BARNES, RACHELLE REDMOND, Ph.D. Racial Microaggressions, Racial Identity, and Working Alliance in Cross-Racial Counseling Supervision Relationships between Black Supervisors and White Supervisees. (2011)
Directed by Dr. L. DiAnne Borders. 162 pp.

Racial microaggressions, a term that evolved from Pierce's (1970, 1978) research in the field of media studies, are subtle, yet offensive behaviors steeped in stereotypes of people of color (POC). These brief acts may not be intentional in nature, but have been found to be pervasive in the everyday lives of POC (Sue, Capodilupo et al., 2007). Racial microaggressions also have been found to arise in cross-racial counseling relationships (Constantine, 2007), cross-racial counseling supervision relationships (Constantine & Sue, 2007), and amongst faculty in counseling and counseling psychology programs (Constantine, Smith, Reddington, & Owens, 2008). Few empirical studies have given attention to the experiences of Black supervisors in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships with White supervisees. As the number of Black students entering doctoral counseling programs has increased, it has become increasingly important to further examine the experiences of Black counselor educators and supervisors in order to provide suggestions for handling issues that may arise in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships. The purpose of this study was to determine the impact perceptions of racial microaggressions and racial identity attitudes have on the supervisory working alliance. Thirty-four doctoral students and recent doctoral graduates of CACREP-accredited counseling programs participated in this study. Results indicated that Black supervisors who perceived, and were more bothered by, racial microaggressions in the supervisory

relationship reported lower perceptions of the working alliance with White supervisees. Implications of the findings are presented and suggestions for future research are provided.

RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS, RACIAL IDENTITY, AND WORKING

ALLIANCE IN CROSS-RACIAL COUNSELING SUPERVISION

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BLACK SUPERVISORS

AND WHITE SUPERVISEES

by

Rachelle Redmond Barnes

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2011

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

To Wayne and Harolyn Redmond,

for teaching me the importance of a good education.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The
Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____
L. DiAnne Borders

Committee Members _____
Derrick Paladino

_____
John Willse

_____
Ruth DeHoog

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, giving honor to God for giving me the strength and endurance to complete this degree. I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. L. DiAnne Borders for believing in me and supporting me throughout my academic journey. I will be eternally grateful for all of her guidance and wisdom. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Derrick Paladino, Dr. Ruth DeHoog, and Dr. John Willse for all of their assistance over the years. Words cannot express my gratitude to my family and friends for all they have done to help me. Many thanks go to my parents, Wayne and Harolyn Redmond, who provided me with the opportunity to attend higher education and, throughout the years, always encouraged me to do my best. Thank you to my sister, Dr. Donna Redmond Jones, for being a great role model and always leading the way in the pursuit of higher education. These last few years would not have been possible without the loving support of my husband, Zachary Barnes, who has been my personal cheerleader, even on my most challenging days. And, to my beautiful daughter, Chelsea, who has added so much to my life, and for that, I am truly thankful. I also would like to thank the members of my cohort, which included Allison, Karen, Kerrie, Maria, Mijin, Elysia, and Amy, for all of the laughs we shared in our program. Finally, heartfelt thanks go out to all of my colleagues, former professors, and mentors for inspiring me to reach my highest goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Racial microaggressions, a term based on the writings of Pierce (1970), are subtle yet offensive, racially-charged indignities that developed over time as more overt forms of racism were condemned. These actions, rooted in racial stereotypes, may not be intentional in nature. Instead, the interpretation of the covert behavior depends, in part, on the perceptions of the recipient. Recently, a conceptual framework of racial microaggressions that occur in the daily lives of minorities living in the United States was developed (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, et al., 2007). Sue and colleagues identified three forms of racial microaggressions: microassaults (i.e., using racial epithets directed towards a person of color), microinsults (i.e., communications that demean one's heritage and racial identity through an insulting message), and microinvalidations (i.e., communications that negate the feelings of someone of color). They also discussed ten themes (e.g., alien in own land, color blindness, etc.) that manifest from the various types of racial microaggressions and the dilemmas that individuals face after being the recipients of these events. Although the term was first used forty years ago, the concept of racial microaggressions recently has received increased attention in the literature, and, more specifically, in the field of counseling and supervision.

1

Constantine (2007) investigated the impact of racial microaggressions on African American clients in cross-racial counseling relationships. Based on her results, she developed a ten-item Likert-type measure of perceived levels of racial microaggressions in therapeutic counseling relationships (e.g., "My counselor seemed to deny having any cultural biases or stereotypes"). She found that African Americans who perceived higher levels of racial microaggressions from White therapists reported perceptions of a lower therapeutic working alliance. In a closely related study, Constantine and Sue (2007) used a qualitative framework to identify and measure Black supervisees' perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision dyads with White supervisors. Based on the results from their interviews, they identified the following seven themes in supervisees' perceptions: invalidating racial-cultural barriers, making stereotypic assumptions about Black clients, making stereotypic assumptions about Black supervisees, being reluctant to give performance feedback for fear of being viewed as a racist, focusing primarily on clinical weaknesses, blaming clients of color for problems stemming from oppression, and offering culturally insensitive treatment recommendations. Based on these themes, Constantine and Sue developed a fifteen item, Likert-type checklist designed to identify racial microaggressions in counseling supervision.

When exploring the dynamics of cross-racial counseling and racial microaggressions, Constantine (2007) noted that levels of racial identity development in Black clients might have an impact on their perception of racial microaggressions. She

speculated that Black clients with lower levels of racial identity might not recognize the discriminatory behaviors as immediately as those with more advanced levels of racial identity development. Therefore, when understanding the impact of racial microaggressions in the cross-racial supervisory relationship, it is important to take into account the racial identity attitude of the minority in the dyadic relationship.

Racial identity development theory focuses on the stages through which individuals travel to achieve a better understanding of their culture and heritage. A number of racial identity development models have been developed to understand the experiences individuals have as they gain a better awareness of their own race. For example, Cross (1971) developed a five-stage model of the Negro-to-Black conversion experience, later revised and renamed the Model of Psychological Nigrescence (Cross, 1991, 1995). The revised model, and the subsequent expanded model, included four stages with multiple racial identity attitudes existing in all of the stages with the exception of one (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The four stages are as follows: Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. According to the theory, individuals in the earliest stages of Black identity development place less emphasis on being Black, whereas in the latter stages of Black identity development there is a greater emphasis on the individual endorsing attitudes that are more multicultural in nature (Cross, 1991, 1995). Based on numerous studies on racial identity spanning the last two decades, which have included studies related to the field of counseling and counselor education (e.g., Bhat & Davis, 2007; Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, &

Alfonso, 1999; Helms & Carter, 1991), it is evident studies on race and racial identity continue to be relevant to the field of social sciences and, more specifically, the field of counseling.

Cook (1994) explored the impact of racial identity in counseling supervision. She used Helms' theories of People of Color (1994) and White Racial Identity (1990) development to discuss how racial issues are addressed in counseling supervision. Cook provided examples of how racial issues may be addressed based on the level of racial identity development of supervisors and supervisees. For instance, supervisors and supervisees in less developed ego statuses (conformity status for people of color and contact status for Whites) may ignore the race of their clients, as well as themselves. In contrast, supervisors and supervisees with higher levels of development, such as the internalization status for people of color and the autonomy status for Whites, acknowledge the value of race and culture of the client, supervisor, and supervisee, while integrating their own cultural values in therapy and supervision (Cook).

Cook also applied Helms' (1990) Black/White interaction model to identify some of the similarities and differences that may occur in supervisory dyads based on the ego statuses of the supervisor and supervisee. In addition, she illustrated possible approaches to racial issues in supervision based on the ego status of an individual. Ego statuses of the supervisors and supervisees determine if the pair is "parallel" or "crossed" (Cook). In cross-racial supervision, parallel dyads consist of individuals from different races that display similar ego statuses. In contrast, crossed relationships include individuals from

different races who exhibit different ego statuses (Cook). There are two types of crossed relationships: regressive and progressive. Regressive supervisory dyads consist of supervisors who have less advanced ego statuses than their supervisees, whereas progressive supervisory dyads include supervisors whose ego statuses are more developed than their supervisees. Crossed relationships, by definition, would be expected to experience greater conflicts (overt and/or covert) than parallel relationships.

Similarly, Constantine and Sue (2007) acknowledged the impact racial microaggressions have on the supervisory relationship, noting the potential these behaviors have to create "impasses" between the supervisor and the supervisee. Such impasse can serve as sources of conflict in relationships between the supervisor and the supervisee and thus affect the working alliance.

Bordin (1983) developed a model of supervision based on the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance, which he first outlined in the context of therapeutic relationships (Bordin, 1979). Three qualities of importance should be considered when developing a working alliance: goals, tasks, and bonds (Bordin, 1979; Bordin, 1983). First, the supervisor and supervisee must mutually agree on goals to work towards in the supervisory process. Bordin (1983) developed a list of eight supervisory goals, most of which are change goals, for counseling supervision: mastery of specific skills, enlarging one's understanding of clients, enlarging one's awareness of process issues, increasing awareness of self and impact on process, overcoming personal and intellectual obstacles

5

toward learning and mastery, deepening one's understanding of concepts and theory, providing a stimulus to research, and maintenance of standards of service.

In addition to goal-setting, a number of tasks related to the goals should be completed to strengthen the working alliance. Specifically, supervisees can be expected to provide a written or oral report about their counseling session and present specific issues and problems for further review. Supervisors, on the other hand, should provide feedback to the supervisees, objectively observe the supervisee's counseling sessions, and be able to draw connections between the supervisees' issues and their goals throughout the supervisory process. Finally, bonds are developed when a sense of trust has been established in the supervisory relationship (Bordin, 1983). These bonds are unique from the bonds in therapeutic working alliance due to the evaluative nature of counseling supervision. The supervisor's role may fall somewhere between that of a teacher and that of a counselor, and this may cause the supervisee to approach the supervision relationship with some apprehension.

Several researchers have investigated the working alliance in cross-racial and cross-cultural counseling relationships (Burkard, Juarez-Huffaker, & Ajmere, 2003; Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999; Constantine, 2007; Schecter, 1992; Ward, 2003; Wong, Beutler, & Zane, 2007). For example, Constantine (2007) found a negative association between the perception of racial microaggressions and the therapeutic working alliance in cross-racial counseling relationships. She noted that the racial hostility that Black clients perceived from their White therapists might weaken the

working alliance. In addition, Constantine speculated that clients who believe their counselors are prejudiced or biased may end the counseling relationship prematurely. If racial microaggressions have such an impact on the working alliance between a counselor and client in cross-racial counseling relationships, a similar impact might be expected on the supervisory working alliance between the supervisor and supervisee from different racial backgrounds.

Few researchers have conducted investigations of the working alliance in cross-racial and cross-cultural supervisory relationships (e.g., Bhat & Davis, 2007; Morgan, 1984; Tsong, 2005). Of these latter studies, few participants were supervisors of color. In addition, to date no published studies have included supervisors-of-color's experiences of racial microaggressions in cross-cultural supervisory relationships.

The terms cross-racial, cross-cultural, and multicultural supervision have been used interchangeably to describe counseling supervision dyads that consist of individuals from different ethnic and racial backgrounds (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004). Although these terms have been used to describe the same phenomenon, there are subtle differences between each of them that can be identified to provide further clarification on the subject matter. Cross-racial counseling supervision exists when there is a racially different supervisor-supervisee dyad (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). On the other hand, cross-cultural supervision can include individuals from different ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds, or all three (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999). Cultural variables can include religion, sexual orientation, and

7

gender, for example. Although there has been an acknowledgement of the issues that may arise in a cross-racial supervision relationship (e.g., Constantine, 1997), few empirical studies have focused on the impact of race in the supervisory process (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Leong & Wagner, 1994). In this study, the term "cross-racial" will be used, as the focus will be on the relationships between Black supervisors and White supervisees.

Statement of the Problem

Issues that may arise in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships have received considerable attention. For the most part, however, attention has been focused on the interactions of White supervisors and supervisees of color. More specifically, researchers have investigated the experiences of the minority supervisee to inform White supervisors of some of the dilemmas that may arise and have a negative impact on the supervision experience. As the field of counseling and counselor education becomes more diverse, however, more persons of color are serving as counseling supervisors of White supervisees. This scenario poses a different challenge than those explored previously, as the history of power, privilege, and oppression in the United States has an impact on the beliefs of those who were born and reared in this country. The purpose of this study is to understand the impact racial microaggressions have on cross-racial counseling supervision experiences. More specifically, the experience of the Black supervisor is of interest as it can inform educators of additional variables that minorities face when providing supervision to White supervisees.

Research Questions

To address the purpose of this study, the following research questions will be explored:

1. Is there a relationship between the supervisors' racial identity attitudes and their perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervisory relationships?

2. Is there a relationship between the supervisors' perception of the supervisory working alliance and their perception of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships?

3. What combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions is most strongly related to perceptions of supervisory working alliance?

Need for the Study

Currently, all but two of the existing CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling programs are housed at predominantly White institutions (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], n.d.). The two exceptions, The University of Texas at San Antonio and St. Mary's University, also located in San Antonio, have reported student populations that are predominantly Hispanic (United States Department of Education [USDOE], n.d.). Thus, Black students and other minority students, who are entering doctoral programs in the counseling field in increasing numbers, face a high likelihood of providing supervision to counseling students from a

9

different racial background. If racial microaggressions have been found to be pervasive in everyday life (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., 2007) and in counseling (Constantine, 2007), then it is highly possible these microaggressions will appear in counseling supervision relationships with Black supervisors. Therefore, it is important to help Black doctoral students and new counselor educators develop skills to address issues of race and culture in the counseling supervision relationship and, more specifically, learn how to approach a supervisee who has exhibited racial microaggressions in supervision. It is hoped that providing additional information on cross-racial supervision relationships will provide a starting point for reducing potential conflicts and increasing positive outcomes in supervision.

Definitions of Terms

Cross-racial counseling supervision refers to a supervision dyad in which the supervisor and supervisee have racially different backgrounds (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). For the purposes of this study, cross-racial counseling supervision will consist of dyads that include Black supervisors and White supervisees.

Racial identity is the way persons think about, feel, or act in reference to their social reference group (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). In this study, Black racial identity will be measured by the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Vandiver et al., 2000).

Racial microaggressions are subtle verbal, behavioral, or environmental acts directed towards persons of color based on stereotypes (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino et al., 2007). Racial microaggressions can include microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations.

For the purposes of this study, racial microaggressions will be measured by the

Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale (Redmond, 2009).

Working alliance is a component of the supervisory relationship that is based on the

following qualities: mutual agreements on goals, tasks, and bonds. In this study, the

working alliance will be measured by the Working Alliance Inventory (Bahrick, 1989).

Overview of Chapters

This research study has been arranged in five chapters. Chapter 1 has provided a

brief overview of racial microaggressions and their impact on counseling and counseling

supervision relationships. Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of literature on racial

microaggressions, cross-racial counseling supervision, and working alliance in

counseling supervision relationships. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology for this study,

and will include additional information regarding the participants, sampling procedures,

instruments, and data analyses that were used. Chapter 4 will report the results from the

data analyses, and Chapter 5 will provide a summarization and discussion of the findings,

including study limitations and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Racial Microaggressions

Pierce (1970) coined the term "microaggressions" to identify the subtle, yet offensive behaviors that degrade and humiliate those to whom they are targeted. He noted that these microaggressions transpire from a sense of superiority one group has over another. Although the focus of his writings was on interpersonal relationships between Black Americans and White Americans, he acknowledged that these "offensive mechanisms" could arise in many other interpersonal interactions.

