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The aim of this study is to examine associations between racial matching, racial identity interactions and working alliance in supervisory dyads. Supervisors’ perspectives are examined to determine relationships between racial identity interactions and racial matching of supervisors and supervisees, and the goal, task and emotional bond components of the supervisory working alliance.

Participants were licensed professional counselors holding supervisors’ registration with the state of Ohio’s Counselor and Social Worker Board. Data were collected using questionnaires to assess: (1) supervisors’ racial identity development (Whites or People of Color instrument), (2) the racial identity development of one of their supervisees (Whites or People of Color instrument),
(3) supervisors’ perspectives on the supervisory working alliance (goal, task and emotional bond components), and
(4) demographic profiles (including race of supervisor and supervisee).

On the basis of racial identity interaction, four groups of supervisory dyads were formed: progressive, parallel high, parallel low, and regressive. Four groups were also formed on the basis of race of supervisor and supervisee in each dyad: W-W (both supervisor and supervisee White), POC-POC (both People of Color), W-POC (supervisor White and supervisee POC) and POC-W (supervisor POC and supervisee White). Data were analyzed utilizing multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

These analyses reveal:
(1) no significant differences between the four racial identity dyad groups or the four racially matched or unmatched dyad groups on the three criterion variables (goal, task and bond of the supervisory working alliance).
(2) statistically significant differences between the four racial identity supervisory dyad groups (progressive, parallel-high, parallel-low, and regressive) on a combined
and single measure of supervisory working alliance.

(3) statistically significant differences in the strength of supervisory working alliance (on a combined measure of supervisory working alliance, including goal, bond, and task components of the supervisory working alliance) between two groups of supervisees – those perceived by their supervisors as having low racial identity development and those perceived by their supervisors as having high racial identity development.

Findings lend credence to the view that racial identity may play a more salient role than race or racial matching within supervisory dyads. Perceptions and reactions toward race of both supervisor and supervisee might be associated with the strength of the supervisory working alliance, and ultimately the efficacy of the supervisory relationship to foster a climate conducive to the growth and development of supervisees as professionals.

Theoretical and practical implications, limitations, and directions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Supervision: An Essential Component of Counselor Training

Counseling supervision, clinical supervision, or psychotherapy supervision is one of the key means that trainees in mental health preparation programs learn to become effective practitioners. It is critical to the process of "making" these professionals (Watkins, 1997, 1998). Supervision provides trainees with an avenue to practice skills that they have learned in laboratory or clinical environments (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998), and plays a pivotal role in both counselor training and client welfare (Borders, 2001).

Some commonalities are present in prevalent definitions of the word supervision. The terms super and vision imply that supervision is a process in which an experienced person (supervisor) with appropriate training and experience mentors and teaches a subordinate (supervisee). It is a process of professional and personal development through which the supervisor challenges, stimulates and encourages a counselor to reach higher levels of competence (Bradley & Kottler, 2001).
Supervision is viewed as an educational process, and in order for it to fulfill this mandate, it is recommended that it be proactive, deliberate, intentional and goal directed. It should also involve active learning strategies designed to engage individual supervisees or groups (Borders, 2001).

A well-accepted definition of supervision has been provided to the counseling profession by Bernard and Goodyear (1998). Key components of this definition include managing the relationship, evaluating, enhancing professional functioning, monitoring quality of professional services, and serving as gatekeeper to the counseling profession (Watkins, 1997).

Through supervision, beginning counselors learn the basic skills involved in conducting effective counseling, building on academic preparation (Helms & Cook, 1999). In addition to training of new counselors, supervisors have the ethical responsibility of acting as gatekeepers to the profession. Supervision is a process that plays a critical role in maintaining standards of the profession, ensuring that professionals who provide service to clients are competent (Holloway & Neufeldt, 1995).
Professional credentialing and licensing bodies acknowledge the centrality of supervision in the training of mental health professionals by directly addressing supervision in codes of ethics and standards of practice. The American Counseling Association Code of Ethics (ACA, 1995) devotes an entire section (section F) to teaching, training, and supervision. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) developed standards for preparation and practice of counseling supervisors (1990), and ethical guidelines for clinical supervisors (1993) to guide the implementation of supervision. ACES standards consist of eleven core areas of knowledge, competencies, and personal traits that characterize effective supervisors.

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP, 1994) stipulates the duration of supervised experience required of counselor trainees in accredited programs, and the conditions under which this experience should take place. It would not be an exaggeration to say that every professional body in the counseling field and in broader helping professions
addresses supervision within recommended practice standards and codes of ethics.

Essential elements of supervision are viewed as the ongoing relationship between supervisor and supervisee, the professional role identity to be acquired, and the focus on the skills to be acquired by the supervisee. Supervision fosters educational and professional development of counselors, but also carries out a critical role as an evaluative tool in assessing fitness for the profession (Bradley & Kottler, 2001). Counseling supervision is seen as having two primary goals: (1) to enhance professional functioning, and (2) to monitor client care (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). To address both of these goals, a sound supervisory relationship is essential.

The Supervisory Relationship

Counseling supervision is viewed as taking place in a relational context. All supervisory approaches acknowledge this relational context, but different approaches accord it varying levels of emphasis “...the supervisor-supervisee relationship appears to be a necessary ingredient to the making, doing, and being of the supervision process itself
and seemingly facilitates or potentiates whatever takes place within that process” (Watkins, 1997, p.4).

The supervisor-supervisee relationship is seen to strongly influence how much learning and change can occur. Rapport is a necessary component of this relationship, but it is not sufficient to ensure that learning takes place (Borders, 2001). Supervisors are required to carefully manage the balance of support and challenge they provide, so that supervisees feel neither too complacent, nor too afraid to take risks or make mistakes (Blocher, 1983).

Interpersonal interactions between supervisor and supervisee form the core of supervision. Interpersonal interactions are influenced by intrapersonal factors of both supervisor and supervisee. The dynamic interaction of these factors may contribute to the strength and efficacy of the supervisory relationship.

Many factors influence the supervisory relationship, including individual, cultural, and developmental differences. Individual differences include qualities such as self-presentation, self-comfort, self-monitoring, personal style, learning style, and belief systems.
Cultural differences include cultural identities and the meanings attached to those identities. Increasingly, attention has focused on racial identity as a vital dynamic in the way cultural differences or similarities are played out in the supervisory relationship (Cook, 1994; Helms & Cook, 1999; Haynes, Corey & Moulton, 2003). In recent years, the supervision literature has recognized that supervisors who ignore cultural and racial issues within the supervisory relationship are less likely to develop counseling that is multicultural (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Race and Racial Identity in the Supervisory Relationship

Attention to racial and cultural issues in supervision is a relatively recent phenomenon, commencing in the 1980’s (Helms & Cook, 1999). The Black, White and People of Color (POC) racial identity models developed by Helms and her associates (1990, 1995a) have gained prominence in this field. Racial identity in these models is not viewed as a biological reality, but as a response to sociopolitical factors caused by interactions in a culture where a dominant White culture and one or several minority cultures co-exist.
Helms postulates several statuses of racial identity, and suggests that in the course of developing a well-adjusted racial identity, individuals progress from lower to higher statuses. The highest racial identity statuses in these models are characterized by an information processing strategy that is accepting of racial differences, and acknowledges the strengths of one’s own and other racial groups. Contrasted with this, the lowest racial identity statuses in the models are characterized by either an obliviousness or denial of the influence of race, or in some cases by an active denigration of self and one’s own racial group.

Racial identity is seen as a key factor in the development of meaningful and fulfilling interpersonal interactions. With increasing importance being accorded to racial, ethnic and multicultural issues in the counseling profession, racial identity has been viewed as an essential element in enhancing skills and competence of counselors in working with culturally different clients. In the past ten years, racial identity in the counseling profession has received increased attention in counseling research (Helms & Cook, 1999).
The interest in racial identity in the counseling profession has progressed to an interest in the effects of racial identity within counseling supervision, and specifically on the supervisory relationship. According to Helms and Cook (1999), “…supervision may be considered the primary vehicle for influencing the therapeutic growth of beginning trainees and, for that matter, seasoned therapists who wish to update their (especially) racial and cultural therapy skills” (p. 277). These authors add that despite the pervasive influence of supervision on trainee growth and development, scant attention has been paid to racial and cultural issues in supervision within the counseling profession.

Developing from earlier work on the influence of race in supervision, Cook (1994) applied racial identity theory to the supervisory relationship. She postulated that supervisors at differing statuses of racial identity have different approaches to racial issues that exist within supervision. Under this conceptualization, both White and People of Color supervisors at the lowest status of racial identity development tended to ignore the race of the client, supervisor or supervisee. Supervisors at these
statuses tended to focus on a “common humanity” and failed to acknowledge that race or racial identity had any impact on the supervisory relationship, the supervision process or the interaction between client and counselor, or supervisee and supervisor.

Cook (1994) adapted the work of Helms (1990) on racial identity interaction, and applied it to the supervision relationship. This study found that interactions were deemed to be progressive if the supervisor was at a more advanced status of racial identity. This type of interaction had the potential to directly influence the racial identity development of supervisee, and indirectly influence the racial identity development of clients. Interactions were considered regressive when supervisors caused supervisees to suppress or ignore racial attitudes and issues in supervision. Parallel relationships took place when both supervisor and supervisee were at similar statuses of racial identity development.

Within the supervisory relationship, it is the supervisor who holds more power than the supervisee by virtue of higher counseling qualifications and experience,
and because the role subsumes evaluative and gate-keeping duties. Thus supervisors' racial identity statuses have a more powerful role in shaping the interactions between supervisor and supervisee, and indirectly between supervisee and client (Helms & Cook, 1999).

If the supervisory relationship is progressive (supervisor at a more advanced racial identity status than supervisee), racial issues are more likely to be discussed within supervision sessions, and the supervisor is in a position to help supervisees process racial issues and advance their own racial identity development. In a regressive relationship however, (supervisor at a less advanced racial identity status than supervisee), racial issues are more likely to be ignored or suppressed within supervision sessions, and the supervisee is more likely to follow this model of interaction within the supervisee-client relationship. Parallel relationships in which both supervisor and supervisee are at advanced statuses of racial identity development allow for free and open discussions of racial issues. By contrast, in parallel relationships where supervisor and supervisee are at low statuses of racial identity development, racial issues are likely to be ignored or avoided (Helms & Cook, 1999).
The supervisory relationship in a multicultural society may be better understood when viewed through the lens of race and racial identity. But if one considers the supervisory relationship to comprise every verbal and non-verbal interaction that takes place within supervision, it becomes difficult to examine the effects of race and racial identity. The supervisory working alliance component of the supervisory relationship permits a more manageable view of the supervisory relationship.

Working Alliance and the Supervisory Relationship

In recent literature, there appears to be a preference to narrow down the scope of the supervisory relationship, and to define it more specifically as the supervisory working alliance by drawing on the work of Bordin (1983). Muse-Burke, Ladany, and Deck (2001) support the view that focusing on the supervisory working alliance is more beneficial than attempting to focus on every interaction that takes place between supervisor and supervisee.

The working alliance aspect of the supervisory relationship has received attention from supervision theorists and researchers (most notably Ladany) in the past

In Bordin’s (1983) model, the supervisory working alliance is presented as a key component of the supervisory relationship. This model seeks to explicate specific elements of supervisory working alliance. The supervisory working alliance is viewed as a collaboration for change that involves three aspects: (a) mutual agreement and understanding between the supervisor and supervisee of the goals of supervision; (b) mutual agreement and understanding of the tasks of the supervisor and supervisee; and (c) the emotional bond between the supervisor and supervisee (Bordin, 1983).

Based on Bordin’s (1983) conceptualization of the three facets of a supervisory working alliance, an instrument to measure the working alliance was developed by Bahrick (1989). Another measure of working alliance was
developed a year later (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). Thus the concept of supervisory working alliance has been successfully operationalized and utilized in counseling supervision research.

Research on Racial Identity and Working Alliance in Supervision

A recent study examined in combination, the effects of race and racial identity interaction on the supervisory working alliance (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). This study specifically aimed to establish how supervisees’ perceptions of their own and their supervisors’ racial identity (in combination) related to the supervisory working alliance and the supervisee’s development of multicultural competence.

Four types of racial identity interactions (progressive, regressive, parallel-high and parallel-low) of supervisors and supervisees were examined, along with four types of supervisor-supervisee racial combinations (White –White, White – POC, POC – White, and POC – POC). The influence of these interactions on the goals, tasks, and bonds of the supervisory working alliance was examined.

Findings of this study indicated that the four types of racial identity interactions were linked from strongest
to weakest supervisory working alliance in the following order: parallel-high, progressive, parallel-low and regressive. Racial matching did not significantly predict aspects of the supervisory working alliance. This lends credence to the view that demographic characteristics (such as race) may not be as influential in interpersonal interactions as psychological constructs, such as racial identity (Helms, 1990).

The study briefly described above focused on the perceptions of supervisees who were trainees in counseling programs. The authors noted that this was one of the limitations of the study and suggested that researchers in the future may want to consider the perceptions of supervisors.

The Current Study

Developing from this prior study, the current study sought to examine supervisor-supervisee racial identity interactions and racial matching, and their effect on the goals, tasks and bond of the supervisory working alliance from the perspective of supervisors. The research design recreated the methodology utilized by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu (1997) in their study with one important variation. The focus in the current study was on the
perceptions of supervisors, rather than on those of supervisees. Supervisors’ self assessment of their own racial identity statuses, their perceptions of their supervisee’s racial identity statuses and their assessment of the supervisory working alliance formed the basis of this project.

Statement of the Problem

The problem this study sought to explore was if racial identity status interactions in supervisors and supervisees (as perceived by supervisors) influenced supervisors’ perceptions of the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance. This study also examined the effects of racial match or non-match on the three aspects of the supervisory working alliance. The current study provided an addition to the counseling supervision literature since a previous study in this area (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997) focused on this issue solely from the perspective of supervisees.
Research Questions

The following research questions were asked in order to gain a better understanding of how race and racial identity interactions influence supervisors’ perceptions of the supervisory working alliance:

a. Does racial identity interaction between supervisor and supervisee influence the three aspects of the supervisory working alliance (namely the goals, tasks and emotional bond)

i) Do supervisory dyads with parallel-high racial identity interactions exhibit the strongest supervisory working alliances?

ii) Do supervisory dyads with parallel-low racial identity interactions exhibit the next strongest supervisory working alliance (i.e., second to parallel-high racial identity interactions)?)

iii) Do supervisory dyads with progressive racial identity interactions report a weaker working alliance than both parallel-high and parallel-low relationships?
iv) Do supervisory dyads with regressive racial identity interactions report the weakest working alliance, (i.e., weaker than in (i), (ii), and (iii) given above)?
b. Do matched supervisory racial dyads (i.e., both supervisor and supervisee of the same race) report a stronger supervisory working alliance than unmatched racial dyads?
c. Do unmatched racial supervisory dyads report a weaker supervisory working alliance than matched racial dyads?
d. Is the difference in working alliance between matched and unmatched racial identity groups the same for groups that are racially matched and those that are racially unmatched?

Research Hypotheses

(a) Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel-high, parallel-low, progressive and regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance
(b) Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both People of Color) and unmatched races regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

(c) Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant interaction effect between racial identity interaction, and racial matching or non-matching on the dependent variables – the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Significance of the Study

The study aimed to add to the body of empirical literature on racial identity, race and the supervisory working alliance in counseling supervision. By focusing on supervisors' racial identity and working alliance perceptions, it augmented prior research that focused on these aspects with supervisees. It followed on from the idea that application of racial identity theory to counseling and supervision is seen as one of the most promising ways in which multicultural issues may be addressed in the profession (D.W. Sue and D. Sue, 1999).
The sample was drawn from practicing counseling supervisors in the field, rather than those in academic settings. Many prior studies on supervision have focused on doctoral level supervisors in academic settings due to the relative ease of accessing this population for empirical research.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations of the current study have been noted:

i) The sample was drawn from counseling supervisors in the State of Ohio, rather than from around the country. It was anticipated that restricting the sample to counseling supervisors in the State of Ohio would be likely to result in restricting the racial diversity of the sample. It also restricted generalizability to other more racially diverse states.

ii) The study sought to examine the perceptions of supervisors regarding their own racial identity statuses, the racial identity statuses of their supervisee, and the supervisory working alliance. Supervisees’ perceptions were not directly sought.
iii) Measuring racial identity is a complex endeavor, because it involves polling social attitudes. Obtaining accurate measurement of these attitudes is a challenge.

iv) Measurement of racial identity is also likely to be affected by social desirability response bias. Thus supervisors may have responded based on how they thought they should respond rather than by what they actually believed or thought.

v) Participants for this study were not randomly assigned to experimental conditions. Therefore the data collected could not indicate true causal links between independent and dependent variables.

vi) Racial identity of participants was not known before the study and thus they were asked to choose the correct instrument. The POC racial identity attitude scale was used for all POC, disallowing for finer within-group differences to be considered.
Definition of Terms

_Counseling Supervision_

Counseling supervision:

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

(Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, p. 6)

_Counseling Supervisory Relationship_

Striking similarities exist between the process of counseling and the process of clinical supervision.

"Perhaps the most pronounced of these similarities is the centrality and role of interpersonal relationship in both processes...the supervisory relationship is a product of the uniqueness of two individuals, paired with the purposes of meeting for supervision and modified by the demands of the various contexts that are the subject or content of that experience” (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, p.34).
Supervisory Working Alliance

The supervisory working alliance is defined as a collaboration for change that involves three aspects: (a) mutual agreement and understanding between the supervisor and supervisee of the goals of supervision; (b) mutual agreement and understanding of the tasks of the supervisor and supervisee; and (c) the emotional bond between supervisor and supervisee (Bordin, 1983).

Race

Race reflects self-identification by people according to the race or races with which they most closely identify. Racial categories are sociopolitical constructs, and are neither scientific nor anthropological classifications (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a).

White

People who indicate their race as “White.”

People of Color (POC)

People who indicate their race as anything other than “White.” This includes self-identification as Black, African American, American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, and any other race that is not “White” and not mentioned in the categories above.
Racial Identity Models

Racial or socioracial identity models are psychological models, and their intention is to explain individuals' intrapsychic and interpersonal reactions to societal racism in its various manifestations (Helms & Cook, 1999). Racial identity models for minority groups consider the effects of domination and oppression these groups have endured due to societal racism (Helms, 1995a).

