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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The Role and Function of Counseling Supervision

Supervision is defined as the facilitation of a counselor’s professional and personal growth, whether through assisting in the acquisition of knowledge or the refinement of skills. It is the process of encouraging counselor development as one strives to increase competency within the profession (Bradley & Kottler, 2001; Holloway, 1997). The course of supervision should be one that challenges, stimulates and encourages a counselor’s proficiency, while taking into consideration personal attributes that may impede on the counseling process (Bradley & Kottler). To do this effectively, supervisors must display competency as a clinician, receive advance training in the area of supervision and be aware of their personal attributes that may obstruct the supervisory role (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Border, 2001).

Professional organizations have taken further steps to clarify the role and function of supervision. The Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (1995) defines supervision as the monitoring of the counselor and client (i.e., clinical performance, professional
development and client welfare), encouraging ethical compliances and evaluating performance and potential. Several models of supervision development have been proposed, as supervisors gain experience, through years of service and training, they are better able to accomplish the task set forth by governing bodies.

Supervisor Development and Focus

Hess’ Model of Supervision

Hess’ (1986) created a three-stage model that examines supervisor development. The beginning stage acknowledges that novice supervisors move from counselor identity to supervisor identity. This stage is marked with anxiety as one obtains a sense of self as supervisor. The exploration stage is described as the move from focusing on self to focusing on the supervisee. While the final stage of development, conformation of supervisor identity, is marked by the integration of the supervisor’s personal and professional attributes. While Hess’s model attends to the professional identity development of the supervisor, other models such as the discriminate model (Bernard, 1997) aids the supervisor in assessing counselor skills and determining role assumption.
Bernard’s Discriminate Model

The discriminate training model directs supervisors to attend to one of three focal points during the supervision process, intervention (processing) skills, conceptualization skills and personalization skills. Supervisors must determine the needs of the supervisee and then assume one of three roles, teacher, counselor, or consultant, to address those needs. The success of the supervision process is determined by the supervisor’s ability to recognize supervisees’ skill deficits and assess whether challenges are occurring at the processing, intervention, conceptualization, or personalization skill level (Bradley, Gould, & Parr, 2001). Using the discriminate model also requires the supervisor to be versatile as the needs of the supervisee are continually changing.

Ethical Guidelines

Current research encourages supervisors and supervisee to explore their own socio-cultural background, beliefs and values and their impact on the counseling and supervision relationship (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Sue & Sue, 2003). As the profession moves to train counselors to serve a culturally diverse world, supervisors must also be
prepared to serve culturally diverse counselors. Governing bodies have also recognized the need to address racial and cultural differences in supervision. The National Board of Counselor Certification set forth the Approved Clinical Supervisor Ethical Guidelines (2003), which state that effective supervision should also explore the impact of cultural issues in the counseling and supervision relationship. The American Counseling Association’s Code of Ethics (2005) calls for supervisors to not only be aware of cultural factors but address their influence on the supervisory relationship.

Race and Racial Identity in Supervision

It is necessary for supervisors to be knowledgeable of cultural biases, stereotypes and the influence of race and racial identity on supervisees to avoid miscommunication in the supervision dyad (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Cook, 1994; Sue & Sue, 1999).

Ancis and Ladany (2001) posited that before supervisors can address the personal development of supervisees; supervisors must examine and challenge their own personal values, beliefs and attitudes. If personal attributes are disregarded, they may hinder the supervisor’s ability to provide quality supervision.
Race and racial identity development has had a profound effect on the supervision relationship (Cook, 1994). Researchers have noted its influence on satisfaction in supervision, the supervision working alliance, professional identity, counseling effectiveness, communication styles and power dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; 2004; Cook, 1994; Cook & Helms, 1988; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997).

Furthermore, investigators of race in the supervision triad have found that supervisors who ignore culture within the supervisory relationship are less likely to be prepared to successfully monitor cross cultural counseling dyads (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Supervisees are also more likely to mimic this behavior when treating racially diverse clients.

The Current Study
The current research explores the influence of supervisors’ race and years of supervisory experience on the focus of supervision, particularly the emphasis on intervention (process) skills, professional behavior skills, personalization skills and case conceptualization skills. Research has determined that effective supervision is comprised of assessing the needs and skill level of
supervisees; while setting appropriate learning goals and developing strategies for supervisee and client growth (Borders, 2001). Cook (1994) asserts that racial factors may complicate the process by shaping how supervisors and supervisees communicate, conceptualize and relate to clients and each other.

The race of the supervisor may also present challenges such as unintentional racism, power dynamics, mistrust and miscommunications (Fong & Lease, 1996). Race may impact the focus of supervision and perceived skill deficits of the counselor. In a study presented by Fukuyama (1995) supervisees noted a lack of supervisor cultural awareness, such as misinterpreting supervisee’s culturally consistent behavior, and questioning the supervisee’s ability to interpret culturally relevant client behavior.

It is important for the supervisor to be aware of the impact of race on the focus of supervision. Skill levels and supervisee competency must be considered from a multicultural stance when cross-cultural supervision occurs. Racial dynamics may influence whether racial and cultural issues are discussed in supervision and inadvertently discussed by the counselor in the counseling dyad. Supervisors who model an avoidance of the topic of
race will impact the counselor’s ability and comfort in discussing such topics with clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Helms & Cook, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

This study investigates the influence of race and supervisor’s years of experience on the focus of supervision; specifically, the emphasis on intervention (process) skills, professional behavior skills, personalization skills and case conceptualization skills. Ratings on these constructs provide information that can be used to improve supervisor training and advance the development of counselors in training. While previous research has investigated the effects of race on supervision satisfaction, racial identity interactions, the working alliance and levels of support (Cook & Helms, 1988; Hilton, Russell, Salmi, 1995; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997), outcome research is lacking in the area of supervisor focus.

Research Questions

The recommendation of previous research on the influence of race and the level of supervisory experience lead to the following questions:
a. Does the supervisors’ race influence the focus of supervision within the supervisory dyad?

b. Do supervisors’ years of experience influence the focus of supervision within the supervisory dyad?

i) Do supervisors with more years of experience emphasize higher skill levels (case conceptualization skills or personalization skills) more often than supervisors with fewer years of experience?

ii) Do supervisors with fewer years of experience emphasize lower skill levels (intervention skills or professional behaviors) more often than supervisors with more years of experience?

Additional variables such as gender, age, the number of supervision training hours and multicultural training hours were examined in connection to the focus of supervision.

Research Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study are threefold:

(a) Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years, two to five years, and over five years of
experience when they are compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

(b) Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

(c) Null Hypothesis 3: There is no interaction effect between race and years of supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Independent variables are defined as years of supervisory experience and race, while dependent variables include personalization skills, process skills, conceptualization skills and professional behavior skills.

Significance of the Study

The influence of the supervisory experience on the counseling supervision process is not a new domain. A review of literature found several studies investigating the impact of experience on the supervisory relationships,
work alliance, support, self-efficacy, and supervision satisfaction. However, a paucity of empirical research explores the influence of race and supervisor’s years of experience on the focus of supervision. Investigating this area of study could lead to greater awareness of the impact of race and the expertise of supervisors at various stages in their career, on the supervision process. A comparison of race and expertise may lead to an understanding of supervision dynamics as well as expansion in empirical research in the area of counseling supervision.

Definition of Terms

Counseling Supervision

The Association of Counselor Education and Supervision defines counseling supervision as:

(a) being performed by experienced, successful counselors (supervisors) who have been prepared in the methodology of supervision; (b) facilitating the counselor’s personal and professional development, promoting counselor competencies, and promoting accountable counseling and guidance services and programs; and (c) providing the purposeful function of overseeing the work of counselor trainees or practicing counselors (supervisees) through a set of
supervisory activities that include consultation, counselor training and instruction, and evaluation. (Bradley & Kottler, 2001, p. 4)

Race

The term race, for the purpose of this study, is a visible characteristic that may distinguish the supervisor from other ethnic groups. Race is a social construct used to group individuals based on phenotypes and physical appearance (Schmidt, 2006). While debate within the profession continues on the usefulness of race in empirical research, findings support that visible difference can influence judgment and classification of others (Helms & Cook, 1999; Schmidt, 2006).

A self-identification process was used, allowing participants the freedom to choose a personal classification. As in previous research, People of color includes those who identify as African-American or Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Native American/American Indian, Biracial or Other. The term White was used to describe those who identify as Caucasian/White (Bhat, 2003; Helms, 1995a; Ladany & Friedlander, 1997).
Years of Experience in Supervision

Little research has investigated the level of experience and its impact on the supervision process. Chagnon and Richards (1995) studied the relationship between supervisors’ ability to assess counselor’s development and their levels of experience. Supervisors were grouped by none, low and high levels of experience during the endeavor. The authors concluded that supervisor level of experience was highly correlated with self-efficacy but no significant difference in level of experience was established.

Quarto (2002) divided years of supervisor experience into four levels: level 1 (0-2 years), level 2 (2-5 years), level 3 (6-15 years), level 4 (16-28 years) when investigating issues of control and conflict within the supervisory dyad. The author found a significant difference in the amount of conflict experienced by novice supervisors than their more experienced counterparts.

Stevens, Goodyear & Robertson (1997) examined the influence of experience and training on supervisory stance, emphases, and self-efficacy. Supervisor experience was grouped into three levels: (1) 0-2 years; (2) 2-5 years; (3) over five years. Findings revealed supervisor
experience had a positive correlation on changes in self-efficacy, yet not associated with supervisory emphasis.

Based on this previous research, years of experience was defined as the number of years in service as a counseling supervisor and divided into three levels. The first level describes supervisors with none to two years of experience, the next group was comprised of supervisors with three to five years of experience and the final category includes supervisors with six or more years of experience.

**Supervision Focus**

Supervision focus is expressed as the area of emphasis during the supervision process. Bernard (1997) described focus areas as processing (intervention) skills, professional behavior skills, conceptualization skills and personalization skills.