Defining Racial Microaggressions

Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. (2007) further explained racial microaggressions and identified three forms of these incidents: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations. Microassaults are intentional verbal and nonverbal acts used by perpetrators to deliberately hurt and demean the recipient. These assaults are typically expressed when perpetrators lose control of their emotions or when they are in a setting in which they feel safe to do so. This type of microaggression represents a more overt form of racism, which has declined over the years as it has become increasingly unacceptable to perform such acts against persons of color (POC).

Microinsults and microinvalidations are subtle snubs, and most perpetrators are unaware that they have said or done anything wrong. Communications that are insensitive and demean one's racial identity or heritage are classified as microinsults. Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. provided several examples of microinsults, both verbal and nonverbal, that included hidden messages that could insult the recipient—messages that are steeped in stereotypes about POC. Microinvalidations are "communications that exclude, negate, or nullify" (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., p. 274) the thoughts, feelings, and realities of POC. Perpetrators of this form of racial microaggressions say or do things to discredit the cultural experiences of the recipient. It has been suggested that racial microaggressions can cause psychological turmoil for recipients, as they require the recipient to constantly question the intention and message of the behavior. Thus, it is important to have a better way to classify and define racial microaggressions in an attempt to gain a better awareness of how to deal with them as they arise in the everyday lives of minorities.

The Taxonomy of Racial Microaggressions

In addition to identifying several forms of racial microaggressions, Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. (2007) provided examples of racial microaggressions based on the following eight themes: alien in own land, ascription of intelligence, color blindness, criminality/assumption of criminal status, denial of individual racism, myth of meritocracy, pathologizing cultural values/communication styles, and second-class

citizen. Table 1 provides examples of each theme identified and their corresponding

assumptions.

Table 1

Examples of Racial Microaggressions and Assumptions

THEME	*EXAMPLES AND ASSUMPTIONS*
Alien in own land	**Example:** *"Where did you learn to speak such good English?"* **Assumption:** You were not born in the United States.
Ascription of Intelligence	**Example:** *A teacher always calls on the Asian student for answers to the math questions.* **Assumption:** Asians and Asian Americans are superior in math.
Color Blindness	**Example:** *"I don't see color. We're all the same."* **Assumption:** Your race or cultural background isn't an important part of your life.
Criminality/Assumption of criminal status	**Example:** *A woman pulling her purse closer to her body as she walks past a Black male.* **Assumption:** Black men are criminals.
Denial of Individual Racism	**Example:** *"I'm not racist. I played on a baseball team with a lot of Latinos."* **Assumption:** A person isn't racist if they have friends of color.
Myth of Meritocracy	**Example:** *"Blacks just needs to work harder to be successful."* **Assumption:** Race has nothing to do with one's success.
Pathologizing Cultural Values/Communication Styles	**Example:** *A student blogs "Black people are so loud in the cafeteria. Why can't they just be quiet."* **Assumption:** Blacks should assimilate to more European styles of communication.

Note: Based on Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. (2007).

Furthermore, Sue, Nadal et al. (2008) conducted a qualitative study on the types

of racial microaggressions experienced by Black Americans. Due to the novelty of this

area, Sue, Nadal et al. chose to use focus groups as a means of study in order to get a

deeper understanding of the experiences reported by the participants. Demographic

information was collected, and the researchers followed an eight-question interview

protocol to collect data for the study. Participants reported incidents that could be

categorized in earlier themes developed (i.e., second-class citizenship, assumption of

criminality). Sue, Nadal et al. also identified three new themes specific to Black

Americans: assumption of intellectual inferiority, assumption of inferior status, and

assumed universality of the Black American experience. Table 2 provides examples and

assumptions related to each of these three themes. It is noted that an additional theme was

used to categorize miscellaneous incidents reported by the participants that did not fit into

the other categories.

Table 2

Racial Microaggressions Reported by Black Americans

THEME	*EXAMPLES AND ASSUMPTIONS*
Assumption of Intellectual Inferiority	**Example:** *A student saying to his peer "I don't want to work with you in my group because you are Black."* **Assumption:** Black people have inferior intelligence to Whites.
Assumption of Inferior Status	**Example:** *A teacher always calls on the Asian student for answers to the math questions.* **Assumption:** Asian and Asian American people are superior in math.
Universality of the Black American Experience	**Example:** *"I don't see color. We're all the same."* **Assumption:** Your race or cultural background isn't an important part of your life.

Note: Based on Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder (2008).

Effects of Racial Microaggressions on Black Americans

In a related study, Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder (2008) took additional steps to identify the ways in which Black Americans perceive, interpret, and react to instances of racial microaggressions and to determine the immediate and cumulative results of these acts. They used focus group interviews, as well, to allow the participants to talk in-depth about their experiences and to allow for rich interactions between the group members. The researchers identified the following five domains that represented the ways participants discussed racial microaggressions: incident, perception, reaction, interpretation, and consequence.

The incident domain focused on the specific situations that potentially may have negative racial undertones and included verbal, nonverbal/behavioral, and environmental situations. Verbal incidents are based on specific comments directed to the participants, while nonverbal and behavioral situations focus more on the body language of the perpetrator. Environmental situations reflect instances where one's physical surroundings may reflect some forms of subtle racism. For example, one's work environment may be viewed negatively if all of the upper management and executives are White, while the majority of the administrative support staff and custodial staff are Black.

The perception domain refers to instances when the participants had to determine whether or not the incident was racially motivated or not. This may happen when a co-worker makes a joke that may be racially insensitive, for example, or when an individual at a restaurant changes tables after being seated next to a group of minorities. After

determining whether or not an incident was racially motivated, the participants went through a reactionary period, and these strong reactions could be cognitive, behavioral, or emotional. Four core ideas evolved from the participants' responses in the reaction domain: healthy paranoia, sanity check, empowering and validating self, and rescuing offenders. Prior to or immediately following an event, participants report feeling paranoid about the situation, maybe as a result of previous instances of racism in their lives. In addition to being paranoid, participants reported checking with other Black individuals to validate their perception of the incident as a racist act. Not only did the participants report receiving validation from others, they also mentioned the empowering nature of the event and how they used the microaggressive event for self-validation, recognizing that their experiences were not their fault, but that of the aggressor. And finally, some of the participants reported feeling the need to rescue the offender, putting the offender's feelings ahead of their own feelings.

After experiencing, perceiving, and reacting to the microaggressive act, participants reported that they had to then interpret the event to be able to make meaning of it. The participants' responses were grouped into these five themes, similar to themes identified earlier: "You do not belong"; "You are abnormal"; "You are intellectually inferior"; "You are not trustworthy"; and, "You are all the same." Finally, the participants spoke about the psychological consequences of experiencing racial microaggressions, which included a sense of powerlessness and invisibility. The respondents also felt forced to comply or conform to White standards while at work, which caused them to feel a loss

17

of integrity. In fact, some respondents noted that they felt the need to act in ways inauthentic to their true selves to avoid confirming any stereotypical beliefs about Black people.

Recently, Torres, Driscoll, and Burrow (2010) conducted a study, using a mixed-methods approach, to identify the types of racial microaggressions experienced by high-achieving Black Americans and to understand how these experiences impact their mental health. Ninety-seven individuals, who had completed their doctoral studies or were current doctoral students, participated in the first part of their study, which used qualitative methodology to identify the racial microaggressions they perceived. They answered open-ended questions about their experiences in graduate school, including their successes and their challenges. Based on their responses, three themes emerged from their study: assumption of criminality/second-class citizen, underestimation of personal ability, and cultural/racial isolation. The first two themes, assumption of criminality/second-class citizen and underestimation of personal ability, are similar to themes also identified by by Sue and colleagues (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., 2007). Participants reported being treated like criminals on their campus and sensing that faculty members had concerns about their level of ability. The third theme, cultural/racial isolation, reflected the participants' sense of being singled out, whether real or perceived, because of their racial background. Participants reported feeling isolated, as though others did not understand what they were experiencing, and worried about how others perceived their academic performance.

The second part of the study, which used quantitive methods to determine the impact of these racial microaggressions, found that the underestimation of personal ability had the most salient effect on the mental health of the participants. Those who perceived more racial microaggressions related to personal ability reported higher levels of stress and higher numbers of depressive symptoms at the one-year follow-up. Torres, Driscoll, and Burrow concluded that the underestimation of personal ability may be a greater threat to one's mental health because of the underlying message or stereotype from which it is based, which may, in turn, threaten the personal goals of high-achieving Black Americans.

Overall, Sue and his colleagues (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., 2007, Sue, Nadal, et al., 2008) have provided an excellent foundation for scholars who seek to address issues related to racism and, more specifically, the impact of racial microaggressions on the lives of minorities, especially Black Americans. Their findings already have sparked an interest in the field of counseling. The following section will provide a detailed overview of recent studies on the impact of racial microaggressions on areas of counseling and counseling supervision.

Racial Microaggressions in Counseling and Counselor Education

Racial microaggressions and their impact on counseling and counseling supervision relationships have gained recent attention in the counseling literature. Qualitative and quantitative studies have investigated the experiences of racial microaggressions on Black clients (Constantine, 2007), Black supervisees (Constantine &

Sue, 2007), and Black counseling and counselor education faculty (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owen, 2008). These initial studies have provided a strong foundation for further studies to explore the experiences of Black individuals in the field of counseling, specifically Black counseling supervisors since there are no studies to date that focus on their experiences of racial microaggressions.

Constantine, 2007

Constantine (2007) sought to understand the impact of cross-racial dynamics in counseling relationships in which the counselor was White, including Black clients' perceptions of racial microaggression acts by the counselors, the therapeutic working alliance, the general and multicultural competence of the White counselors, and the clients' overall satisfaction with their counseling experience. Because this was the first attempt to examine racial microaggressions in counseling, Constantine's study required several initial steps.

Constantine (2007) conducted a focus group during the initial phase of her study to help develop the categories of racial microaggressions experienced in cross-racial counseling relationships. The focus group consisted of Black students at a large, predominantly White university in the northeastern United States. These students, former clients at the university's counseling center, were contacted by center clerical staff members who asked if they were willing to participate in a focus group about their experiences at the counseling center. Each focus group ($n = 3$) consisted of eight

members (17 women and 8 men). Each participant received $20 for participating in the study.

Constantine (2007) created several questions for the focus groups based on a thorough review of theoretical and empirical literature on racial microaggressions and counseling Black students, including journal articles, books, and internet sites, as well as Constantine's own clinical experiences with Black college students. A Black counseling psychology doctoral student conducted and audiotaped the focus group sessions, which lasted from 55 to 75 minutes.

After the audiotapes were transcribed, Constantine (2007) identified twelve themes, some of which were similar to previous themes identified by Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., (2007), and examples of racial microaggressions that could be used to develop a scale to address the persistency and frequency of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling relationships. These twelve themes included (1) colorblindness, (2) overidentification, (3) denial of personal or individual racism, (4) minimization of racial-cultural issues, (5) assignment of unique or special status, (6) stereotypic assumptions about members of a racial or ethnic group, (7) accused hypersensitivity regarding racial or cultural issues, (8) the meritocracy myth, (9) culturally insensitive treatment considerations or recommendations, (10) acceptance of less than optional behaviors on the basis of racial-cultural group membership, (11) idealization, and (12) dysfunctional helping or patronization.

These themes then were converted into a 12-item, 3-point Likert-type scale (1 = this never happened, 2 = this happened, but it did not bother me, 3 = this happened and I was bothered by it) to be used to assess racial microaggressions in counseling relationships. The scale was then presented to a group of experts, four college mental health professionals and student affairs professionals who had experience working with Black students in the college setting. Based on their feedback, one item was omitted and several were revised to ensure that the items were clear.

Constantine (2007) piloted the revised 11-item scale with a subgroup of ten participants from her original focus groups to gain additional feedback on how well the scale captured their experiences in counseling with a White counselor. Based on feedback from the group, an additional item was dropped because it lacked clarity. The final instrument, which was used in the second phase of Constantine's study, consisted of 10 items.

Participants in the second phase of the study were Black undergraduate students from three mid- to large-sized, predominantly White universities in the northeastern portion of the United States (Constantine, 2007). All of the participants were clients at their prospective university's counseling center and had been diagnosed with adjustment disorder. In addition, Constantine restricted participation to those individuals who were receiving individual counseling services only. Forty of the forty-one clients fully participated in this study. After their final counseling sessions, the participants were given survey packets that included the following measures: client demographic

questionnaire, Racial Microaggressions in Counseling Scale (Constantine, 2007), Working Alliance Inventory-Short Form (Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989), Counselor Rating Form-Short (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983), Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991), and the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire-8 (Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979). It was noted that the Working Alliance Inventory-Short Form was chosen because it was the most frequently used instrument measuring alliance, and it has demonstrated high reliabilities in other studies. In addition, Constantine used the total score for this inventory and not the score for each subscale (i.e., tasks, bonds, and goals).

Constantine (2007) explored eight hypotheses in this study. She first hypothesized that there would be a negative association between the perceptions of racial microaggressions by Black clients and their perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance, the counselors' general and multicultural counseling competence, and their satisfaction with the counseling process with their White counselors. A second hypothesis was that the clients' perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance would be positively associated with the perceptions of their counselors' general counseling competence, multicultural competence, and their satisfaction with the counseling process. Constantine also hypothesized that the clients' perceptions of the counselors' general and multicultural competence would be positively associated with their overall counseling satisfaction ratings.

For the fourth hypothesis in this study, Constantine (2007) assumed that the clients' perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance would significantly mediate their perceptions of the racial microaggressions and of their counselor. An additional hypothesis indicated that the clients' perceptions of the counselors' general counseling competence and multicultural counseling competence would significantly mediate between the relationship of the clients' perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance and their satisfaction with counseling. Constantine (2007) also hypothesized that the clients' perceptions of the counselors' general and multicultural counseling competence would significantly mediate the relationship between their perceived racial microaggressions and satisfaction with counseling. The seventh hypothesis indicated that the relationship between the clients' perceived racial microaggressions and satisfaction with counseling would be significantly mediated by their perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance and the counselors' multicultural counseling competence. The final hypothesis indicated that the clients' perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance would significantly mediate the relationship between the perceived racial microaggressions and the satisfaction with counseling.

There were several significant findings in this seminal study. First, Constantine (2007) found that Black clients who perceived higher levels of racial microaggressions in counseling sessions with White counselors had lower perceptions of the working alliance in the therapeutic relationship. In addition, Black clients who perceived higher levels of working alliance with their White therapist also reported higher perceptions of their

24

therapists' general and multicultural counseling competence. Finally, Black clients who perceived higher levels of racial microaggressions in their counseling sessions with White therapists reported lower levels of satisfaction with counselor ratings. Constantine noted that the results from this study should be taken with caution as there were significant intraclass correlations (ICCs) for the perceived racial microaggressions, therapeutic working alliance, multicultural counseling competence, and satisfaction with counseling variables. Therefore, Constantine concluded that the participants' ratings could have been influenced by their previous experiences of racial discrimination and interactions with White individuals not related to their counseling experience and suggested that further research be conducted to address the issue of rating nonindependence between therapeutic working alliance, multicultural counseling competence, and counseling satisfaction.