White Racial Identity

The White racial identity model (Helms, 1995a) holds that Whites in the United States have a deeply ingrained sense of privilege and superiority because of living in a society where Whites are the dominant socioracial group – both numerically and economically (Helms, 1992). As White persons move from less developed to more developed racial identity statuses, they overcome internalized racism, and develop a realistic and self-affirming racial identity (Helms & Cook, 1999).

People of Color (POC) Racial Identity

In this model (Helms, 1995a), POC is a collective term used for all non-White racial groups in the United States – Blacks, Asians, Africans, Latinos/Latinas and Native Americans. As POC individuals move from less to more
developed racial identity statuses, they overcome negative racial group perceptions and develop a capacity to value their own unique identities, and understand the experiences of other oppressed groups (Helms & Cook, 1999).

Racial Identity Statuses

Statuses (also referred to as ego statuses) are “cognitive-affective-conative intrapsychic principles for responding to racial stimuli in one’s internal and external environments” (Helms & Cook, 1999). Statuses are not static types. Rather, they are dynamic and evolving.

White Racial Identity Statuses

Seven statuses of White racial identity are postulated (Helms & Cook, 1999): Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Immersion, Emersion, and Autonomy. Definitions of each of these statuses may be found in the table on page 80 in Chapter II. The White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) is an instrument designed to measure racial identity attitudes pertinent to six of these statuses.

People of Color (POC) Racial Identity Statuses

Six statuses of POC racial identity are postulated by Helms (1995a): Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion, Emersion,
Internalization, and Integrative Awareness. Definitions of each of these statuses may be found in the table on page 76 in Chapter II. Attitudes pertinent to four of these statuses are measured by the POC Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS) developed by Helms (1995b).

Phase I of Racial Identity

Lower statuses of racial identity or less developed statuses in both the White and POC models are considered to be less cognitively complex. Phase I in the White racial identity model consists of the statuses of contact, disintegration and reintegration. Phase I in the POC racial identity model consists of the statuses of conformity, dissonance, and immersion (Helms, 1990).

Phase II of Racial Identity

Higher statuses of racial identity or more developed statuses in the White and POC models are more cognitively complex. Phase II in the POC racial identity model consists of the statuses of emersion, internalization, and integrative awareness. Phase II in the White racial identity model consists of the statuses of pseudo-independence, immersion-emersion, and autonomy (Helms, 1990).
Racial Identity Interaction in Supervision

Helms’ racial identity interaction model (1990) was applied to the supervision dyad by Cook (1994). The interaction model considers similarities and differences in attitudes that may occur when supervisor and supervisee have dominant racial identity statuses that are either parallel or crossed.

Parallel-high Racial Identity Interaction

Both supervisor and supervisee are at more developed statuses of racial identity development, i.e., both are at Phase II.

Parallel-low Racial Identity Interaction

Both supervisor and supervisee are at less developed racial identity statuses, i.e., both are at Phase I.

Progressive Racial Identity Interaction

The supervisor is at a more developed racial identity status than the supervisee, i.e., supervisor at Phase II and supervisee at Phase I. Thus the supervisor is in a position to help the supervisee advance in his or her racial identity development (Cook, 1994).
Regressive Racial Identity Interaction

The supervisor is at a less developed racial identity status than the supervisee, i.e., supervisor at Phase I and supervisee at Phase II. This may lead to the supervisee suppressing his or her racial identity attitudes (Cook, 1994).

Racial Matching

Both supervisor and supervisee in the supervisory dyad are of the same racial group – i.e., both are White or both POC.

Racial Non-Matching

Supervisor and supervisee in the supervisory dyad are of different racial groups – i.e., one is White and the other is a POC.

Summary

Although race and racial identity have been acknowledged as influential factors in the counseling supervisory relationship, not many empirical studies have focused on these aspects from the perspectives of supervisors. This study aimed to establish if there were significant associations between racial matching, racial identity interactions, and supervisory working alliance in supervisory dyads. Counseling supervisors in the state of
Ohio participated in the study and shared their perspectives of their own racial identity development, the racial identity development of one of their supervisees, and the supervisory working alliance.
CHAPTER II

Counseling Supervision

The view of supervision as an interaction between two individuals, supervisor and supervisee, has prevailed over the years, and across disciplines. The counseling profession acknowledges the pivotal role that supervision plays in both counselor training and client welfare. Emphasis on adequate and effective supervision has been a major force in the acceptance of counseling as a professional discipline (Borders, 2001).

This chapter begins with an overview of contemporary scholarly thought on counseling supervision. It then progresses to an overview of the literature on aspects of counseling supervision of particular relevance to the current study. Following on from definitions of counseling supervision, the particular challenges and importance of multicultural supervision are discussed. Coverage of the salience of the supervisory relationship in counseling supervision is provided. Key aspects of the supervisory relationship under the working alliance conceptualization (Bordin, 1983) are discussed. The literature review then focuses on the particular dynamics of race and racial
identity, and their influence on or within supervisory relationships. This chapter concludes with a specific review of prior research on race, racial identity and the supervisory working alliance.

Definitions of clinical supervision or psychotherapy supervision share many common aspects. A working definition, was provided by Bernard and Goodyear (1998), and has gained wide acceptance in the counseling profession:

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

Supervision is viewed as a distinct intervention by Bernard and Goodyear (1998), and although the authors acknowledged that it shares commonalities with the
interventions of education, counseling and consultation, they maintained that it is a unique process. Supervision is distinct from education because it is tailored to the unique needs of the individual supervisee and his/her clients. It is distinct from counseling because unlike in the former, where counselor values are not imposed on clients, in supervision, supervisee performance is evaluated against definite criteria imposed by supervisors. Similarities exist between consultation and supervision, but in the former there is no evaluative role of the consultant on the client. Thus supervision has been conceptualized as comprising multiple skills, drawn from other interventions, and configured in such a way as to make supervision distinct from all other interventions (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Psychotherapy supervision has been defined as “an essentially dyadic human interaction with a focus on modifying the behavior of the supervisee, so he or she may provide better service to a third person (patient) ordinarily not present” (Hess, 1980).

Both supervisor and supervisee bring latent and manifest agenda to the interaction, influenced by both
internal factors (such as previous supervision experiences) and external factors (such as the requirements of agencies or licensing laws). More often than not, supervisor and supervisee may find themselves in an unstructured human relationship with rules that are not clearly articulated or that may not be articulated at all. This ambiguity could lead to difficulties in working together productively (Hess, 1980).

According to Hess (1980), there are six models of psychotherapy supervision, based on the primary role undertaken by the supervisor: lecturer model, teacher model, case review model, collegial-peer model, monitor model, and therapist model. Each of these models may differ according to the goals, the extent of choice offered to supervisees to attend and be engaged in the sessions offered, and the nature of the relationship. For example in the monitor model, the supervisor plays the role of the external censor or evaluator, while in the teacher model, the supervisor-supervisee relationship is one of superordinate to subordinate.

Essential elements of supervision are viewed as the ongoing relationship between supervisor and supervisee, the
professional role identity to be acquired, and the focus on the behavior to be acquired by the supervisee. In addition to fostering the educational and professional development of counselors, the supervisor also carries out a critical role as an evaluator in assessing the supervisee’s fitness for the profession, thus protecting current and future clients of the supervisee from unethical or incompetent counseling practices (Bradley & Kottler, 2001).

Despite the acknowledged value of counseling supervision to the profession, direct training in supervision is rare, and resources available to new supervisors, though varied, are limited. Counseling supervisors are called upon to integrate the experience gained from prior life roles, such as supervisee, teacher, therapist, researcher, colleague and consultant (Styczynski, 1980).

There seems consensus that counseling supervision is at its core, an educational process. “Supervision must be proactive, deliberate, intentional, and goal directed, involving active learning strategies designed to engage a particular supervisee (or group of supervisees)” (Borders, 2001, p. 418).
The variables to be considered in providing effective counseling supervision increase dramatically in number if one considers the multicultural and multi-socioeconomic nature of society. Gardner (1980) made the observation that ethnocentric and sociocentric bias contribute to the problems encountered by mental health professionals in attempting to treat the problems of clients who differ from them in terms of race, ethnicity, or social class. This next section provides an overview of the area of multicultural supervision – an area that has received increasing emphasis in the past two decades.

Multicultural Supervision

Against a backdrop of a rapidly changing demographic composition within the United States, projections indicate that visible racial and ethnic minorities will constitute a numerical majority sometime between 2030 and 2050 (Sue & Sue, 1999). These demographic changes increase the potential for multicultural interactions within society, and consequently within counseling and supervision. Directly addressing multicultural issues in supervision is essential to providing ethical and effective services to
clients, and ensuring adequate training of counselors (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

The responsibility for initiating discussions about multicultural issues rests with supervisors (Fukuyama, 1994; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Bernard and Goodyear, 1998). As Bernard and Goodyear (1998) phrased it, “the willingness of the supervisor to open the cultural door and walk through it with the supervisee is perhaps the single most powerful intervention for multicultural supervision” (p. 45).

According to Haynes, Corey, & Moulton (2003), it is necessary for supervisors to break the “taboo” of discussing racial and cultural differences. Haber (1996) acknowledges that establishing a climate of mutual respect and understanding is important, but cautions that supervisors should not emphasize culture at the expense of the client’s welfare and the supervisee’s development.

Contributions to the multicultural supervision have been identified as being theoretical or anecdotal (Leong & Wagner, 1994). The need for empirical study in this area is being increasingly experienced. In the past twenty years, increasing attention has been paid to supervision issues in research (Borders, 2001). Researchers who have been drawn
to multicultural supervision find that despite the rhetoric, not much concrete progress has been noted in the actual addressing of cultural issues in counseling supervision.

Vander Kolk (1974) undertook early research in this area, surveying the expectations of both Black and White supervisees regarding White supervisors prior to commencing supervision. Findings indicated that Black supervisees tended to have more negative pre-perceptions of White supervisors than White supervisees.

Gatmon et al. (2001) recently explored whether racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation issues were discussed in supervisory relationships, who initiated such discussions, and whether such discussions influenced levels of satisfaction, and strength of supervisory working alliance. The authors reported a low frequency of discussions of multicultural variables within supervisory relationships with only 12.5% to 37.9% of the sample reporting such discussions. They concluded that further training is required for supervisors to increase their levels of comfort in addressing multicultural variables within the supervisory relationship. Recommended areas for
supervisor training included “racial identity development, cross-cultural communication, professional diversity guidelines, and power dynamics” (p. 109).

Additional findings by Gatmon, et al. (2001) indicated that supervisees report higher levels of satisfaction with supervision and an enhanced working alliance when discussions about cultural variables took place within supervision. Further, the authors noted that it is not cultural match between supervisor and supervisee that is important, but the presence of open discussions of similarity and difference. This observation is similar to Helms (1990) contention that demographic characteristics on their own do not exert as potent an influence on human interaction as do psychological variables such as racial identity.

Supervision is one of the key means by which supervisees develop conceptual, diagnostic, and intervention skills (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). Counseling supervisors have been described as “crucial catalysts” focusing attention to cultural issues in training and supervision (Constantine, 2001). If all relevant issues are not addressed in supervision, future practitioners run the
risk of becoming ineffective or unethical counselors, and supervisors end up not adequately serving either supervisees or their clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). Multicultural issues in supervision are considered one of the “relevant” issues to be addressed in supervision.

Supervision may be viewed as the “primary vehicle” for enhancing and / or developing the racial and cultural therapy skills of all those involved in the supervision, ranging from beginning supervisees to experienced supervisors (Helms & Cook, 1999). It is recommended that supervisors and supervisees frame their supervisory discussions through the lens of culture (Daniels, D’Andrea, & Kim, 1999).

Empirical attention to multicultural supervision has experienced growth in recent times (Constantine, 2001), particularly in the last decade. In 1994, Leong and Wagner’s review indicated that only three empirical studies on multicultural supervision had been conducted at the time. The past decade has witnessed growth in both theoretical formulations and empirical investigations regarding multicultural supervision. There is some discussion in the profession regarding whether the correct
term to use is multicultural supervision. Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) and Leong and Wagner (1994) were of the opinion that cross-cultural supervision more accurately describes a situation where one or more members of a supervision triad are of different cultures. Bernard (1994) stated her preference for the term "multicultural supervision", but noted that definitional clarity is required.

In the ACA code of ethics only limited attention is paid to multicultural issues in the section on teaching, training and supervision. Although in the "Standards for Counseling Supervisors" (ACES, 1990) a more direct statement was made regarding the need for counseling supervisors to be sensitive and knowledgeable regarding individual differences and understand how these differences influence the supervisory relationship, no specific framework to develop multicultural competence in supervision was offered. Interestingly, the Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors (ACES, 1995) provided no mention of multicultural competence (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

Ancis and Ladany (2001) developed multicultural
supervision guidelines to provide counselor educators and supervisors with a framework to develop multicultural competence. These guidelines are “divided into five domains: personal development (supervisor-focused and supervisee-focused), conceptualization, interventions, process, and evaluation” (p. 79). These guidelines indicate that supervisors have a responsibility to develop both their own and their supervisees’ multicultural competence.

Multicultural supervision competencies have been put forward recently by Haynes, Corey, and Moulton (2003). These authors recommend ten competencies for supervisors to develop in order to provide effective multicultural supervision. Foremost amongst these is to explore racial dynamics in the supervisory relationship.

Arkin (1999) noted that there are two approaches of supervisors to cultural diversity in supervision, both of which are detrimental to the development of supervisees. The first approach entails minimizing cultural differences and exercising pressure on the supervisee to adapt or conform to the mainstream culture. The second approach involves maximizing cultural differences and ignoring common factors. According to Arkin, what is required is for
supervisors to develop acceptance and respect for cultural diversity without allowing the ethnic identity of supervisees to influence the quality of the supervision they provide. Supervisors must be trained in multicultural competency by focusing on four dimensions self-awareness, knowledge of the cultural context, the supervisory relationship, and multicultural supervisory skills.

Bernard (1994) in concluding comments on a special section on multicultural supervision, outlined four training and supervision parameters for achieving multicultural competence in supervision: (1) Supervisees must be at least multiculturally sensitive as their clients, and supervisors must be at least as multiculturally competent as their supervisees, (2) training programs must determine the level of multicultural development at which a trainee is ready to work with clients (3) Supervisors must draw on their understanding of both developmental supervision models and racial identity development models to assess readiness for supervisees to be multiculturally challenged, and seize the moment, and (4) supervisors require supervision to develop their own multicultural development.
In an exploratory study on multicultural issues in the supervisory relationship, Constantine (1997) found a marked discrepancy between levels of multicultural training between supervisor and supervisees - seventy percent of supervisors in the study had not completed a formal multicultural course, whereas seventy percent of supervisees reported completion of at least one multicultural course. Supervisees reported that the supervisory relationship would have been enhanced with greater time spent on processing cultural issues, and some noted reluctance on the part of supervisors to raise issues of multicultural diversity in the context of their relationship. It is noteworthy that some supervisors in this study indicated that multicultural issues were not important in supervision, while others divulged that they had not given thought to such issues.

There is a need for cultural responsiveness in supervision, especially since there are detrimental consequences to supervisors failing to understand their own cultural biases and assumptions. These include a tendency to prematurely judge supervisees according to a limited world view, ineffective interaction characterized by
miscommunication and/or misunderstanding, and insensitivity to supervisees’ non verbal cues (Garrett, et al., 2001). Thus one of the principal forums to address multicultural issues in counseling supervision appears to be the counseling supervisory relationship.

Supervisory Relationship in Counseling Supervision

Successful supervision takes place within the context of a complex professional relationship. It is in this relationship, one that is mutually involving and ongoing, that the supervisor employs specific strategies to stimulate the supervisee’s development as a professional (Holloway, 1995). In Holloway’s model, a “Systems Approach to Supervision”, the supervision relationship is considered the core factor. The supervision relationship is considered a crucial aspect of the counseling supervision process by other theorists (Greben & Ruskin, 1994; Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Supervision relationships, like counseling relationships are highly personal undertakings, and are reflective of the attitudes, experiences and personalities of the people in the relationship - supervisors and
supervisees (Greben & Ruskin, 1994). Definite similarities have been noted between counseling relationships and supervision relationships, most especially in the centrality and role of interpersonal relationships in both (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

The supervision relationship is viewed on the one hand as a teacher-student relationship where the aim is imparting objective knowledge, and on the other hand it is like an artisan-apprentice relationship, where the focus is on subjective experience. By establishing an atmosphere of mutual trust and collaborative colleagueship, supervision has the potential to be directly beneficial to participants, and indirectly beneficial to clients of supervisees (Greben & Ruskin, 1994).

The supervisory alliance incorporates relational skills on the part of the supervisor, and technical aspects through the tasks undertaken in supervision. These two dimensions, relational and technical, interact with each other in the supervisory process and sometimes overlap (Gilbert & Evans, 2000).

The supervisory working alliance was conceptualized by
Bordin (1983), based on an extension of his work on the therapeutic working alliance. It was his view that the working alliance was a collaboration for change, with three identified aspects: “(1) mutual agreements and understandings regarding the goals sought in the change process; (2) the tasks of each of the partners; and (3) the bonds between the partners necessary to sustain the enterprise” (p. 35).

In this conceptualization, the supervisory working alliance was viewed as consisting of the dimensions of goals, tasks and bonds. The following eight goals of supervision were considered to be incorporated in the working alliance: (1) mastery of specific skills, (2) enlarging understanding of clients, (3) enlarging awareness of process issues, (4) increasing awareness of self and impact on process, (5) overcoming personal and intellectual obstacles toward learning and mastery, (6) deepening understanding of concepts and theory, (7) providing stimulus to research, and (8) maintaining standards of service.

Following from the goals of the supervisory working alliance, Bordin (1983) provided a list of related tasks.
These were: (1) Preparing an oral or written report of the sessions under review, (2) participating in objective observation of sessions, either via recordings or direct observation, and (3) selecting of problems and issues for presentation.

The bonds required in the supervisory alliance ranged between those of teacher to student, and therapist to patient. Bordin (1983) also likened the supervisor – supervisee relationship to that of player to coach. It is important for the learner to respect the coach and have the opportunity to learn from the coach through demonstrations of skills. The evaluative and gate-keeping roles of supervisors create a bonding problem, and underscore the need to develop trust in the supervisory working alliance.