**Summary**

Conceptual models of supervisory development have received much attention in the last decade. Yet, little descriptive research can be found on the progression of the supervisor as they develop skills, receive training and cultivate their own professional identity. As supervisors gain expertise in the practice of supervision, it is
reasonable to assume there was an increase in competency and a mastery of the supervisor role. Like counseling, the role of supervisor may be convoluted if multicultural training and diversity initiatives are not considered. The aim of this study is to establish whether an association between race, years of experience and the focus of supervision is evident.
CHAPTER II

Counselor Supervision

A review of literature supports the importance of supervision in the counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Bradley & Ladany, 2001; Hess, 1986; Stoltenberg, McNeill & Crethar, 1994; Watkins, 1990; 1994). Supervision has been viewed as a challenging, stimulating and encouraging experience that aids the counselor in reaching higher levels of competency (Bradley & Kottler, 2001). It not only promotes the growth of the counselor, but is necessary for the protection of clients and the profession.

The role of the supervisors, supervisor experience and models of supervisor development must be delineated to understand the complexity of the supervisory dyad. A critical review of the discrimination model of supervision is detailed and examined as a contributing feature to supervisor skill development and goal attainment. Research supporting the integration of multicultural concepts in supervision as an ethical practice will also be discussed. The chapter concludes with an assessment of racial identity development, race, and supervision experience as influences on the areas of focus in supervision.
Bernard and Goodyear (1998) defined supervision as: an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous 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)

The authors contend that supervision is a unique process that focuses on the behavior and evaluation of the supervisee. Other researchers have defined the purpose of supervision as the facilitation of professional and personal development, the promotion of counselor competencies and the promotion of professional accountability (Bradley, 1998). To provide effective service, supervisors must be trained to attend to supervisee’s behaviors and evaluate their abilities.
Models of Supervision

Hess’ Model of Supervisor Development

Hess (1986) depicts a three-stage model of supervisor development. Each stage is hallmarked by the supervisor’s personal and professional growth and identity development. The beginning stage is described as the move from supervisee (peers are fellow students and counselors) to supervisors (peers are prominent figures in the profession and community). This stage usually lacks formal training in supervision and supervisor anxiety is high. One coping strategy commonly used during this stage is the focus on concrete techniques or intervention skills. Attending to these skills may be considered a safe domain as one transitions from counselor to supervisor.

The exploration stage occurs when a supervisor regards supervision as a professional activity and recognizes the impact he or she has on the supervisee. It is common for supervisors in this phase, to modify goals and objectives to meet the learning needs of the supervisee.

Hess (1986) postulates that during the exploration stage of development, supervision regularly focus on case conceptualization skills and conflicts that may occur in
the counseling dyad and less attention is given to impressing the supervisee (p. 252).

Parallel processes among client, counselor and supervisor may gain consideration during this phase. Supervisors gain an awareness of strengths and weakness and eagerly seek training to advance skill level. As the professional identity of the supervisor is solidifying, participating in professional organizations is now seen as an essential component.

The confirmation of the supervisor’s identity stage is characterized by a shift from anxiety associated with the role of supervisor to excitement in the growth and achievements of the supervisee. Evaluation of the supervisee is now a more comfortable and valuable process.

Watkins’ Model of Supervisor Development

Watkins (1990; 1993) also formulated a four stage model of supervisor development from earlier counselor development models. He hypothesized that as supervisors move from novice to expert they must alter their behaviors, thoughts and styles to overcome internal challenges that occur at each level (Stevens, Goodyear & Robertson, 1997). In the first stage, role shock, supervisors are acutely aware of weaknesses. They may experience “impostor
phenomenon” or a lack of confidence in abilities. At this stage, supervisors rely on concrete approaches and little attention is focused on the supervision process.

During the role recovery/transition phase of development, some recognition of strengths and abilities are evident. A sense of supervisor identity is developed and some focus is given to the supervision process. Technique-oriented interventions are set aside and more flexibility in supervision is apparent. Watkins (1990) also suggests that supervisors recognize parallel processes occurring in the relationship, but may lack the confidence to confront these issues.

In the role consolidation stage, the supervisor forms a higher level of self awareness. The role of supervisor and counselor are easily differentiated and a greater degree of openness and competence can be seen in the supervision process (Watkins, 1990). As supervisory challenges occur, the supervisor is more confident in his or her ability to manage dilemmas. The final stage, role mastery, is marked with consistency and assurance in ability and skill level. There is a solid awareness of strengths, weaknesses and the impact of the supervision process on the counselor’s development. Stevens, Goodyear,
and Robertson (1997) describe this stage as “trading a negative self-image and a fear of mistakes for a sense of humor” (p. 75). The developmental process of a supervisor is more than an internal progression to self-awareness. Supervisors must also be able to discern what role (teacher, counselor, or consultant) to assume when addressing the needs of the supervisee. If supervisee skill deficits occur, the supervision process should then focus on these challenges in order to facilitate the growth of the supervisee and to assure the quality of client care. Bernard’s Discrimination Model

The discrimination model provides a concise format to ensure supervisors can be purposeful and proactive in their approach to supervision (Bernard, 1997). The model identifies three focus areas (intervention skills, conceptualization skills and personalization skills) that are salient features of counseling and then directs the supervisor to assume one of three roles (teacher, counselor, or consultant) in addressing the supervisee’s behavior (Bradley, Gould & Parr, 2001). To implement the model, the supervisor identifies deficient behavior(s) and then assumes the role associated with the skills necessary to attend to that focus area. For the purpose of this
study, the three focus areas were detailed and used to conceptualize what may be emphasized in supervision.

Intervention skills (also known as processing skills) are the observable behaviors of the supervisee. These skills include the ability to accurately employ techniques and to create an atmosphere of trust in the counseling relationship. Conceptualization skills address how the counselor understands what occurs in session. This includes the ability to conceptualize client information, determine whether information is essential or inconsequential and identify client themes. Personalization skills are the reflection of each supervisee’s unique contribution to counseling (Bradley, Gould, & Parr, 2001). The use and development of personalization skills are influenced by a counselor’s cultural background, personality, and sensitivity to others.

In the supervision process, supervisors determine if interventions must focus or emphasize less complicated skills, such as greeting the client and applying techniques; moderate skills, such as interpreting and discerning essential and nonessential information; or complex skills, such as incorporating counselor’s personal
style, while not contaminating the counseling process with personal issues.

Bernard (1997) suggests that misinterpretation of personalization skills can easily occur in supervision. Since personalization skills greatly impact client interaction, supervisors must openly discuss their perceptions of the counselor’s ability and style. Culture can also impact the counselor’s skill development and the focus of supervision. For instance, racial and cultural differences may influence client greetings (i.e., the use of eye contact) and choices of therapeutic interventions (i.e., the use of individualistic approaches with a client whose culture values collectivism). A lack of cultural understanding may also lead to supervisors and supervisees misinterpreting client information and themes or engaging in ineffective interactions (Cook, 1994). Understanding the impact of race and other multicultural issues in supervision may increase counselor knowledge of various cultures and create an open environment to discuss ethical and social differences as they pertain to the counseling dyad.
Multicultural Supervision

Vander Kolk (1974) was the first to research the effects of race on the supervision process. The study investigated preconceived beliefs of Black and White supervisees regarding White supervisors. Findings indicated Black supervisees were more likely to negatively anticipate the supervision experience than White supervisees. Although no follow-up studies were indicated, the impact of race on the supervision relationship is evident and the necessity for further research in the area was noted.

Since that time, prominent figures in the field of supervision agree that multicultural issues must be a direct component of the supervision process to provide effective service to supervisees and clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; 2004; Fukuyama, 1994). To achieve this goal, supervisors must be willing to take responsibility to initiate discussions regarding race and cultural issues (Leong & Wagner, 1994). This can not be done successfully if supervisors are without knowledge or preparation.

Supervisor Experience and Cultural Dynamics

Supervision experience and training could play a significant part in how multicultural issues are examined
within the supervision dyad. Bernard (1997) postulates that it is unreasonable to expect supervisors with no training in multicultural awareness or experience in multicultural counseling to be proficient in addressing the needs of supervisees in the supervision dyad. Lack of training and experience may increase the likelihood that supervisors emphasize client similarities and therefore minimize cultural differences (Priest, 1994).

Gatmon et al. (2001) explored whether racial, ethnical, and other cultural variables were discussed in supervision and if these discussions enhanced the supervisory working alliance and levels of satisfaction. The finding suggested that few supervisors (12.5% to 37.9%) initiated racial discussions within the supervisory dyad. Lack of these discussions may lead to misinterpretation of supervisee needs.

Priest (1994) suggests that cultural differences in the communication styles of the supervisor and supervisee may negatively impact the supervisory dyad. He wrote that differences in tone of voice, and other nonverbal expressions (i.e., facial expressions and animated gestures) may hamper the relationship. This misinterpretation of nonverbal behaviors may be more likely
to occur when supervisors have had little or no cross-cultural training.

Theoretically, it is reasonable to consider that these dissimilar cultural styles may also influence the focus of supervision. For example, if a supervisee of color displays animated behaviors that may appear overly assertive or inappropriate to a White supervisor, that supervisor may be more likely to focus on evaluating the behaviors rather than the understanding its cultural context.

Barriers to Effective Supervision

Ryan and Hendricks (1989) examined barriers to effective supervision of Asian and Hispanic social workers by white supervisors. The authors acknowledged five factors that may influence the supervisee’s personal and professional growth in supervision. The first factor, cognitive orientation, is used to describe the perceptions of diverse supervisees. Cognitive orientation considers that some cultures are more likely to attend to nonverbal information than others when conceptualizing a case. Hispanic supervisees may at first perceive supervision a personal relationship and are more likely to self-disclose unwarranted information. Asian supervisees were more likely
to attend to nonverbal information when conceptualizing a client and therefore miss important verbal cues.

The motivation orientation of a supervisee could create a sense of frustration for the supervisor; especially when focusing on personalization and conceptualization skills. Hispanic supervisees may not focus on client themes and view many client circumstances as a product of fate. The authors encourage supervisors to evaluate supervisee behaviors based on subjective cultural factors. They contend that some supervisee behaviors are likely understood by members of a given culture; but, could be considered as a lack of skills by supervisors of different cultures.

The third factor, the communication style of the supervisor, may also be met with passivity in supervision. Supervisees may interpret the talkativeness of other subordinates as attention-seeking behavior and limit the amount of their participation in supervision. If differences in communication styles are not addressed, supervisees are likely to deny the existence of client challenges and appear less accessible in supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). The fourth style noted by Ryan and Hendricks (1989) is the variation in value orientation.
Culturally diverse supervisees may focus on family or group orientation over individualism and hierarchical approaches over egalitarian. The influence of value orientation should be processed within a cultural context so that trainees are able to understand and effectively communicate with clients.

