imagine that you are working with a supervisor who is culturally different from you. If your supervisor is culturally competent, what types of behaviors and feedback would you expect to receive during supervision to make supervision successful? What would they do and say? Any examples?”

12. “We are coming to the end of our discussion. I would like to go around the group and ask each of you to share at least one major point which occurs to you from this discussion.”
Appendix F
Research Invitation Letter & Consent Information

Your participation is requested in a study:

An Investigation of Student Counselor Trainees’ Perceptions of Supervisor’s Culturally Competent Behaviors and Feedback in Supervision

Dear Counselor Trainees,

You are invited to participate in a study of counselor trainees’ cultural competency and their perceptions on culturally competent supervision feedback. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a counselor trainee and graduate student in a counseling program. I ask that you read the following information and ask any questions you may have before you participate in this study.

This study is being conducted by Hyun Kyung Lee, M.A., a doctoral student in the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology program at the University of Minnesota, under the supervision of Patricia McCarthy Veach, Ph.D., Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Minnesota.

The major purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of counselor trainees’ multicultural competence and their perceptions of a supervisor’s multicultural feedback in a hypothetical supervision situation. By participating in this study, we ask you to participate 2 hour focus group discussion including watching brief supervision interactions.

Relevant background information: Changing demographics of the U.S. population has brought increased recognition of the importance of multicultural issues, with increased research attention on multicultural counseling competency including counselor training and supervision. Although some studies have explored the question of what constitutes culturally competent supervision and counseling, few studies have identified culturally competent feedback in clinical supervision and culturally competent characteristics of supervision, particularly from the perspectives of counselor trainees. This study can provide a better understanding of those issues and result in practical suggestions for future training and practice.

If you agree to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following:

- Schedule for a focus group meeting using a sign-up sheet provided. When you come to the focus group meeting, you will be asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire. Then you will be asked to watch a video of two hypothetical clinical supervision interactions. After watching each scenario, you
will discuss your views on scenarios and culturally competent supervisor behaviors. Completion of these activities will take approximately 1.5 – 2 hours. Pizza and snacks will be provided for you in the focus group.

The risks involved in participating in this study are minimal. You may experience some mild discomfort due to discussing possible challenges related to working with culturally diverse client in supervision.

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential. In any sort of report this researcher might publish, any information that will identify you as an individual participant will NOT be included. In any written reports, data will be presented in aggregate (group) form. The records of this study will be kept private, stored in a password protected computer. Only the researcher will have access to the records. Focus group discussion will be audiotaped and transcribed. All tapes will be destroyed after transcription and no identifiers will be kept.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota or the researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question in focus group or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

If you have any questions, you may contact Hyun Kyung Lee, MA at leex2357@umn.edu or Hyun Kyung’s advisor, Patricia McCarthy Veach, PhD at veach001@umn.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), contact Research Subjects’ Advocate line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware Street S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; telephone 612.625.1650. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Hyun Kyung Lee
Doctoral Candidate, M. A.
Educational Psychology

Patricia McCarthy Veach, Ph.D., L.P.
Faculty Advisor
Educational Psychology
Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature:___________________________________________

Date: ____________________
Scenario A

In this scenario the supervisor, Kate, is confronting the supervisee, Michael, regarding culturally insensitive comments he made during the counseling session. During the session Michael was counseling a Hmong woman. When the woman described the ritual marriage she entered into when she was 14, Michael openly voiced his shock that the client was married at “such a young age.”

Scenario B

In this scenario the supervisor is confronting the student regarding culturally insensitive comments the student made during the counseling session. During the session the student was counseling a Somali patient regarding abnormalities seen on an ultrasound. In response to the information the student gave, the patient replied “All children are a gift from God; I do not want to do anything differently with this pregnancy.” The student failed to acknowledge this comment and continued talking about pregnancy termination.

Appendix H

Email confirmation of Focus group

Dear Focus Group Participants,

Thank you for participating in a focus group study of counselor trainees’ perceptions of culturally competent supervisor behaviors and feedback. You were selected and invited as a possible participant because you are a counselor trainee and graduate student in a counseling program.

As you heard last week (in class visit), when you come to the focus group meeting, you will be asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire. Then you will be asked to watch a video of two brief, hypothetical clinical supervision interactions. After watching each scenario, you will discuss your views of the scenarios and the supervisor’s behaviors. Completion of these activities will take approximately 1.5 – 2 hours. Some snacks will be provided for you in the focus group. Based on all of your schedules and availability you provide last Monday, I try to accommodate your preferred schedule as much as possible. However, please understand that your assigned focus group meeting time might not be your first choice.

Please mark your calendar and be on time for our focus group. Also, feel free to email me if you have any questions or concerns before our meeting. Thank you again for your participation. I am looking forward to meeting with you soon.

Sincerely,

Hyun Kyung Lee
Doctoral Candidate, M. A.
Educational Psychology