Five essential elements of the supervisor-supervisee relationship have been proposed by Haynes, Corey and Moulton (2003) These include establishing trust, encouraging self-disclosure, identifying transference and countertransference, examining diversity issues, and establishing appropriate boundaries. Race is one of the factors that has been researched in the course of examining diversity issues in supervisory relationships.
Race and the Supervisory Relationship

People continue to be judged by their outward appearances, and because of this race continues to be a factor that influences human relationships. Race is present in the supervision relationship because all key players are members of society. They may therefore hold prevalent societal racial attitudes such as superiority, inferiority, resentment and fear toward people of races different from their own. These attitudes in turn have an impact on the working alliance (Grant, 1999).

Supervisors are in a key position to discuss the relevance of race-related stimuli to counseling or supervision because of the power accorded to them in dyadic relationships. It is up to them to decide how racial issues might be pertinent to the problem or the relationship dynamics, and how best to raise them, regardless of whether a client or supervisee raises them. When racial issues are overlooked, minimized, or distorted, the relationship and its outcomes are compromised (Thompson, 1997).

Racial dynamics, and the supervisor’s frame of reference and worldview influence all aspects of
supervision (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). Supervisors have more power in the supervisory relationship than supervisees, and are thus in a position to ensure that racial issues are adequately addressed (Grant, 1999).

The focus on race in the supervisory relationship literature has tended to revolve around effects of interaction between a White supervisor and supervisees who identify as non-White. In a seminal study, Vander Kolk (1974) found that Black supervisees (in rehabilitation counseling) had quite different expectations of White supervisors than did White supervisees. Black supervisees surveyed before their first supervision session were more likely than White supervisees to anticipate that their White supervisors would lack empathy, respect and congruence. These negative expectations could very well lead to negative self-fulfilling prophecies. Grant (1999) expressed the view that differences in race between supervisor and supervisee should be acknowledged in the early phases of the relationship.

Another landmark study on race in supervision was undertaken by Cook in her dissertation research (Cook & Helms, 1988). In this study, supervisees’ perceptions of
cross-racial supervision relationships were explored. The sample included supervisees who identified as African, Latina/Latino, Asian, and Native American (ALANA). Findings indicated that supervisees’ perceptions of cross-racial supervision differed according to race and gender. Female Asian supervisees were found to be more satisfied with the supervisory relationship with White supervisors than Asian males supervisees. Asian, Black, and Latino male supervisees were more satisfied with supervision by White supervisors than were Native American male supervisees. A limitation of this study was that it did not include the perceptions of White supervisees (Leong & Wagner, 1994).

Positive and negative critical incidents in multicultural supervision were explored in a study by Fukuyama (1994) on a sample of People of Color supervisees. Events classified as positive by these supervisees included openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and involvement in multicultural activities. A lack of cultural awareness in the supervisor, and a questioning of the supervisee’s abilities when culturally relevant interventions were utilized were noted as negative critical incidents by supervisees. Supervisees in this study also
provided six suggestions to make supervision more multiculturally effective.

An interesting addition to the literature was provided by Cook and Hargrove (1997) in a discussion of the dynamics that occurred in a supervision triad where supervisor, supervisee, and client were all Black females. Contrary to initial expectations that rapport would be more easily established in a supervisee-client relationship where both were Black females, this was not borne out. Through honest processing by both supervisor and supervisee, the supervisee was able to realize that her need to be socially accepted by a Black female client detracted from her ability to conduct effective therapy. She was in fact more effective in her work with a White client than she was with a Black client. An important point to note therefore is that race effects can and do influence supervision even when all parties are of the same race.

Daniels, D’Andrea, and Kim (1999) examined the conflicts and communication problems that took place in a supervision relationship where the supervisee was Asian American (and well assimilated into mainstream culture by self report) and a White supervisor who was an experienced
counselor but had no training in multicultural counseling and supervision. The university internship instructor (and first author of the study) noted that differences in interpersonal style, counseling goals and perceptions of the roles of supervisor and supervisee in the supervision process existed, and contributed to a less than effective supervision experience.

A recent study examined cross-racial supervisory dyads at university counseling centers (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). The aim of this survey research was to provide a "snapshot" of how racially different supervisor-supervisee dyads perceived and evaluated their supervisory relationship. Not surprisingly, there were more dyads with Caucasian supervisors and minority supervisees (43 dyads) than there were minority supervisors and Caucasian supervisees (17 dyads) in the study. Analysis was conducted to compare perceptions of supervisors (as a group) with supervisees (as a group), and significant differences were found in culture and race related areas.

There were marked discrepancies between reports on the extent to which supervisors addressed cultural issues related to the supervisory relationship. For example, in response to a question asking if supervisors acknowledged
lack of expertise regarding supervisee’s culture, 93.1% of supervisors responded “yes”, while only 50% of supervisees answered “yes”. For another item asking if supervisors initiated discussions of cultural differences within the dyad, 63.8% of supervisors answered “yes”, against 53.3% of supervisees. The difference was higher for an item on initiating discussion on cultural differences in general (91.4% of supervisors responded “yes”, while only 75.0% of supervisees responded “yes” to this question). The authors speculated that social desirability might have contributed to supervisors over-reporting their efforts to address cultural issues (Duan & Roehlke, 2001).

Differences in racial background, combined with the power differential in the supervision relationship, were noted to be likely to increase supervisees’ feelings of uncertainty and apprehension. These feelings may be eased by a direct and positive attitude demonstrated by supervisors (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). An openness and awareness of the impact of racial identity on the part of supervisors has been recommended as one way of addressing racial issues in supervision (Helms & Cook, 1999; Haynes, Corey & Moulton, 2003).
Racial Identity in the Supervisory Relationship

Racial Identity Models

Racial identity models are psychological models that provide a theoretical framework for us to understand attitudes towards racial similarities and differences in individuals and groups. In the words of Helms and Cook (1999), “…their intention is to explain individuals' intrapsychic and interpersonal reactions to societal racism in its various manifestations. They are descriptions of hypothetical intrapsychic pathways for overcoming internalized racism and achieving a healthy socioracial self-conception under varying conditions of racial oppression” (p. 81).

Helms (1995a) clarified that in racial identity theories, racial classifications are not seen as biological realities. Instead, they are viewed as sociopolitical and economic conveniences, with the awareness that non-White racial groups have endured conditions of domination and oppression.

Helms and Cook (1999) comment that in counseling, racial identity models are useful for assessing the influence of racial factors on the client's concerns as
well as the reactions of the client and therapist to one another. According to D.W. Sue & D. Sue (1999) the work on racial and cultural identity among minority groups and Whites is one of the most promising approaches to addressing multicultural counseling.

Many models have been proposed to describe the socioracial adaptations of specific socioracial groups. Some of these models are "typologies" that propose static character types, which develop in response to being deprived by or benefiting from racism. Some are stage theories that propose a sequential process by which an individual's growth toward healthy adjustment occurs (Helms & Cook, 1999). The majority of the models have a single socioracial group as their focus (either African American or White American). Some models do attempt to explain the adaptation of diverse groups to similar conditions of oppression (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998, Myers et al., 1991).

Helms originally proposed White and Black racial identity models. She later expanded the Black model to pertain to other Visibly Ethnic Racial Groups (VREG) or People of Color (POC). Helms (1996) conceptualized the
development of racial identity as involving dynamic evolution rather than static types. The models trace the statuses that an individual moves through from overcoming the internalized racism of his or her group, to achieving a realistic and self-affirming racial group identity.

Helms and Cook brought to our attention the common ego status themes in both the People of Color (POC) and White Models (1999, p.85). These are:

(a) persons must overcome societal definitions of one’s socioracial group by redefining oneself in personally meaningful terms

(b) self definition involves a sequential differentiation or maturation of ego statuses

(c) simplest or least complex statuses develop first

(d) the seeds of more complex statuses are inherent in earlier statuses

(e) statuses that are most consistently reinforced in the environment become strongest and potentially dominant

(f) a status is dominant when it occupies the largest percentage of the ego and is used most frequently for interpreting racial material
(g) statuses that are not reinforced recede in importance and become recessive

(h) recessive statuses are infrequently used to govern responses to racial stimuli

(i) ego statuses are hypothetical constructs that cannot be measured

(j) the strength of ego statuses is inferred from their behavioral expressions – schemata

(k) schemata typically reflect the themes that are present in the person’s socioracial environment(s)

(l) environments can be internal (psychological) or external (environmental).

People of Color (POC) Racial Identity Model

The term People of Color (POC) in Helms model (1995a) includes all those people who are perceived as not being “pure” White, and as a result have experienced negative racial-group conceptions directed against them. These include African Americans, Asians, Latinos/Latinas, and Native Americans. The identity developmental task for POC is to overcome internalized racism, and move towards a self-affirming individual and collective identity (Helms & Cook, 1999).
Helms’ POC model has drawn elements from other racial identity models, including Cross (1971). The POC model (Helms, 1995a) describes six statuses. Of particular relevance to the counseling field are the “Information Processing Strategies” (IPS) that Helms postulates for each status.

The following table, adapted from Helms and Cook (1999), summarizes characteristic elements and information processing strategies indicative of each of the six statuses presented in the POC model.
Table 1

Summary of POC Racial Identity Ego Statuses and Information Processing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Characteristic Elements</th>
<th>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>External self-definition that implies devaluing of own group and allegiance to White standards of merit. Person is probably oblivious to socioracial groups' sociopolitical histories</td>
<td>Selective perception, distortion, minimization, and obliviousness to socioracial concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>Ambivalence and confusion concerning own socioracial group commitment and ambivalent socioracial self-definition. Persons may be ambivalent about life decisions</td>
<td>Repression of anxiety-evoking racial information, ambivalence, anxiety, and disorientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Characteristic Elements</th>
<th>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Idealization of one’s socioracial group and denigration of that which is perceived as White. Use of own-group external standards to self-define and own-group commitment and loyalty is valued. May make life decisions for the benefit of the group.</td>
<td>Hypervigilance and hypersensitivity towards racial stimuli and dichotomous thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>A euphoric sense of well-being and solidarity that accompanies being surrounded by people of one’s own socioracial group</td>
<td>Uncritical of one’s own group, peacefulness, joyousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Characteristic Elements</th>
<th>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>Positive commitment to and acceptance of one’s own socioracial, internally defined racial attributes, and capacity to objectively assess and respond to members of the dominant group. Can make life decisions by assessing and integrating socioracial group requirements and self-assessment</td>
<td>Intellectualization and abstraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>Capacity to value one’s own collective identities as well as empathize and collaborate with members of other oppressed groups. Life decisions may be motivated by globally humanistic self-expression</td>
<td>Flexible and complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Table 6.3: Summary of ALANA Racial Identity Ego Statuses, Examples, and Information Processing Strategies (IPS), Helms & Cook, 1999, p. 87.
White Racial Identity Model

The White racial identity model has been described as an elaborate and sophisticated model of White racial identity development (D.W. Sue and D. Sue, 1999). These authors consider Helms as the most influential White identity development theorist.

In the White racial identity model (Helms, 1995a) it is assumed that being a member of the dominant socioracial group contributes to a false sense of racial-group superiority and privilege. The identity developmental journey of Whites involves abandoning racial group entitlement and privilege (Phase I), and replacing it with a non-racist and realistic self-affirming racial identity (Phase II) (Helms & Cook, 1999).

The White racial identity development (WRID) model consists of seven ego statuses, each with their characteristic elements and prominent information processing strategies (IPS). It is the IPS that hold great promise for supervisor and supervisee to understand each other within the supervisory relationship. The following table outlines characteristic elements and information processing strategies for each of the statuses in the model (Helms, 1995a, Helms & Cook, 1999).
Table 2

Summary of White Racial Identity Ego Statuses and Information Processing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Characteristic Elements</th>
<th>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the racial status quo, obliviousness to racism and one’s participation in it. If racial factors influence life decisions, they do so in a simplistic fashion</td>
<td>Obliviousness, denial, superficiality, and avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>Disorientation and anxiety provoked by unresolvable racial moral dilemmas that force one to choose between own-group loyalty and humanism. May be stymied by life situations that arouse racial dilemmas</td>
<td>Suppression, ambivalence, and controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Characteristic Elements</td>
<td>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>Idealization of one’s socioracial group; denigration and intolerance for other groups. Racial factors may strongly influence life decisions</td>
<td>Selective perception and negative outgroup distortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>Intellectualized commitment to one’s own socioracial group and subtle superiority and tolerance of other socioracial groups as long as they can be helped to conform to White standards of merit</td>
<td>Selective perception, cognitive restructuring, and conditional regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Searching for an understanding of the personal meaning of Whiteness and racism and the ways by which one benefits from them as well as a redefinition of Whiteness</td>
<td>Hypervigilance, judgemental, and cognitive-affective restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Characteristic Elements</td>
<td>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emersion</td>
<td>Sense of discovery, security, sanity, and group solidarity and pride that accompanies being with other White people who are embarked on the mission of rediscovering Whiteness</td>
<td>Sociable, pride, seeking positive group-attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Informed positive socioracial group commitment, use of internal standards for self-definition, capacity to relinquish the privileges of racism. Person tries to avoid life options that require participation in racial oppression</td>
<td>Flexible and complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Table 6.4: Summary of White Racial Identity Ego Statuses, Examples, and Information Processing Strategies (IPS), Helms & Cook (1999, p. 90).
Helms and Cook (1999) remind us that most individuals develop more than one status, and that if multiple statuses do exist, they can function together. The authors advise that in a counseling situation, an awareness of racial identity can help form hypotheses about the dynamics in an individuals’ life, but these should be confirmed or disconfirmed in one’s actual interactions.

The WRID model has been criticized by Rowe, Bennett, and Atkinson (1994) on three grounds: (a) the model is based on minority identity models and role statuses evolving from the experiences of oppression and stereotyping, which White people have never encountered (b) too much emphasis is placed on Whites’ attitudes to others and too little emphasis on their attitudes to themselves (c) the linear progression from less to more healthy is based on Helms’ ethics. These criticisms have been rebutted by Helms (1995a), and despite its’ drawbacks, the WRID model continues to be used in empirical research.

Helms (1995a) informed us that the racial identity model was proposed as a framework for promoting better psychotherapy relationships in four ways: (a) to analyze racial reactions in the counseling relationship from a
psychological rather than a demographic perspective, 
(b) use this systematic analysis of racial dynamics to 
select the most effective intervention, (c) acknowledge 
race as a psychological characteristic of Whites as well as 
People of Color, and thus reduce the emphasis on changing 
People of Color, (d) replace victim-blame perspectives with 
the capacity to promote modification of unhealthy racial 
identity development (p. 196).

Racial Identity Interactions in Counseling Supervision

Given the power differential in counseling supervision 
(favoring the supervisor), the supervisor’s racial identity 
status(es) may shape the racial identity of the supervisee, 
and the client (Helms and Cook, 1999). Supervisors are 
ascripted more power in the relationship than supervisees by 
virtue of their professional credentials, evaluative role, 
and responsibility for client welfare (Cook, 1994).

Cook (1994) applied racial identity theory to 
counseling supervision to explain how racial issues might 
be addressed or ignored through her potential approaches to 
racial issues in supervision (PARI) model. In this model, 
she postulated how supervisors and supervisees at similar 
or different racial identity development statuses were
likely to react within the counseling supervision dyad. For example, a White supervisor with a primary racial identity status of Contact, or a POC supervisor with the primary racial identity status of Conformity (POC), were likely to ignore race in the supervision dyad and with the client. They were also postulated to more likely assume a theoretical approach that generalized to all individuals, and focus instead on a “common humanity”.

Four types of racial identity interactions between counselor and client were postulated by Helms: parallel, crossed, progressive, and regressive (1990). A parallel relationship was described as one in which the counselor and client belonged to the same or similar status of racial identity development and thus shared similar attitudes. A crossed relationship was described as one in which counselor and client belonged to opposite statuses of racial identity development and thus had opposing attitudes. A progressive relationship was defined as one where the counselor was at least one status higher than the client, and a regressive relationship was one in which the client was at one or more status higher than that of the counselor. According to this model of counselor-client
racial identity interaction, regressive relationships were more likely to be terminated because of the inability of the counselor to enter the client’s frame of reference. Progressive relationships carried the potential for the counselor to develop the client’s racial identity. Thus it was believed that by knowing the racial identity development of client and counselor, it was possible to predict the quality of their relationship.

Cook (1994) adapted this model of racial identity interaction between counselor and client to the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Cook (1994) described progressive supervision as when the supervisor was at a more advanced status of racial identity development than the supervisee. In regressive supervisory relationships, the opposite situation prevailed - the supervisee was at a more advanced status of racial identity development than the supervisor.

Thus, Cook (1994) postulated that if the supervision dyad was progressive (supervisor at more advanced status than supervisee), supervisees may be assisted to progress in their racial identity development. If the dyad was regressive (supervisee at more advanced status than supervisor), supervisees may repress any racial concerns,
and were unlikely to progress in their racial identity development. This would have a direct bearing on his or her efficacy as a counselor.

Helms and Cook (1999) provided an example of the difficulties that might be encountered in a crossed dyad, with a White supervisor and a POC supervisee. The supervisor might demand that the supervisee counsel according to traditional White-normed counseling theories, while the supervisee might struggle to implement more racially responsive counseling practices. The supervisee in such a situation was likely to experience frustration, and was likely to receive negative evaluations from the supervisor.

In a Parallel-High supervisor-supervisee interaction, the advanced development of supervisor and supervisee was likely to foster greater inclusion of all the racial concerns of all relevant parties in the relationship. Conversely, in a parallel-low interaction, racial issues were more likely to be ignored or suppressed.
Recent Studies Applying Helms’ Racial Identity Models to Working Alliance

The influence of racial identity within the counseling relationship has been investigated in recent research. Bukard, Ponterotto, Reynolds and Alfonso (1999) examined the impact of White racial identity of 124 counselor trainees on working alliance in same-racial and cross-racial counseling audiotape simulations. It was hypothesized that lower developmental levels of White racial identity (contact, disintegration, and reintegration) would inversely predict cross-racial working alliance ratings; higher levels of White racial identity (pseudo-independent and autonomy) were hypothesized to positively predict working alliance ratings in cross-racial counseling simulations.