Ryan and Hendricks’ (1989) also found that cultural learning styles, termed sensory orientation, also have a profound effect on the supervisory process. The ability to verbalize ideas and thoughts were deemed difficult for some Asian trainees. Yet, “Hispanic supervisees tended to over talk in supervision and resist writing about interactions, feelings and underlying concepts” (p. 37). The authors recommend that cross-cultural supervisors become knowledgeable in cultural factors that may influence the supervision process. It is through cultural understanding that supervisors were better able to support supervisees in confronting cultural barriers that may impinge on their ability to provide effective interventions.

Bernard & Goodyear (1998) describe the work of Ryan and Hendricks as a generalization of cultural differences that do not address the supervisee as an individual. Although the authors have made general assumptions
regarding Asian and Hispanic supervisees, the essence of their research holds true. Miscommunications, frustrations and inappropriate supervisor interventions may occur if cultural and racial differences are ignored.

The Impact of Race on the Supervisory Process

The ongoing attempt to understand multicultural influences in counseling supervision has gained notoriety over the last two decades. However, most contributions in the area are theoretical in nature with only some support from empirical investigations (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Leong & Wagner, 1994). The available research has mostly focused on the area of support, satisfaction and the working alliance. Only a paucity of empirical research addresses the impact of race on the emphasis and focus of supervision. The following section describes relevant investigations into the influence of race on the supervision process.

Helms (1984) began investigating differences in self evaluations of visible racial/ethnic groups' (VREG) and that of their supervisors (individual and group). She found that White supervisors evaluated supervisee skill levels more negatively than group supervisors and VREG supervisees; particularly, in the area of case
conceptualization and professional development skills. Significant differences in the evaluation of styles of self-expression (language styles and expression of feelings) and cultural value orientations (timing and goal orientation) were found.

Cook and Helms (1988) examined the supervisees’ perception of cross-racial supervision. The sample included African, Latina/Latino, Asian, and Native American (ALANA) supervisees. Findings indicated a difference in the perceptions of cross-racial supervision according to race and gender. Asian, Black, and Latino male supervisees were more satisfied with supervision by White supervisors than were Native American male supervisees. Asian male supervisees were also more satisfied with supervision with White supervisors than female counterparts. Cook and Helms also determined that directive supervision and expertise as a clinician were important themes in ALANA perceptions of the supervisor.

Fukuyama (1994) examined VREG’s classification of critical positive and negative incidents in multicultural supervision. Positive categories included openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and participation in multicultural activities. Questioning of the
supervisee’s abilities when culturally relevant interventions were utilized was noted as negative critical incidents by supervisees. This study was one of the first attempts at allowing the supervisees to define what they believed were the significant aspects of race and culture that may influence the supervision process (Helms & Cook, 1999).

The investigation of race and culture in counseling and counseling supervision not only includes the identification of differences based on racial grouping but also a theoretical framework aimed at understanding cultural similarities and differences in attitudes and behaviors. These racial identity models have assisted the supervision profession in understanding and improving communication across cultures.

Helm’s Racial Identity Development Model

Several racial identity models have shown promise in approaching multicultural issues in counseling (Sue & Sue, 1999; 2003). Helms’ (1984) racial identity model has received much attention in the multicultural literature. Originally, Helms developed two identity models that addressed the racial development of Whites and Blacks. She
later expanded the Black Identity Development model to include all People of Color (POC).

People of Color Racial Identity Development Model

The POC racial identity model is based on the premise that VREG’s must overcome negative racial group conception and internalized racism to develop “a realistic self-affirming collective identity” (Helms & Cook, 1999). For this to occur, POCs must evolve through several ego statuses. Racial and cultural information received at each status are processed according to the level of development. A detailed explanation of these statuses and information processing strategies are found in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Information Processing Strategies (IPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity (Pre-encounter)</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 (Encounter)</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>
<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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Integrative Awareness - 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. IPS: Flexible and complex

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 Development Model

The White racial identity model, assumes that members of the majority socio-racial group contribute to a false sense of racial-group superiority and privilege (Helms & Cook, 1999). Healthy White identity development is obtained through the abandonment of societal norms used to cope with racial matters. Table 2 summarizes the White racial identity development model and characterizes information processing strategies used at each level.
Table 2

Summary of WRIAS Ego Statuses and Information Processing Strategies

Contact- 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. IPS: Obliviousness, denial, superficiality, and avoidance.

Disintegration- 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. IPS: Suppression, ambivalence, and controlling.

Reintegration- Idealization of one’s socioracial group; denigration and intolerance for other groups. Racial factors may strongly influence life decisions. IPS: Selective perception and negative outgroup distortion.

Pseudo-Independence- 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. IPS: Selective perception, cognitive restructuring, and conditional regard.

Immersion- 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. IPS: Hypervigilance, judgmental, and cognitive-affective restructuring.

Emersion- 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. IPS: Sociable, pride, seeking positive group-attributes.

Table continues
Autonomy—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. IPS: Flexible and complex

Note. Adapted from Table 6.4: Summary of White Racial Identity Ego Statuses, Examples, and Information Processing Strategies (IPS), Helms & Cook (1999, p. 90).
Racial Identity Development and Supervision

Cook (1994) utilized Helms’ models of identity development to understand potential ways supervisors and supervisees may approach racial issues in supervision. She determined that at each stage of development, supervisors are likely to assume an approach compatible to their current ego status. For instance, if a POC supervisor is operating from a status of conformity, that supervisor may ignore the supervisee’s race and its impact on counseling interactions. Table 3 describes these potential approaches to racial issues in supervision.
Table 3

Summary of People of Color (POC) and White Racial Identity Ego Statuses and Potential Approaches to Racial Issues in Supervision (PARI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity (POC)</th>
<th>Contact (White)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI: Ignores race of client, supervisee, and supervisor. Assumes theoretical approach generalizes to all individuals; focuses only on “common humanity”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissonance (POC)</th>
<th>Disintegration (White)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI: Acknowledges client’s race as demographic or descriptive characteristic; lacks awareness of assumptions being made about the client based on race. Ignores supervisee’s and supervisor’s race.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immersion/Emersion (POC)</th>
<th>Reintegration (White)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI: Recognizes own race as standard for “normal” behavior of client and “effective” performance of partner. Recognizes other-race clients, but cultural differences seen as deficits or forms of “resistance.” Holds biases toward theoretical approaches that represent own cultural perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-Independence (White)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARI: Discuss racial differences only if interacting with POC. Discusses cultural differences, based on generalized assumptions about various racial groups. Recognizes cultural biases of theories; lacks working knowledge of how to adapt theories to POC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Immersion/Emersion (White)

PARI: Acknowledges race of client, supervisee, and supervisor, and their respective cultural assumptions and racial attitudes. Considers sociopolitical implications of race in therapy and supervision.

Internalization (POC)  Autonomy (White)

PARI: Integrates personal cultural values and therapeutic and supervision values. Acknowledges race of client, supervisee and supervisor and the cultural and sociopolitical influences on the therapeutic and supervisory relationships. Names cultural conflicts in supervision interactions without internalizing racial prejudices of other-race supervision partner.

Integrative Awareness (POC)

PARI: Recognizes race as an aspect of each person’s identity and potential variability in racial identity attitudes. Acknowledges cultural assumptions of supervision partners and negotiates cultural sensitive approaches to supervision and therapy. Serves as advocate for oppressed groups in interactions with agencies and training program.

Adapted from table 3.1 Summary of People of Color (POC) and White Racial Identity Ego Statuses and Potential Approaches to Racial Issues in Supervision (PARI), Bernard & Goodyear (1998, p. 42).
Criticism of Helm’s Model

Helm’s models of racial identity development have been influential in the study of multicultural counseling. However, Helm’s models of racial identity development have been met with some criticism; particularly the White racial identity development model.

Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson (1994) postulated several concerns with Helm’s model. First, the idea of White racial identity development as a parallel process to minority identity development has little merit. The authors state the attitudes of minority groups towards Whites are developed through the recognition that Whites represent an oppressing society. Whites, however, develop beliefs and attitudes regarding minorities through societal stereotyping and not through societal oppression. The authors contend the development of Whites and minority can not be viewed as a parallel process when in fact they are quite contrary.

Another criticism noted is the title of the model. The premise for the model is to depict how Whites develop sensitivity and appreciation of racial groups at different levels or stages. The title is misleading in that it has little to do with how Whites develop attitudes toward their
racial group membership. The final criticism of the model is the exclusivity of Blacks as the focus of White racial attitudes. Rowe, et al. (1994) finds this a limitation of the model. The focus on Blacks neglects other minority groups, and therefore lacks generalization.

Supervisor Race, Experience and Supervision Focus

Some empirical data studies have examined the relationship between supervisor experience and behavior. Borders (1991) found that novice supervisors when compared to expert supervisors use less approval statements and focused more on the mastery of techniques. Stevens, Goodyear, and Robertson (1997) investigated the influence of supervisory experience and supervisor training on supervisor behaviors, particularly supervision focus and self-efficacy. Data were collected from 60 participants in the Southern California area with various years of experience. The participants were grouped by 0-2 years of experience, 2-5 years of experience, and over 5 years of experience. The authors found a direct relationship between the amount of training on supervisory behaviors, but no significant between-group differences were found when considering experience alone. However, experience was related to confidence, self-efficacy, and effectiveness.
The findings of Stevens and his colleagues differ from that of other researchers. Previous research found that supervisors with more years of experience are more flexible (Holloway, 1997), supportive (Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995) and is a major factor in supervisor behavioral changes (Borders, 1991). Yet, research considering the combination of race and supervisor experience as factors that influence the focus of supervision are scarce. It is the goal of the current study to provide further insight into the influence of supervisor experience and race on supervisory behaviors.

Supervision Emphasis Rating Form-R (SERF-R)

The supervision emphasis rating scale was originally developed in 1986 by Lanning to address the need for more psychometric instruments to measure supervisor differences (i.e., the focus of supervision) on dimensions deemed important to the supervision process. Research findings using the SERF are reported below.

Lanning (1994) studied 390 supervisors and trainees to determine if the four subscales of professional behavior skills, processing skills, personalization skills, and conceptualization skills, indeed measured four different emphasis domains. All participants were given the SERF and
asked to complete the form after six supervision session. The authors found the SERF did not correspond well to all four focus areas.