Constantine (2007) identified several limitations to her study. First, caution must be used when generalizing the results to the larger population. The sample was small and came from a specific geographic region. Second, the Racial Microaggressions in Counseling Scale was newly developed by Constantine and had not been validated prior to the study. In addition to these issues, Constantine noted that some of the participants may have had lower levels of racial identity awareness; thus, they may not have recognized some of the racial microaggressions in their relationship with their White counselor. She suggested several ideas for further research, which included surveying Black clients who are receiving services through community mental health agencies,

determining if racial microaggressions have an impact on the mental health of Black clients, and examining the experiences of White counselors in cross-racial counseling dyads with Black clients to have a better understanding of how their experiences may impact the counseling relationship.

Constantine and Sue, 2007

Constantine's (2007) initial study focused on the impact of racial microaggressions in the counseling relationships. In a later study, Constantine and Sue (2007) conducted a qualitative investigation on the perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision dyads in which the supervisor was White and the supervisee was Black. Constantine and Sue used purposive sampling to identify and select a sample for this study. Ten individuals participated in the study and they met the following criteria: self-identified as Black, engaged in a counseling supervision relationship with a White supervisor within the last two years, acknowledged that subtle racism exists, and had personal experiences with racism within supervision. Constantine and Sue developed an interview protocol and piloted the initial interview with two Black female advanced doctoral students. These students suggested changes for clarifying some of the interview questions, reordering of some of the interview questions, and adding follow-up questions to gain a better understanding of the experiences of the Black supervisees. The interview protocol (not published) was revised based on this feedback.

Constantine, the primary researcher of the study, who is Black, conducted the interviews with the participants, in a private office (Constantine & Sue, 2007). Although

not stated, the participants may have been more responsive to the primary researcher because she was the same race, whereas talking with someone from another race about this sensitive subject matter may have proven more difficult for the participants. As the primary researcher, Constantine also used interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) to gain a better understanding of the Black supervisees' experiences and to help identify emerging themes. Constantine read each interview multiple times to gain a holistic view of the experiences of the Black supervisees with their White supervisors. After noting several initial themes, Constantine consulted with an independent auditor to review the interviews and assist with determining the predominant themes. The final list of seven themes that were identified encompassed the experiences of at least 30% of the participants in the study. After these themes were determined, a two-person team of Black counseling psychologists served as consultants and developed a 15-item checklist based on the experiences of the participants and the themes that emerged. The measure, the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist, was designed to assist supervisors with reflecting on the thoughts and experiences of their supervisees in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships.

The Racial Microaggressions in Supervision checklist reflected the following seven themes that seemed to best capture the experiences of Black supervisees in cross-racial counseling supervisory dyads with White supervisees: invalidating racial-cultural issues; making stereotypic assumptions about Black clients; making stereotypic assumptions about Black supervisees; reluctance to give performance feedback for fear of

27

being viewed as racist; focusing primarily on clinical weaknesses; blaming clients of color for problems stemming from oppression; and offering insensitive treatment recommendations.

Several supervisees in the study felt that, at times, their supervisors "tended to minimize, dismiss, or avoid" (Constantine & Sue, 2007, p. 146) discussing issues related to race and culture during supervision sessions. They reported that their experiences of being invalidated led to feelings of frustration. In addition, some of the supervisees felt that their White supervisors, not only had stereotypic assumptions about their clients, but seemed to have stereotypic views about the Black supervisee. Constantine and Sue provided several excerpts from the interviews that substantiated the supervisees' perceptions of racial microaggressions. One supervisee appeared shocked by the comments of her supervisor, while another supervisee stopped discussing Black clients with the supervisor because the supervisor seemed uncomfortable discussing topics related to that specific population. Two supervisees noted comments that their supervisors said to them about themselves that they found offensive, which led to one of the supervisees requesting a new, culturally competent supervisor.

A "Catch-22", as Constantine and Sue (2007) described it, was found as some supervisees noted that their supervisors were reluctant to give feedback for fear of being viewed as racists, while other supervisees felt as though their supervisors focused primarily on their clinical weaknesses. The latter theme was based on the supervisees' beliefs that their supervisors viewed them as incompetent in some ways. In addition to

interpersonal issues within the supervisory relationship, supervisees also reported that

their supervisors tended to blame their minority clients for the problems they were having

based on systemic oppression (Constantine & Sue). The comments made by the

supervisors caused the supervisees to feel frustrated and lose trust in their supervisors.

Finally, some of the supervisees reported that their supervisors suggested culturally

insensitive treatment recommendations for working with their clients of color.

Constantine and Sue noted that some of the biases that supervisors had may be, in part,

related to Eurocentric conceptualizations in the field of mental health, such as

encouraging clients to individuate from their families, which may be culturally

insensitive to collectivistic cultural groups. They concluded that racial microaggressions

are present in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships and that the perception of

racial microaggressions can have a dire impact on the supervision process. Constantine

and Sue also suggested that the study be replicated to increase the generalizability of the

results and to determine if other effects might be present.

Constantine, Smith, Redington, and Owens, 2008

Racial microaggressions not only have been found in counseling and counseling

supervision relationships, but also within the work environment of counseling and

counseling psychology programs. Specifically, Black faculty members in counseling and

counseling psychology programs have reported instances of racial microaggressions from

their White colleagues (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owen, 2008). Constantine et

al. designed a qualitative study to identify some of the ways in which racial

microaggressions towards Black faculty are manifested in counseling and counseling psychology programs.

Purposive sampling (not described) was used to identify a sample appropriate for the study. Participation criteria were as follows: self-identification as Black, tenure-track or tenured faculty member in a doctoral-level counseling and counseling psychology program, acknowledgement that subtle racism exists in the United States, and personal experiences of subtle racism in academia. Fifteen individuals were contacted; however, only twelve individuals (7 women, 5 men) agreed to participate in the study.

A pilot interview was conducted with one Black male and one Black female faculty members in doctoral-level counseling programs and, based on their feedback, revisions were made. The final protocol (not published) used for the study included a semistructured audiotaped interview that was non-prescriptive and allowed for additional probing for any of the areas that were of focus for the study. One black counseling psychologist (the first author of the study) and one biracial (Asian and White) female doctoral student in counseling psychology conducted the interviews with the twelve participants. The term *racial microaggression* was defined prior to commencing the interviews. In addition the interviewers also confirmed that the intention of the interviews was to focus on the instances of subtle racism experienced as a faculty member in the participants' respective programs. The interviews lasted 45 to 70 minutes.

Constantine et al. (2008) identified the following seven themes that permeated the experiences of the Black faculty: alternating feelings of invisibility/marginalization and

hypervisibility; having their qualifications or credentials questioned or challenged by other faculty colleagues, staff members, or students; receiving inadequate mentoring in the workplace; encountering organizational expectations to serve in service-oriented roles with low-perceived value by administrators or other faculty colleagues; having difficulties determining whether subtle discrimination was race or gender based; being self-consciousness regarding choice of clothing, hairstyle, or manner of speech; and using coping strategies to address racial microaggressions (Constantine et al., 2008). It was noted that some of the themes were interconnected to a degree.

First, participants reported feelings of invisibility within their departments, with the exception being when their expertise (typically related to race- or ethnic-related topics) was needed (Constantine et al., 2008). They reported feeling highly visible during these exceptional times (e.g. recruiting an applicant of color for an employment position). These feelings were also reported in relation to the research conducted by the participants, especially when the research was related to racial, ethnic, or gender issues. The participants indicated that their research was not valued. Some participants noted that their research in these areas was highly valued during times of accreditation by the programs' respective accrediting bodies (e.g. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs or the American Psychological Association).

Second, the credentials of the Black faculty appeared to be in question by other faculty, staff, and students (Constantine et al., 2008). Eight of the participants in the study reported that they experienced this phenomenon and provided examples, which included

being referred to by their first name, without invitation, or as "Miss" or "Mister" instead of "Doctor", and being directly questioned about their academic credentials by faculty and staff. One faculty member described an experience in her school's cafeteria when a White man assumed she was working in the cafeteria and proceeded to give her his order for his meal.

Some of the black faculty members ($n = 7$) reported a lack of adequate mentoring in their workplace (Constantine et al., 2008). One participant indicated that she decided to do without mentoring after one failed attempt at seeking out mentoring from another faculty member of color. Six of the black faculty members acknowledged that they felt as though it was expected for them to serve in other service roles on campus (e.g., faculty advisor of a cultural-based student organization), and that these roles had very little perceived value by their colleagues.

Several of the female respondents in the study stated that they had difficulties determining whether the treatment they received was based on their race or their gender (Constantine et al., 2008). One respondent provided an example of her experience as acting department chair. She noted how colleagues would profess their confidence in her, but covertly spoke with the dean to have her decisions overturned. At the conclusion of her tenure and following these negative experiences, she processed her feelings with her colleagues, who indicated they were uncomfortable with confronting her, fearing she would perceive them as racist or sexist. By not coming to her directly, she still viewed her colleagues as racist and sexist.

32

Although the first five themes appear to be closely related, in that they revolve around the actions of the participants' colleagues and are centered on job responsibilities, the sixth theme seemed to be more personal. Three of the respondents indicated that they felt self-conscious about how their hairstyles, clothing, and manner of speech were perceived by others (Constantine et al., 2008). One Black male faculty member acknowledged that he was conscious about being perceived as intimidating, and he would dress and speak in a manner that would fail to perpetuate stereotypes of Blacks. Another participant, a Black female, spoke on being conscious about her style of dress, tone of voice, and her bilingualism (i.e. her ability also to speak "Ebonics"). She stated that she would wear her African clothes less frequently due to the pressure of not appearing "too Black" (Constantine et al., p. 353).

The final theme identified the coping strategies that the respondents used to address the subtle racism that they experience while at work. Several strategies were identified, including the following: seeking support from colleagues, friends, partners, or family ($n = 10$); being wise about choosing if, when, and how they would address the racial microaggressions ($n = 7$); participating in prayer and other forms of spirituality ($n = 6$); withdrawing, interpersonally or emotionally, from faculty they perceived as perpetrators of racial microaggressions ($n = 3$); and resigning to the fact that there will always be some form of racist treatment in the academic environment ($n = 3$).

Based on the experiences of the Black faculty members, Constantine et al. (2008) concluded that counseling and counseling psychology faculty need to engage in more

professional development, training, and dialogue pertaining to the subtle forms of racism experienced by Black faculty. They stated their belief that engaging in these activities would improve the health of the programs, clients, and students.

Michael-Makri, 2010

A recent study investigated racial and ethnic minority graduate students' experiences of racial microaggressions in CACREP-accredited counseling programs in predominately White institutions (PWIs). Michael-Makri (2010) sent an invitation to participate to CACREP liaisons and various listservs in an effort to identify participants for the study. Any student was able to complete the survey; however, only those respondents who identified themselves as a racial or ethnic minority were included in the study. A demographics questionnaire, adapted from the Racism and Life Experiences Scale (Harrell, 1997), and the Daily Life Experiences scale, also from the Racism and Life Experiences Scale, were the instrumentation used to gather data regarding the participants' experiences of racial microaggressions in counseling programs.

One hundred, eighty-seven respondents were included in the sample. Of that number, 77 participants indicated that their primary race was African American, 37 identified as Hispanic, 29 identified as Multiracial, 16 identified as International, 14 identified as Native American, 8 identified as Asian American, 4 identified as Arab American, and 2 identified as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Additionally, the majority of the respondents ($n = 116$) indicated they were currently enrolled in a master's

program, while the remaining participants ($n = 71$) indicated they were enrolled in doctoral programs. Eighty-four percent of the respondents (n = 154) were female.

The results of the study found that racial and ethnic minority students in CACREP-accredited counseling programs at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) experienced moderate levels of racial microaggressions. There was no significant difference between American racial and ethnic groups, nor was there a significant difference between the American racial and ethnic participants and international participants. It is noted that Asian Americans, Arab Americans, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders were not included in this analysis due to a low response rate. In addition, there was no significant difference between the experiences of master's students and doctoral students. There were no significant differences between male and female respondents in this study. Michael-Makri concluded that racial and ethnic minority students in CACREP-accredited programs at PWIs experience racism and racial microaggressions in their programs, and urged faculty in these programs to be cognizant of the findings and make special efforts to create an environment in which these students can be successful.

Critical Race Theory and Racial Microaggressions

The critical race theory (CRT) movement, which originated in the legal field in the 1970s following the Civil Rights Movement, includes the works of a number of scholars whose goal is to better society by studying and transforming the relationships between race, racism, and power (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). This theory evolved from

and built on two very significant movements: critical legal studies and radical feminism. Since its inception, CRT has expanded beyond the realms of law and into fields such as education, ethnic studies, and political science (Delgado & Stefanic).

Basic Tenets of the Critical Race Theory

There are six basic tenets, or themes, associated with critical race theory (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). First, critical race theorists believe that racism is an ordinary, normal part of everyday life and the experiences of people of color. Second, the hierarchy of race, what Delgado and Stefanic refer to "white-over-color ascendency," serves psychic and material purposes in society. Theorists, again, agree that racism in ingrained in American culture, and thus it is hard to eradicate it. The concept of colorblindness has only helped to reduce more blatant forms of racism. In addition, Delgado and Stefanic noted that racism continues to advance the interests of elite Whites (materially) and working class people (psychically), which they referred to as "interest convergence" or "material determinism," thus providing no incentive to end it.

The "social construction thesis," the third tenet, affirms that race and races are categories that are products of society that can be changed and manipulated based on what is convenient. Although people from similar origins share similar physical features, such as skin color, hair texture, and bone structure, there are a variety of other traits that cannot be linked to genetics, including personality, intelligence, and morality. Another theme, differential racism, is a recent concept that has been given attention by theorists. In society, it has been observed that minority groups are racialized differently based on

the trends within the labor market. Thus, a minority group's status, in terms of how they are treated, may be more or less important depending on the needs of the industry.

The fifth theme of CRT draws attention to the ideas of intersectionality and anti-essentialism. No person has one single identity, but instead multiple, overlapping identities that could be related to their race, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, etc. These identities at times could be in conflict with one another, testing one's loyalty and allegiance to a specific identity. The final tenet of CRT is referred to as the voice-of-color thesis, which assumes that people of color will be able to speak about certain matters to Whites that they would presumably not be aware of, specifically in relation to race and racism. Based on their experiences of oppression and minority status in the United States, persons of color may be best able to communicate these issues. In CRT, legal storytelling and narrative analysis are used by writers in the movement to discuss their own experiences and how they pertain to laws.

Critical Race Theory in Education

As previously stated, CRT emerged from the legal field. However, other disciplines, especially education, have drawn from this theory to help identify and address issues pertaining to their field. Solórzano (1998) further expanded on the following critical race theory tenets as they relate to the field of education: the centrality and intersectionality of race and racism, the challenge to dominant ideology, the commitment to social justice, the centrality of experiential knowledge, and the interdisciplinary perspective. Different from traditional CRT tenets, scholars in the field

of education challenge the traditional ideologies of the educational system, including meritocracy, colorblindness, and equal opportunity. By challenging these beliefs, critical race theorists in education promote social justice in the field of education and fight for the abolition of racism in the broader world. Finally, CRT in education focuses on analyzing race and racism in education by viewing it in historical and contemporary contexts through an interdisciplinary lens.

Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso (2000) furthered explained the differences between traditional tenets of CRT and those more closely related to the field of education. First, race and racism is the primary focus in the research and scholars challenge the traditional models, texts, discourse, etc., to show how the social constructs of race, gender, and class intersect to have a significant impact on communities of color. In addition, CRT in education uses liberating and transforming methods to further research discrimination based on race, gender, and class. Finally, CRT in education is open to learning about issues of discrimination by examining research in other disciplines, including ethnic studies, women's studies, and sociology, to name a few. Based on these strengths, Solórzano et al. used critical race theory to explore the impact racial microaggressions have on campus climate at predominantly White institution.

In accordance with CRT tenets, Solórzano et al. (2000) followed a qualitative, focus group research design to give their participants the opportunity to tell their stories in their own words, which can be empowering in itself. Participants were chosen through purposive sampling, and the sample included 34 Black students (18 females, 16 males)

from three elite, predominantly White, Research I institutions in the United States. In sum, there were ten focus groups. A grounded theory approach was used to analyze the data to identify patterns and themes from the participants' responses.

The students reported instances of racial microaggressions in academic spaces on campus, both inside and outside of the classroom setting. Within the classroom setting, the students reported feeling invisible, believing that the coursework ignored or minimized experiences of Black people or provided stereotypical viewpoints, sensing that faculty had low expectations of them, and experiencing racial segregation within peer study groups. Outside of the classroom setting, the students reported feeling unwanted or viewed as being somewhere inappropriate in settings such as the library and other campus buildings.

Similarly to their experiences in academic spaces, the students reported having negative experiences in social spaces on campus as well. Specifically, several of the responses centered on the presence of campus police or security and the students' sensed that they were perceived and treated as criminals. Students noted being treated differently than their White peers when it came to having parties, noting that the Black students had to have campus security. One student even commented that the Black students had to use different entrances to the buildings, including exiting out of the back of the buildings. Another student noted that he and his friends were playing football in a campus parking lot one night when several members of campus police (four or five cars and two

additional officers on bikes) approached them. He noted that it took at least 45 minutes for the officers to listen to their story, and in the end, they were forced to leave.

As a result of these instances on campus, Black students reported creating spaces, what Solórzano et al. (2000) referred to as "counter-spaces," on and off campus to serve as a place where they could have positive collegial experiences. These counter-spaces nurtured the students and allowed them not only to be supported academically, but also develop relationships with others that provided them with additional support.

The feedback the participants provided was invaluable to the study of racial microaggressions on college campuses. However, future research should allow for more quantitative methods of examining the impact racial microaggressions have on Black students in higher education. It would be beneficial, for example, to explore additional variables related to the students' psychological well-being to determine if these cumulative experiences lead to an increase in symptoms related to anxiety and depression.

<div align="center">Criticisms on the Construct of Racial Microaggressions</div>

Although Sue and colleagues (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., 2007, Sue, Nadal, et al., 2008) have further defined the construct of racial microaggressions and added empirical studies to the literature on the topic, there has been some discussion and dissension about the validity of it. In the May-June 2008 issue of *The American Psychologist*, several authors provided non-refereed commentaries on Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s (2007) article on racial

<div align="center">40</div>

microaggressions and their impact in everyday life. For example, Schact (2008)

countered Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s inference about the dynamics in the cross-

racial counseling relationship based on racial microaggressions, pointing out that several

other issues, not related to race, could be impacting the interaction between the counselor

and the client. Specifically, he noted that the authors focused solely on the racial

dynamics and did not probe further into underlying, more general interpersonal issues of

the client and the counselor, explaining that these same issues could have a similar effect

on same-race counseling dyads. Harris (2008) also questioned how one would know

whether or not they were being treated unfairly based on their race or ethnicity.

Specifically, he questioned Sue's reported experiences on a flight (see Sue, Capodilupo,

Torino, et al., 2007, p. 275), providing alternative reasons for the treatment he and his

colleagues received while on the aircraft. He did not question Sue's ideology, per se, but

he pondered whether or not Sue's experiences were based on an "experiential reality" (p.

276) or whether they were solely used to affirm his taxonomy of racial microaggressions.

Thomas (2008) also argued that Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s (2007)

perspective was "flawed," and went as far to describe it as "macrononsense." He

contended that Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. wanted to have things both ways in regards

to interracial interactions. For instance, Thomas used affirmative action as an example,

noting how the authors were in support of this policy, yet considered it offensive if an

individual is asked if they were hired for a job or admitted into a university based on their

race. He also commented on three of the identified themes, stating that he felt the

41

examples of racial microaggressions were "irrational reasons" (p. 274) for causing emotional turmoil in persons of color. For example, Thomas pointed out that many Americans, both White and non-White, have ethnicities that are not native to the United States and that many Americans are proud of their ethnicity. Therefore, asking persons about their ethnicity in the "appropriate context" (p. 274) should not be considered an act of prejudice or discrimination. Further, Thomas particularly took issue with the idea that a minority could become emotionally distressed from someone commenting on their intelligence (i.e., a Black American being told they are "articulate" or the assumption that an Asian American will do well in math and science), feeling as though Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al. overemphasized the impact these statements could have on an individual. Finally, Thomas felt that they were trying to focus too much on the race and ethnicity of an individual and less on the individual as a human, citing the dismissal of Rogerian concepts in favor of judging people based on their demographics. Overall, Thomas argued that Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s ideas promoted a sense of victimization and were in opposite direction of the current philosophies in psychology, which are heading towards the positive side of human nature.

In contrast to Schact and Thomas, Goodstein (2008) supported Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s (2007) findings, but found their language confusing at times. Specifically, she noted that there was no clear distinction between race and culture, pointing out that White Americans may not be the only persons who have a Western European worldview. She acknowledged that this is especially important in the therapeutic setting as clinicians

42

need to be aware of the point of view of their client, regardless of race. Goodstein also voiced her concern about the authors' notion that racial self-awareness is "*the* prerequisite for cultural competence" (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al., p. 283) and suggested that it is just one of several attributes that can lead to cultural competence. Overall, Goodstein was appreciative of Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, et al.'s contribution to the field of psychology and encouraged scholars to continue having discussions that clearly delineate the distinct differences between race, culture, and other characteristics of an individual's identity and how these differences can help Whites have a better understanding and awareness of racism.

Sue, Capodilupo, Nadal and Torino (2008) responded to the criticisms, pointing out that the majority of these responses were another way in which Whites tried to negate or nullify the experiences of persons of color in the United States. They referred to previous writings that discussed the guilt that Whites experience about their privileged status, noting that this is one of the reasons they have difficulty acknowledging the existence of race-related issues. Specifically, Sue, Capodilupo, Nadal et al. referred to Schact (2008), Thomas (2008), and Harris' (2008) commentaries, stating that their comments were based on "false analogies, surface arguments, and flawed reasoning." They further clarified that their findings, and specifically the taxonomy that followed, were race-specific, and countered Schact's views on general microinteractions that occur in relationships. In addition, Sue, Capodilupo, Nadal et al. stated that Thomas' equating the experiences of political conservatives to those of people of color were "laughable"

43

and explained that, because Thomas is a White male, it was difficult for him to understand how he was imposing his power to define reality onto the experiences of people of color (POC). Additional examples of the daily experiences of POC were provided, showing how racism is ingrained in society. In response to Harris (2008), Sue, Capodilupo, Nadal et al. agreed that in instances of subtle racism, several reasons could be provided to explain the act. However, they noted that these multiple reasons could get in the way of understanding the unconscious factors that were underlying the acts or behaviors. In regards to the criticisms about victimization, the authors argued that they were amazed that POC can survive and flourish in the face of the everyday racisms they experience. In conclusion, it was noted that there will always be alternative explanations for racial microaggressions, and that POC spend time thinking of these explanations as they encounter these events. However, the experiential realities of POC should not be dismissed, as this takes away the power of the POC to define their own reality.

Limitations of Previous Research on Racial Microaggressions

There are several limitations that have been identified in the study of racial microaggressions, specifically as it relates to studies in the field of counseling. First, several studies have identified similar participation criteria when recruiting individuals for their studies (e.g., Constantine, Smith, Redington, and Owens, 2008; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Capidilupo, & Holder, 2008; Sue, Nadal et al., 2008). Specifically, participants had to acknowledge that subtle racism exists in the United States. In addition, the participants must have had a personal experience of a racist act. It is

understandable that researchers would try to remain consistent in these early studies, which can be viewed as a strength of the research design. However, these criteria, alone, yielded a very selective group of participants, so the results cannot be generalized to a larger population.

Second, the majority of the studies (e.g., Constantine, Smith, Redington, and Owens, 2008; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue, Capidilupo, & Holder, 2008; Sue, Nadal, et al., 2008) were qualitative and designed to gain further information about the experiences of Black Americans. This allowed for themes to be developed about the impact of racial microaggressions on the recipient. However, quantitative studies would provide researchers the opportunity to identify additional relationships and draw more conclusions about racial microaggressions and other variables, such as personality traits, racial identity, or psychological functioning. For example, Constantine and Sue acknowledged that their preliminary findings would suggest that racial microaggressions would have a significant impact on the supervisory relationship. Thus, a future study should include quantitative methods to measure specific components of the supervisory relationship, including the supervisory working alliance. Finally, the majority of the current studies on racial microaggressions in the counseling literature do not address the coping strategies that Black Americans use to deal with their experiences of subtle racism. This information is necessary, as it would be helpful for counselors and counselor educators to know so that they can be of further assistance to their clients and trainees, respectively, who may report similar experiences.

45

Finally, there appears to be a gap in the literature as it relates to the differences between how men and women perceive racial microaggressions. Recently, a taxonomy of gender microaggressions has been developed, and the following themes emerged: sexual objectification, second-class citizen, assumptions of inferiority, denial of the reality of sexism, assumptions of traditional gender roles, and use of sexist language (Capodilupo et al., 2010). Several of these themes are closely related to the themes presented for racial microaggressions. Thus, it may be difficult for women to accurately identify the microaggressions they perceive in everyday life, and in counseling and counseling supervision. Black females, for example, may feel as though they are being treated inferiorly in comparison to others in counseling supervision relationship. However, they may not be able to determine if they are being treated differently because of their race, gender, or a combination of the two. Current literature has not found significant differences between the experiences of racial microaggressions between males and females (Barnes, 2010; Michael-Makri, 2010). Further studies need to investigate the interaction between racial and gender microaggressions in counseling, counseling supervision, and everyday life.

Although valuable information has been learned about the experiences of racism in the lives of Black Americans, further studies are needed, not only to gain a better understanding of how these microaggressions are impacting the lives of Black Americans, but also to understand how their own personal characteristics impact their perceptions of subtle racism. One phenomenon that needs to be further explored is the

racial identity of Black Americans who perceive racial microaggressions in their lives. Since one's racial identity can fluctuate throughout life, it would be helpful to know if one's racial identity impacts how he or she perceives racial microaggressions and the impact that these events have on one's life.

<p style="text-align:center">Black Racial Identity</p>

Following the Black Power Movement of the 1960s, a pivotal theory on Black racial identity was developed to better understand how individuals came into their Blackness (Cross, 1971). This theory served as a foundation for future theoretical models of racial identity development and has been revised (Cross, 1991) and recently expanded based on additional empirical studies (Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Worrell, Cross, & Vandiver, 2001).

<p style="text-align:center">Cross' Model of Psychological Nigrescence</p>

Cross (1971) developed a five-stage model of the Negro-to-Black conversion experience, later revised and renamed the Model of Psychological Nigrescence (Cross, 1991,1995), which outlines stages of racial identity development in Black Americans. The original model included the following five stages: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, and internalization-commitment. During the pre-encounter stage, an individual's worldview is based on European ideals that shape an individual's sociological, cultural, and psychological way of being (Cross, 1971). Individuals in the pre-encounter stage are viewed to have self-hatred and poor psychological functioning. The encounter stage includes two steps. The first step of the

encounter stage includes a shocking or personal event that jars the old viewpoint of the individual. Following the event, the individual enters a phase during which he or she tests the validity of the new perspective. The Immersion-Emersion stage is marked by intense feelings of pride about one's Blackness and a dichotomous way of thinking. In addition, individuals in this stage may put down anything that represents White, Eurocentric culture. The next stage, Internalization, is characterized by an integration of the new identity with previously held beliefs, which creates a balanced worldview for the individual. Finally, an individual who has progressed through the Internalization stage and continues to be a social activist to bring about change within his or her race has reached the final stage, Internalization-Commitment. Black Americans in internalization were thought to have a healthy self-acceptance and overall psychological well-being.

The 1991 Revised Model of Nigrescence

Following a number of research studies, the theory of psychological Nigrescence was revised to reflect two major changes. First, Cross (1991, 1995) clarified the differences between reference group orientation (RGO) and personal identity (PI). Reference groups refer to one's social identity (e.g., race, ethnicity) while one's personal identity is a combination of personality traits (e.g., intelligence) and psychological functioning. The second change focused on the number of stages and racial identity attitudes within those stages. The Internalization and Internalization-Commitment stages were merged, as empirical data found there were no significant differences between them.

48

Thus, the revised model included the following four stages: Pre-Encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization.

In addition, multiple racial identity attitudes were identified within each stage, with the exception of Encounter (Cross, 1991). In the Pre-encounter stage, two identity attitudes were identified, which include Assimilation and Anti-Black. Black Americans with Assimilation attitudes view themselves as Americans and individualistic and not as much as a part of a racial group. Individuals who exhibit Anti-Black identity attitudes have a very negative view of Black people. Some may characterize their beliefs as those similar to White racists, as these individuals have a hatred for Black people and feel no sense of connection with the racial group.

Following the Encounter, Black Americans then emerge into the Immersion-Emersion stage, which has two racial identity attitudes: Anti-White and Pro-Black. Black Americans who endorse Anti-White identity attitudes loathe all things considered White (Cross, 1991). They engage fully in the problems of the Black community, and their pent-up anger and frustration may be displayed in unpredictable and volatile ways. Pro-Black identity attitudes, on the other hand, reflect an intense, almost cultlike, involvement in all things Black. This would include joining organizations such as the Black Panthers or the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and wearing Black or Afrocentric clothing.

The last stage, Internalization, encompassed three racial identity attitudes, including Black Nationalist, Biculturalist, and Multiculturalist (Cross, 1991). Individuals

with Black Nationalist identity attitudes stress the importance of the Afrocentric perspective on everyday life, including how they perceive themselves, others, and the world. The individuals continue to be involved in issues related to the Black community. Biculturalist attitudes reflect individuals who give equal importance and meaning to being Black or Afrocentric and being American. These individuals may continue to pursue interests in the Black community, but also comfortably participate in mainstream activities, as well. Finally, the Multiculturalist identity attitude combines multiple reference group orientations (e.g., race, gender, Ethnicity, sexual orientation) into their worldview. These individuals continue to have a presence in the Black community and are concerned about its issues, but they typically come from a multicultural perspective and seek to end oppression across multiple groups.

The 2001 Expanded Model of Nigrescence

As the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Vandiver et al., 2000) was being developed and validated, an expanded model of psychological Nigrescence emerged from the results of that data that had been collected. There were no changes to the number of stages in the model or the explanation of reference group orientations and personal identities. Multiple identity attitudes still existed in this expanded model. However, the Anti-Black attitude was divided into two new identities (Miseducation and Self-Hatred), resulting in three Pre-Encounter racial identity attitudes. In addition, the Immersion-Emersion Pro-Black attitude was renamed to Intense Black Involvement.