Bukard et al. (1999) utilized an audiotaped counseling vignette in their study. Two parallel written intakes provided background on the “client”, one where the client was described as African American, and the other where the client was described as White. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups (either African American client or White client), and after hearing the audiotape,
they were asked to make two ratings of the working alliance. In the first, participants were asked to place themselves in the role of counselor and, based on their impressions of the client, rate their ability to form a working alliance with the client. In the second rating, they were asked to cast themselves as observers, and rate the working alliance between the counselor and the client in the counseling vignette. Results indicated that for both White and African American clients, disintegration and reintegration attitudes negatively affected working alliance ratings, and pseudo-independence and autonomy attitudes positively affected working alliance.

Methodological limitations of this study discussed by Bukard et al. (1999) included the analogue nature of the study, the limited counseling experience and multicultural counseling experience of participants, and the use of the WRIAS in the study, in view of recent psychometric challenges leveled against that instrument.

In another study by Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997), the researchers tested the hypothesis that supervisees’ multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competence are functions of
their racial identity and their supervisors’ instructions to focus on multicultural issues. Ladany, et al. (1997) utilized the Cultural Identity Attitude Scale (CIAS, Helms & Carter, 1990b) and the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS, Helms & Carter, 1990a) to measure racial identity. Results from 116 supervisees, both Persons of Color and Whites, indicated that their racial identity status was significantly related to self-reported multicultural competence. Self-reported multicultural competence was not found to be significantly related to multicultural case conceptualization ability. Supervisors’ instruction to focus on multicultural issues was significantly related to conceptualizations of a multicultural treatment strategy.

Specific Prior Research on Race, Racial Identity and the Supervisory Working Alliance

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997, aimed to find out how supervisee perceptions of their own and their supervisor’s racial identity (in combination) related to supervisory working alliance and supervisee’s development of multicultural competence. Participants in this study were 105 counseling trainees in supervision, and they were
administered instruments to measure their own and their supervisor’s racial identity and the working alliance. In order to manage the large number of potential racial identity interactions, the researchers utilized two phases of racial identity development rather than individual statuses. Phase I consisted of less advanced racial identity statuses, and Phase II consisted of more advanced racial identity statuses. Based on the literature, four types of racial identity interactions were deemed to exist in supervisory dyads: (a) regressive relationships (supervisee – Phase II, supervisor – Phase I), (b) progressive relationships (supervisor – Phase II, supervisee – Phase I), (c) parallel high relationships, in which both supervisor and supervisee were of comparable racial identity statuses (both supervisor and supervisee at Phase II), and (d) parallel-low relationships (both supervisor and supervisee at Phase I).

The instruments administered to measure racial identity were the Cultural Identity Attitude Scale (CIAS, Helms & Carter, 1990b) for People of Color in the sample, and the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS, Helms & Carter, 1990a) for Whites in the sample. The researchers developed a measure called the Perceptions of Supervisor
Racial Identity (PSRI) for this study. The PSRI was used to assess supervisee’s perceptions of their supervisor’s racial identity. The Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee (WAI-T) developed by Bahrick (1989) was used to assess trainees’ perceptions of the three factors of goals, tasks, and bond in the supervisory working alliance. The Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory – Revised (CCCI-R, LaFrombise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991) was modified for use in this study.

Findings regarding supervisory alliance indicated that supervisees in parallel-high interactions reported the strongest agreements on the goals and tasks of supervision. Progressive interactions were found to have the next strongest working alliances for both agreement on the tasks and goals, and the emotional bond. Not surprisingly, regressive interactions predicted the weakest supervisory alliance.

Results in regard to supervisee multicultural competence indicated that parallel-high and progressive interactions were most influential in terms of supervisee perceptions of supervisor influence on multicultural development. Parallel-low and regressive interactions were
least influential in terms of supervisee multicultural development. The findings also showed that racial matching did not significantly predict aspects of the supervisory working alliance, lending support to the idea (Helms, 1990) that demographic characteristics alone (such as race) may not be as important to relationships as psychological variables such as racial identity.

Limitations of this study noted by the authors included: (a) the ex post facto nature of the research design prohibiting causal inferences, (2) the exclusive reliance on supervisee perceptions, (3) the difficulty of generalizability given the unique between and within-group differences of People of Color.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell and Pannu (1997) provided several suggestions for future researchers in the area to consider. The first of these was to consider supervisor’s perceptions of racial identity, which is what the current study did. They also suggested that researchers assess the influence that racial identity interaction has on other aspects of supervision, and explore the dynamics of parallel process as applied to racial identity interactions between the supervisee-supervisor and client-supervisee.
A specific recommendation made by Ladany, Brittan-Powell and Pannu (1997) was for supervisors to assess their own and their supervisees’ racial identity to better understand the type of supervisory racial identity interaction. This identification would help supervisors to anticipate areas of conflict and strengthen the supervisory working alliance.

In this study and the other one carried out in the same year (Ladany et al., 1997) on racial identity in the supervision relationship, the focus was on racial identity of the supervisee, not the supervisor. Considering the power differential in the supervision relationship, finding a mechanism to address racial identity development of supervisors, and bringing it to the forefront of their consciousness is vital to increasing the possibilities of addressing the effects of racial identity development. It was for this reason that supervisors were selected as participants in the current study instead of supervisees.

Another consideration that prompted the selection of supervisors as participant in the current study was the possible discrepancy between multicultural training
received by current trainees and supervisors. Given the emphasis on multicultural issues in counseling programs today, supervisees are likely to have a theoretical orientation to racial identity theory and its’ potential effects in counseling and supervision relationships. Supervisors on the other hand, particularly those who may have been in training programs before the strong emphasis on multiculturalism as a fourth force in counseling existed (Pedersen, 1991) may not have received training in these areas. The current study therefore provided some insight into the perceptions of counseling supervisors in the field at the present time regarding racial identity and working alliance.

This chapter provided a brief synthesis of literature relevant to the current study. It began with an overview of some of the prevalent definitions of counseling supervision and then moved on the unique challenges of multicultural supervision necessitated by the increasing racial and ethnic diversification of the population. The vital nature of the supervisory relationship in counseling supervision was discussed, along with key aspects of the working alliance conceptualization (Bordin, 1983) of the
supervisory relationship. The literature review then moved on to discuss the particular dynamics of race and racial identity, and their influence on the supervisory relationship. The chapter concluded with a review of prior research on race, racial identity and the supervisory working alliance, with a special emphasis on the study by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997), which considered perspectives of race, racial identity, and strength of the supervisory working alliance from the viewpoint of supervisees.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to investigate the strength of supervisory working alliances in supervision dyads of matched or unmatched race, and matched or unmatched racial identity statuses.

Supervisors and supervisees race were ascertained from a demographic questionnaire completed by participating supervisors. Racial identity statuses of supervisors, their perceptions of racial identities of supervisees, and the supervisory working alliance were all measured utilizing established self-report instruments completed by participating supervisors.

Recommended protocols for research on human subjects were followed throughout the research study. Participants were fully informed of the purpose of the study and participation was completely voluntary (please refer to Appendix F for a copy of the initial letter mailed to prospective participants). Research participants were requested not to put their names on any part of the questionnaires. Envelopes were coded against a master list
to facilitate follow-up. The identity of research participants was protected by separating envelopes from completed questionnaires as soon as they arrived. Envelopes were then destroyed.

Sample

Participants in this study comprised a random sample of counseling supervisors registered as supervisors with the State of Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board (OCSWB). Names and contact details of participants were obtained from the most recent list prepared by the OCSWB “Counselors with Supervising Counselor Designation, July 2002 (OCSWB, 2002a).

The “Supervising Counselor” designation of the OCSWB allows supervisees to identify supervisors to provide supervision required for new counselors to complete the practice component of licensure requirements. In the state of Ohio, supervising counselors must meet the following requirements: (1) be licensed as a Professional Counselor (PC) or a Professional Clinical Counselor (PCC) in the state of Ohio for three years. (2) document 2 years full time direct counseling service under supervision, and (3) document 2 quarter hours of academic work or ten clock
hours of continuing education hours in clinical supervision (OCSWB, 2002b).

Sampling Plan

The sampling frame consisted of approximately 2,500 names and addresses of counseling supervisors from the OCSWB register of counseling supervisors in the state of Ohio (OCSWB, 2002a). Participants for this study were selected from the sampling frame by a random selection method.

In the previous research study that examined supervisees’ perspectives on racial identity and the supervisory working alliance (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997), analyses were conducted on a final sample of 105 participants. The authors in that study made an estimation based on previous research on racial identity interaction (Carter & Helms, 1992) that a sample size of 80 was required in order to exceed statistical power of .90 using an alpha level of .05 and an effect size of .250 ($\eta^2$). Their final sample consisted of 105 participants.

In the current study, sample size was determined by considering this prior research and by consulting Stevens (2002). According to Stevens, for a four-group MANOVA
study, a sample size of 64 (16 per group) would be required for a very large effect size and a power of .80. A sample size of 132 (33 per group) participants would be required for a large effect size and a power of .80 (p. 627). Thus in the current study it was decided that a sample size greater than 64 would be the minimum required, and a sample size of 132 participants would be preferred.

Questionnaire packets were mailed out to participants. Given that low response rates has been one of the major problems of mail surveys (Dillman, 1991), a conservative return rate expectation of between 30 - 50% was anticipated. Using this figure as a guide, a total of 350 questionnaire packets were mailed to counseling supervisors randomly selected from every county in Ohio as recorded in the OCSWB register of clinical supervisors (2002a).

A decision to over-sample by a factor of two in those counties in which the White population was less than 90% as per United States census information (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000c) was made in order to enhance the likelihood of obtaining a more racially diverse sample.

Participants were requested to fill out the self-assessments (racial identity scale and demographic
questionnaire) based on their racial self-identification, attitudes and experiences. For the two instruments that required supervisor completion with a specific supervisee in mind, supervisors were requested to select the supervisee with whom they had most recently completed all supervision requirements. It was stipulated that this supervisee had to be someone who had completed supervision requirements and had progressed from that particular supervision site (as opposed to having dropped out or curtailed supervision). This method of supervisee selection (by supervisors) was adopted to introduce a form of standardization in the supervisee selection process, and to avoid the possibility of supervisors selecting the supervisee with whom they believed they had had the most positive supervision experience. Supervisors were requested to complete the perceptions of supervisee racial identity instrument (White or People of Color, depending on the race of their supervisee) and the supervisory working alliance inventory with the selected supervisee in mind.

Special attention was paid to the fact that supervisors would have to select the correct instrument in two instances: first, they would be required to choose the
WRIAS or PRIAS based on their own race, and second, they would have to choose the PSeRIW or PSeRIP based on the race of their supervisee. Instruments were color coded (photocopied on colored paper) to help ensure that supervisors selected the correct instruments. In addition a one-page instruction sheet/check list was included in the instrument package (please refer to Appendix E).

Prior research on increasing mail survey response rate by using colored paper has been inconclusive (Dillman, 1991). In this study, the use of colored paper was utilized to increase accuracy of questionnaire choice, not enhance response rate. Although an enhanced response rate would have been considered advantageous. The color-coding system was pilot tested with a small group of supervisors, and they reported that they did not have any problems in selecting the correct instruments. Color codes were as follows: PRIAS - pink paper; WRIAS - purple paper, PSeRIW - blue paper, and PSeRIP - yellow paper.

Research Instruments

White racial identity attitude scale - WRIAS

White racial identity was measured utilizing the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) social attitudes
inventory (Helms, 2002a). This version of the instrument was developed from an earlier version of the instrument developed by Helms and Carter (1990a). The inventory was designed to assess six White racial identity attitude statuses according to Helms model of White racial identity. Brief descriptions of each status were provided by Helms in the preliminary scoring information document (Helms, 2002b):

(a) Contact: naiveté and lack of awareness of the sociopolitical significance of racial-group membership, especially one’s own;

(b) Disintegration: confusion and self-disorientation with respect to one’s own Whiteness as well as ambivalent awareness of the implications of race for members of other racial groups;

(c) Reintegration: active and passive endorsement of White superiority and Black inferiority;

(d) Pseudo-Independence: White liberalism characterized by an intellectual acceptance of one’s Whiteness and quasi-recognition of the sociopolitical implications of racial differences;

(e) Immersion/Emersion: proactive and self-initiated development of a positive White identity; and active racial
humanism expressed from a positive White (non-racist) orientation (p. 2).

The current version of the WRIAS (Helms, 2002a) consisted of 60 Likert scale items, and two experimental items (item 61 and item 62). Some items on this version had been replaced based on research findings and elaborations of the theory by Helms after the original instrument was developed by Helms and Carter (1990a). Ten items were added to assess Immersion/Emersion attitudes, which were not assessed in earlier versions of the WRIAS. The Likert scale consisted of five intervals: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Scoring for each of the sub-scales consisted of totaling scores for the 10 items identified as measuring each of the 6 statuses or schemas (Helms, 2002b).

Recommendations for use of the instrument included:

(Helms, 2002b):

(1) users compute their own reliability coefficients for each scale because of the influence of environmental factors on the responses to the scale

(2) users refer to psychometric information on the WRIAS reported by Helms (1996, 1999) in case they were unable to conduct their own analyses
the measure be used in its entirety, and that each of the six sub-scale scores be computed for each participant.

Statistical analysis and interpretations make use of all six scores because prior research (Helms, 1999) indicates that the scales may interact with each other in significant ways.

Two examples of items on the WRIAS are:

"I just refuse to participate in discussions about race."

"I am not embarrassed to say that I am White."

Helms and Carter (1990a) have reported reliability coefficients on an earlier version of the scale of .53, .77, .80, .71, and .67 for the sub-scales of Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy respectively.

Users of the WRIAS are cautioned against "assigning" one status to each individual, and it is suggested that if a researcher wishes to focus on a predominant status, he or she should adjust the scores for intraindividual variability. Thus for example, the contact score could be

...
adjusted using the following formula:

\[
\text{Contact Adjusted Score} = \frac{\text{mean contact}}{\text{mean contact} + \text{mean disintegration} + \text{mean reintegration} + \text{mean pseudo independence} + \text{mean immersion/emersion} + \text{mean autonomy}}.
\]

The WRIAS has been the object of rigorous psychometric evaluation, both by the developers and other authors. It has been noted that Helms and Carter (1990a) provided minimal information on how the scale was actually constructed (Fischer & Moradi, 2001). These authors also note that internal consistency estimates on some of the WRIAS sub-scales have been low, with those on the Contact subscale being the most troublesome.

Behrens (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of data from 22 studies, and reported the following internal consistencies: .50 (Contact), .77 (Disintegration), .78 (Reintegration), .67 (Pseudo-Independence), and .61 (Autonomy). Behrens (1997) also reported high correlations (approaching 1.00) between the Disintegration and Reintegration sub-scales, and the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy sub-scales. This high inter-correlation between
scales supported the use of Phase I and Phase II scores in the current study. However, the low internal consistency of the Contact sub-scale remained an issue of concern.

The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS)

The People of Color racial identity attitude scale (Helms, 1995b) was designed to assess four racial identity statuses experienced by People of Color according to the People of Color racial identity model developed by Helms (1995a). Helms developed this model and instrument to widen the scope of the Black racial identity model and the corresponding Black racial identity attitude scale (RIAS), which focused solely on the experiences of Blacks in a White society. The PRIAS purports to measure the racial identity development of all people of color, including Blacks, Asians, Hispanics/Latinos. In short, it seeks to examine the racial identity development of all people who do not self identify as White. The statuses of racial identity development in this model are thus hypothesized to result from the racial socialization experiences of People of Color in a predominantly White society.

The PRIAS yielded information on four sub-scales:

a) Conformity / Pre-encounter - conformance to the
racial status quo. Denial or lack of awareness of personal relevance of societal racial dynamics;

(b) Dissonance – confusion, disorientation when racial dynamics are in consciousness or awareness;

(c) Immersion / Resistance – physical and psychological withdrawing into one’s own racial / ethnic group; and

(d) Internalization – integration of positive own group racial identification with the capacity to realistically appreciate the positive aspects of Whites (Helms, 1995b, p. 1).

The PRIAS (1995b) consisted of 50 Likert scale items. As in the WRIAS (Helms, 2002a) the Likert scale was a 5 point scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Scoring for each of the sub-scales consisted of finding the mean of scores for each of the items identified in the key as measuring the different statuses of racial identity experienced by People of Color.

No psychometric information on this measure has been published to date. Helms (1995b) encouraged users to conduct their own psychometric evaluations including
reliability studies and factor analysis of the sub-scales. Mean subscale scores may be utilized in order to perform subscale comparisons.

Two examples of items on the PRIAS are:

"Anglo-Americans (Whites) are more attractive than people of my race", and

"I don’t know whether being the race I am is an asset or a deficit."

Working alliance inventory-supervisor - WAI-S

The WAI-S (Bahrick, 1989) is a self-report instrument that assesses supervisors’ perceptions of the quality of the supervisory alliance. The instrument was developed based on Bordin’s (1983) conceptualization of the working alliance. Three aspects of the supervisory relationship are assessed in the WAI-S - goals, tasks and bond, and thus the instrument yields data on three sub-scales. Ratings are based on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = sometimes, 5 = often, 6 = very often, and 7 = always). Twelve items have been assigned to each subscale and therefore scores for each subscale are obtained by totaling scores on each of the subscale items. Information on item polarity is also included for each
item. Higher scores reflect increased strength in that particular aspect of the working alliance.

In a previous study, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were .93 for all three sub-scales (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu, 1997). Examples of items on this scale are:

“I am clear as to what I expect _____ to do in our supervision sessions”, and

“_______ has some fears that if she / he says or does the wrong things that I will disapprove.”

_Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity for Whites (PSeRIW) and Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity for POC (PSeRIP)_

The PSeRIW and the PSeRIP were adapted for this study from the original instrument “Perceptions of Supervisor Racial Identity (PSRI) developed by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997). The PSRI was used to assess supervisee’s perceptions of their supervisor’s racial identity. The PSRI consisted of items that described overt behaviors that supervisors at different statuses of racial identity development might exhibit. It therefore did not require specific knowledge about racial identity theory from participants.
The PSRI consisted of short paragraphs, one for each racial identity status in the White and People of Color racial identity models, which describe behaviors typical of each status. It was developed with the input of four experts in the field of racial identity theory, who rated each of the paragraphs in the pilot version of the PSRI on a 9-point scale to indicate the extent to which each paragraph accurately depicted the status of racial identity and whether or not it was reflective of Phase I or Phase II of racial identity development (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997).