To address this need, two major revisions were made to improve its ability to measure the four emphasis areas. The SERF-R was reformatted into a rank order scale to insure that participants could not emphasize the four areas equally and were forced to discriminate. Validity was established by submitting a list of supervisory behaviors to a panel of supervisors who were asked to identify in which focus area an item should be placed. Validity was established by a consensus of 80% on the emphasis of the item.

Lanning & Freeman (1994) conducted a study of supervisor emphasis using 132 counselors-in-training and 36 clinical supervisors. Their finding supported the use of the SERF-R in measuring supervision emphasis and found that split-half reliabilities were in satisfactory range. Other research using the SERF-R found supervisor emphasis was not influenced by training and experience alone (Stevens, et al. (1997). However, emphasis did correspond with higher levels of self-efficacy and feeling of support (Stevens, et al., 1997; Wells, 1998).
This chapter provided a brief synthesis of relevant literature in the field of counseling supervision. A discussion regarding supervisor development was presented along with description of role of the supervisor and the focus areas necessary to facilitate counselor growth. Race and multicultural challenges were addressed along with an argument for the necessity of racial and ethnic considerations in the supervision dyad. The literature review moved to cover racial identity development and concluded with a discussion of relevant research in the area of supervision experience and focus.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

This study investigated the influence of race and supervision experience on the focus of supervision; specifically, whether the supervisors’ years of service and race impacted the emphasis on process skills, personalization skills, conceptualizations skills, or professional behaviors, in the supervisory dyad. A discussion of the research design, sample, sampling plan, and instrumentation are included in this chapter.

Research Design

Supervisors’ race and years of service in supervision was obtained from a demographic questionnaire completed by participating supervisors. The focus of supervision was measured utilizing an established self-reporting instrument completed by supervisors.

Participating supervisors was fully informed of the purpose of the study and that involvement in this research endeavor was voluntary. All recommended protocols for research on human subjects were followed throughout the study and maximum efforts were made to maintain anonymity.
Questionnaires were completed by using a password protected web-based survey site.

Sample

Participants derived from a random sample of self-identified counseling supervisors listed as members of the American Counseling Association (ACA). Names and contact information of possible participants were obtained from the most recent membership roster. The use of the ACA membership roster allowed this study to obtain a national sample of counseling supervisors.

Sampling Plan

The sampling pool consisted of approximately 800 members self-identified as counselor supervisors randomly sampled by ACA. Two hundred members were randomly selected for participation in the pilot study and 600 potential participants remained for use in the current study. Of those 600 potential participants, 588 had usable contact information.

Sample size was determined using summary statistics from pilot data in Brooks’ (2005) SPSS syntax for obtaining sample size for a two-way MANOVA. It was determined that a sample size of 60 (no fewer than 10 per group) was needed
to detect the moderate effect size seen in the pilot study with power of .80. Information regarding syntax and output is included in Appendix G. In order to obtain appropriate power and effect size, this study sampled 588 individuals. Sampling 528 individuals over the necessary sample size accounted for invalid contact information, replacing supervisors who decline participation and inappropriate contacts (such as members who identified as a counseling supervisor, but are not practicing supervision).

Supervisors were asked to complete two self-assessments, Supervision Emphasis Form-Revised (Lanning & Freeman, 1994) and a demographic questionnaire. The first instrument required participants to provide information regarding areas of emphasis during supervision. The demographic questionnaire yielded data regarding race, years of service, age, hours of supervision training and house of multicultural training. A pilot study was completed to identify potential areas of concerns.

Pilot Study

A list of 200 self-identified counselor supervisors was obtained from the original list of 800 supervisors provided by American Counseling Association for the purpose of conducting a pilot study. Emails requesting
participation in this research endeavor were mailed to all potential participants. Twenty one emails were returned due to invalid addresses and fours emails were received declining participation.

Of the 200 counselor supervisors contacted, twenty seven possible participants responded, however, only twenty-one completed the entire assessment. Sixteen of the twenty-one participants identified as White/Caucasian and five identified as people of color or biracial (i.e., African American, Asian American, Caucasian and Latina, and White and Native American). The sample included 6 males and 15 females. All males identified as White/Caucasian.

Several factors may have contributed to the low response rate. Emails were sent during a time period where many graduate students were requesting participation in various studies. Thus, supervisors may have been forced to answer a limited number of requests due to time constraints. Another factor may be the time allotted to complete the study. Counseling supervisors were only given ten days to respond before the questionnaires were made unavailable. Finally, follow-up emails soliciting responses were not sent. Schaefer & Dillman (1998) suggests that follow-up emails are essential to increase response rates
for email and web surveys. These challenges were addressed in the current study by increasing the number of contacts, sending follow-up emails at seven, ten and fifteen days. The ten-day timeframe was increased to twenty days to address the weak response rate.

Supervision Experience

Supervisors in the pilot study ranged from novice supervisors (4 months of experience) to highly experienced (30 years of experience). The mean amount of supervision experience in the current sample was 8.571 years. Twenty percent of the sample reported two years or less of supervision experience. Thirty-eight percent reported three to five years experience and forty-two percent reported over six years of experience.

Level of Education and Multicultural Training

The majority of participants reported having a Ph.D. (61%) in counselor education, clinical or counseling psychology and the remainder of participants reported having a master’s degree in counseling.

Participants were asked the amount of specific training in multicultural issues. Responses varied from 5 hours to 150 hours of training. One respondent noted no
formal training in multicultural issues; however, self-directed training had been continuous.

Pilot Study Results

Descriptive statistics for the pilot study were evaluated. All supervisors, regardless of years of experience, ranked personalization skills the highest (M = 3.0952, SD = 1.044). However, some differences occurred when considering race. White supervisors ranked processing skills (M = 2.438, SD = .96398) and conceptualization skills (M = 2.438, SD = 1.31498) similarly; however, POC supervisors ranked processing skills (M = 3.0, SD = 1.0) higher than conceptualization skills (M = 2.2 SD = .83667).

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of race and level of supervision on the focus of supervision. No significant differences were found among the level of supervision or race of the supervisor on the dependent variables. The lack of significance may be largely due to the number of participants. A larger sample pool will enhanced these results. Other suggestions for improvement will be addressed at the end of the chapter.

Suggestions for Improvements based on Pilot Study

Improvements were included in the current study based on information gained from the pilot study. A demographic
question regarding age was included to determine if there is any significance in supervision emphasis and the age of the supervisor. The question regarding multicultural training was reworded to emphasize “formal training”. This will alleviate possible confusion in training received through personal growth (i.e., review of literature) and formal instruction received through professional organizations or through college courses. An increase in the sampling pool and follow up email procedures should also increase the study’s sample size.

Instrumentation

Supervision Emphasis Rating Form-Revised

The Supervision Emphasis Rating Form (SERF) was revised in 1994 (Lanning & Freeman, 1994). The instrument is used to measure the area most emphasized by supervisors within the supervision dyad. It was revised from a Likert scale to a rank order instrument in 1994, to alleviate the tendency of supervisors to inflate self-ratings. The revised instrument consists of 15 competency sets with four answer choices. Competency sets are comprised of professional behavior skills, process skills, personalization skills and conceptualization skills. Users must determine the order in which to rank the importance of
these skills in supervision practice. A participant must choose from 1 = most likely to emphasize, 2 = likely to emphasize, 3 = unlikely to emphasize, or 4 = least likely to emphasize when determining supervision focus. Three forms of the SERF were developed by the author. The form used in this study, Form SG, was designed to consider the supervisor’s general supervision practice with counselor trainees rather than the counselor trainee’s perceived emphasis or the emphasis of the supervisor with a particular trainee (see Appendix C). An example of competency sets on Form SG includes:

A. The counselor maintains appropriate conduct in personal relationships with clients.
B. The counselor uses appropriate reflection of feelings with a client.
C. The counselor maintains a non-judgmental attitude despite value differences with a client.
D. The counselor is able to prioritize client problems.

Lanning and Freeman (1994) reported internal consistency reliability as .776, .753, .736, and .698 for the subscales of professional behaviors skills, process skills,
personalization skills, and conceptualization skills, respectively.

Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic information was requested from 97 participants. Questions explored gender, race, supervision training, multicultural training, and years of service in supervision. Information regarding licensure and geographic location was also obtained (see Appendix F).

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection began by selecting a random sample of self-identified counselor supervisors from the most recent American Counseling Association membership list. An email solicitation was sent to potential participants inviting them to complete a web-based questionnaire using Survey Monkey. According to Schaefer & Dillman (1998), web-based surveys provide an inexpensive method of contact, while offering the opportunity to increase response rate and speed. Supervisors received a personalized invitation to participate in the survey; those who choose to decline involvement did so by accessing a link included in the email (see Appendix D).

Follow up email notifications were sent seven days, ten days and fifteen days after the original request to
those who had not participated and did not decline involvement (see Appendix E). All emails contained a link to the website and a password to prevent unauthorized access to the questionnaires as recommended by Schaefer & Dillman, 1998. Confidentiality was maintained through the use of respondent identification numbers. All corresponding names and email addresses were the sole possession of the primary investigator.

Accessibility of Questionnaires

The survey was accessible for twenty days. On the seventh day, the tenth day, and again on the fifteenth day, a request was sent to participants who had not completed the survey. Once the twenty-day time frame expired, the survey was closed and made unavailable to participants.

Data Analysis Procedures

Descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, and standard deviation) for all independent and dependent variables were computed. Independent variables were comprised of race and supervision experience. Supervisors were assigned one of three groups. Previous research arranged supervisory experience levels into three categories: (1) zero to two years; (2) two to five years; (3) over five years (Stevens, Goodyear & Robertson, 1997). Supervisors were grouped in
one of two racial groups, people of color or white/Caucasian, depending on self-reported ethnicity.

**Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)** was used to test the following null hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years of experience, two to five years of experience, and over five years of experience when compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no interaction effect between race and supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Independent variables are defined as supervisory experience and race, while dependent variables consist of personalization skills, process skills, conceptualization skills and professional behavior skills.
A MANOVA was chosen to determine if mean differences among the populations (levels of experience) were likely to have occurred by chance. A multivariate analysis also prevented the inflation of type 1 errors. In addition, a MANOVA allows for the evaluation of linear combination of several variables. This assessment detects significant overall differences that are not found when studying the variables individually (Stevens, 2002).