Cross-Racial Counseling Supervision

The terms cross-racial supervision (Duan & Roehlke, 2001), cross-cultural supervision (Leong & Wagner, 1994), and multicultural supervision (Bernard, 1994; Fukuyama, 1994) have been used interchangeably to label supervisory relationships that include individuals from different racial backgrounds. The differences can be between the supervisor and the supervisee (dyadic) or between the supervisor, supervisee, and the client (triadic). For the purpose of this study, the term *cross-racial supervision* will be used to define supervisory relationships in which the supervisor and supervisee have different racial backgrounds.

A special section in the December 1994 issue of *Counselor Education and Supervision* gave attention to various perspectives on cross-racial and cross-cultural issues in counseling supervision. Several authors contributed to these initial discussions, which focused on topics that should be considered when supervising those who are of a different cultural background.

Leong and Wagner, 1994

Leong and Wagner's (1994) seminal article questioned what the field knew about cross-cultural counseling supervision and what needed to be known in the field. They noted that, although much attention was being given to other areas in relation to cross-cultural issues, very little research had been done on cross-cultural supervision. In their review of literature, Leong and Wagner identified three categories in which the literature, at that time, could be assigned. The first category included literature that only briefly

mentioned cross-cultural variables since the focus of their writings were on additional factors that might have an impact on the process of supervision. The second category included those articles, based on clinical experiences, which identified possible problems and solutions in cross-cultural supervision. The final category included articles that provided a theoretical foundation for cross-cultural supervision that would allow for the issues to be measured empirically.

After reviewing the literature, Leong and Wagner (1994) concluded that (a) race has an impact on the process of supervision, (b) the supervisee's perception of the supervisor can be influenced by race, and (c) there may be occurrences where race does not have an impact on supervision. In addition, they made several recommendations for increasing awareness of cross-cultural supervision in the field. They noted that there needed to be additional research conducted on the then current stage models of cross-cultural supervision, and critical questions (e.g., whether or not cross-cultural counseling supervision is a developmental process) needed to be answered. In addition, Leong and Wagner suggested that specific techniques should be developed to help supervisors increase awareness, knowledge, and cross-cultural counseling skills in their supervisees. Recommendations were made regarding theoretical models of cross-cultural counseling supervision, suggesting that these models include more emphasis on the influence of roles and personality dynamics in supervision. Leong and Wagner challenged researchers to modify their conceptualization of race and ethnicity to include the multiple psychological variables that may have an impact on an individual's identity. Finally, it

was recommended that researchers consider additional factors (e.g., working alliance) in the supervisory relationship instead of focusing only on specific characteristics (i.e., race and ethnicity) only when conducting research (Leong & Wagner).

Cook, 1994

Cook (1994) developed a conceptual framework was developed using racial identity interactions to better understand the ways that race issues are approached or avoided in counseling supervision. Helm's (1994) People of Color racial identity model and White racial identity model (1990), along with Helm's (1990) interaction model, were used to show how the racial identity attitudes, or ego statuses, could possible impact the supervision relationship.

Cook (1994) pointed out that Helm's (1990) model of interaction explored some of the issues that evolve when members of a pair have ego statuses are "parallel" or "crossed." According to Cook, individuals of same or different races can be in a parallel pair if they both exhibit the same ego status. These pairs view people of color (POC) and Whites in similar ways.

In contrast, members of a crossed pair have opposing ego statuses. Their opposing views may lead to conflicting situations, some of which may be due to differences in their views of race, but also go further into more traits related to one's personality. In supervision, this could have disastrous results because the supervisor and supervisee will be continuously challenging one another on one issue or another. There are two types of crossed pairs, progressive and regressive (Helms, 1994). In supervision, progressive

crossed pairs include a supervisor who is more advanced, which will allow the supervisee to learn from their supervisor in hopes of furthering their racial identity development (Cook, 1994). Regressive pairs, on the other hand, include a supervisor whose racial identity development is less advanced than his or her supervisee. In this situation, the supervisee may choose to suppress his or her own racial identity attitudes, which may, in turn, happen within their therapeutic relationships, as well. Due to the position of power the supervisor holds in the relationship, the supervisor can consciously or unconsciously control the extent to which racial identity attitudes of the pair are discussed in supervision (Cook, 1994).

In addition to discussing the implications of race in counseling supervision relationships, Cook (1994) also suggested that further research is needed to be conducted in cross-cultural supervision. Specifically, she acknowledged that studying racial identity in the context of the supervision relationship would be a powerful starting point due to the many dimensions that can be explored. She suggested that traditional research could focus on the impact racial identity attitudes have on other perceptions of the supervisory relationship, such as trust and attractiveness. Cook also noted that more process-oriented variables, to include critical incidents in supervision, also would provide a wealth of results.

Fukuyama, 1994

Fukuyama (1994) used a phenomenological approach to observe "critical incidents" in cross-racial counseling supervision. Fukuyama contacted racial and ethnic

54

minority students ($n = 18$). These students had completed a predoctoral internship at an

APA-approved site (university counseling center). A brief questionnaire asking about

"critical incidents" was mailed to these students, and ten students responded. Of the ten

respondents, six were women, and they represented the following ethnic backgrounds:

African American, Asian American, Latin and Caribbean Islanders, and International.

Initially, the respondents were asked to identify a positive critical incident related

to multicultural issues that occurred during the supervision process. Three categories

emerged, including openness and support, culturally relevant supervision, and

opportunities to work in multicultural activities (Fukuyama, 1994). Supervisees had

positive experiences when (1) their supervisors did not stereotype them personally or

their clinical cases, (2) their supervisors trusted the supervisees' abilities to handle

challenging clients, and (3) their supervisors provided general support and

encouragement when the supervisees were working with clients with culturally different

backgrounds. In addition, one respondent noted that her supervisor helped her identify

her own values that were significant and having an impact on the relationship she was

having with her client. Finally, respondents who were given the opportunity to participate

in multicultural activities, such as giving a presentation in a multicultural counseling

course or participating in group supervision that focused on issues of cultural diversity,

reported a sense of validation from these positive experiences.

Respondents then were asked to describe a negative incident that occurred during

the supervision process. Only forty percent ($n = 4$) were able to provide examples of

negative events, and Fukuyama (1994) grouped these into two categories: lack of supervisor cultural awareness and questioning supervisee abilities. One respondent noted that his or her supervisor was "insensitive" to the norms of the Hispanic culture and insisted that the supervisee was experiencing countertransference because of the warmth showed to clients. Another respondent noted that some of her supervisors questioned the interventions he/she used with ethnic minority clients, and the respondent perceived this as criticism from the supervisors.

Fukuyama (1994) provided several recommendations for cross-cultural counseling supervision. Although Fukuyama initially defined multicultural supervision as a supervisory relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee in which there is a cultural difference based on race and ethnicity, some of the suggestions she provided focused more on the process of supervising students who are working with clients from culturally different backgrounds.

Priest, 1994

Although the majority of early articles focused on the experiences of the White supervisor, Priest (1994) focused on the issues that may arise in supervision when the supervisor is a minority and the supervisee is White. First, it is important to note that the supervisor has the responsibility of helping supervisees identify any prejudicial or faulty thinking they may have when working with clients from a diverse background. To do so, though, requires that supervisors first examine and challenge their own thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and perceptions. Following this self-examination, supervisors of color must think

about some of the cultural issues that may arise in supervision and how to approach these issues with the supervisee. For example, Black supervisors may need to think further on how to present issues pertinent to the Black race in a manner in which a non-Black supervisee would be able to understand.

In his review of literature, Priest (1994) found that White supervisees may have a negative perception of the minority supervisor. For example, a White supervisee may believe that their minority supervisor is less competent than a White supervisor. Priest also found that supervisees may direct their own misconceptions and racial stereotypes onto their supervisor, who, in turn, may attempt to avoid the feelings and emotions the result from the situation.

Communication styles also may present a unique variable to the minority supervisor-White supervisee relationship (Priest, 1994). The supervisee may not be used to receiving feedback in a manner that is different from their European method of communication. Supervisors who are more animated in their method of communication may cause supervisees to feel as though they are being climbed all over, while supervisors who are speak in more measured tones, taking brief moments to ponder over information presented before providing feedback, may cause feelings of detachment in the supervisee, who may be used to receiving immediate feedback (Priest).

Based on his review of literature, Priest (1994) proposed several other topics that should be explored in relation to cross-cultural counseling supervision. These included identifying developmental stages of cross-cultural supervision and learning more about

57

the impact of communication styles on the supervisory relationship. In addition, it also may be wise to explore other variables, such as the supervisor-supervisee expectation outcomes and learning, and how all of these variables combined have an impact on how information and feedback is processed during sessions.

Research on Issues in Cross-Racial Counseling Supervision with Black Supervisors

Prior to Leong and Wagner's (1994) article on cross-cultural supervision, Remington and DaCosta (1989), whose area of study was psychiatry in Canada, used four case studies to further illustrate and understand the issues that arise in cross-racial supervisory relationships between Black supervisors and White supervisees. Based on their observations, they found that one White supervisee avoided talking with his Black supervisor about issues with a client that, although innocuous, appeared to be based on racial stereotypes for fear that the supervisor would believe that he did not handle the situation appropriately. Another supervisor seemed to overcompensate when talking about race with a White family that adopted a Black child, following a discussion with his Black supervisor that pointed out the supervisee's avoidance of this topic during the previous five sessions with the family.

A third supervisee, a White male from South Africa, highly praised his Black supervisor and always deferred to his teachings due to his status as a faculty member. This was very different from how he treated his White supervisors, and when this topic was approached in supervision, the supervisee acknowledged that he had had little experience communicating with Black people who were not servants. The supervisee

acknowledged that the supervision relationship was an unreality to him, and therefore his customary ways of deciphering relationships was at a lost. A final supervisee was having difficulties working with his immigrant clients, and he blamed his difficulties on a physical ailment that was affecting his attitude and mood. When his supervisor broached this topic, pointing out that the supervisee had recently emigrated to Canada himself only two years earlier, the supervisee remained defensive, affirming that the difficulties he was experiencing were based on him having physical ailments and not any ethnocultural issues.

Remington and DaCosta (1989) provided several recommendations on reducing ethnocultural issues in supervision. In addition to encouraging the supervisor to initiate conversations on cultural issues and ensuring that multicultural issues are infused into the curriculum for students, they also suggested that supervisors meet and consult with other supervisors regularly to discuss ethnocultural issues. By doing so, the supervisors will be able to stay abreast of issues that may be occurring in the supervision and find rigorous, more systematic ways of dealing with these issues.

Cross-Racial Counseling Supervision: Perspectives from the Black Supervisor

The majority of the research that has evolved since Leong and Wagner's (1994) initial review of literature has been focused on the experiences of the White supervisor and the minority supervisee. This trend is similar to the early literature of cross-racial counseling in which emphasis was placed on understanding the experiences of the White counselor and the minority client. However, as the field of counseling has become more

59

diverse, it has become necessary to empirically explore a different reality—that of the minority supervisor. To date, no studies pertaining specifically to the experiences of Black supervisors have been located. Instead, the studies focus on a more diverse group of participants (i.e., White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, etc.) and tend to emphasize the experiences of supervisees, not supervisors. While information from these studies is valuable to field of counseling and counseling supervision, studies designed specifically to address the unique experiences of the Black supervisor are necessary, as these experiences build on larger sociological issues of race and class in the United States.

<center>Working Alliance in Counseling Supervision</center>

The supervisory working alliance model (Bordin, 1983) was developed based on Bordin's (1979) model of working alliance in the psychotherapeutic relationship. The language of the working alliance was adapted to reflect the variables associated with supervisory working alliance. Similar to the therapeutic working alliance, the supervisory working alliance also has three major components: goals, tasks, and bonds.

Bordin (1983) identified several goals that would contribute to the development of the supervisory working alliance. These goals are as follows: mastery of specific skills, enlarging one's understanding of clients, enlarging one's awareness of process issues, increasing awareness of self and impact on process, overcoming personal and intellectual obstacles toward learning and mastery, deepening one's understanding of concepts and theory, providing a stimulus to research, and maintenance of standards of service.

<center>60</center>

Bordin (1983) also acknowledged that supervisors and supervisees should complete certain specific tasks in order to achieve these goals. For example, supervisees should complete written or oral reports on the therapeutic sessions with clients in order to receive feedback from their supervisors. This feedback may include alternative ways in which the supervisee could have responded to the issues discussed in the counseling session. In addition to the supervisee's report, supervisors are expected to provide feedback to supervisees based on direct or indirect observations of their sessions. Direct observation is imperative because supervisees may leave out pertinent information when discussing their clients. Finally, Bordin suggested that supervisees complete a presentation on the specific problems and issues that they are having in their counseling sessions. The supervisor, then, determines how these issues are related to the stated goals of supervision, as well as the therapeutic goals of the client, and be able to draw connections between the current issue and previous process issues.

Finally, bonding in the supervisory relationship is different than how the therapist and client bond in a counseling relationship. There is an evaluative component to the supervisory relationship, and bonding in supervision tends to fall somewhere between those bonds of the teacher-student relationship and those of the therapist-client relationship (Bordin, 1983). Supervisees already may feel some anxiety about the feedback they may receive from their supervisors. Thus, trust is a necessary component to allow for further probing into the supervisees deeper thoughts and feelings.

Working Alliance, Racial Identity, and Race in Counseling Supervision

In a more recent study, Bhat and Davis (2007) investigated racial matching, racial identity interaction, and supervisory working alliance from the perspective of the supervisor. Although the majority of the participants in the study were White ($n = 108$), the findings are still valuable.

Participants in the study ($n = 119$) were asked to complete several instruments regarding their racial identity, the racial identity of their supervisee, and their perception of the working alliance in the supervisory relationship (Bhat & Davis, 2007). Participants who self-identified as White were administered Helms' (2002) White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS), and participants who self-identified as a person of color were administered Helm's (1995) People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS). In addition, Bhat and Davis adapted Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu's (1997) Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity, making one version (Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity for Persons of Color) designed to measure the perceptions of racial identity of supervisees of color and another version (Perceptions of Supervisee Racial Identity for Whites) designed to measure the perceptions of racial identity of White supervisees. The participants were also administered the Working Alliance Inventory-Superivisor (Bahrick, 1989) and a demographic questionnaire.

In the final sample, supervisors and supervisees were initially grouped according to racial matching, and then they were grouped according to racial identity interaction within the dyads. There were four racial identity interaction groups: progressive

62

(supervisor with a high level of racial identity development paired with a supervisee with lower levels of racial identity), parallel high (both the supervisor and supervisee had high levels of racial identity development), parallel low (both the supervisor and supervisee had low levels of racial identity development), and regressive (the racial identity development of the supervisor is lower than that of the supervisee).

Results of the study indicated significant differences among the racial identity groups (progressive, parallel high, parallel low, regressive) comparing the combined working alliance of each group. Supervisors in progressive and parallel high racial identity groups perceived stronger working alliances with their supervisees than those in parallel low and regressive groups. The weakest working alliance was reported in parallel low racial identity groups. Bhat and Davis (2007) speculated that participants in low parallel racial identity groups not only may have lower levels of awareness regarding issues of race and culture, but also may lack a general insight of knowledge, thus inhibiting the growth of the working alliance.

There were very few participants who identified as a person of color ($n = 11$). Ten of the participants self-identified as Black and one participant self-identified as Latino. Although the numbers were low, there were no significant relationships were found, based on race alone, in racially matched and racially unmatched relationships. This was consistent with the findings from a previous study (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997).