The final versions of the PSRI consisted of four items for the People of Color scale and six items for the White scale. Participants were asked to rate on a 9-point scale (1 = not descriptive at all, 9 = completely descriptive) the extent to which each paragraph reflected their supervisors’ racial identity status.

With the permission of the first author of the PSRI (Ladany), the instrument was adapted for use in the current study by substituting the word supervisor for the word supervisee. Thus the PSeRIW and the PSeRIP survey the
impressions of supervisors regarding racial identity of their supervisees.

The following is an example of the first item from the PSeRIW, reflective of the racial identity status of contact in the White racial identity model:

"I get the sense that my supervisee has not thought about what it means to be White in the United States. I also feel he or she doesn't think of issues of race or culture as personally relevant. In fact, I doubt that my supervisee would say racism is a very serious problem in the United States. My supervisee also seems to approach the world with a color-blind or cultureless perspective. Furthermore, my supervisee seems to rarely seek out contact with people of color and at times I think my supervisee views people of color with curiosity or maybe even fear."

An item from the PSeRIP, reflective of the identity status of conformity in the People of Color racial identity model is presented below:

"My supervisee seems to have a negative image of people of color. I notice that my supervisee tends to associate with mostly White people and has little to do with
members of his or her own racial group. I believe that my supervisee generally identifies with White people and White values and at times may even accept negative stereotypes about himself/herself or his/her own racial heritage”.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire consisted of questions regarding gender, age, education completed, multicultural training or education, and experience as a counseling supervisor (in number of months). Information was also collected on participants’ self-identified racial group, their assessment of their supervisee’s racial group, and the percentage of racial diversity in their last work or study setting.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection began by selecting a random sample of potential participants from the OCSWB register of supervising counselors. These potential participants were sent a complete research packet consisting of a letter requesting their participation in the study, the questionnaires, instructions on choice of instruments, and a stamped, addressed envelope for return of the completed
questionnaires. Participants were requested to return the completed questionnaires in the postage-paid envelope within three weeks.

Each return envelope was coded in order to facilitate follow-up with non-respondents. The codes were held in a master list that only the principal researcher had access to. A reminder postcard was sent to participants who had not responded after the initial 3-week period. Two weeks after the postcard was sent out, a complete questionnaire package along with a follow-up letter was mailed out to non-respondents.

Data Analysis Procedures

Once data collection was complete, descriptive statistics for all independent and dependent variables were computed.

The first dimension under which groups were formed was on the race of the supervisor and supervisee. Using race of supervisor and supervisee as the defining variable, supervisor-supervisee dyads were categorized as being in 4 groups: the first where both supervisor and supervisee were White, the second where the supervisor was White and the supervisee was a person of color, the third where the
supervisor was a POC of the supervisee was White, and the fourth group, where both supervisor and supervisee were identified as POC. Table 3 provides an outline of how these groups were formed:

Table 3.

**Racial Match or Non-Match in Supervisory Dyads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Race Interaction</th>
<th>Supervisor’s Race (as Reported by Supervisor)</th>
<th>Supervisee’s Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC - POC</td>
<td>Supervisor POC</td>
<td>Supervisee POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - W</td>
<td>Supervisor White</td>
<td>Supervisee White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - POC</td>
<td>Supervisor White</td>
<td>Supervisee POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC - W</td>
<td>Supervisor POC</td>
<td>Supervisee White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second variable utilized for formulating groups was racial identity statuses for White and POC supervisors and supervisees. Scores on the WRIAS and PSeRIW were used to measure racial identity development of White supervisors and supervisees. For the purposes of this investigation, the first three White racial identity statuses of contact, disintegration, and reintegration were combined to form Phase I WRIAS scores, and the latter three sub-scales of pseudo-independence, immersion-emersion, and autonomy were combined to form Phase II WRIAS scores. Table 3 summarizes the sub-scales that were combined to form Phases I and II of White racial identity in the current study.

Table 4.

*Phase I and Phase II of White Racial Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Sub-scales Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Pseudo Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racial identity development for POC supervisors was assessed using the PRIAS. For POC supervisees, racial identity development was assessed using the PReRIP.

As in the process followed for White supervisors and supervisees in the study, Phase I and Phase II POC scores were computed. Scores on the first two POC racial identity statuses of conformity and dissonance were combined to form Phase I POC scores, and the latter two sub-scales of immersion-resistance and internalized awareness were combined to form Phase II POC scores. Table 5 summarizes the POC sub-scales that were combined to form Phase I and Phase II for racial identity development of POC.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Sub-scales Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Immersion-Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the method utilized previously by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997), Phase I (less advanced) and Phase II (more advanced) scores of racial identity development were computed for every supervisor in the study, and his or her supervisee measuring the extent of racial identity development in each participant.

For each supervisor and supervisee, a measure of intrapersonal contrast of Phase I racial identity development versus Phase II racial identity development was obtained. In order to obtain the intrapersonal contrast of more to less advanced racial identity development, Phase II scores were divided by Phase I scores for each supervisor and supervisee. This score provided a measure of the extent of racial identity development for each participant and his or her supervisee.

Racial Identity Interaction

Once this measure of intrapersonal extent of racial identity development for each supervisor or supervisee was obtained, the next step was to compare this score with the scores of others in the subgroup (i.e., comparing supervisors with other supervisors in the study, and comparing supervisees with other supervisees in the study).
A median split was used to identify supervisors and supervisees who were higher or lower in their level of racial identity development when compared with the rest of their cohort of supervisors or supervisees in the study.

Each supervisor was characterized as being high or low in racial identity development, and each supervisee was characterized as being high or low in racial identity development (when compared with others in their sub-group). Thus by comparing the level of racial identity of each supervisor with her or his supervisee, racial identity interactions were characterized as being progressive, parallel high, parallel low, or regressive. Table 6 provides a summary of how each type of racial identity interaction was categorized.
Table 6.

*Racial Identity Interaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Racial Identity (RI) Interaction</th>
<th>Supervisor’s Level of Racial Identity Development</th>
<th>Supervisee’s Level of Racial Identity Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive RI Interaction</td>
<td>Supervisor at a high level of racial identity development</td>
<td>Supervisee at a low level of racial identity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel High RI Interaction</td>
<td>Supervisor at a high level of racial identity development</td>
<td>Supervisee at a high level of racial identity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Low RI Interaction</td>
<td>Supervisor at a low level of racial identity development</td>
<td>Supervisee at a low level of racial identity development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive RI Interaction</td>
<td>Supervisor at a low level of racial identity development</td>
<td>Supervisee at a high level of racial identity development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method of Analysis to Test the Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were proposed in order to establish the relationships between racial identity, racial matching, and supervisory working alliance.

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel-high, parallel-low, progressive and regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both People of Color) and unmatched races regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no interaction effect between race and racial identity on the goals, tasks, and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

In order to test these hypotheses, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing racial identity and race as the independent variables, and the goal, task and bond of the working alliance as dependent variables. "MANOVA tests whether mean differences
among groups on a combination of dependent variables are likely to have occurred by chance” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p. 375).

Two advantages of the method make it applicable in the current study: (1) it enables the examination of the joint effect of independent variables on the dependent variable, and (2) it can lead to more powerful tests by reducing error (within cell) variance (Stevens, 2002).

A multivariate F value (Wilks' Lambda) was obtained based on a comparison of the error variance/covariance matrix and the effect variance/covariance matrix. The "covariance" here was included because in case the two measures are correlated, we must take this correlation into account when performing the significance test.

Assumptions for MANOVA

Three assumptions for MANOVA (Stevens, 2002) were examined and determined to have been met. These were:

(1) The observations are independent

(2) The observations on the dependent variables follow a multivariate normal distribution with each group

(3) The population covariance matrices for the
dependent variables are equal (homogeneity of variance).

A violation of the independence assumption is considered to be very serious (Stevens, 2002). This assumption was addressed by sending the questionnaires to individuals and by instructing them to respond with just one supervisee in mind. Although every supervisor in the counseling profession is likely to have more than one supervisee at the same time, each participating supervisor was instructed to select only one supervisee and complete the relevant questionnaires with that one supervisee in mind.

The assumption of normality was examined graphically for each group using the “Explore” feature of SPSS. According to Stevens (2002), it is necessary to check to see whether multivariate normality is reasonable. This was accomplished by checking the univariate normality for each variable.

Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices was applied to check the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. Since the Box test was not significant ($p = .069$) it was noted that this assumption for MANOVA had
also been met and that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables were equal across groups.

Table 7.

4 x 4 Factorial Design of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable 2: Racial Matching</th>
<th>Independent Variable 1: Racial Identity Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel-high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC - POC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC - W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - POC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology stipulated that if significance was obtained in the MANOVA analysis, the univariate F tests for
each variable would be interpreted to assess their respective effects. Post hoc comparisons would also be undertaken.

Diagrammatical Representation of Variables

Figure 1:

Four x Four Independent Variables

The figure above shows the four groups of supervisory dyads formed on the basis of race of supervisor and supervisee, and the four groups of supervisory dyads formed
on the basis of racial identity interaction between supervisor and supervisee.

Figure 2:
*Three Dependent Variables*

![Dependent Variables Diagram]

The figure above shows the three dependent variables in the study: the task, goal, and bond components of the supervisory working alliance. Each of these dependent variables is a subscale of the working alliance inventory (Bahrick, 1989).
CHAPTER IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the associations between racial matching, racial identity interactions and working alliance in supervisory dyads. Specifically, the study investigated supervisors’ perspectives to establish if there were significant relationships between racial identity interactions of supervisors and supervisees, and the goal, task and emotional bond components of the supervisory working alliance. The study further sought to establish if there were significant relationships between racially matched and unmatched supervisory dyads and the strength of the supervisory working alliance. Finally, the study investigated if there was an interaction effect between racial matching and racial identity interactions in supervisory dyads.

This chapter presents in detail the analyses described in Chapter Three. To begin with, a description of the research participants is provided. Next reliability analyses conducted in the current study are presented. Correlation analyses on the sub-scales of instruments are
presented. Statistical analyses carried out to test the research hypothesis are reported. Finally, the results of supplemental analyses are presented.

Participants in this study were counseling supervisors registered as supervisors with the State of Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board (OCSWB). Each participant was requested to complete a total of four questionnaires: the WRIAS or PRIAS based on their racial identity, the PSeRIW or PSeRIP based on the racial identity of their supervisee, the WAI-S, and a demographic questionnaire. Questionnaire packets were prepared, placing questionnaires in random order to reduce ordering effects on the data collected. Special attention was paid to the fact that supervisors would have to choose between two instruments: one based on their own race (WRIAS or PRIAS) and the second based on the race of their supervisee (PSeRIW or PSeRIP). Instruments were color coded to help ensure that supervisors selected the correct instruments. In addition a one-page instruction sheet / check sheet was included in the questionnaire package.
Description of Participants

A total of 350 questionnaire packets were mailed out. The first mailing of questionnaires was carried out, follow-up postcard were mailed two to three weeks later, and a new set of questionnaire packets was mailed out to non-respondents after a further two weeks. Using this method, a total of 159 questionnaire packets were returned (45.43% of the total sample).

Fourteen of the 159 respondents stated that they were unable to participate because they were no longer in a counseling supervision role, or stated that they had never been counseling supervisors, and had been placed on the OCSWB register in error. Seven participants returned the research questionnaires stating that they were now retired and had been for several years. Two participants returned the questionnaires stating that they worked in rural areas with no racial diversity, and they were therefore not participating. Seventeen questionnaire packets were returned by the postal services due to being undeliverable - the most common reason being that the addressees had moved and forwarding time had expired. Thus responses from a total of 119 participants (34% of the original sample)
formed the basis of statistical analysis in this research study.

The demographic questionnaire consisted of questions regarding gender, age, level of education completed, experience as a counseling supervisor (in number of years and / or months), and amount of training in multicultural issues in supervision. Information was also collected on participants' self-identified racial group, their assessment of their supervisee's racial group, and the percentage of racial diversity in their last work setting, as well as in their current work setting.

Information gathered from the demographic data is summarized in Tables 8 - 12.
Table 8  
*Gender and Age of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years and mos.)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99.16%</td>
<td>50.45</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>31-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

All 119 participants answered the question regarding their gender. Of the 119, eighty (67.2%) were female, and thirty-nine (32.8%) were male.

**Age**

The age range of participant supervisors was between 31 years to 74 years, with the mean age being 50.45 years.
Table 9

*Education, Supervision Experience and Multicultural Training Of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75.6 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.6 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Experience</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99.16 %</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.6-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Training in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73.11 %</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20 %</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>6-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education

On the question of level of education completed, the majority of participants reported that they had completed a Master’s degree qualification (n = 90, 75.6%). Twenty-one participants reported having a doctoral degree (17.6%), and 8 participants (6.7%) reported having an “other” qualification (other than a master’s or doctoral degree). These “other” qualifications included four participants who were enrolled in doctoral programs, one who had completed several graduate hours of post-masters study, one who was a licensed social worker, and two who were enrolled in Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies (CAGS) programs.

Supervision Experience

There was a wide range noted in the level of supervision experience, which was reported in years and / or months (6 months – 40 years). The mean level of supervision experience in the sample was 10.98 years.

Multicultural Training

Participants were given the option of reporting specific training they received in multicultural issues in supervision in hours, weeks or months. The majority of participants (87 or 73.11%) reported a range of between
0 – 100 hours of training received, with the mean being 16.59 hours. Five participants of the 119 reported a range of 1 – 12 weeks of training in multicultural issues in supervision, and three out of 119 participants reported a range from 6 – 32 months of training in multicultural issues in supervision. Twenty-four participants (20.17%) did not respond to this question.

Table 10

Race of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race of Supervisor</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian / White</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American /</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisors’ Race

All participants responded to questions regarding their own race or the race of their supervisees. As was expected, the majority of supervisors self-identified racially as Caucasian / White (n = 108, 90.8%). Ten participant supervisors self-identified as African American / Black (8.4%), while only one participant self-identified as Hispanic / Latino (0.8%). There were no supervisors who described themselves as Native American, Asian American, biracial or placed themselves in the “Other” (none of the above) category.
Table 11
Race of Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race of Supervisees</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian / White</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American / Black</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American / American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisees’ Race

Once again, amongst the supervisees, Caucasian / White supervisees were the largest group (n = 93, 78.2%). Twenty-four supervisees were identified as African American / Black by their supervisors (20.2%), while 2 supervisees
(1.7%) were placed in the “Other” racial category. These two supervisees were described to be of Middle Eastern racial origin. There were no supervisees in the sample in the Hispanic, Native American, Asian American or Biracial groups.

Table 12

Socioeconomic Status of Participating Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (as described by participants)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>84.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lower class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socioeconomic Status

Sixty four participants (53.8%) described their socioeconomic status as middle class. Thirty-four participants reported their socioeconomic status as upper middle class. Eighteen of the 119 participants did not respond to this question.

Racial Matching or Non-Matching of Dyads

Using race of supervisor and supervisee as the defining variable, supervisor-supervisee pairs were categorized as being in 4 groups: the first where both supervisor and supervisee were White (W-W), the second where the supervisor was White and the supervisee was a person of color (W-POC), the third where the supervisor was a POC and the supervisee was White (POC-W), and the fourth group, where both supervisor and supervisee were identified as POC (POC-POC).

Percentage of Racial Diversity in Previous and Current Work Environments of Participants

The last two sections of the demographic questionnaire examined the levels of racial diversity in the participants’ previous and current work environments. Many of these questions were omitted wholly, or partially by
participants. Tables J1 and J2 in Appendix J present the information gathered from these questions.

Of the 106 participants who responded to the question: “Estimate the percentages of Whites in your previous place of employment”, the range was between 2 – 100 %, with the mean of 78.21 %. Thus for 106 participants, the mean percentage of Whites in their previous place of work was 78.21%. Ninety-six participants responded to the question: “Estimate the percentage of African Americans or Black in your previous places of employment”. The range of percentages given in response to this question were from 0 – 99%, with the mean being 20.66%. In other words, for 96 participants, the mean percentage of African Americans or Blacks in their previous place of employment was 20.66%.

One hundred and four participants responded to the question: “Estimate the percentages of Whites in your current place of employment.” The reported range here was 1-100 %, with a mean of 87.39%. Ninety participants responded to the question: “Estimate the percentage of African Americans or Blacks in your current places of employment.” The reported range of percentages lay between 1 – 100 %, with a mean of 21.72%.
Participants who responded to this question noted a racial breakdown of mainly Whites and African Americans in both their previous and current places of employment.

Reliability Analyses on Research Instruments

White racial identity attitude scale – WRIAS

White racial identity was measured utilizing the WRIAS (White Racial Identity Attitude Scale) Social Attitudes Inventory (Helms, 2002a). WRIAS measures the attitudes of Whites towards “Blacks”. The inventory is designed to assess six White racial identity attitude statuses according to Helms model of racial identity (Helms, 1995a).

The statuses measured are: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Immersion-Emersion, and Autonomy. Scores for each scale were obtained by totaling item scores for items assigned for each subscale. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients, means, and standard deviations for the six sub-scales as well as Phase I and II scales are presented in the next table.
Table 13

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations for WRIAS Sub-scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIAS Sub-Scale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I WRIAS</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>70.26</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II WRIAS</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>103.63</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficients of three sub-scales: contact, pseudo-independence, and autonomy were noted to be low. When Phase I and Phase II scores were computed, the alpha coefficients were noted to be higher for them than for individual sub-scale scores (Phase I $\alpha = .77$, $M = 70.26$, $SD = 10.54$; Phase II $\alpha = .79$, $M = 103.63$, $SD = 11.07$).
The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS)

The People of Color racial identity attitude scale (PRIAS) is designed to assess four racial identity statuses experienced by People of Color according to the People of Color racial identity model developed by Helms (1995a). These statuses are hypothesized to result from the racial socialization experiences of People of Color in a predominantly White society. It consists of four sub-scales: (1) Conformity / Pre-encounter, (2) Dissonance, (3) Immersion / Resistance, and (4) Internalization.
Table 14

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations for PRIAS Sub-Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIAS Sub-Scale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity / Pre-encounter</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion – Resistance</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I POC</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>45.90</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II POC</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha coefficients for conformity / pre-encounter and internalization were low. Alpha coefficients for the combined POC Phase I items were $\alpha = .60$, $M = 45.90$, $SD = 7.36$, and POC Phase II items $\alpha = .66$, $M = 83.10$, $SD = 7.72$.