Assumptions for MANOVA

Stevens (2002) emphasizes several assumptions associated with the MANOVA. These assumptions are:

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 homogeneous.

The independence of the observations was addressed by randomly sampling participants and individually administering instruments through a password-protected website. Participants were also asked to base responses on their personal practice of supervision.

Graphical techniques and empirical data, such as scatterplots and univariate statistics were used to check
for normality for each group. The Box test of homogeneity of covariance matrices was used to check for equality. The Box test is a generalization of the Bartlett univariate homogeneity of variance test and is very sensitive to nonnormality (Stevens, 2002).

**Analysis and post hoc procedures**

Wilks' lambda values and F statistics were used to report findings. Analyses of variance on each dependent variable were conducted, if needed, as post hoc tests to the MANOVA. Information regarding supervisor’s racial identity development was also examined post hoc.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the methodology used to explore the relationship between race, years of experience, and the focus of supervision. Discussions of sampling procedures, research instrumentation, reliability and validity analysis were provided. Finally, the null hypotheses were tested and analyzed using a MANOVA.

The next chapter depicts the results of the MANOVA and descriptive statistics. Information obtained from the demographic questionnaire was also presented.
CHAPTER IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between race, years of experience and supervisor emphasis, particularly on professional behavior skills, processing skills, conceptualization skills and personalization skills. The study also sought to investigate if there was an interaction effect between race and years of experience as well as a significant association with areas emphasized during supervision.

The chapter also explores in detail the analysis of the null hypotheses discussed in Chapter Three. Demographic details of the study participants are first discussed, followed by a presentation of reliability and correlation analyses of the instruments and subscales. Statistical analyses used to test the research hypotheses are also reported. The section concludes with a presentation of supplemental analyses.

A national sample of American Counseling Association members who self-identified as counselor supervisors was presented with an email requesting the completion of two questionnaires. All participants completed the demographic survey and the Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form-Revised.
Demographics of Participants

Emails requesting participation in the research study were sent to 588 potential participants. Follow up emails were also sent to non-participants at seven, ten, and fifteen days. This method of solicitation yielded 110 responses (18.71% of the sample). Three declined participation stating they were no longer counselor supervisors. Thirteen declined participation without explanation. Therefore, a total of 97 responses were usable for analysis (16.50% of the sample) in this research endeavor.

The demographic information collected included gender, age, states in which licensure is held, highest level of education completed, hours of training in supervision, hours of training in multicultural issues in supervision and years of experience. The questionnaire also requested participants to identify their race/ethnic group. A summary of the demographic data is presented in Tables 4 – 14.
Gender

Information regarding gender was explored in the demographic survey. The study consisted of thirty-nine (40.21%) male participants and fifty-eight (59.80%) female participants. All participants answered questions regarding gender.

Age

The age of participants varied from 28 years to 68 years. The mean age was 42.46 years. All participants answered the question regarding age.

Table 4

Gender and Age of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>28-68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States Represented in the Study

Information was requested on the state where licensure was held. One participant (1%) each represented Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, and Virginia.

Two participants (2%) each represented California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, and New Mexico. Three participants (3%) each represented Florida, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, and South Carolina. States represented by four participants (4%) each were North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

Six participants (6%) were from New York, 11 (11.34%) were from Texas, 14 (14.43%) were from Ohio, and 14 (14.43%) reported “no licensure” for counselor supervisors.
Table 5

*States Represented in the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants from Each State</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri, Nevada, South Dakota, Oregon, New Jersey, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, New Mexico</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participants from Each State</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No licensure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Education**

The highest level of education, Master degree, Doctorate, or Other, was also described by supervisors. A Masters degree was reported by 26 (26.80%) supervisors. Four of the 26 stated they had completed all course work in a doctoral program, but had not completed the dissertation process. A Doctoral degree had been completed by 64 (65.98%) supervisors and 7 supervisors reported “other” as their highest level of education. Two participants described this as a Professional Diploma and two described this as a Certificate of Advance Study. Five supervisors did not specify the type of degree held.

**Supervision Training**

Counselor Supervisors were asked to state the number of hours of supervision training they had received. The
range of hours was vast, from 0 hours to 1800 hours. The mean level of training in supervision was 85.96 hours. Four participants did not respond to this question, but stated they had participated in informal training.

Participants with 1800 hours and 1200 hours were removed to further inspect the mean score. The mean level of training in supervision without the outliers was 55.87 with a range of 0 – 210 hours.

Training in Multicultural Issues

Demographic information was obtained on the number of training hours participants had received in Multicultural Issues in supervision. Seventy-nine supervisors (81.44%) responded to this question with hours ranging from 0-800 with a mean of 38.48. Seven supervisors neglected to answer the question and 11 supervisors stated they were unsure of the number of hours or stated that training was not formal. Thus 18 participants (18.56%) neglected to answer the question.

One participant with 800 hours of training was removed to inspect the mean score. The mean level of multicultural training without the outlier was 28.72 with a range of 0 – 125 hours.
Table 6

Level of Education, Supervision and Multicultural Supervision Training

<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>Education</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Training</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>217.43</td>
<td>0-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Multicultural Issues</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81.44</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>91.90</td>
<td>0-800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Experience

Years of experience was obtained through the demographic questionnaire. Supervisors were asked “how many years have you been providing counseling supervision?” Participants were assigned to one of three groups, 0-2 years of experience, 2-5 years, and over 5 years. Of the 97 supervisors, 16 (16.49%) had been providing supervision for
0-2 years, 21 (21.65%) reported 2-5 years of experience and
60 (61.49) reported of 5 years of supervision. The range of
experience was 1-34 years with a mean of 8.61 years.

Table 7

*Years of Experience and Participant groupings based on
Years of Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Experience in Years</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>1-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race

Ninety-seven participants provided information regarding their race/ethnic group. The White/Caucasian
group consisted of 76 participants (76.77% of the sample).
African American supervisors comprised of 5 participants
(5% of the sample), 2 participants reported their race as
Hispanic/Latino (2% of the sample), and 2 participants
reported their race as Native American (2% of the sample). Asian Americans were represented by 4 participants (4% of sample) and the Biracial/Other group was comprised of 8 supervisors (8%). Similar information regarding race and ethnic demographic information is reported by the American Counseling Association (personal communication, April 26, 2007). ACA supervisors comprise of 87.27% Caucasians, 5.98% African Americans, 3.03% Hispanic/Latino, .94% Native Americans, and 1.61% Multiracial and other.

Supervisors in the Biracial/Other group were asked to specify their racial composition. Specific ethnicities included White, African American and Hispanic; Asian American and White; Asian, Hispanic and German; Caucasian and Hispanic; Irish; and two supervisors noted their race as Caucasian and Native American. One supervisor noted an International race, but did not specify ethnicity.
Table 8

Race of Supervisors and Participant Groupings Based on Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Supervisors</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Analysis on Research Instrument

Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form-Revised (SERF-R)

The focus of supervision was measured by the Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form-Revised (Lanning & Freeman, 1994). This instrument was designed to assess which of four skills: professional behavior, processing, personalization, and conceptualization, supervisors emphasize during supervision. To score the instrument, each item was assigned to a subscale and then all items for that subscale were totaled. Reliability for the instrument was determined using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients. Means and standard deviation for each sub-scale are also presented in Table 9. The reliability coefficients, means and standard deviation were similar to previous studies using the SERF-R.
Table 9

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations for SERF-R subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERF-R sub-scales</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Behavior Skills</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Skills</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalization Skills</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization Skills</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>38.45</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability coefficients for the sub-scales: professional behavior skills and the personalization skills were high (\(\alpha = .71, M = 41.26, SD = 6.86\) and \(\alpha = .76, M = 33.54, SD = 7.18\), respectively). Processing skills and conceptualization skills had the lowest reliability coefficient (\(\alpha = .64, M = 36.75, SD = 5.93\) and \(\alpha = .61, M = 38.45, SD = 5.91\), respectively).

Correlations between SERF-R subscales

An analysis was conducted to determine sub-scale correlations. All sub-scales revealed a significant correlation with the other three subscales: Professional
Behavior Skills with Processing Skills ($r = .44$, $p < .05$), Professional Behavior Skills with Personalization Skills ($r = .40$, $p < .05$), Professional Behavior Skills with Conceptualization Skills ($r = .24$, $p < .05$), Processing Skills with Personalization Skills ($r = .28$, $p < .05$), Processing Skills with Conceptualization Skills ($r = .15$, $p < .05$), and Personalization Skills with Conceptualization Skills ($r = .48$, $p < .05$).

Statistical Analyses to Test Null Hypotheses

Statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, version 11.5. Descriptive statistics, multivariate analysis of variance and a one-way analysis of variance were computed.

Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviation were examined for professional behavior skills (beh), processing skills (proc), personalization skills (pers) and conceptualization skills (conc) for each racial group (white/Caucasian and supervisors of color). Tables 10 and 11 illustrate the means and standard deviation for each sub-scale in relationship to each supervision group.
Table 10

Means and Standard Deviation for Behavioral skills and Processing skills of the SERF-R for Supervisor Racial Groups and Years of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Groupings</th>
<th>BEH</th>
<th>Proc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svsors of Color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Means and Standard Deviation for Personalization Skills and Conceptualization Skills of the SERF-R for Supervisor Racial Groups and Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Groupings</th>
<th>Pers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Con</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svsors of Color</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Svsors = Supervisors
The following research questions were used to examine the data for trends or apparent differences between groups. The first question asked was, does supervisors' race influence the focus of supervision within the supervisor dyad? An examination of the data reveals differences between the mean scores of the sub-scales of the White supervisors and the supervisors of color. The White supervisors had the highest mean scores on the Processing skills scale (M = 37.26). Conversely, the highest mean scores of supervisors of color were for the conceptualization skills sub-scale (M = 38.90). On first examination, it appears that White supervisors may be more likely to focus on Processing skills, a lower level skill, than supervisors of color. On first examination, it appears that Supervisors of color are more likely to focus on case conceptualization skills than White supervisors.