Several limitations were presented by Bhat and Davis (2007). In particular, they noted that the findings were limited because they only focused on the perceptions of the supervisor and did not include any data from the supervisees. They, again, noted the low numbers of minority participants, which can impact the ability to generalize these results to a larger population. Based on their findings, Bhat and Davis suggested that racial identity should be included in updated models of supervision. Additionally, they suggested that assessing the racial identity attitudes of specific groups may provide a greater understanding of the supervisory relationship, instead of combining all persons of color into one group. Finally, Bhat and Davis recommended that more studies be focused on the perceptions of the supervisor, and noted that there was no way to ascertain accuracy of the supervisors' perceptions in their study.

Logan (2010) investigated the effects of supervisees' race and the match between supervisors' and supervisees' colorblind racial attitudes on the supervisory working alliance. Recruitment materials were sent to personal contacts in clinical psychology, counseling psychology, school psychology, and social work programs. Fifty supervisory dyads participated in this study; all of the supervisors were White. The majority of the supervisors ($n = 32$) were female. Thirty-three of the supervisees self-identified as White and 17 self-identified as a person of color (specific details regarding race and ethnicity were not provided). In addition, eight of the supervisees were male and 42 were female.

The supervisors and supervisees completed the following questionnaires three times over an eight-week period: Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (Bahrick, 1990),

Color-blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000), the Skill subscale of the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey – Counselor Edition – Revised (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991; Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D'Andrea, 2003), and the Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960). Additionally, supervisors completed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (Myrick & Kelly, 1971).

There were several significant findings in Logan's study. First, supervisors rated their racial awareness significantly higher than the supervisees rated themselves; overall, the participants rated their racial awareness in the middle to high average range. In addition, Supervisees of Color reported a more positive working alliance in comparison to White supervisees; this was the opposite of what Logan hypothesized. The findings also suggest that, when controlling for supervisee race and racial awareness, supervisees perceive the total working alliance at higher levels when their supervisors are more racially aware than the supervisees. When the supervisees' counseling skill was included in the model, supervisee race continued to be a significant predictor of the overall working alliance at the onset of the study. Finally, while the results found that the supervisees' general effectiveness as a counselor significantly predicted the working alliance bond, issues related to race and racial awareness continued to have a significant impact, as well.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter I and II provided an overview of the literature of racial microaggressions, cross-racial counseling supervision, and supervisory working alliance, and presented the rationale for this study. The review of literature supported the need for additional research regarding the experiences of Black counselor educators and supervisors and, more specifically, their experiences in cross-racial counseling supervision. Based on the review, it is evident that research on the impact of racial microaggressions in the supervisory working alliance would provide additional insight about Black supervisors' experiences in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships. In this chapter, the methodology for this study will be explained, including a description of the adaptation of Constantine and Sue's (2007) Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist and an overview of the study procedures (i.e., participants, instrumentation, data collection). In addition, research questions and hypotheses are identified, and the methods for data analysis are presented.

Hypotheses

The premise of the current study is based on the following hypotheses:

RQ1: Is there a relationship between the supervisors' level of racial identity and their

perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervisory

relationships?

H1a: There will be a negative relationship between supervisors' pre-encounter racial

identity attitudes and their perception of racial microaggressions. Thus,

supervisors who endorse high levels of pre-encounter racial identity attitudes will

perceive fewer racial microaggressions.

H1b: There will be a positive relationship between supervisors' immersion-emersion and

internalization racial identity attitudes and their perception of racial

microaggressions. Supervisors who endorse high immersion-emersion and

internalization racial identity attitudes will perceive more racial microaggressions.

RQ2: Is there a relationship between the supervisors' perception of the supervisory

working alliance and their perception of racial microaggressions in cross-racial

counseling supervision relationships?

H2: There will be a negative relationship between the supervisors' perception of the

supervisory working alliance and their perceptions of racial microaggressions. As

the perception of the supervisory working alliance increases, the number of

perceived racial microaggressions decreases.

RQ3: What combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial

microaggressions is most strongly related to perceptions of supervisory working

alliance?

H3: Supervisors who endorsed high scores on Self-Hatred or Anti-White and

Afrocentricity and lower levels of a working alliance bond will perceive higher

levels of racial microaggressions.

Participants

Purposive sampling, in addition to snowballing, was used to identify participants

for the main study. Eligible participants for this study must meet the following criteria:

self-identify as being Black; enrolled in a CACREP-accredited doctoral program in

counseling, or employed as junior faculty members in a CACREP-accredited program,

less than two years removed from their doctoral studies; and provided counseling

supervision to a White supervisee within the last two years.

Instruments

Several instruments were administered to the participants in this study. They were

presented in the following order (from the most innocuous to the most provocative):

Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor, Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale, Cross

Racial Identity Scale, and a demographics questionnaire. The instruments were presented

in this order to try to prevent one scale from influencing the responses to another scale. A

description of each instrument and the psychometric properties are described below.

Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor

Two inventories have been developed to measure supervisory working alliance. The Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor (WAI-S; Bahrick, 1989, see Appendix A) was selected for this study because it was grounded in Bordin's (1979, 1983) theory of working alliance, unlike the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), which measures client focus, rapport, and identification (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990).

Bahrick (1989) adapted Horvath and Greenberg's (1985) Working Alliance Inventory, which was based on Bordin's (1979) model of working alliance in the counseling relationship; Bordin (1983) further expanded the model of working alliance to the supervisory relationship. Bahrick modified the language used on the original model to reflect the supervisor-supervisee relationship. For example, the terms "client" and "therapist" were replaced with "supervisee" and "supervisor," respectively. After the wording was changed to reflect the dynamics in counseling supervision, the instrument was given to seven raters to determine if the 36 statements reflected Horvath and Greenberg's definitions of goals, tasks, and bonds. The majority of the respondents (97.6%) agreed on the items in the bond subscale. However, the raters were unable to make distinctions between the goal and task subscales, only agreeing 60% on items related to goals and 64% on items related to tasks. Although Bahrick concluded that the WAI-S only measured two dimensions, goals/tasks and bonds, she continued to use Horvath and Greenberg's original method of calculating three subscale scores (goals,

tasks, and bonds) and a global working alliance score (i.e., the sum of the three subscales) for her study.

The WAI-S is a 36-item instrument which includes statements about the supervisors' perceptions of the goals, tasks, and bonds in relationships with their supervisees. Each subscale (task, bond, and goal) has twelve items. An example from the task subscale is "_____ and I both feel confident about the usefulness of our current activity in supervision." An item from the bond subscale states "I believe _____ likes me." An example from the goal subscale reads "The current goals of these sessions are important for _____." There are fourteen reverse-coded items (i.e., five in the task subscale, 3 in the bond subscale, and 6 in the goal subscale).

Supervisors respond to each item based on their perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Responses to each question are given along a seven point Likert-type scale (1 = "Never" to 7 = "Always"). Each subscale is summed, with scores ranging from 12 to 84, and global scores range from 36 to 252. Higher scores reflect stronger perceptions for each component being measured. A recent study using the WAI-S reported the following alpha coefficients: Task, .83; Goal, .87; and Bond, .74 (Bhat & Davis, 2007). In addition, the reported Cronbach's (1951) alpha for the global, or composite, score was .93. In this study both the subscales and global score were analyzed to determine their relationships with the other variables.

Cross Racial Identity Scale

The Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS; Vandiver et al., 2000, see Appendix B) measures Black racial identity development based on the revised and expanded models of psychological Nigrescence (Cross, 1991, 1995; Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The CRIS is the first measure designed to directly measure all aspects of the expanded model of Nigrescence Theory.

The CRIS was developed over a five-year period, and there were six phases of study during those years (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). Phase 1 focused on item development and content validation. Phases 2 through 4 focused on collecting data to ensure a minimum reliability coefficient of .70 for each of the six subscales and construct validity. The researchers hoped to find reliability coefficients of .80 or higher during the final two phases of the study.

During Phase 1, a pool of 250 items was generated based on the Nigrescence constructs (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). After many discussions and revisions over a three month period, 126 items remained. These items were used in a content validity study to determine which ones best demonstrated Nigrescence theory. Seventy-five experts in the field of multicultural psychology participated in that study. They were asked to rate each item along a 10-point Likert-type scale to measure six racial identities (it is noted that this was prior to the Nigrescence model being expanded, therefore, there were only two Pre-encounter attitudes). Following an analysis of the data, 57 items were selected for the initial version of the CRIS.

Due to the transitory and cumulative nature of race-based events, Encounter was not included as a subscale on the measure. There are eight identity attitudes in three of the remaining stages of Nigrescence Theory, but only six are measured in the final version of the CRIS. In the early stages of development, there were seven Nigrescence identities measured, including Assimilation, Miseducation, Self-Hatred, Intense Black Involvement, Anti-White, Black Nationalist, and Multiculturalist. The Biculturalist identity attitude was not included because its characteristics overlap those of the Multiculturalist identity attitude. During the item development it appeared the items for the Intense Black Involvement overlapped with those for the Black Nationalist. The Intense Black Involvement subscale was removed early on to reduce any confusion, and the Black Nationalist scale was revised to reflect a more empowering aspect of the ideology, resulting in it being renamed Afrocentricity.

Data were collected from five different samples over the remaining four years of study, resulting in approximately 1000 participants from two university campuses. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 59, with twice as many female participants as there were males. The majority of the participants were working towards a bachelor's degree, and there were an equivalent number of participants across academic classification.

Over the course of the study, reliability coefficients for each subscale ranged from .59 to .90. At the end of the final phase, reliability estimates for each subscale, with the exception of Pre-encounter Miseducation (.78), were above .80, which was the goal for the measure.

The final version of the CRIS has forty items, and there are six subscales (Assimilation, Miseducation, Self-Hatred, Anti-White, Afrocentricity, and Multiculturalist) that represent racial identity attitudes. Each subscale consists of five items, and an additional ten items are used as fillers. An example of a statement from the Assimilation subscale is "I think of myself primarily as an American, and seldom as a member of a racial group." An item from the Miseducation subscale states, "Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work." Self-hatred is assessed by participants responding to statements such as "I go through periods when I am down on myself because I am Black." An example of an item on the Anti-White subscale reads, "I hate the White community and all that it represents." The Afrocentricity subscale is assessed based on responses to items such as "Blacks will never be free until we embrace an Afrocentric perspective." An example of a Multiculturalist Inclusive subscale item is "As a multiculturalist, I am connected to many groups (Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Whites, Jews, gays & lesbians, etc.)." Finally, one of the filler items states, "My relationship with God plays an important role in my life."

The CRIS has a seven point Likert-type scale (1 = "strongly disagree" to 7 = "strongly agree"). Each subscale can be summed, with totals ranging from 5 to 35. Alternatively, the sum of each subscale can be divided by five to produce a score that ranges from 1 to 7. The former method of calculating the subscale scores will be used in this study because it will provide a greater variability of the responses. It should be noted that the CRIS subscale scores cannot be collapsed or combined to create one global score.

73

Therefore, each participant will have a CRIS profile with six subscale scores. Higher scores represent a stronger endorsement for the racial identity attitude being measured. Each subscale score will be analyzed individually to determine the degree of influence each racial identity attitude has on the remaining variables in the study.

Reported Cronbach's alpha and construct reliability estimates range from .78 to .90 across all six subscales (Worrell, Vandiver, & Cross, 2004). Worrell, Vandiver, Cross and Fhagen-Smith (2004) found reliability estimates ranging from .70 to .85 and construct reliability coefficients ranging from .69 to .86. Exploratory factor analyses confirmed six independent factors in an earlier, 50-item version of the CRIS with subscale intercorrelations ranging from |.04| to |.42| (Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002). In addition, CRIS subscales have not been found to be influenced by the effects of social desirability (Worrell et al., 2004).

Pilot Study Phase I: Adapting the Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale

This scale, initially titled Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Scale-Supervisor's Form (RMSS-SF, see Appendix C), was adapted, with permission (see Appendix D), from the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist (Constantine & Sue, 2007), which was originally developed to assess the perceptions of Black supervisees in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships with White supervisors. After receiving permission, the checklist was initially reviewed and the language was adapted to make it more suitable for use with supervisors. In addition, one item from Constantine and Sue's initial checklist (item 9, "I believe that my supervisor sometimes

focused on my clinical weaknesses in supervision because of my racial or cultural group") was omitted from the checklist as it related specifically to the evaluation of the supervisee and was not relevant for this version. One additional item (item 3, "My supervisee sometimes questioned my qualifications as a supervisor due to my racial or cultural background") was added to the RMSS-SF based on an additional theme that was identified in a later study of the experiences of Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty (Constantine et al., 2008).

An expert in the field of counseling supervision was initially consulted and was able to provide additional feedback, which led to the inclusion of one more statement from Constantine's (2007) initial article on racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling relationships (item 8, "My counselor at times may have either overestimated or underestimated my capabilities or strengths based on my cultural group membership").

The revised, 16-item version of the RMSS-SF was then given to five Black counselor educators who had expertise in multiculturalism in counseling and supervision for their review. They were asked to review the scale and answer questions about the appropriateness and clarity of the content of the measure (see Appendix E). Of the five counselor educators who were contacted, four responded and provided feedback regarding the scale. Two reviewers utilized the feedback form provided and two reviewers provided summative statements of their feedback.

One reviewer noted that some of the items (i.e., items 1, 6, 8, 10, and 14) might not provide accurate results if the supervisee had not had any coursework in multicultural

counseling. Based on this feedback, an additional question was added to the demographics form for participants to indicate whether or not their supervisee had completed any multicultural coursework. This reviewer also commented that the scale read as though it was intended for Black supervisors of White supervisees, which is its purpose. A second reviewer noted that item 1 ("My supervisee sometimes avoided discussing or addressing racial or cultural issues that I thought were important") needed to be more objective, and recommended omitting "that I thought were important" from the statement to achieve this goal. This recommendation was implemented into the revised version of the scale. This reviewer also suggested rewording item 5 ("My supervisee may have thought at times that I was overly sensitive about racial or cultural issues") because it would be difficult to assume another person's thoughts. Based on this suggestion, the item was reworded to read, "At times my supervisee communicated that I was overly sensitive about racial or cultural issues." This same reviewer also commented on item 11 ("My supervisee often was very knowledgeable about racial and cultural issues with regard to counseling"), noting that its appropriateness would depend on the purpose of the scale. After further review, item 11 was omitted from the revised scale because it did not appear to reflect a microaggressive act towards the supervisor and, in the supervisory relationship, it would not be expected for a counselor-in-training to be "very" knowledgeable about multicultural counseling skills as the skills would be developing throughout the matriculation of their program.

The third reviewer also commented on the appropriateness of item 5. In addition, the reviewer commented that items 2 and 7 needed to be more concrete. Specifically, the reviewer noted that item 7 "required too much interpretation of the supervisee's behavior." After thoughtful consideration of these suggestions, it was decided that no changes would be made to those items at this time. The third reviewer also proposed changing the name of the instrument to prevent any bias from participants. It is noted that the name was only provided for the reviewers. The acronym will be used when presented to the study participants. A fourth reviewer suggested changing the word "about" to the word "to" in item 2. This suggestion was incorporated in the revised version of the scale (see Appendix F).