Working alliance inventory-supervisor - WAI-S

The WAI-S (Bahrick, 1989) is a self-report instrument assessing supervisors’ perceptions of the strength of the supervisory working alliance. The instrument yields data on
three sub-scales: goal, task and bond. Twelve items are assigned to each subscale and scores for each subscale are obtained by totaling scores on each of the subscale items. Reliability coefficients for the WAI-S are reported next.

Table 15

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations for WAI-S Sub-scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAI Sub-Scale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>69.38</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>67.67</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity - Whites (PSeRIW) and Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity - People of Color (PSeRIP)*

The PSeRIW and the PSeRIP survey the impressions of supervisors regarding racial identity development statuses
of their supervisees. The PSeRIW consists of 6 statements and the PSeRIP consists of 4 statements. Each of these statements is reflective of a corresponding status on the White or POC racial identity model. Participants were required to rate on a 9-point Likert scale the extent to which each statement reflected their supervisee’s racial identity status. Phase I (less advanced) and Phase II (more advanced) scores of racial identity development were calculated for each supervisor and supervisee in the study.

Correlations Between Sub-scales on Research Instruments

Correlations on WRIAS

Correlation analysis on the WRIAS revealed significant correlations between certain sub-scales: Contact with Pseudo-Independence (r = .37, p < .05), Contact with Autonomy (r = .21, p < .05), Disintegration with Reintegration (r = .61, p < .05), Reintegration with Pseudo Independence (r = -.19, p < .05), Reintegration with Autonomy (r = -.31, p < .05), Pseudo Independence with Autonomy (r = .51, p < .05), Pseudo Independence with Immersion-Emersion (r = .38, p < .05), and Immersion-Emersion with Autonomy (r = .50, p < .05). The correlation matrix for the WRIAS may be found in Appendix K.
**Correlation on PRIAS**

No significant correlations were found between the sub-scales on the PRIAS. Limited group size in this case \((n = 11)\) is likely to have contributed to this outcome. The correlation matrix for the PRIAS may be found in Appendix K.

**Correlations on WAI-S**

On the WAI-S, significant correlations were found between the three sub-scales of the task, goal and bond of the supervisory working alliance: task with bond \((r = .68, p < .05)\), task with goal \((r = .88, p < .05)\), and bond with goal \((r = .71, p < .05)\). The correlation matrix for the WAI-S may be found in Appendix K.

**Measuring the Extent of Racial Identity Development for Each Participant**

For each supervisor and supervisee, a measure of intrapersonal contrast of Phase I racial identity development versus Phase II racial identity development was obtained by dividing Phase II scores by Phase I scores for each supervisor and supervisee. This score provided a measure of the extent of racial identity development for each participant and his or her supervisee.
Racial Identity Interaction and Racial Matching

Once this measure of intrapersonal extent of racial identity development for each supervisor or supervisee was obtained, the next step was to compare this score with the scores of others in the subgroup (i.e., comparing supervisors with other supervisors in the study, and comparing supervisees with other supervisees in the study. A median split was used to identify supervisors and supervisees who were higher or lower in their level of racial identity development when compared with the rest of their cohort of supervisors or supervisees in the study.

Each supervisor was characterized as being at a high or low level of racial identity development, and each supervisee was characterized as at a high or low level of racial identity development (when compared with others in their respective cohorts). By comparing the level of racial identity of each supervisor with her or his supervisee, racial identity interactions were characterized as being progressive, parallel high, parallel low, or regressive. For example, a relationship in which supervisor with a high level of racial identity development was paired with a supervisee with a high level of racial identity development
was deemed to be a parallel-high racial identity interaction.

Four groups were also formed on the basis of race of supervisor and supervisee in each dyad.

Table 16 presents the numbers of supervisory dyads in each of the 8 sub-groups formed by either racial matching or non-matching, or by racial identity interaction.
Table 16

Size of Groups of Supervisory Dyads Formed According to Racial Identity Interaction and Racial Matching / Non Matching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Dyads</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel High</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Low</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Match / Non-Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-W (W Svor – W Svee)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-POC (W Svor – POC Svee)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC-W (POC Svor – W Svee)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC-POC (POC Svor – POC Svee)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Svor = Supervisor, Svee = Supervisee
For supervisory dyads grouped according to racial identity interaction, group sizes ranged from 26 to 35. For supervisory dyads grouped according to race match or non-match, the group sizes were more varied. The largest group was of White supervisors and white supervisees. Group sizes for the other groups were as follows: White Supervisor and POC supervisee, \( n = 21 \), POC supervisors and White supervisees, \( n = 7 \), and POC supervisors and POC supervisees, \( n = 4 \).

**Statistical Analyses to Test Null Hypotheses**

Statistical analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, version 11.5. Descriptive statistics were computed, followed by multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

**Descriptive Analyses**

An examination of the means and standard deviations for each group of supervisory dyads was first carried out to detect any obvious differences between the subgroups, and to visually examine the data in the light of the research questions. Table 17 shows the means and standard deviations for the goal, task, and bond sub-scales for each of the eight supervisory dyad groups.
Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for the Task, Bond, and Goal Sub-scales of the WAI-S for Each of the 8 Supervisory Dyad Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Dyads</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.96</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66.27</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Match / Non-Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Svor-W Svee</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Svor-POC Svee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69.77</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC Svor-W Svee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC Svor-POC Svee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to testing the hypotheses, descriptive data was visually examined in the light of the research questions. The aim here was to observe if there were trends present, and if they were easily discernable from the data. One specific question that was asked was do supervisory dyads with parallel-high racial identity interactions exhibit the strongest supervisory working alliance? An examination of the data does indicate some differences between the sub-groups on the mean scores of the task, bond and goal of the supervisory working alliance. For the goal sub-scale, the highest mean score was for the Parallel-High group (70.71). But this was not the case for the task and bond component of the supervisory working alliance. On the racial identity interaction variable, the group sizes for the four sub-groups ranged from 26 - 35. The Progressive group had the highest mean task scale of 71.86, and the Parallel-Low group had the lowest task mean of 66.27. An unexpected finding was that for the Regressive group, the highest bond sub-scale mean was noted (71.18) and the lowest once again was the Parallel-Low group (65.50).

Another question was, “do supervisory dyads with parallel-low racial identity interactions exhibit the next
strongest supervisory working alliance (i.e., second to parallel-high racial identity interactions)?” This did not appear to be borne out by the data because the parallel-low group had the lowest mean scores for each of the 3 working alliance sub-scales: task = 66.27, bond = 65.50, and goal = 64.46.

The next question was, do supervisory dyads with progressive racial identity interactions report a weaker working alliance than both parallel-high and parallel-low relationships?” This did not appear to be the case at all in the current study.

Supervisory dyads with regressive racial identity interactions did not report the weakest working alliance, (i.e., weaker than in progressive, parallel high and parallel low alliances).

Regarding the independent variable of racial match or non-match, the question was “do racially matched supervisory racial dyads (i.e., both supervisor and supervisee of the same race) report a stronger supervisory working alliance than unmatched racial dyads, and conversely, do unmatched racial supervisory dyads report a weaker supervisory working alliance than matched racial dyads?”
From an observation of the data, it was noted that for the Race Match / Non-match variable, on the task sub-scale, the sub-group of POC Supervisor – POC Supervisee had the highest mean score (74.00), while the POC Supervisor – White Supervisee sub-group had the lowest task mean (68.00). On the bond sub-scale once again the POC Supervisor – POC Supervisee had the highest mean score (76.75), and the POC Supervisor – White Supervisee sub-group had the lowest mean score (65.71). This pattern was also noted in the goal sub-scale of the supervisory working alliance: the POC Supervisor – POC Supervisee had the highest mean score (75.00), and the POC Supervisor – White Supervisee sub-group had the lowest mean score (63.43). Two group sizes were extremely small however: the POC Supervisor – POC Supervisee group size was 4, and the POC Supervisor – White Supervisee group size was 7.

The final question had to do with the interaction effect between racial identity interaction and racial match/non-match: “is the difference in working alliance between matched and unmatched racial identity groups the same for groups who are racially matched and those that are racially unmatched?”
Testing of Null Hypotheses

In order to answer these questions in a more definitive and rigorous manner, the following null hypotheses were tested:

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel-high, parallel-low, progressive and regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both People of Color) and unmatched races regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant interaction effect between racial identity interaction and racial match/non-match on the dependent variables - the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.
Assumption Testing for MANOVA

Before utilizing MANOVA to test the hypotheses, three assumptions for MANOVA were tested. These were: (1) the observations are independent (2) the observations on the dependent variables follow a multivariate normal distribution with each group, and (3) the population covariance matrices for the dependent variables are equal (homogeneity of variance).

The assumption of independent observations was addressed by sending the questionnaires to individual supervisors, and by instructing them to select only one supervisee and complete the relevant questionnaires with that one supervisee in mind.

The assumption of normality was examined graphically for each group using the “Explore” feature of SPSS. A check on whether multivariate normality was reasonable was accomplished by checking the univariate normality for each variable.

Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices was applied to check the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices. Since the Box test was not significant \( (p = 0.069) \) it was noted that this assumption for MANOVA
had also been met and that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables were reasonably homogeneous across groups.

The results of the MANOVA analysis are presented in Table 18.
Table 18

Summary of 4 x 4 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Racial Matching, Racial Identity Interaction, and Interaction Effect (Wilks’ Lambda).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect or Variable</th>
<th>Value: Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypo. df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Match / Non Match</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>243.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Interaction</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>243.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Match x Racial Identity Interaction</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>290.63</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from MANOVA failed to reject the null hypotheses. Results indicated that:

(1) there were no significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel-high, parallel-low, progressive and regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance

(2) there were no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both People of Color) and unmatched races regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance

(3) there was no significant interaction effect between the two independent variables of racial identity interaction and race match / non-match.
Supplemental Analyses

Supplemental analyses were carried out to explore the data further. The first analysis that was conducted was a 2 x 2 MANOVA, where instead of four groups of race supervisory dyads and four groups of racial identity supervisory dyads, combinations were made that resulted in two groups on each dimension.

Figure 3 provides a diagrammatic representation of these newly formed groups.
The figure above shows the 2 groups of supervisory dyads formed on the race dimension: matched race and unmatched race. The matched race group consisted of the two groups where the supervisor and supervisee were of the same
race - either both were White or both POC. The unmatched race group consisted of the two groups where supervisor and supervisee were of different races.

On the racial identity interaction dimension, two groups were formed on the basis of supervisor’s perceptions of supervisee’s racial identity: Supervisees High Racial Identity and Supervisees Low Racial Identity. The group named “Supervisees with High Racial Identity” was formed by combining the two groups from the original design in which supervisees’ racial identity was rated as high by their supervisors (i.e., the parallel high and regressive groups). The group named “Supervisees with Low Racial Identity” was formed by combining the two groups of supervisory dyads from the original design in which supervisees were considered to have a low level of racial identity development (the parallel low group and the progressive group).

The second supplemental analysis that was carried out involved combining the three sub-scales of the dependent measure, the goal, task and bond components of the supervisory working alliance, into a single measure of supervisory working alliance and examine relationships with it and the independent variables.
Racial Matching – Non-Matching Groups

Given the small sizes of two groups on the racial matching dimension (POC-POC group, \( n = 4 \); and POC-W group, \( n = 7 \)), a decision was made to collapse the four groups into two: one in which both supervisor and supervisee were of the same race (either both White or both POC), and another in which the supervisor and supervisee were of different races). The matched race group was the larger of the two with an \( n \) of 89. The unmatched race group was smaller (\( n = 29 \)) and was made up of dyads where one member of the dyad was a POC or the other was White. Means and standard deviations on each of the three dependent measures are presented in the next table.
Table 19


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Match (both supervisor and supervisee White or both POC)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Non-Match (supervisor and supervisee in a mixed racial dyad of White and POC)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of means for the task, bond and goal sub-scales of the working alliance showed very little obvious differences between the racially matched and racially unmatched supervisory dyads. This was borne out statistically through a 2 x 2 MANOVA analysis (Table 22).
Racial Identity Interaction Groups

On the racial identity dimension, groups were also collapsed to form two rather than four groups. This was done based on the supervisees’ level of racial identity development. Supervisees who were perceived to have high levels of racial identity development were placed in one group, the Supervisees High Racial Identity group (parallel high and regressive groups combined), and supervisees who were perceived as having lower levels of racial identity development were placed in the second group, Supervisees Low Racial Identity group (parallel low and progressive groups combined).
Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations for Two Groups: Supervisees with Low and High Levels of Racial Identity Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees with Low Racial</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67.15</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees with High Racial</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71.11</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these figures above, for all three sub-scales, the task, bond and goal subscale means were higher for the Supervisees with high racial identity group when compared to the means for the supervisees with low racial identity group.

A similar though smaller difference in means was observed when supervisors were combined into two groups:
supervisors with high racial identity development versus supervisors with low racial identity development. Means and standard deviations for these two groups are presented next.

Table 21
Means and Standard Deviations for Two Groups: Supervisors with Low and High Levels of Racial Identity Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors with Low Racial Identity Development</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors with High Racial Identity Development</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 x 2 MANOVA

The relationship between racially matched and non-matched racial dyads and supervisees grouped according to high or low levels of racial identity was examined using MANOVA. These results are presented in the following table.

Table 22

Summary of 2 x 2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) for Racial Matching, Racial Identity Interaction, and Interaction Effect (Wilks’ Lambda).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect or Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypo. df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race Match / Non Match</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svees with High and Low Racial Identity Development</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Match x Svee Racial Identity Interaction</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2 x 2 MANOVA analysis failed to find significant differences between supervisees with high and low racial identity development, and racially matched and unmatched groups of supervisory dyads on the goal, task and bond of the supervisory working alliance.

Analyses with a Combined Measure of Working Alliance

The next supplemental analysis that was conducted was to examine the effects of race and racial identity on a unitary measure of supervisory working alliance. The decision to explore this aspect was made because correlation analysis showed that the task, bond and goal of the supervisory working alliance were highly correlated with each other (please refer to Appendix K). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for this single and combined measure of supervisory working alliance was .93.

Results of this analysis are presented next. First, group sizes, means, and standard deviations on the single measure of working alliance are presented.
Table 23

Descriptives for Unitary Measure of Supervisory Working Alliance for the 8 Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Identity Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>77.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel High</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>80.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race Match / Non-Match</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Svor – W Svee</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>80.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Svor – POC Svee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>77.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC Svor – W Svee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>78.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC Svor – POC Svee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.25</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>80.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the table above, from a visual examination of the data, it was noted that the mean for the working alliance single measure was the highest for the Parallel High racial identity dyad group \((n = 35, M = 71.22, SD = 5.33)\), and the lowest for the Parallel Low racial identity dyad \((n = 26, M = 65.41, SD = 6.86)\).

On the dimension of race, the group where both supervisor and supervisee were POC in the supervisory dyads had the highest working alliance mean \((n = 4, M = 75.25, SD = 5.36)\). The group where supervisors were POC and supervisees were White had the weakest working alliance \((n = 7, M = 65.71, SD = 8.88)\). The small group sizes in these cases were noted.

In order to test if these differences were statistically significant, a one-way ANOVA was conducted for the four groups formed on the basis of race, and the four groups formed on the basis of racial identity. The results of these analyses are presented next.
Table 24

One-way ANOVA – Racial Matching (4 groups), Racial Identity Interaction (4 groups), and Supervisory Working Alliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>277.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92.45</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>49.83.94</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5261.30</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>633.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>211.29</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4624.58</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in the table above, on the dimension of racial identity, significant differences were noted between the four groups (parallel high, progressive, regressive and parallel low) on the working alliance combined measure. These differences were noted to be highly significant ($p < .01$) and an effect size of between medium and large was noted ($\eta^2 = .12$).

In order to understand if high or low racial identity on the part of supervisors or supervisees influenced the working alliance, a further one-way ANOVA was conducted. This analysis compared supervisees with high racial identity with supervisees with low racial identity, and also compared supervisors with low racial identity with supervisors with high racial identity.

Another one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the matched race group (both supervisor and supervisee POC or White) with the unmatched race group.

Results of these analyses are presented next.
Table 25

One-way ANOVA – Racial Matching (2 groups, Racial Identity Interaction (2 groups of Supervisees and 2 groups of Supervisors), and Supervisory Working Alliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race (Matched &amp; Unmatched)</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5259.92</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5261.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees with High and Low Racial Identity</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>578.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>578.01</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4680.43</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5258.44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors with High and Low Racial Identity</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5189.90</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5258.44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant difference on the supervisory working alliance between the group of supervisees assessed as having high racial identity development by their supervisors, and the group of supervisees assessed as having low racial identity development by their supervisors was found \( (F = 14.20, df = 1, 115), p < .01 \).

No significant difference on working alliance was found between supervisors with high racial identity development and supervisors with low racial identity development, or between the matched race group and the unmatched race group.

Summary

Findings from MANOVA failed to reject the null hypotheses. This statistical analysis showed that:

1. There were no statistically significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel high, parallel low, progressive or regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

2. There were no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both POC) and unmatched races
regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

3. There were no significant interaction effects between the two independent variables of racial identity interaction and racial matching or non-matching.

Supplemental statistical analyses showed a statistically significant difference ($p = < .01$) between the four racial identity groups on a single measure of working alliance, with a medium to large effect size ($\eta^2 = .12$).

Another supplemental statistical analysis showed that the difference in strength of working alliance between two groups of supervisees – those perceived by their supervisors as having low racial identity development and those perceived by their supervisors as having high racial identity development was highly significant ($p = <.01$), and also showed a medium to large effect size ($\eta^2 = .11$).
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between racial matching, racial identity and supervisory working alliance within supervisory dyads. These aspects of the supervisory relationship were examined from the perspective of counseling supervisors. In this chapter, the results of the statistical analyses reported in Chapter Four are discussed. A comprehensive discussion of the overall findings against the null hypotheses is presented, along with a discussion of supplemental analyses. Implications of the study and limitations are presented. Finally, directions for future research in the area are suggested.