Another question asked was, does supervisors' years of experience influence the focus of supervision within the supervisory dyad? Particularly, do supervisors with more years of experience emphasize higher skill levels (case conceptualization skills or personalization skills) more often than supervisors with less experience? Using a visual inspection of the descriptive statistic, this did
not hold true. Supervisors with more experience, 2-5 years or over 5 years, appear to focus on behavioral skills and processing skills more than the least experienced group: behavioral skills $M = 41.90$ and $41.45$, respectively, processing skills $M = 37.29$ and $36.97$, respectively. Novice supervisors were more likely to emphasize personalization skills ($37.63$) than the other groups.

The final question was does the interaction effect between race and years of experience influence the focus of supervision. From a visual inspection of the means (see Tables 12 and 13) supervisors of color with over 5 years of experience emphasized behavioral skills more often than the other groups ($M = 43.92$). White supervisors with 2 - 5 years of experience focused on processing skills more often than the remaining groups ($M = 38.60$). Conceptualization skills were emphasized more by supervisors of color with 2 - 5 years of experience ($M = 40.50$) and personalization skills were emphasized more by novice supervisors of color ($43.60$). Groups sizes were rather small for the supervisors of color groups (0-2 years of experience, $n = 5$ and 2 - 5 years, $n = 4$). Further investigation was completed to determine if these differences were significant.
Table 12

Means and Standard Deviation for the Interaction of Racial Groups and Years of Experience on Professional Behavioral Skills and Processing Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Proc</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groupings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>37.15</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svsors of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Means and Standard Deviation for the Interaction of Racial Groups and Years of Experience on Personalization Skills and Conceptualization Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Con</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Groupings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>38.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>38.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svsors of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>40.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>39.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Svsors = Supervisors
Testing of the Null Hypotheses

In order to answer the questions presented, the following null hypotheses were tested:

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years, two to five years, and over five years of experience when they are compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no interaction effect between race and years of supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Assumption Testing for MANOVA

The following three assumptions for MANOVA must be tested before testing the null hypotheses: (1) observations are statistically independent, (2) the observations on the dependent variables follow a multivariate normal
distribution with each group, and (3) homogeneity of variance; the population covariance matrices for the dependent variables are equal.

Observations were statistically independent by randomly sampling supervisors and having those supervisors complete the online questionnaire. Univariate normality was checked for each dependent variable graphically and by examining z-scores. The assumption of normality was met.

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was used to check homogeneity of covariance matrices. The Box test was not significant (p = 0.333), thus the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met.

The results of the MANOVA analysis are illustrated in Table 14.
Table 14

MANOVA for White Supervisors, Supervisors of Color, and Interaction Effect (Wilks’ Lambda)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypo. df</th>
<th>Error Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>n²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Yrs of Exp</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANOVA Findings

The MNAOVA failed to reject the null hypotheses. The findings indicated:

There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years, two to five years, and over five years of experience when they are compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

There is no significant interaction effect between race and years of supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.
Supplemental Analysis

Supplemental analyses were performed to further identify trends in the data. Dependent variables were grouped into lower level skills (professional behavior skills and processing skills) and higher level skills (conceptualization skills and personalization skills). This decision was made to determine if combined skill levels were influenced by race or years of experience.

A MANOVA was executed to test this hypothesis; although a greater difference was obtained, no statistical significance was reached. The results of the MANOVA can be found in Table 15.

Other supplemental analysis studied the affects of gender, level of education, supervision training, and multicultural training on supervision focus.

The influence of gender on personalization, professional behavior skills, processing skills and conceptualization skills were also investigated. Multivariate and univariate analysis proved no significant difference were evident.

An ANOVA was used to investigate the supervisors’ level of education. The analysis revealed no statistical significant regarding supervision focus.
Table 15

MANOVA for White Supervisors, Supervisors of Color, and Interaction Effect (Wilks’ Lambda) after Skill Level Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypo. df</th>
<th>Error Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>n²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race x Yrs of Exp Interaction</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences were found between race and years of experience when grouping sub-scales into lower level and higher level skills. However, this difference did not prove significant.

Summary

MANOVA findings failed to reject the null hypotheses. The statistical analysis revealed:

1. There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years, two to five years, and over five years of experience when they are compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills,
process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

2. There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

3. There is no interaction effect between race and years of supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Supplemental analyses also revealed no significant differences between race and years of experiences on the combined sub-scales of lower level skills and higher level skills.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between supervisors’ race and years of supervisory experience on the focus of supervision. The findings of this study were non significant, however, some support of the influence of race and other cultural factors on clinical supervision has been noted. Although the magnitude of these influences may not have been fully realized in this endeavor; they remain crucial to the process and outcome of supervision.

Multicultural differences have been recognized as an influential factor in the supervisory relationship. Yet, empirical support has been lacking (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004; Helms & Cook, 1999; Wells, 1998). Studies conducted in the area of race and ethnicity report finding racial difference between supervisors and supervisees have influenced perceptions of support, levels of communication and satisfaction (Fukuyama, 1995; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995). Leong and Wagner’s (1994) extensive review of cross-cultural supervision found that race profoundly influences cross-cultural supervision in ways that may distort the
The current study aimed to investigate the impact of race along with the influence of years of experience on the focus of supervision. In this chapter, a discussion of the sample is presented. The results of the statistical analyses on the null hypotheses are discussed. Supplemental analyses, implication of the study and limitations are also discussed. Finally, directions for future research are suggested.

Sample Characteristics

Participants were members of the American Counseling Association who self-identified as counselor supervisors. A national sample of counseling supervisors was obtained. Participants were comprised of 97 self-identified counselor supervisors. The response rate, gender, race, years of experience, state representation, specific training in supervision and multicultural issues and highest level of education are discussed.

Response Rate

The response rate for the participants in this study was low. There were 588 emails sent to potential participants. A total of 110 potential participants
responded to the email request and 97 of those respondents chose to participate in the study. This yielded a moderate response rate of 16.50% (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Several factors may have contributed to the response rate, including lack of interest in the subject matter, limited time available to participate in research surveys, or a disinterest in internet-based questionnaires.

Three participants declined participation due to not currently supervising counselors. Members of the American Counseling Association do not have to be employed or licensed as a Counseling Supervisor to be added to the rooster. Thus, some members may have an interest in counselor supervision without current experience supervising. Lack of recent experience may have deterred others from participating.

Gender

Study participants were comprised of 58 (59.80%) females and 39 (40.21%) males. A slightly higher female representation in this study appears to be consistent with similar research (Bhat, 2002; Steven, Goodyear, & Robertson, 1997; Wells, 1998) and the profession at large. When the sample was compared to level of education 26 (66.67%) male participants held a doctoral degree, while
37(63.79%) of female supervisors held an advance degree. This also appears to be in line with previous studies in counseling supervision (Wells; Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson). Another explanation may be that more women than men chose to participate in the study.

Race

Among the participants 78.35% identified as Caucasian/White, 5.15% were African American/Black, 2.06% were Hispanic/Latino, 2.06% identified as Native American, 4.12% were Asian American and 8.25% identified as Other. Those who selected “other” identified as Biracial or Multiracial. This included one participant who noted an International heritage without stating nationality.

Although the sample was small, the level of diversity (21.64% non-Whites) appears to be appropriate for a national survey.

States Represented in the Study

The demographic survey asked participants to disclose the state in which their supervision licensure was held. The sample revealed 36 states were represented. Residents of Ohio comprised the largest number of participants (14.43%) followed by Texas (11.34%). Some participants (14.43%) noted there was no license for counselor
supervisors in their state. Therefore, it is unclear what additional states may have been represented within this sample.

Level of Education of Participants

Information regarding the participants’ highest level of education was obtained. Master level practitioners accounted for 24.74% of supervisors and doctoral training accounted for 65.98% of the sample, while 9.28% of the sample chose “other”. Most participants categorized as others reported being in the process of completing a doctoral degree. Two participants noted they held Certificates in Advance Study. One stated a Professional Diploma Candidacy had been received.

The high number of PhDs and Ed.Ds participants was not representatives of the profession or the American Counseling Association (ACA) membership. This researcher reasons that many members who noted they are counselor supervisors are also counselor educators and members of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision a division of ACA. It is also likely that those with higher levels of education are more willing to participate in research endeavors such as this one.
Hours of Supervision and Multicultural Training

All participants acknowledge some training in counseling supervision (number of hours varied from 0 to 1800 hours of training). Yet, not all supervisors had formal training in multicultural supervision (hours varied from 0 to 800 hours). Some supervisors stated that although they may not have formal training in multicultural supervision; cultural experiences and literary reviews have provided informal training.

Discussion of the Null Hypothesis

The analysis to test the null hypotheses was completed using a MANOVA. The null hypotheses were as followed:

Null Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences between supervisors with zero to two years of experience, two to five years of experience, and over five years of experience when they are compared simultaneously on the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.

Null Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences between White supervisors and supervisors of color regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills.
Null Hypothesis 3: There is no interaction effect between race and supervisory experience regarding the emphasis of personalization skills, process skills, professional behavior skills and conceptualization skills. No significance regarding the interaction between race and years of experience were found.

The MANOVA failed to reject the null hypotheses. A comparison of the means on the sub-scales of personalization, professional behavior skills, processing skills and conceptualization skills for racial groups failed to show any difference. A comparison of means on the same sub-scales for years of experience did show differences, however these differences were not found to be significant. Lack of statistical significance may be a result of the sample size.

Discussion of the Supplemental Analysis

Several supplemental analyses were used to further explore the data. Follow up univariate analysis revealed some difference in the supervisors of color group and White supervisors in their emphasis on professional behavior skills; however, this difference was not large enough to show statistical significance. Previous research (Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson, 1997) referred to the SERF-R in
terms of lower levels of focus (professional behavior skills and processing skills) and higher level of focus (personalization skills and conceptualization skills), so a decision was made to collapse the dependent variable into two groups by combining professional behavior skills and processing skills (lower level skills) and combining personalization skills and conceptualization skills (higher level skills). A MANOVA was executed to test the hypothesis; although a greater difference was obtained, no statistical significance was reached. The sample size may have influenced the results presented. A larger sample may contribute to greater statistical significance. Other supplemental analysis studied the affects of gender, level of education, supervision training, and multicultural training on supervision focus.

The influence of gender on personalization, professional behavior skills, processing skills and conceptualization skills were also investigated. Multivariate and univariate analysis proved no significant difference were evident.