Pilot Study Phase II: Piloting the Main Study with Seasoned Counselor Educators

As mentioned earlier, the first phase of the pilot study included an initial review of the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Scale-Supervisor's Form. After revising the scale, the second phase of the pilot study was initiated.

Procedures

Websites of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs were viewed to locate a pool of Black counselor educators and their email addresses. Only counselor educators who were perceived to be Black, based on pictures on the departmental website, were contacted. If the counselor educator's biography was included on the website, and if it indicated that the individual was not born in the United States, then they were omitted from the pool. In May 2009, following approval from the Institutional

77

Review Board (IRB), an email was sent to a pool of 86 potential Black counselor educators inviting them to participate in this study. They were provided with a link to surveymonkey.com, which was used to administer the scale. Initially, the participants were asked to read the informed consent statement and electronically consent to participating in the study. They were informed that they could terminate their participation at any time. After providing informed consent (see Appendix G), participants were asked to complete the materials for this study in the following order: Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor (WAI-S), Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Scale-Supervisor's Form (RMSS-SF), Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS), and the demographics questionnaire. The directions in the WAIS-S instructed participants to think of a White counseling student they had supervised during the last two years. The directions in the RMSS-SF instructed participants to refer to the same supervision relationship from the WAI-S. A follow-up email was sent to the pool in August 2009.

Participants

To participate in the study, participants had to meet the following inclusion criteria: self-identified as Black; was at least two years post-graduation from a doctoral program in counseling, or a closely related program; acknowledged that subtle racism existed; had served as a supervisor to a White supervisee within the last two years; and had personal experiences of racism in counseling supervision relationships.

78

Results

Of the 86 Black counselor educators who were contacted via email, two emails were returned indicating that they were no longer valid, two emails were returned with "Out of Office" replies, and six replied and indicated they did not meet the participation criteria. Additionally, three individuals began the survey, but did not progress beyond the consent form. Overall, 16 Black counselor educators completed the study (19% response rate). Eleven males and five females completed the study, and their ages ranged from 31 to 67, with a mean age of 48.

All of the participants self-identified as Black or African American. In addition, all of the participants reported that they were born to Black mothers. Although 13 participants indicated that their fathers were Black or African American, one participant reported that his father was biracial (African American/Native American), one participant reported that his father was African, and one participant did not respond to this question.

The majority of the respondents ($n = 10$) were counselor educators in programs in the South. Two of the participants taught in the Mid-Atlantic and two taught in the Southwest. The remaining two participants taught in programs in the Midwest and Rocky Mountains. Number of years as a counselor educator ranged from 3 to 30 years, with a mean of 11.7 years. Additionally, 14 participants reported that their supervisees had taken a course in multicultural counseling, while the remaining two indicated that their supervisees had not taken a multicultural counseling course.

79

An item-total correlation analysis was conducted to determine if the items on the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision-Supervisor Form (RMSS-SF) measured one construct. All of the items were related to the same construct, with corrected item-total correlation coefficients ranging from .58 to .90. In addition, Cronbach's alpha for this pilot study was .93.

Pearson-product moment correlations were used to determine the relationship between perceptions of racial microaggressions, racial identity attitudes, and perceptions of supervisory working alliance. There were several significant findings in this study. Two racial identity attitudes were positively correlated with the supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions (Pre-encounter Self-Hatred, .78, and Immersion-Emersion Anti-White, .52). Based on this finding it appears that as individuals progress through stages of racial identity, they may be more aware of racial microaggressions, but these acts will not bother them as much in the latter stages of development as they will in earlier stages. In contrast, there was a negative correlation between working alliance and Immersion-Emersion Anti-White (.63). Individuals who endorsed very intense, negative feelings towards Whites also perceived lower levels of working alliance in their supervisory relationship.

Participants were given the opportunity to provide open-ended feedback to questions on the demographics questionnaire. When asked if their experiences with the identified supervisee were similar to experiences with other White supervisees, the majority ($n = 10$) reported that this relationship was typical and similar to other

relationships with White supervisees. One participant responded that their relationship was atypical because this supervisee in particular "set out to bully and intimidate and threaten me." Another respondent indicated that her relationship was neither typical nor atypical in comparison to other cross-racial supervisory relationships with White supervisees, and that some of her students tended to "distrust and challenge [her] often" and some have "refused" to accept her supervision or feedback. This same participant indicated that students would tell her what other professors believed and would talk with them behind her back about what she was teaching; the students would then come back and share what they learned from the other professors with the participant. The participant noted that her program is dysfunctional and that the students were aware of the problems within the department.

Participants were given the opportunity to provide additional feedback. Another respondent indicated that she was concerned about how her supervisee would discuss his or her experiences in supervision with her to White faculty. She did not expand further on this comment. One male participant indicated that White female supervisees "try to invoke their gender and cultural privilege to weaken my authority," although he believed they should use these variables to empower themselves. Finally, a female respondent indicated that it would be "unethical" not to teach students of color how to deal with supervisees who are racist, biased, or prejudiced.

Based on the feedback from respondents, an additional item was added to the final version of the scale. Item 16 reads "My supervisee discusses our supervision meetings

with White faculty in the department to validate or discredit my feedback." In addition to adding an item, the name of the revised scale was changed to "Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale" (EBSS) in efforts to distinguish this measure from previous instruments developed (see Appendix H).

Demographics Questionnaire

A questionnaire (see Appendix I) was developed to collect demographic information about the participants, including the following information: age, gender, region where doctoral program was located, number of years as a counselor educator. In addition, several items assessed the participants' race and ethnicity. For example, in addition to being asked how they perceived themselves, participants were asked to identify the race and ethnicity of their mother and father, and they were asked to identify the race that they believed others perceived them to be. These questions were asked to increase the validity of this study as there are some individuals who may be multiracial but identify themselves as Black. Following the pilot study, the questionnaire was revised in order to gain a better understanding of the participants' experiences in cross-racial counseling supervision (see Appendix J). Additional open-ended questions were asked to gain further insight about the supervisee being referenced and the participants' overall experience with White supervisees.

Procedure

Based on the results from the pilot study, several changes were implemented for the procedure, specifically in regards to recruitment. In the main study, department

82

chairs of CACREP-accredited counseling programs were contacted via electronic mail to determine the number of Black doctoral students and/or junior faculty members within the department. They were given the option of having postcards with a link to the study (via SurveyMonkey) sent to those departments that identified potential participants for the study, forwarding the recruitment materials on to potential participants, or replying with the names and contact information of potential participants so that they can be directly contacted. In addition to identifying potential participants through doctoral programs, a request for participation was sent to listservs for counselor educators and students (i.e, CESNET), counselors interested in areas of multiculturalism (e.g., Diverse Counselors), and doctoral alumni of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. A link to the study materials was included in the request. In addition, potential participants were asked to disregard the email if they had already completed the study. The inclusion criteria were as follows: self-identifies as Black, currently enrolled in a CACREP-accredited doctoral program in counseling or employed as a junior faculty member in a CACREP-accredited program with less than two years removed from their doctoral studies, and has provided counseling supervision to a White supervisee within the last two years. Several inclusion criteria were dropped from the pilot study due to the limitations it might pose on the final results (i.e., an acknowledgement that subtle racism exists and having had personal experiences of racism in counseling supervision relationships), especially in regards to generalizability. Finally, participants were given

the opportunity to submit their name into a contest to win one of several gift certificates to Barnes & Noble.

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics were calculated using Predictive Analytics SoftWare (PASW; Release 18.0). Internal consistency of each scale (Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale, Cross Racial Identity Scale, and Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor) was analyzed using Cronbach's alpha to test their reliabilities. Multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the relationships among perceptions of racial microaggressions, the six racial identity attitudes, and perceptions of the supervisory working alliance (goals, tasks, and bonds). Canonical correlations were used to determine which combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions most closely is associated with the task, bond, and goal of supervisory working alliance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among racial microaggressions, racial identity, and supervisory working alliance in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships of Black supervisors and White supervisees. In this chapter, results from the statistical analyses will be presented and will include a description of the sample, descriptive statistics, instrument reliabilities, and hypothesis testing.

Sample Characteristics

Emails were sent to 230 department chairpersons. Of the 230 chairpersons who were contacted, 16 responded and indicated they did not have anyone who met the criteria for the study. Six "Out of Office" replies were received, while 4 emails came back "Return to Sender". Three chairpersons responded and indicated they would forward the information on to potential participants in their departments, and 2 chairpersons sent contact information for the appropriate contact person. Additionally, several requests for participation were sent to the listservs; however, the number of respondents from those requests cannot be determined as it was not necessary to reply to those requests.

Selected demographics of the participants are in Table 3. Thirty-four respondents participated in the study. The majority of the participants ($n = 32$) self-identified as Black and indicated that both of their parents were Black. One participant self-identified as Black, but indicated that one parent was White. An additional participant self-identified as Biracial, indicating that one parent was Black and one parent was White. The latter two participants were included in this study because it was possible they identified more strongly with their Black racial heritage and they may have experienced racial microaggressions in supervision if their supervisees perceived them to be Black.

In addition, 88.2% of the sample ($n = 30$) was female. The participants' ages ranged from 26 to 53, with a mean age of 35. One participant did not report his age. The majority of the participants ($n = 20$) lived in the South. Six participants were in counseling programs in the Southwest and 5 participants were from the Midwest. There was 1 respondent from each of the following regions: Mid-Atlantic, Rocky Mountains, and West. The majority of the participants ($n = 30$) identified themselves as doctoral students, and their years in counselor education ranged from 1 to 5, with a mean of 2.59 years.

Participants reported that 88.2% of the supervisees ($n = 30$) in the supervisory relationship described for this study were female. The participants also indicated that the majority of their supervisees ($n = 30$) had taken a multicultural counseling course. Several of the participants ($n = 11$) indicated that their experience with the selected supervisee was typical or very typical in comparison to their supervision relationships

with other White supervisees. Eight participants (23.5%) indicated that their experiences were somewhat typical, while 4 participants (11.8%) stated that their experience with the selected supervisee was neither typical nor atypical in comparison to similar supervisory relationships. Six participants (17.6%) indicated their experience with the selected supervisee was atypical or very atypical, while 5 participants (14.7%) indicated that their experience was somewhat atypical.

Table 3

Participant Demographics

Variables	*n*	%
GENDER		
Male	4	11.8
Female	30	88.2
AGE		
Younger than 30	9	26.5
30 years old to 45 years old	19	55.9
Older than 45 years old	5	14.7
Not reported	1	2.9
RACE/ETHNICITY*		
Black or African American	33	97.1
West Indian	2	5.9
Multiethnic (Black or African American and White)	1	2.9
Other Responses Given (Human)	1	2.9
CURRENT POSITION		
Doctoral Student	30	88.2
Counselor Educator	4	11.8
YEARS IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION		
1 year or less	7	20.6
2 years to 4 years	25	73.5

Table 3

Participant Demographics (continued)

Variables	n	%
More than 4 years	2	5.9
REGION		
New England	0	0
Mid-Atlantic	1	2.9
South	20	58.8
Midwest	5	14.7
Great Plains	0	0
Rocky Mountains	1	2.9
Southwest	6	17.6
West	1	2.9
Pacific	0	0
SUPERVISEE GENDER		
Male	4	11.8
Female	30	88.2

*Note: Participants were able to select more than one race/ethnicity.

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to conducting reliability analyses, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between male and female supervisors and how they perceived racial microaggressions. There were no significant differences between male and female supervisors, $F(1,32) = 0.03$, $p = 0.85$. An additional one-way ANOVA was performed to determine if there were any significant differences in perceptions of racial microaggressions between those who supervised males and those who supervised females. There were no significant differences between these two groups, $F(1, 32) = 0.14$, $p = 0.71$. Thus, all participants were included in the sample and additional analyses were performed on the entire group.

Descriptive statistics (i.e., ranges, mean scores, and standard deviations of all of the study variables) are included in Table 4. Five of the six subscales of the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) showed some variability in the scores, although the scores on these subscales were skewed to the right of the mean. The remaining subscale, Multiculturalist Inclusive, showed less variability than the other subscales; respondents endorsed higher levels of this racial identity attitude, which resulted in the scores being skewed to the left of the mean. The mean scores on the CRIS were slightly different in this study than in a previous study involving Black college students (Worrell, Vandiver, & Cross, 2004). Overall, the respondents in that study endorsed higher levels of Afrocentricity ($M = 19.5$) and Multiculturalist Inclusive ($M = 28.0$) in comparison to the other racial identity attitudes. Additionally, Black, mostly undergraduate college students endorsed higher scores on all of the racial identity attitudes except Multiculturalist Inclusive in comparison to the current sample (see Table 5).

The range of scores and the means of each subscale of the Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor's Form (WAIS) were very similar and distributed evenly around the mean, with the exception of the Goal subscale, which was slightly skewed to the left. Previously reported mean scores on the WAIS were very similar to those in the current study. The mean scores in the current study were only slightly higher on the Bond and Goal subscales of the WAIS than those scores (Bond, $M = 65.71$ and Goal, $M = 63.43$) of counseling supervisors in an earlier study (Bhat & Davis, 2007). The means on the Task

subscale were nearly identical. Overall, the mean scores on this scale fell in the high average range, which reflect positive perceptions of the supervisory working alliance.

This was the first administration of the Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale; thus, previous means are not available for comparison. However, there was variability between the scores and the scores were evenly distributed around the mean.

Table 4

Sample Score Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations

	Possible Range	Sample Range	Sample Mean	Sample *SD*
EBSS	0 - 32	0 - 26	10.5	8.5
WAIS				
Task	12 - 84	48 - 82	67.2	9.9
Bond	12 - 84	44 - 83	66.6	10.6
Goal	12 - 84	42 - 82	66.3	11.7
CRIS				
Assimilation	5 - 35	5 - 30	12.2	6.7
Miseducation	5 - 35	5 - 23	10.4	4.4
Self-Hatred	5 - 35	5 - 15	7.4	2.9
Anti-White	5 - 35	4 - 16*	6.4	2.6
Afrocentricity	5 - 35	6 - 30	13.8	5.2
Multiculturalist Inclusive	5 - 35	17 - 35	30.6	4.2

Note: 1) EBSS = Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale, 2) WAIS = Working Alliance Inventory – Supervisor's Form, and 3) CRIS = Cross Racial Identity Scale
* A score of "0" was used for items that were skipped.

Table 5

Mean Comparison: Cross Racial Identity Scale

CRIS Subscales	Sample Mean	Worrell, Vandiver, & Cross, 2004
Assimilation	12.2	13.6
Miseducation	10.4	13.7
Self-Hatred	7.4	9.8
Anti-White	6.4	10.2
Afrocentricity	13.8	19.5
Multiculturalist Inclusive	30.6	28.0

Note: Scores from Worrell, Vandiver, & Cross (2004) were converted from 7 point scale for the purpose of comparison.

Table 6 provides an overview of the relationships between perceptions of racial microaggressions, racial identity attitudes, and supervisory working alliance. Overall, there were negative relationships between perceptions of racial microaggressions and perceptions of each aspect of the supervisory relationship. Respondents who perceived, and were more bothered by, racial microaggressions in the supervisory relationship reported lower perceptions of the working alliance, including tasks, bonds, and goals.