In our increasingly multicultural and multiracial environments, race and racial identity are viewed as important factors in the development of effective interpersonal relationships. The supervisory relationship is one such interpersonal relationship where these factors are considered to be influential. It has been noted that despite an awareness of the importance of racial and cultural factors in supervision, insufficient attention has
been paid to them in professional literature and research (Helms & Cook, 1999).

The work of Helms on racial identity interaction (1990) was applied to the supervisory relationship by Cook (1994). Cook discussed the effects of progressive, parallel and regressive supervisor-supervisee racial identity interactions on supervisory relationship, supervisee development, and client welfare. Helms and Cook (1999) noted that in supervisory relationships where the supervisor is at a more advanced status of racial identity development than the supervisee, racial issues are more likely to be discussed openly. Supervisors who do this, model open communication of racial and cultural issues that supervisees can implement in their relationships with clients.

Racial differences between supervisor and supervisee in the supervisory relationship have also been the focus of investigation by several investigators (Vander Kolk, 1974; Cook & Helms, 1988; Fukuyama, 1994; and Duan & Roehlke, 2001). These studies indicated that cross-racial supervision does influence levels of satisfaction, communication, and openness within supervisory dyads.
The current study aimed to investigate the relationships between race, racial identity and supervisory working alliance. Participants were registered supervisors in the state of Ohio. They completed a total of four instruments: a demographic survey, which included questions on the identified race of supervisors and supervisees, an instrument to measure the racial identity of supervisors (WRIAS or PRIAS), an instrument to measure supervisors’ perceptions of the racial identity development of supervisees, and an instrument to measure supervisors’ perceptions of the supervisory working alliance.

Four groups of supervisory dyads were formed on the basis of racial identity interaction: parallel high, progressive, parallel low and regressive groups. Four groups were also formed on the basis of racial matching or non-matching within supervisory dyads: supervisor and supervisee both White, supervisor and supervisee both POC, supervisor White/supervisee POC, and supervisor POC/Supervisee White.
Issues Arising From The Sample

Response Rate

The return rate of 45.43% and the final figure of 34% of useable questionnaires from a total of 350 sent out was low, and raised some questions regarding non-response. Possible reasons for non-response included the length of the questionnaires, the time required to participate, the element of choice of questionnaires required of participants, lack of interest in the topic, or discomfort with racial and/or racial identity issues.

Two participants who opted not to participate noted that they worked in rural areas with no racial diversity. Therefore they did not believe that their participation would provide information of value in a study examining influences of race and racial identity on the supervisory process. One participant noted objections to using the terms “Anglo Americans” and “Whites” interchangeably, and voiced the opinion that all Whites are not Anglos. So it is possible that some non-response could have resulted from participants having objections to the way in which certain items were phrased.
Gender Ratio

In the study, the male to female ratio was 39:80. Since the OCWSB does not maintain data on gender of registered counseling supervisors, it was difficult to ascertain representativeness of this sample from the source. One recent study on supervision in Ohio found a male to female ratio of 45.6:54.4 (Tromski, 2000). An alternative explanation for a higher number of females in the sample could simply be that more women than men chose to respond to the call for participants.

Gender was not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables: the task, goal, bond, or the unitary measure of supervisory working alliance.

Race

Among participating supervisors, Whites comprised 90.8% and African Americans comprised 8.4 % of the sample. A higher number of African Americans were reported to be supervisees (20.2%). The percentage of White supervisees was 78.2%. A previous study on supervisees in Ohio had a much lower figure of African American supervisees (1.4%) with 95.1% White (Tromski, 2000). The higher percentage of African American participation in the current study might
have resulted from the over-sampling by a factor of two in racially diverse counties in Ohio. Additionally, higher numbers of African Americans may have self-selected into the study because of an interest in the topic being researched.

Racial break-down of the sample indicated very little diversity with the POC sub-sample. In the supervisors group, there was one supervisor who self-identified as Hispanic/Latino. In the supervisees group, two supervisees were identified as being of Middle Eastern backgrounds. The data suggests that racial diversity amongst counseling supervisors and supervisees in the state of Ohio is still very much a case of two racial groups, Whites and African Americans.

Age

The mean age of participants was 50.45, with the youngest participant being 31 years old, and the oldest being 74 years old. The mean age of supervisor participants in a previous study in Ohio was 44.38 years (Tromski, 2000). We cannot be sure if more older than younger prospective participants chose to participate in the study. However, it does not seem unlikely that the youngest
participant was 31 years given that counseling supervisors first complete graduate training to become counselors, and then require a further two years of practice as counselors before they can undertake supervision of trainee counselors.

Age was not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables: the task, goal, bond, and the unitary measure of supervisory working alliance.

Supervision Experience

Supervisors in the study appeared to range from novice supervisors (6 months of experience) to highly experienced (40 years of experience). The mean amount of supervision experience in the current sample was 10.98 years. This range of supervision experience does raise the question of whether more experienced supervisors have the ability and skills to foster a stronger working alliance than novice supervisors. This was not borne out in the current study however. Correlation analysis showed no significant correlation between supervision experience and any of the dependent variables: the task, goal, bond, or the unitary measure of supervisory working alliance.
Specific Training in Multicultural Issues

Twenty-four participants omitted the question on multicultural issues in supervision. It was unclear whether these twenty-four participants omitted the question (of reporting specific training they received in multicultural issues in supervision in hours, weeks or months) by oversight, or omitted it because they had no training in multicultural issues in supervision.

Specific training in multicultural issues was not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables: the task, goal, bond, and the unitary measure of supervisory working alliance.

Reliability Analyses of Instruments

In accordance with recommendations made by the developer of the WRIAS (Helms, 2002b) and PRIAS (Helms, 1995b), that users compute their own reliability coefficients for each scale because of the influence of environmental factors on the responses to the scale, these analyses were carried out in the current study. Reliability levels on some of the sub-scales of the WRIAS and PRIAS were noted to be low.

On the WRIAS, Cronbach’s alpha reliability
coefficients for the sub-scales of Contact ($\alpha = .40$, $M = 29.37$, $SD = 3.92$), Pseudo-Independence ($\alpha = .34$, $M = 35.21$, $SD = 3.47$), and Autonomy ($\alpha = .45$, $M = 35.14$, $SD = 4.11$) were of concern. Previous research has shown lower reliability coefficients for the Contact subscale $\alpha = .53$ (Helms and Carter, 1990a), and $\alpha = .51$ (Constantine, 2002). Constantine (2002) commented on the suboptimal reliability coefficients of the Contact subcale. These studies were conducted on an earlier version of the instrument. However the low coefficients for the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy sub-scales in the current study are a further concern.

Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients calculated for the combined Phase I and Phase II scores were of a more acceptable level ($\alpha = .77$ and .79 respectively). These alpha levels are slightly higher than the alpha levels found in the previous study utilizing combinations of sub-scales into Phase I and Phase II of racial identity: $\alpha = .73$ and .70 for WRIAS Phase I and WRIAS Phase II respectively (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997).

In the case of the PRIAS, no psychometric information on this measure has been published to date. Helms (1995b) suggests that users conduct their own psychometric
evaluations including reliability studies and factor analysis of the sub-scales. Mean subscale scores may be utilized in order to perform subscale comparisons.

Alpha coefficients for each of the sub-scales in the POC follow: Conformity / Pre-encounter $\alpha = .29$; Dissonance $\alpha = .69$; Immersion-Resistance $\alpha = .81$; and Internalization $\alpha = .57$. Only one of the four scales obtained a reliability coefficient more than .80, and the alpha for the Conformity/Pre-encounter status was noted to be of definite concern. Alpha coefficients for the combined POC Phase I items and POC Phase II items were $\alpha = .60$ and $\alpha = .66$.

Low numbers of POC participants in the current sample are an indication that the alpha coefficients may not be well estimated. There were only 11 supervisors of color in the current study. Ten of these identified as African American and one as Hispanic/Latino. Alpha coefficients for POC Phase I and Phase II in an earlier study (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997) were .86 and .76. However this previous study utilized an earlier version of the instrument (Helms & Carter, 1990b) than was used in the current study.

The WAI-S (Bahrick, 1989) is a self-report instrument
that assesses supervisors' perceptions of the quality of
the supervisory alliance. The instrument yields data on
three sub-scales: goal, task and bond. In a previous study,
very high alpha coefficients (α = .93) were obtained for
all three sub-scales (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu,
1997). Alpha coefficients for the three sub-scales in the
current investigation were not as high, but were
acceptable: task α = .83, bond α = .74, and goal α = .87.

Correlations Among Sub-scales on Research Instruments

Positive correlations on the WRIAS sub-scales showed
some support for combining scores from the Pseudo-
Independence, Immersion-Emersion and Autonomy sub-scales
into a Phase II White racial identity attitude scale:

Pseudo Independence with Autonomy (r = .51, p < .05),
Pseudo Independence with Immersion-Emersion (r = .38, p <
.05), and Immersion-Emersion with Autonomy (r = .50, p <
.05). However, it was also noted that the contact subscale
(a Phase I subscale) had low, positive correlations with
two Phase II sub-scales: Pseudo-Independence (r = .37, p <
.05), and Autonomy (r = .21, p < .05). It is possible that
participants in the current study may have taken a
different view of some items than the developer had in
mind. This phenomenon has been discussed in the literature as a potential weakness of survey research (Schwarz, 1999).

On another instrument, the WAI-S, significant correlations were found between the three sub-scales, task, goal and bond of the supervisory working alliance: task with bond \((r = .68, p < .05)\), task with goal \((r = .88, p < .05)\), and bond with goal \((r = .71, p < .05)\). These high and positive correlations were considered to support the decision to use the working alliance as a unitary measure in the supplemental analyses.

Discussion of Analyses to Test Null Hypotheses

A 4 x 4 MANOVA was selected as the analyses to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads with parallel-high, parallel-low, progressive and regressive racial identity interactions regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

2. There are no significant differences among supervisory dyads of matched race (supervisor and supervisee both White or both People of Color) and unmatched races regarding the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.
3. There is no significant interaction effect between racial identity interaction and racial match/non-match on the dependent variables – the goals, tasks and emotional bond of the supervisory working alliance.

MANOVA failed to reject the null hypotheses. Although the means on the sub-scales of the task, bond and goal components of the four groups formed on the racial identity dimension, and the four groups formed on the racial matching dimension showed differences, these differences were not found to be significant.

Various reasons might have contributed to this outcome. First of all, this study surveyed the perceptions of supervisors regarding racial matching, racial identity, and supervisory working alliance, while a previous study explored these aspects from the perspective of supervisees (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). It is possible that supervisors are a more homogeneous group than supervisees, and thus do not demonstrate as much variability on racial identity as do supervisees. It is also possible that the anticipated differences were just not present in the current sample.

Other possible reasons for not finding significant
differences between the groups included the 34% response rate, use of a random sampling method, small size of some of the supervisory dyad groups, lack of racial diversity within the sample and within the POC group, and social desirability in responses. Each of these points will be discussed next.

There was a less than 50% response rate from prospective participants (45.43%). Of the 159 out of 350 questionnaire sets that were returned, 40 were not completed. Responses from a total of 119 (34%) participants were analyzed for the study.

Racial diversity was higher for supervisees than supervisors in the current study. However, for both supervisors and supervisees, there was little within group variability with the POC subgroups. Of the 119 participants, there were only 11 POC supervisors. Ten of these POC supervisors were African American and one self identified as Hispanic or Latino. Among the 119 supervisees, 93 were White and 24 were African American. The only other representation from any other racial group other than African Americans among the POC supervisees was two supervisees believed to be from the Middle East.
Perhaps more significant results might have been obtained if the instrument used in the study was the racial identity attitude scale (Helms & Parham, 1996) developed specifically for use with African Americans (instead of the broader POC instrument).

Resulting from the lack of racial diversity in the sample, the size of two of the groups formed on the basis of race was extremely small. The POC-POC group (both supervisor and supervisee POC) comprised only 4 supervisory dyads and the POC-White group (POC supervisor and White supervisee) consisted of 7 supervisory dyads. These small sizes of groups resulted in a reduction of power.

Social desirability bias might have influenced results. Although Helms (1995a) found no correlation between the racial identity attitude scale and social desirability response bias, it seemed very unlikely that participants would be unaware of the intent behind many of the items. For example, in the WRIAS, item 15 is worded thus: “A Black person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.” In the WAI-S, supervisors who agreed with (for example) item 35: “________ doesn’t know what to expect as a result of supervision” might have felt
that by doing so they were admitting that their supervision was lacking and that they were not meeting the needs of the supervisee.

Findings in the current study were contrary to findings in the previous study on racial matching, racial identity interactions and supervisory working alliance. Ladany, Brittan-Powell and Pannu (1997) found in their study of supervisees’ perceptions of racial matching, racial identity and supervisory working alliance that racial identity interactions did influence the strength of the supervisory working alliance. Parallel high racial identity dyads had the strongest supervisory working alliance followed by progressive, parallel low and regressive dyads in that order. This study showed that from the perspective of supervisees racial identity is influential in the supervisory relationship. However, the current study showed no strong associations between racial matching and racial identity interaction, and supervisory working alliance from the perspective of supervisors by conducting MANOVA (the analysis used in the previous research). The idea that perspectives of supervisors and supervisees might differ is quite plausible, given likely
differences in education, experience, and training between these two groups.

Counseling supervision literature has identified several individual and developmental differences that play a part in the supervisory relationship. These include gender issues, cognitive or learning styles of supervisees, personality of supervisor and supervisee, and developmental differences in supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). One or more of these factors may have played a more dominant role than racial matching or racial identity interaction in this sample of supervisors.

Discussion of Supplemental Analyses

Supplemental analyses were carried out to explore the data further. Since some of the groups in the original design were small, a decision to collapse the four groups into two was made. On the race dimension, the matched race group \((n = 89)\) was formed by combining the POC-POC and White-White groups, and the unmatched race group \((n = 29)\) was formed by combining the POC-White and White-POC groups.

Similarly on the racial identity dimension, two groups were formed based on supervisees’ level of racial identity development. The supervisees with high racial identity
development group was formed by combining the parallel high and regressive groups \((n = 63)\), and the supervisees with low racial identity development group was formed by combining the parallel low and regressive groups \((n = 54)\). Two groups of supervisors were also formed on the basis of high and low racial identity development.

Differences in means of these sets of two groups on the task, bond and goal sub-scales were noted on the basis of a visual examination of the data. However, a 2 x 2 MANOVA conducted with these combined groups found that these differences were not significant.

The other supplemental analysis that was run was conducted to examine the effects of race and racial identity on a unitary (combined goal, task and bond sub-scales) measure of supervisory working alliance. In comparing the means, it was noted that the parallel high group had the strongest working alliance \((M = 71.22, SD = 5.33)\), and the parallel low group had the weakest working alliance \((M = 65.41, SD = 6.86)\). On the racial matching dimension, the POC supervisor – POC supervisee dyad group had the strongest working alliance \((M = 75.25, SD = 5.36)\), and the POC supervisor – White supervisee had the weakest working alliance \((M = 65.71, SD = 8.88)\).
Results on a one-way ANOVA found a significant difference between the groups formed on the basis of racial identity development (progressive, parallel high, parallel low, and regressive) on the strength of the supervisory working alliance: $F (3, 113) = 5.16, p = .01, \eta^2 = .12$. The effect size was large. Thus when the task, bond and goal components of the supervisory working alliance were considered separately, there was no significant difference found. But when a single measure of supervisory working alliance was used (goal + task + bond), a significant difference between the progressive, parallel high, parallel low, and regressive supervisory relationships was found. No significant differences on supervisory working alliance for the four groups on the racial matching dimension were found (White-White, POC-POC, POC-White, White-POC). These findings are consistent with the findings of Ladany, Brittan-Powell and Pannu (1997), and the theoretical contention of Helms (1990) that racial identity attitudes rather than race alone are influential in interpersonal relationships.

The four groups on the racial matching and racial identity interaction were combined into two groups for
further analysis. A one-way ANOVA conducted to compare the mean supervisory working alliance for the matched race group (White-White + POC-POC) and the unmatched race group (POC-White + White-POC) failed to find any significance. A one-way ANOVA conducted to compare the mean supervisory working alliance for supervisees with high racial identity (parallel high + regressive) with supervisees with low racial identity (parallel low + progressive) showed a highly significant difference between these two groups F (1, 115) = 14.20, p = < .01, η² = .11.

This last finding raises an interesting issue regarding the importance of perceptions of supervisors. Since supervisors were responsible for rating the racial identity development of supervisees', these findings show that when these perceptions were positive, the supervisory working alliance was also perceived favorably by supervisors. In other words, supervisors who thought that their supervisees were more highly developed in terms of racial identity also thought that the supervisory working alliance was strong. Conversely, supervisors who thought that their supervisees were less developed in terms of racial identity also thought that the supervisory alliance was less strong. It may not then be racial identity
development per se, but rather the perceptions of supervisors that influence the strength of the supervisory working alliance.

Results from the analyses conducted raise some interesting implications of the study. These will be discussed next.

Implications of Findings

Theoretical Implications

Findings in the current study support the theoretical position (Helms & Cook, 1999) that racial identity is a salient dynamic in supervisor–supervisee interactions. Findings in the current study did not indicate that racial matching played a key role in these interactions. Supervision models in use at the present time have not included racial identity interaction and racial matching in their formulation. A revisiting of existing models of supervision, incorporating race and racial identity variables might help develop more multiculturally effective models. Such models would provide an avenue for supervisors to carry out one of the multicultural supervision competencies suggested by Haynes, Corey and Moulton (2003): explore racial dynamics in supervisory relationships
Dynamics of racial identity interaction in the supervisory relationship have been examined in this and previous studies mainly through the lens of Helms (1995a, 1995b) racial identity theories. A further theoretical understanding of these dynamics in supervisory relationships may be achieved by assessing and measuring racial identity attitudes using a variety of instruments that are currently available. A starting point to review some of these more recent and population-specific theories of racial identity is the review by Fischer and Moradi (2001).