An ANOVA was used to investigate the supervisors’ level of education. The analysis revealed no statistical significant regarding supervision focus.
Supervisor’s hours of training was divided among three groups: less than 40 hours, 40 – 80 hours and over 80 hours. This classification was used because of the vast number of hours in supervision training reported by the participants (0 hours of training to 1800 hundred hours of training). The three groups were used to determine if the number of hours of supervision training influenced what skills were emphasized by supervisors. There was no evidence that the number of hours in supervision training impacted what was emphasized in supervision.

Finally, an investigation of the influence of multicultural training on supervision emphasis was conducted. The hours of multicultural training were also divided into three groups: less than 40 hours, 40 – 80 hours, and over 80 hours. This also provided no statistical significance.

The analyses were conducted with perceived importance of supervision focus (professional behavior, process, personalization and conceptualization skills) as the dependent variables and race and years of experience as the independent variables. A difference was found between White supervisors and supervisors of color on the professional behavior scale. Supervisors of color were more likely to
emphasis behavioral skills than White supervisors. Although this difference was present, statistical significance was lacking. When combining focus area into lower levels of skill focus and high levels of skill focus, a difference in the interaction of years of experience and race were also determined. Again these differences were not significant.

Findings were not consistent with current theoretical approaches; however, they did prove consistent with empirical data. As mentioned in previous chapters, theoretical approaches have noted the impact of race on counseling and/or supervision relationships and the parallel process (Bradley & Kottler, 2001; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Cook & Helms, 1988; De’Andrea & Daniels, 2001). Yet, empirical research investigating race have found contradicting evidence regarding the influence of this construct (Bhat, 2003; Chagnon & Russell, 1995; Hilton, et al. 1995; Stevens, et al. 1997). This researcher is not denying the influence of societal oppressing and stereotyping on minority groups; however, empirical data supports the need for the counseling profession to rethink current multicultural theories and develop new empirically based models.
Implications of Findings

The current study has several theoretical implications for counseling supervisors, supervisees and counselor educators.

In order for multicultural and multiracial issues in counseling supervision to be fully integrated into counselor education programs and clinical settings it must be examined from the introspective stance of the supervisor. Supervisors will not be able to assist supervisees in understanding the impact of race and multiracial issues, without first investigating its impact on supervision. An awareness of racial/ethnic differences has been cited as an important element in the supervisory relationship (Haynes, Corey & Moulton 2003; Tummala-Nara, 2004; Wells, 1998).

Multicultural competencies in counseling have been beneficial in providing a framework for increasing counselor awareness, yet supervisors have only a paucity of empirical research regarding competency in supervision. Current models of supervision are negligent in the incorporation of race and racial variables. Hess’s (1987) supervisee and supervisor development is one such model.
Hess acknowledges the effect of race on supervision interaction, particularly in the focus of supervision, but does not incorporate race or cultural factors into the supervisor’s stage development. Another important aspect of this model is the significance of supervisor experience to stage progression. He contends that the more experience a supervisor has, the more likely stage progression will take place.

Findings in this study raise two important issues regarding supervision practices. First, is the exploration of race alone enough? Previous research investigating the impact of race on supervision, particularly supervisor emphasis, has concurred with the findings in this study (Stevens, Goodyear, Robertson, 1997). Race alone has not impacted supervisees' satisfaction, sense of support, skill development or self efficacy (Ladany, Friedlander, & Myrna, 1999). Leong & Wagner (1994) stated race and ethnicity are often examined in a simplistic manner, failing to capture their complexity. The authors suggest an investigation of race in regards to the interaction of personality characteristics and cultural dynamics.

Another theoretical implication is the quantity of the supervisor experience may be more meaningful when
investigated along with quality (Robiner, Saltzman, Hoberman, & Schirvar, 1997). The results of this endeavor supports that research in the area of years of experience have not yielded much significance in determining its impact on emphasis. Others have found no significant impact on the evaluation process, working alliance, or supervisee development (Ladany et. al., 1999; Robiner et. al., 1997; Stevens et. al., 1997).

The current study also has implication in the area of supervision and multicultural training. Literature cites that supervisors are not yet receiving enough training in supervision and multicultural supervision (D’Andrea & Daniels, 2001; Hayes et al., 2003; Tummala-Nara, 2004; Well, 1998). Yet, this study does not support the literature.

Participants in this study had many hours of training, with few exceptions. Although the study did not investigate the type of training received, several forms of training could impact supervision focus. Training in cultural competency, skills and techniques, supervision relationship, evaluations and ethical considerations may impact whether behavioral skills, processing skills,
personalization skills, or conceptualization skills are emphasized.

This study raised several questions regarding current counselor supervision literature and racial influences. However, limitation to the current research must also be taken into consideration.

Limitations of the Study

Theoretical and practical implications and findings have been considered while recognizing the limitations of the study. This includes generalizations, demographic data sheet, the use of the SERF-R, grouping of years of experience and the use of an online survey method.

A national sample was obtained to investigate race and years of experience on supervision focus. Although state representation was high; conversely, the response rate was low. Lack of diversity within the sample as well as the size of the sample presents a challenge in generalizing the data. It is not possible to use this current study as a representation of any ethnic supervisor.

The outcome of this research endeavor may be due to the following factors. First the response rate (16.50%) was small. Of the 588 email request sent to potential
participants, 110 responded while 97 supervisors completed the questionnaire.

Another factor may be the amount of diversity among ethnic groups. White supervisors comprised the largest sample group (78 participants), while the supervisors of color group had far less representation (n = 21). The largest minority group represented was the multiracial group (8 participants) while the next largest group, African-Americans was represented by 5 participants. Other ethnic group participation yielded 4 Asian Americans, 2 Hispanic/Latinos and 2 Native Americans. A larger more diverse group may yield more significant results.

Grouping supervisors based on years of experience varied in the research literature. The method of grouping chosen in this study may have presented challenges; although it has been used in a similar study performed by Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson (1997). Participants in the zero - two years of experience group accounted for 16.5% of the sample, two - five years of experience accounted for 12% of the sample, while the over five years of experience group accounted for 61.9% of the sample. A larger group size for zero - two and two - five years may provide different results.
Finally supervisors were asked to complete the SERF-R regarding their general supervision practices. It may be difficult to assess supervision practices without having a particular supervisee in mind. The information from this scale is ipsative rather than normative. Essentially supervisors are forced to assess the merits of one skill or emphasis relative to the other three. Thus, it is not possible to infer if emphasis would change if the participant were rating an actual supervision relationship.

Additional limitations consist of the demographic data sheet. The data sheet assessed variables such as gender, age, years of experience, training, education levels and ethnicity. Years of experience was grouped in three subgroups based on a similar study. Consensus could not be found in the literature on how years of experience should be grouped. Authors seemed to agree that 0 - 5 years of experience should be categorized as novice or less experienced supervisors and over 5 years of experience were more experienced. This study used the 0 - 2 years, 2 - 5 years and over 5 years to be consistent with the Stevens, Goodyear & Robertson’s (1998) research regarding years of experience and supervision focus.
Further limitations to the study were the use of the Supervision Emphasis Rating Form-Revised (Lanning & Freeman, 1994). This instrument is an ipsative instrument which forced participants to rank order their skill emphasis. This instrument was designed to prevent supervisors from emphasizing all skills equally. The authors contend that in practice, a supervisor can not emphasize everything at the same level of importance, yet in the original measure (SERF) they were reluctant to assign importance. Although the form was appropriate in measuring the focus of supervision, other measures may have revealed different results.

The final limitation may be the use of an internet based survey. The use of a secure web-based service was determined as the timeliest and cost effective manner for conducting a national survey. The potential participants could assess the survey at their leisure and the researcher could receive an immediate response. Contrary to earlier reports by Schaefer & Dillman (1998), internet surveys appear to be common and are easily over looked when invitations to participants are sent by email.
Direction in Future Research

Since no significant findings were identified, it is recommended that additional research be conducted to further examine the impact of race and experience on the supervisor and the supervision relationship. A relationship that is interpersonally focused and imperative to the development of the counselors’ therapeutic competence requires more in-depth exploration. Future research may benefit in not only investigating the impact of race on supervisor emphasis but also the impact of racial identity development models.

Investigations of racial identity development and interactions may provide information regarding motives for supervision focus. A qualitative approach to cultural competencies can provide a new prospective on the current research in racial interactions and supervision focus.

An additional recommendation would be the need for research into the development of standardized training criteria. Participants in this study reported 0 to 1800 hours of training. However, no specific information regarding learning objectives or areas of study were received. Training standards that include competency, theory, techniques, and skill development could be
beneficial to supervisors and counselor educators. Future investigations into how supervisors change as they gain experience with or without formal training can also substantiate the need for standardized training requirements.

Supervisee satisfaction with supervision should also be explored within the parameters of supervision focus. Supervisors who emphasize one skill above others may find supervision more favorable and supportive.

A large body of research has also been conducted on the supervisory working alliance. It may prove consequential to determine how supervision focus influences the task, bonds, and goals associated with Bordin’s (1983) model.

Research in consumer progress as it relates to supervision focus, training, and cultural competencies are lacking in the counseling literature. As the profession gains greater understanding of the parallel processes that occur in supervision, it may prove meaningful to explore whether cultural competencies directly influence clients’ overall feeling of satisfaction in counseling.
Conclusion

The exploration of the current study was to determine the influence of race and years of experience in supervision. Although results failed to reach statistical significance, regarding the influence of race and years of experience on professional behavior skills, processing skills, personalization skills and conceptualization skills, this author believes that what was not found speaks to the importance of continued supervision and multicultural supervision research.

Non significant findings support the position that race alone may not be as important as race in combination with other multicultural variables. The participant’s hours of supervision and multicultural supervision training contradicts previous literature that states supervisors are not receiving training in supervision and multicultural topics. Further investigation in culture, experience, and training may provide the necessary ingredients to foster improved supervisee and client growth.
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Correspondence with Institutional Review Board
A determination has been made that the following research study is exempt from IRB review because it involves:

Category 2. research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior

Project Title: The Impact of Supervisors’ Race and Years of Experience on the Focus of Supervision

Project Director: Denita N. Hudson

Department: Counselor Education

Advisor: Thomas Davis

Rebecca Cale, Associate Director, Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

The approval remains in effect provided the study is conducted exactly as described in your application for review. Any additions or modifications to the project must be approved by the IRB (as an amendment) prior to implementation.
Appendix B

Correspondence and Permission Regarding the Use of the SERF-R
From: Hudson, Denita
Sent: Thursday, November 18, 2004 3:11 PM
To: 'wayne lanning'
Subject: RE: Supervision Emphasis Form-Revised

Thank you Dr. Lanning. I will be sure to share my finding with you.
Denita
-----Original Message-----
From: wayne lanning [mailto:lanning@u.arizona.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2004 6:53 PM
To: Hudson, Denita
Subject: Re: Supervision Emphasis Form-Revised

Hello Denita,

Glad to hear you are at the dissertation stage. Good luck with it. Of course you may use the SERF-R for your study. I would be interested in finding out your results when it is completed.