Findings from this study raise the issue of different perceptions of racial and racial identity issues held by supervisors. Future theory development in supervision may benefit from focusing on how perceptions of supervisors and supervisees may be different, and what factors shape these perceptions. Trust, self-disclosure, transference and countertransference, and other factors suggested by Haynes, Corey and Moulton (2003) to be influential in shaping supervisor–supervisee relationships may also be influential in shaping their perceptions of each other.
**Applied Implications**

Training in supervision is seen as essential to enabling supervisors make sound judgments about their supervisory practices (Haynes, Corey and Moulton, 2003). Race and racial identity dynamics raise several implications for the training of supervisors.

If racial identity interactions are associated with the supervisory working alliance, it is recommended that all supervisors be intentional about understanding different racial identity models and exploring their own racial identity development and that of their supervisees. This may require supervisees to seek out workshops and continuing education opportunities. A clear understanding of predominant ways of thinking at different statuses of racial identity development or the different information processing strategies utilized at each status of development (Helms, 1995a) would be particularly helpful for supervisors to build on areas of strength with supervisees and work through areas of conflict.

Findings in the current study point to the importance of perceptions of supervisors, and raise implications for practice of supervision. The study identified a link
between supervisors perceiving that their supervisee was at a less advanced status of racial identity development and correspondingly perceiving that the supervisory working alliance was not as robust as it could be. Supervisors must be very aware that their perceptions of supervisees are powerful forces in the shaping of the supervisory working alliance. Supervisors may benefit from training in identifying and overcoming possible errors in perception.

Supervisors must be cognizant that if racial identity interactions are low and supervisory working alliances are weak, the learning of supervisees may be adversely affected. This lack of learning may then be taken by supervisees into counselor-client interactions, to the detriment of future clients (Helms & Cook, 1999).

Limitations

Finding and implications have been considered with an awareness of the limitations of the study. Foremost amongst these were issues of external validity and generalizability. Since this study drew on a sample of supervisors from a single state in the Midwest, it could at best, provide a snapshot of supervisor-supervisee interactions in that state. Generalizing these findings to
supervision relationships in other parts of the country is not possible.

Generalizability to more racially diverse populations was also limited because the sample was not very racially diverse. In the sample, there was very little diversity in the POC group – no participant supervisees were Hispanic / Latino, Asian or Native American. No participating supervisors were Asian or Native American, and only one identified as Hispanic / Latino. Although POC share many common experiences, African Americans in the United States have a unique history, and it is possible that the POC instrument did not adequately cover all aspects of their racial identity development.

Low reliability coefficients on some of the sub-scales of the WRIAS and the PRAIS were another limitation noted in the current study. Responses on some items indicated that consistent with Schwartz (1999) views on the limitations of survey instruments, participants might have answered in ways that they believed were more acceptable, or they might have interpreted items on instruments in ways that were different from those intended by the scale authors. Results might have also been affected by social desirability
response bias - supervisors being unwilling to acknowledge that their racial identity statuses might require further development or that the working alliance that they shared with supervisees was less than ideal in terms of the goal, bond and task elements. Participants in the current study were counseling supervisors with several years of professional training. As such they are likely to have been more sophisticated in their understanding of the instruments and the intent behind questions than samples of students.

The design of the study called for supervisors to assess the racial identity development of their supervisees and the supervisory working alliance. It thus depended solely on supervisors’ perceptions, and no corresponding information was available from supervisees themselves.

Finally, the nature of the study only allowed noting of associations between racial matching, racial identity and supervisory working alliance. It was not possible to attribute causation or direction to any of these variables, or say, for example, that progressive or parallel high racial identity interactions caused a stronger supervisory working alliance. It could be equally possible that a
strong supervisory working alliance caused supervisors to perceive supervisees’ racial identity development in a favorable light.

Directions for Future Research

The current study focused on the perceptions of counseling supervisors regarding racial identity (of themselves and their supervisees) and supervisory working alliance. It is suggested that researchers in future obtain perspectives of both supervisors and supervisees directly from them and about themselves (rather than about each other).

Widening the scope of future studies to incorporate supervisors from around the country, rather than a single state would yield more generalizable results. It is also recommended that future studies be conducted with more racially diverse populations. The current sample obtained very limited numbers of POC-POC and POC-White supervisor-supervisee dyads. It would be interesting and helpful for future researchers to focus on these types of dyads.

Examining relationships between racial identity interaction and other supervision dynamics besides supervisory working alliance may yield interesting additions to the literature. Examining constructs related
to racial identity (such as acculturation and ethnic identity) might also prove fruitful.

In the current study, no significant relationships were found between racial matching in supervisory dyads and supervisory working alliance. Future researchers may wish to explore potential relationships between racial matching and other variables such as satisfaction with supervision.

Future researchers may wish to utilize a wider variety of racial identity instruments other than the instruments developed by Helms. Using more specific instruments for different POC groups, such as the Black racial identity attitude scale for African Americans, and the Asian identity attitude scale for Asians (Fischer & Moradi, 2001) might provide specific input into particular dynamics present in different racial subgroups.

Conclusion

This study provided an addition to the literature by focusing on the perspectives of practicing supervisors regarding race, racial identity and supervisory working alliance. It provided an opportunity to empirically examine the theoretical position that race and racial identity are valuable constructs to consider in the realm of multicultural supervision (Helms & Cook, 1999).
Findings of the study failed to find any statistically significant associations between racial matching in supervisory dyads and the supervisory working alliance. This was the case when the task, goal and bond aspects of the supervisory working alliance were considered separately through MANOVA, as well as when the working alliance was utilized as a single measure using ANOVA.

By contrast, statistically significant relationships between racial identity interaction and supervisory working alliance were found in the current study. There were significant differences between four groups of supervisory dyads formed on the basis of racial identity interaction (progressive, parallel high, parallel low and regressive) on a unitary measure of supervisory working alliance. Significant differences were also found between two groups of supervisory dyads formed on the basis of perceptions of supervisors regarding supervisee racial identity development (supervisees with high racial identity development versus supervisees with low racial identity development).

These findings lends credence to the position that race alone may not be as important a factor as racial
identity in influencing interpersonal interactions (Helms 1990). Within supervisory dyads, it may be the perceptions and reactions toward race of both supervisor and supervisee that may determine the strength of the supervisory working alliance, and ultimately the efficacy of the supervisory relationship to foster a climate conducive to the growth and development of supervisees as professionals.
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Nicholas Ladany, Ph.D.
Counseling Psychology Program Coordinator
LeHigh University
Iacocca Hall, Room A-227
111 Research Drive
Bethlehem, PA 18015

Dear Dr. Ladany

I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at Ohio University. At the present time, I am working on my dissertation proposal, and I am writing to request your assistance. Your research work in the arena of counseling supervision has created an interest in me to take one of your studies and adapt it.

The study I am referring to is: "The Influence of Supervisory Racial Identity Interaction and Racial Matching on the Supervisory Working Alliance and Supervisee Multicultural Competence" (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). My plan is to recreate this study from the perspective of supervisors, rather than supervisees. In order to do this, I require your permission to adapt the measure created for the 1997 study, Perceptions of Supervisor Racial Identity (PSRI), so that it assesses the perceptions of supervisee racial identity instead.

I am eager to work on my dissertation during summer, and for this reason, I would greatly appreciate it if you would send me the original PSRI and your written permission to adapt it as soon as you are able to. Any additional references or suggestions that you might have would be most appreciated. My mailing address is:

Christine Bhat
Counselor Education Program,
201 McCracken Hall,
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Thank you for your assistance and the great contribution your work has made to the counseling supervision literature
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Christine Bhat
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Nick Ladany

Nicholas Ladany, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
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Counseling Psychology Program
Department of Education and Human Services
College of Education
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, PA 18015
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Correspondence Regarding the Use of the

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory
Dear Dr Bahrick

I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at Ohio University. At the present time, I am working on my dissertation proposal, (Committee Chair – Dr Tom Davis), and I am writing to request your assistance. I would like to utilize the measure of supervisory working alliance created by you.

My plan is to study the influence of racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance (from the perspective of supervisors). I hope to build on a previous study that studied the same factors from the perspective of supervisees (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). In this previous study your measure of supervisory working alliance was utilized. I would appreciate it if you could send me a copy of the instrument Working Alliance Inventory (for Supervisors and Trainees) and the scoring instructions.

I am eager to work on my dissertation during summer, and for this reason, I would greatly appreciate it if you would send me these instruments with your written permission to use them in my study as soon as you are able to. Any additional references or suggestions that you might have would be most appreciated. My mailing address is:

Christine Bhat
Counselor Education Program,
201 McCracken Hall,
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Thank you for your assistance and contribution to the profession.

Sincerely

Christine Bhat
Subject: Fwd: WAI for supervisors and trainees
Date: Tue, 11 Jun 2002 13:31:32 -0500
From: Audrey Bahrick <audrey-bahrck@uiowa.edu>
To: csbhat@frognet.net

Dear Christine,
This message can serve as written permission to use the Working Alliance Inventory (for supervisors and trainees) in your research. I am putting copies of the instruments as well as scoring instructions in the mail today. Let me know if I can be of further help.
Sincerely,
Audrey Bahrick
Appendix E

Special instructions to participants (regarding choice of instruments)
INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS

- **ALL PARTICIPANTS** MUST COMPLETE **BOTH** QUESTIONNAIRES THAT ARE ON **WHITE PAPER**
  1. Demographic Questionnaire
  2. Supervision Research Questionnaire – Supervisor Form

- **YOU MUST** **CHOOSE ONE** QUESTIONNAIRE (**EITHER PURPLE OR PINK**) **BASED ON HOW YOU SELF-IDENTIFY RACIALLY**

  - **IF YOU RACIALLY SELF IDENTIFY AS **NOT WHITE** (African American, African, Asian, Latino/Latina, Native American, or other Visible Racial/Ethnic Minority Group), COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON **PINK PAPER**

  **OR**

  - **IF YOU RACIALLY SELF IDENTIFY AS **WHITE**, COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON **PURPLE PAPER**

- **YOU MUST** **CHOOSE ONE** QUESTIONNAIRE (**EITHER BLUE OR YELLOW**) **BASED ON THE RACE OF YOUR SUPERVISEE**

  - **IF YOU BELIEVE YOUR SUPERVISEE IS **WHITE**, COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON **BLUE PAPER**

  **OR**

  - **IF YOU BELIEVE YOUR SUPERVISEE IS **NOT WHITE** (African American, African, Asian, Latino/Latina, Native American, or other Visible Racial/Ethnic Minority Group), COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON **YELLOW PAPER**

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!
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*Letter to Prospective Participants*
October 12, 2002

Dear Counseling Supervisor

We are writing to request your participation in a study designed to enhance our understanding of the effects of interpersonal and racial dynamics within the supervision dyad. We appreciate the time and effort required to participate, and thank you for your willingness to contribute to research in the arena of counseling supervision.

This project is focused on the perspectives of counseling supervisors and data gathered through your participation is a vital element of the research process. Participation in this study is voluntary and will require approximately 20 minutes of your time. If you consent to participate in this study, please follow the instructions provided in the instruments booklet.

In this booklet, you will find four instruments that require completion by you. For two of the instruments, you will be asked to select the correct form of the instrument based on your own race and the race of your supervisee. For instruments that require you to comment on your supervisee, please select the supervisee with whom you have most recently completed supervision requirements. Your responses are requested within 2 weeks of receipt of the booklet. A follow-up reminder post-card will be sent to you 17 days from the date of this letter if a response is not received.

You are requested to complete the questionnaires and return them to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed. Please do not put your name on any of the questionnaires. There are no known potential risks to you as participants, and all efforts are being made to preserve anonymity of responses. No individual data will be reported in this study and response envelopes will be coded to facilitate follow-up with non-respondents. As soon as the questionnaire booklet is received, it will be separated from the envelope so that no link will be maintained between your identity and your responses. The envelopes will be destroyed as soon as we mark off the code on them against the master list, which will be held only by the first researcher.

If you would like a copy of findings to be sent to you upon completion, please send an email request to csbhat@frognet.net providing your postal address or your email address. For any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Christine Suniti Bhat by email (csbhat@frognet.net) or by telephone at (740) 594-0524. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, at (740) 593-0664.

Once again, thank you for your willingness to contribute your views to the development of research in counseling supervision.

Sincerely

Christine Suniti Bhat M.A., M. Psych
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education
Ohio University

Thomas E. Davis, Ph.D., LPCC
Professor, Counselor Education
Ohio University
Appendix G

Follow-up Post card to Participants
Dear Counseling Supervisor

Two weeks ago you received a packet requesting you to participate in a study designed to enhance understanding of the effects of interpersonal and racial dynamics within the supervision dyad. Should you wish to participate, you are requested to complete the questionnaires and return them to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided in the packet sent to you earlier.

We understand that you are busy people, and would truly appreciate your participation in this study.

Sincerely

Christine Suniti Bhat M.A., M. Psych Thomas E. Davis, Ph.D., LPCC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education Professor, Counselor Education
Ohio University Ohio University
Appendix H

Follow-up Letter to Participants
Dear Counseling Supervisor

We are writing again to request your participation in a study designed to enhance our understanding of the effects of interpersonal and racial dynamics within the supervision dyad. The first request was sent to you approximately one month ago. We appreciate the time and effort required to participate, and thank you for your willingness to contribute to research in the arena of counseling supervision.

This project is focused on the perspectives of counseling supervisors and data gathered through your participation is a vital element of the research process. Participation in this study is voluntary and will require approximately 20 – 30 minutes of your time. If you consent to participate in this study, please follow the instructions provided in the instruments booklet.

In this booklet, you will find four instruments that require completion by you. For two of the instruments, you will be asked to select the correct form of the instrument based on your own race and the race of your supervisee. For instruments that require you to comment on your supervisee, please select the supervisee with whom you have most recently completed supervision requirements. Your responses are requested within 2 weeks of receipt of this booklet.

You are requested to complete the questionnaires and return them to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed. Please do not put your name on any of the questionnaires. There are no potential risks to you as participants, and all efforts are being made to preserve anonymity of responses. No individual data will be reported in this study and response envelopes will be coded to facilitate follow-up with non-respondents. As soon as the questionnaire booklet is received, it will be separated from the envelope so that no link will be maintained between your identity and your responses. The envelopes will be destroyed as soon as we mark off the code on them against the master list, which will be held only by the first researcher.

If you would like a copy of findings to be sent to you upon completion, please send an email request to csbhat@frognet.net providing your postal address or your email address. For any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Christine Suniti Bhat by email (csbhat@frognet.net) or by telephone at (740) 593-0524. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, at (740) 593-0664.

Once again, thank you for your willingness to contribute your views to the development of research in counseling supervision.

Sincerely

Christine Suniti Bhat M.A., M. Psych  Thomas E. Davis, Ph.D., LPCC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education  Professor, Counselor Education
Ohio University      Ohio University
Appendix I

Demographic Questionnaire
Please complete this demographic survey. If you do not know the exact answer to a question, please give an estimate. All responses will be kept confidential. You will have to either check the correct box, or fill in the blanks. Thank you.

- Your gender is (check one):  Male □  Female □
- Your age is _________ years
- Level of Education:  Masters □  Doctorate □  Other □
- Supervision experience:  _________ years and / or _________ months
- Specific Training in Multicultural Issues in Supervision:  hours ____________
  (or) weeks ____________ (or) months ____________
- The racial / ethnic group you self-identify with is (please check one):
  Caucasian/White □  African American/Black □
  Hispanic/Latino □  Native American/American Indian □
  Asian American/Pacific Islander □  Biracial (please specify) □
  Other □ (please specify). This may include a combination of the preceding categories or an unnamed category. _______________________________________
- The race/ethnicity of your supervisee is
  Caucasian/White □  African American/Black □
Hispanic/Latino □ Native American/American Indian □

Asian American/Pacific Islander □ Biracial (please specify) □

Other □ (please specify). This may include a combination of the preceding categories or an unnamed category. _______________________________________

- Write the percentage (from 0 to 100) of people in your last work environment who were of the racial/ethnic groups given below. (Make your best estimate)

  ______% Asian/Pacific Islander  ________% Hispanic/Latino
  ______% African American/Black _________% Native American/American Indian
  ______% Caucasian/White  _____________% Biracial (Please specify)
  ______% Other (please specify) _______________________________________

- Write the percentage (from 0 to 100) of people in your current work environment who are of the racial/ethnic groups given below. (Make your best estimate)

  ______% Asian/Pacific Islander  ________% Hispanic/Latino
  ______% African American/Black _________% Native American/American Indian
  ______% Caucasian/White  _____________% Biracial (Please specify)
  ______% Other (please specify) _______________________________________

- How would you describe your socioeconomic status?

  ______________________________________
APPENDIX J

Percentage of participants who responded to the question on racial break-down of people in last work environment, current work environment, and mean levels of participation reported for each racial group.
Table J1

Percentage of participants who responded to the question on racial break-down of people in last work environment, current work environment, and mean levels of participation reported for each racial group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Reported in last work environment</th>
<th>n number who responded</th>
<th>% of sample who responded</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>L.P.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42.86 %</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49.58 %</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American / Black</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80.67 %</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/ American Indian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.13 %</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.93 %</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.21 %</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: L.P. = Level of participation.
Table J2

*Number of Participants Who Responded to the Percentages of People of Different Racial Groups at their Current Place of Employment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Groups</th>
<th>No. who Answered this Question</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>M %</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>0-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American / Black</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>23.01</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.07</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>1-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

Correlations between Subscales on Research Instruments
Table K1

Correlations (Pearson) between sub-scales on the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIAS Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Reint</th>
<th>Pseudo</th>
<th>Immer-Em</th>
<th>Auto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reint</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immer-Em</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 108

Correlations rounded to the nearest hundredth

* p < .05 (Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2-tailed).

Key:

Con = Contact

Pseudo = Pseudo Independence

Dis = Disintegration

Immer-Em = Immersion-Emersion

Reint = Reintegration

Auto = Autonomy
Table K2

*Correlations (Pearson) between sub-scales on the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIAS Sub-Scales</th>
<th>Conform</th>
<th>Dissonance</th>
<th>Immersion</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity/Pre-Encoun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Resistance</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 11

Correlations rounded to the nearest hundredth

* p < .05 (Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2-tailed).
### Table K3

Correlations (Pearson) between sub-scales on the Working Alliance Inventory – Supervisor Scale (WAI-S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAI-S Scales</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 118

Correlations rounded to the nearest hundredth

\[ p < .05 \text{ (Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2-tailed).} \]