If I can help in any other way please let me know.

Again, I wish you well with your research.

wl

Wayne Lanning
Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
University of Arizona, South
1140 N. Colombo
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(520) 458-8278, ext 2173

On Nov 17, 2004, at 4:43 PM, Hudson, Denita wrote:

Dr. Lanning,

Hello. I am a doctoral student in the Counselor Education program at Ohio University. I am currently working on my dissertation proposal and would like to use the Supervision Emphasis Rating Form Revised in my research.

I plan to investigate how race and racial identity influences the focus of supervision. I believe using the SERF-R is essential to my study; therefore would be grateful to have your permission to use the instrument.
If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at the number and email address listed below.

Thank you for your consideration,
Denita N. Hudson
Appendix C

Supervision Emphasis Rating Form-Revised
Supervision Emphasis Rating Form – Revised (Lanning, W. & Freeman, B., 1994).

A number of competencies that many supervisors consider important for counselors to demonstrate in practicum and internship are listed below. Competencies are listed in sets of four. You are requested to rank order the competencies in each set from 1 to 4 in terms of how likely you are to emphasize each in supervision.

Click "Next" to get started with the survey. If you'd like to leave the survey at any time, just click "Exit this survey". Your answers will be saved. You may return at a later time to complete the survey.

**Within each set, please rank the one you would most likely emphasize as "1" and the one you would least likely emphasize as "4". Please rank all the competencies within all sets.**

1. 
   ____ The counselor maintains appropriate conduct in personal relationships with clients.
   ____ The counselor uses appropriate reflection of feeling with a client.
   ____ The counselor maintains a non-judgmental attitude despite value differences with a client.
   ____ The counselor is able to prioritize client problems.

2. 
   ____ The counselor is knowledgeable about ethical codes of behavior.
   ____ The counselor is able to identify client themes.
   ____ The counselor recognizes his/her personal limitations and strengths.
   ____ The counselor demonstrates the use of open-ended questions.

3. 
   ____ The counselor is aware of socioeconomic and/or cultural factors that may influence the counseling session.
   ____ The counselor uses open-ended questions and allows the client maximum freedom of expression.
   ____ The counselor is aware of his/her own needs and conflicts.
   ____ The counselor keeps appointments with clients.

4. 
   ____ The counselor makes appropriate use of additional information obtained from other professional sources.
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The counselor is able to risk self in counseling with a client.

The counselor communicates his/her sincerity and genuineness to the client.

The counselor maintains confidentiality of client information.

5.  
The counselor is aware of the effects of his/her own anxiety in the counseling process.

The counselor engages in appropriate confrontation with the client.

The counselor recognizes when he/she needs consultative help from another professional.

The counselor is able to set attainable goals in line with client readiness.

6.  
The counselor shows a commitment to personal growth.

The counselor prepares clients for termination.

The counselor responds to client non-verbal behavior.

The counselor understands how people are the same even though they may be worked with differently.

7.  
The counselor is able to develop short and long term goals with a client.

The counselor allows him/herself the freedom to be wrong in the counseling session.

The counselor communicates his/her respect and positive regard to the client.

The counselor actively participates in professional organizations.

8.  
The counselor formulates specific plans and strategies for client behavior change.

The counselor makes appropriate referrals of clients.

The counselor is able to keep personal problems out of the counseling session.

The counselor accurately reflects the content of a client's speech.

9.  
The counselor is able to manage a strong expression of client’s feelings.
10. The counselor recognizes when a client needs help in continuing to cope.

   The counselor takes advantage of opportunities for additional training.

   The counselor is able to identify and manage personal feelings that are generated in counseling.

   The counselor maintains a receptive and appropriate posture during the session.

11. The counselor takes advantage of opportunities for additional training.

   The counselor is able to identify and manage personal feelings that are generated in counseling.

   The counselor maintains a receptive and appropriate posture during the session.

   The counselor recognizes and admits when he/she enters into a “power struggle” with the clients.

12. The counselor identifies the need for and uses immediacy appropriately.

   The counselor engages in adequate note-keeping on clients.

   The counselor is able to choose and apply techniques appropriately.

   The counselor is able to tolerate ambiguity in the counseling sessions.

13. The counselor maintains appropriate relationships with professional colleagues.

   The counselor is able to interpret client behaviors within a coherent theoretical framework.

   The counselor can effectively manage his/her frustration with lack of progress with clients.

   The counselor engages in appropriate nonverbal expressions.
14.  
____  The counselor exhibits appropriate eye contact.

____  The counselor understands which techniques are compatible and consistent with his/her stated theoretical model.

____  The counselor is aware of his/her own needs for approval from the client.

____  The counselor engages in adequate preparation for counseling sessions.

15.  
____  The counselor is aware of how his/her attraction to the client is affecting the counseling process.

____  The counselor maintains her/his office neatly and orderly.

____  The counselor reinforces appropriate client behavior.

____  The counselor is able to predict the effects on a client of the techniques applied in counseling.
Appendix D

Email to Prospective Participants
Dear Counselor Supervisor,

We are writing to request your participation in a pilot study designed to investigate the influence of racial dynamics on the supervision process. Your name and email address was obtained through The American Counseling Association, as a member who self identified as a counselor supervisor. We consider your response vital to the completion of this research endeavor and appreciate the time and effort this may require.

The focal point of the study is the expertise of the counseling supervisor. Therefore, your participation is a critical component of the research and may lead to the development of additional research in the field of counseling supervision.

If you agree to participate in the study, please visit the following address to complete the questionnaire.

Participation is voluntary and will require approximately 30 minutes of your time. If it becomes necessary for you to exit the survey before completion, please click on exit the survey; this will save your responses until you return to complete the survey.

You must enter the password, listed below, to gain access to the study

**PASSWORD: [diatech]**

Your responses are requested within 3 week of receipt of this email. A follow-up reminder will be sent to you via email 7 days from the date of this email if a response has not been received and again on the 10th day.

There are no known potential risks to you as a participant and all efforts are being made to preserve anonymity of responses. No individual data will be reported in this study and responses will be coded to facilitate follow-up with non-respondents. No link will be maintained between your identity and your responses.

Your participation in completing the survey implies consent to use the data for research purposes. If you would like a copy of the findings or have any questions, please contact Denita Hudson by email (Denita.N.Hudson.1@ohio.edu) or by telephone at (937) 836-8398.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to contribute to research in the field of counseling supervision.

Sincerely,

Denita Hudson, M.S., PC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education
Ohio University

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

[Survey Link]
Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
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Follow-up Email to Prospective Participants
Dear Counselor Supervisor,

Recently we emailed you requesting your participation in a pilot study designed to investigate the influence of racial dynamics on the supervision process. Your name and email address was obtained through The American Counseling Association, as a member who self identified as a counselor supervisor. We consider your response vital to the completion of this research endeavor and appreciate the time and effort this may require.

The focal point of the study is the expertise of the counseling supervisor. Therefore, your participation is a critical component of the research and may lead to the development of additional research in the field of counseling supervision.

If you agree to participate in the study, please visit the following address to complete the questionnaire.

Participation is voluntary and will require approximately 30 minutes of your time. If it becomes necessary for you to exit the survey before completion, please click on exit the survey; this will save your responses until you return to complete the survey.

You must enter the password, listed below, to gain access to the study

   PASSWORD: [diatech]

Your responses are requested within 2 week of receipt of this email. A follow-up reminder will be sent to you via email 15 days from the date of this email if a response has not been received.

There are no known potential risks to you as a participant and all efforts are being made to preserve anonymity of responses. No individual data will be reported in this study and responses will be coded to facilitate follow-up with non-respondents. No link will be maintained between your identity and your responses.

Your participation in completing the survey implies consent to use the data for research purposes. If you would like a copy of the findings or have any questions, please contact Denita Hudson by email (Denita.N.Hudson.1@ohio.edu) or by telephone at (937) 836-8398.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to contribute to research in the field of counseling supervision.

Sincerely,

Denita Hudson, M.S., PC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education
Ohio University

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

[Survey Link]
Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
Appendix F

Demographic Questionnaire
Please provide the following demographic information below.

All information was keep confidential. Thank you.

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

What is your age?

In what state are you licensed as a counseling supervisor?

How many years have you been providing counseling supervision?

What is your highest level of education?

How many hours of formal training in supervision have you received?

How many hours of formal training have you received in multicultural issues in supervision?

What racial or ethnic group do you identify with?

- White/Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic/Latino(a)
- Native American/ American Indian
- Asian American/ Pacific Islander
- Biracial/Other (please specify)
Appendix G

Syntax Command for Power
MATRIX DATA variables = group race rowtype_ beh proc pers conc
   /FACTOR = group race
   /FORMAT = lower nodiagonal.
BEGIN DATA
  1 1 N 8 8 8 8
  1 1 MEAN 2.00 2.50 2.50 3.00
  1 2 N 8 8 8 8
  1 2 MEAN 1.00 3.00 3.50 2.50
  2 1 N 8 8 8 8
  2 1 MEAN 2.00 2.17 3.17 2.67
  2 2 N 8 8 8 8
  2 2 MEAN 2.50 3.00 2.50 2.00
  3 1 N 8 8 8 8
  3 1 MEAN 2.13 2.63 3.13 2.13
  3 2 N 8 8 8 8
  3 2 MEAN 1.00 3.00 4.00 2.00
   . . sd 1.02 .978 1.04 1.20
   . . N 48 48 48 48
   . . corr .3
   . . corr .3 .3
   . . corr .3 .3 .3
END DATA.
MANOVA beh proc pers conc by group (1,3) race (1,2)
   /MATRIX=IN(*)
   /METHOD UNIQUE
   /ERROR WITHIN+RESIDUAL
   /POWER T(.05) F(.05)
   /PRINT SIGNIF (MULT AVERF)
   /NOPRINT PARAM (ESTIM) .