Table 6

Correlational Matrix

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(1) EBSS	1.00	.06	-.20	.18	.13	-.14	.06	***-.53***	***-.49***	***-.55***
(2) CRIS Assimilation	.06	1.00	.16	-.03	.05	*-.35*	.25	-.33	-.24	*-.39*
(3) CRIS Miseducation	-.20	.16	1.00	.23	-.01	.14	-.04	.00	-.02	-.04
(4) CRIS Self-Hatred	.18	-.03	..23	1.00	.12	.33	-.09	-.02	-.03	-.07
(5) CRIS Anti-White	.13	.05	-.01	.12	1.00	.13	*-.36*	-.23	-.19	-.23

Table 6

Correlational Matrix (continued)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(6) CRIS Afrocentricty	-.14	*-.35*	.14	.33	.13	1.00	-.32	-.14	-.21	-.08
(7) CRIS Multiculturalist	.06	.25	-.04	-.09	*-.36*	-.33	1.00	.08	.05	-.09
(8) WAIS Task	***-.53***	-.33	.00	-.02	-.23	-.14	.08	1.00	***.85***	***.94***
(9) WAIS Bond	***-.49***	-.24	-.02	-.03	-.19	-.21	.05	***.85***	1.00	***.81***
(10)WAIS Goal	***-.55***	*-.39*	-.04	-.07	-.23	-.08	.09	***.94***	***.81***	1.00

Note: Bold, italicized are significant at 0.01 level; italicized are significant at 0.05 level

Cronbach's (1951) alpha was used to determine internal consistency for each subscale of both the CRIS and the WAIS. George and Mallery (2003) noted that an acceptable level of internal consistency ranges from $\alpha = .70$ to $\alpha = .80$. In the current study, all of the subscales of the WAIS, which each have 12 items, met this level of consistency ($\alpha = .79$ to $\alpha = .92$). In addition, 4 of the 6 subscales of the CRIS met this level; the outliers included the Miseducation subscale ($\alpha = 0.63$) and Self-Hatred subscale ($\alpha = .69$). It is noted that the low reliability of the Miseducation subscale would have an impact on its power. Thus, caution should be taken when interpreting results related to this subscale because its lower power may affect how it is associated with the remaining variables. Each CRIS subscale included 5 items. Table 7 shows a comparison between previously reported Cronbach's alphas and current alphas for WAIS and CRIS subscales. Additionally, the EBSS was found to be highly reliable ($\alpha = .92$).

Table 7

Reliability Comparisons for WAIS and CRIS

	Sample α	Previous Studies
WAIS		*Baker, 1991*
Task	.87	.86
Bond	.79	.84
Goal	.92	.87
CRIS		*Worrell, Vandiver, & Cross, 2004*
Assimilation	.89	.85
Miseducation	.63	.78
Self-Hatred	.69	.89
Anti-White	.76	.89
Afrocentricity	.83	.83
Multiculturalist Inclusive	.76	.82

Main Analyses

The purpose of this exploratory study was to investigate possible relationships among Black supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions, racial identity attitudes, and perceptions of the working alliance in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships with White supervisees. Three research questions and hypotheses were developed to understand this relationship. Statistical analyses were used to examine these questions and hypotheses and the following results are presented.

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between the supervisors' racial identity attitudes and their perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervisory relationships?

H1a: There will be a negative relationship between supervisors' pre-encounter racial

identity attitudes and their perception of racial microaggressions. Thus,

supervisors who endorse high levels of pre-encounter racial identity attitudes will

perceive fewer racial microaggressions.

H1b: There will be a positive relationship between supervisors' immersion-emersion and

internalization racial identity attitudes and their perception of racial

microaggressions. Supervisors who endorse high immersion-emersion and

internalization racial identity attitudes will perceive more racial microaggressions.

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine the

relationship between racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions

and potential predictors. There were no significant findings between the variables (see

Table 8). Therefore, the study found no support for concluding relationships exist

between supervisors' racial identity attitudes and their perceptions of racial

microaggressions.

Table 8

Multiple Regression: Predictors of Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions

Predictor	R^2	B	Std. Error	t
	.15			
Pre-encounter				
Assimilation		.03	.25	.10
Miseducation		-.46	.37	-1.27
Self-Hatred		.83	.57	1.47
Anti-White		.45	.64	.7

Table 8

Multiple Regression: Predictors of Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions (continued)

Predictor	R^2	B	Std. Error	t
Immersion-Emersion				
Anti-White		.45	.64	.7
Internalization				
Afrocentricity		-.31	.35	-.89
Multiculturalist		.13	.41	.31

Dependent Variable: Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions
Note: Predictors are racial identity attitudes in Cross Racial Identity Scale.

Research Question 2

Is there a relationship between the supervisors' perception of the supervisory working alliance and their perception of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships?

H2: There will be a negative relationship between the supervisors' perception of the supervisory working alliance and their perceptions of racial microaggressions. As the perception of the supervisory working alliance increases, the number of perceived racial microaggressions decreases.

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the relationship between working alliance and perceptions of racial microaggressions and potential predictors. Pearson product-moment correlations found negative relationships between all types of working alliance, which included task ($r = -.53, p < .01$), bond ($r = -.49, p < .01$), and goal ($r = -.55, p < .01$). In addition, all three predictors (task, bond, and goal) were included in the multiple regression model, which produced $R^2 = .31$, $F(3, 30)$

= 4.39, $p < .05$. Although these predictors had a significant effect on the perceptions of racial microaggressions overall, the degree to which each variable predicts perceptions of racial microaggressions cannot be determined. This may be due to a large variance inflation factor (VIF), which possibly resulted from each of the predictors (i.e., Tasks, Bonds, and Goals) being highly correlated with one another. Thus, these subscales of the working alliance may be working as one variable. Table 9 summarizes the findings.

Table 9

Multiple Regression: Predictors of Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions

Predictor	R^2	B	Std. Error	t	Tolerance	VIF
	.31*					
Task		-.05	.42	-.11	.097	10.32
Bond		-.10	.23	-.45	.278	3.60
Goal		-.28	.32	-.90	.122	8.17

Dependent Variable: Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions
Note: Predictors are scales of supervisory working alliance.
*Significant at the 0.05 level

Research Question 3

What combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions is most strongly related to perceptions of supervisory working alliance?

H3: Supervisors who endorsed high scores on Self-Hatred or Anti-White and

Afrocentricity and lower levels of a working alliance bond will perceive higher

levels of racial microaggressions.

A canonical correlation analysis was performed to determine which combination of variables was most strongly associated with perceptions of the supervisory working alliance. Each dimension reflects a linear correlation between the predictor set (EBSS and CRIS subscales) and the criterion set (WAIS). The first dimension accounts for the maximum amount of variance in the predictor set of variables. The second dimension accounts for any variance that is not accounted for in the first dimension. The third dimension accounts for any leftover variance from the first two dimensions. Tables 10 through 14 outline the results from the analysis, which were not significant with a Wilks's lambda of .37 ($p > .05$). Therefore, it is not possible to determine which combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions more strongly relate to supervisory working alliance. If any of the dimensions were statistically significant, then the canonical coefficients would be used to explain which variables in the set most strongly influence the dimension.

Table 10

Tests of Canonical Dimensions

Dimension	Canonical Correlation	Wilks' λ	χ^2	df	p
1	.75	.37	27.74	21.0	.15
2	.37	.85	4.59	12.0	.97
3	.14	.98	.55	5.0	.99

Note: Each dimension represents a combination of variables that best predict perceptions of supervisory working alliance.

Table 11

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Set

	Dimension		
Variable	1	2	3
EBSS	.83	-.14	-.20
CRISPA	.61	.40	.24
CRISPM	.09	.09	-.62
CRISPSH	-.27	.56	-.49
CRISIEAW	.09	-.13	.23
CRISIA	.51	-.87	-.15
CRISIMCI	-.13	-.48	-.36

Note: EBSS = Perceptions of Racial Microaggressions
    CRISPA = Pre-encounter Assimilation
    CRISPM = Pre-encounter Miseducation
    CRISPSH = Pre-encounter Self-Hatred
    CRISIEAW = Immersion-Emersion Anti-White
    CRISIA = Internalization Afrocentricity
    CRISIMCI = Internalization Multiculturalist Inclusive
    Each dimension represents a combination of variables that are most closely
    associated with perceptions of supervisory working alliance.

Table 12

Raw Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Set

	Dimension		
Variable	1	2	3
EBSS	.10	-.02	-.02
CRISPA	.09	.06	.04
CRISPM	.02	.02	-.14
CRISPSH	-.09	.19	-.17
CRISIEAW	.03	-.05	.09
CRISIA	.10	-.17	-.03
CRISIMCI	-.03	-.11	-.09

Note: Each dimension represents a combination of variables that are most closely associated with perceptions of supervisory working alliance.

Table 13

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Criterion Set

| | Dimension | | |
Variable	1	2	3
WAIST	-.22	1.60	-2.78
WAISB	-.21	1.00	1.60
WAISG	-.60	-2.48	1.29

Note: WAIST = Working Alliance Task
    WAISB = Working Alliance Bond
    WAISG = Working Alliance Goal
    Each dimension represents a combination of variables that are most closely
    associated with perceptions of racial microaggressions and racial identity attitudes.

Table 14

Raw Canonical Coefficients for Criterion Set

| | Dimension | | |
Variable	1	2	3
WAIST	-.02	.16	-.28
WAISB	-.02	.09	.15
WAISG	-.05	-.21	.11

Note: Each dimension represents a combination of variables that are most closely associated with perceptions of racial microaggressions and racial identity attitudes.

Summary

This chapter revealed the results of the current study. Demographic information

about the sample was described and preliminary data analyses were included. The results

for each of the hypotheses were reported. The results indicated that relationships exist

between perceptions of racial microaggressions and each aspect of the supervisory working alliance (tasks, bonds, and goals); however, the degree to which each of the three variables predicts perceptions of racial microaggressions cannot be determined at this time. There were no significant relationships between the supervisors' racial identity attitudes and their perceptions of racial microaggressions. Finally, the researcher could not determine which combination of racial identity attitudes and perceptions of racial microaggressions is most closely associated supervisors' perceptions of the supervisory working alliance. The current findings, limitations, and implications for further research will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter will discuss the results of the study, which will include an interpretation of the study findings, a description of the limitations of the study, study implications for the field of counselor education, and suggestions for future research.

Summary

Racial microaggressions are subtle, yet offensive behaviors, based on stereotypes, which are directed towards people of color (Pierce, 1970). Racial microaggressions have been found to be pervasive in everyday life (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, et al., 2007). They also have been found to persist in counseling relationships between White counselors and Black clients (Constantine, 2007), counseling supervision relationships between White supervisors and Black supervisees (Constantine & Sue, 2007), and counseling and counseling psychology programs towards Black faculty (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008).

The current study is the first to investigate the relationship between perceptions of racial microaggressions and perceptions of supervisory working alliance in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships between Black supervisors and White supervisees. Racial identity attitudes were also explored to determine their impact on Black supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions. Analyses were conducted to

determine which combination of variables (i.e., perceptions of racial microaggressions and racial identity) could predict perceptions of supervisory working alliance in these relationships.

Results indicated that there is a negative relationship between all aspects of supervisory working alliance (i.e., tasks, bond, and goals) and the supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions. The more supervisors perceived, and were bothered by, racial microaggressions, they perceived lower levels of the working alliance.

<div align="center">Findings of the Current Study</div>

The results of this study found no significant relationships between the perception of racial microaggressions and racial identity attitudes. This result is different from a previous study, which found a positive relationship between supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions and pre-encounter self-hatred ($r = .78$) and immersion-emersion anti-White ($r = .52$; Barnes, 2010). This difference may be reflective of the differing levels of experiences of the supervisors in each study. In the previous study, respondents were seasoned counselor educators (i.e., at least two years post-doctorate), whereas in this study, the respondents were current doctoral students and counselor educators who recently graduated (i.e., less than two years post-doctorate). Those who participated in the previous study may have been able to better identify racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships because they have been engaged in a greater number of supervisory relationships. Additionally, the seasoned supervisors were, generally, older than participants in the current sample, and may have more advanced

racial identity attitudes in comparison to more novice counseling supervisors. When comparing the mean scores on the racial identity attitudes of the participants in the previous study, the mean scores for the Multiculturalist Inclusive attitude for each group were identical (M = 30.6); however, the scores from the previous study showed less variability than in the current study, with raw scores ranging from 23 to 35.

It also was hypothesized that respondents who endorsed higher scores on pre-encounter racial identity attitudes (assimilation, miseducation, and self-hatred) would perceive fewer racial microaggressions. Overall, the majority of the participants in this study endorsed lower scores on the pre-encounter racial identity attitudes scales and higher scores on the internalization multicultural racial identity attitudes, which also may have had an impact on the lack of a significant finding. The lack of variability of the scores on the six racial identity subscales may have reduced the likelihood of finding significant relationships between the variables in the study.

As expected, negative relationships were found between the supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions and their perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, which included tasks, bonds, and goals. This finding is consistent with the results from a previous study in which respondents viewed the overall working alliance more negatively as they perceived, and were bothered by, more racial microaggressions ($r = -.76$; Barnes, 2010). Similarly, Constantine (2007) also found that Black clients had lower perceptions of the therapeutic working alliance when they perceived racial microaggressions in counseling relationships with White therapists. Although it appears

103

that the strongest relationship was between the perception of racial microaggressions and

the perception of the goals subscale of the supervisory working alliance ($r = -.55$), it is

noted that the scales of the supervisory working alliance were highly correlated and, thus,

may be acting as one variable.

Participants in this study were asked to provide additional information about their

experiences with White supervisees in supervision relationships. The feedback from the

participants supports the findings of the study. One participant provided the following

feedback on how racial microaggressions affected the supervisory relationship:

> This student did not understand, acknowledge or appreciate her white
> privaledge [sic] and how that fact plays a role and has an impact on her
> counseling sessions with clients of other racial backgrounds. In fact, her
> White privaldge has an impact on our supervisor/supervisee relationship
> as well. She wanted me to coddle her and I refused to do that. I don't
> coddle any of my supervisees. She was very sensitive to directions I would
> give her and critiques I would make when listening to her session tapes.
> She tried to make my critiques into a personal "attack", when in fact it was
> nothing like that.

An additional respondent, whose assimilation racial identity attitude score was

higher than the mean, expressed frustration about her experiences working with

White supervisees, noting

> I have worked with several caucasian supervisee's [sic] and colleagues. I
> find that often, I am seen as the expert on "All things Black". That makes
> me uncomfortable. I find my annoyance is heightened when I know they
> have taken a course in multicultural issues and they still have these biases.

Another participant reported a different, more positive experience with her

supervisee. She stated,

> The supervisee was gregarious and overly confident at times, which made
> the experience typical; however, supervision was atypical because his
> client was an African American male and the supervisee became attached
> and emotional with his client. During supervision, we openly talked about
> race, where he was totally comfortable with addressing the obvious and
> what was uncomfortable for him during sessions, and approaches he may
> have needed to modify. Additionally, the supervisee respected my opinion
> and feedback as an African American woman.

Although the findings support the hypothesis that racial microaggressions have an

impact on supervisory working alliance, there were no statistically significant findings on

which combination of variables (i.e., perceptions of racial microaggressions and racial

identity attitudes) are most closely associated with supervisory working alliance. No

studies in the current literature have examined similar variables; thus, no comparisons

can be made to previous studies. The findings of this study may be a result of a low

sample size ($n = 34$). One combination of variables, though, showed promise in being

closely associated with levels of supervisory working alliance (high levels of racial

microaggressions, high levels of pre-encounter assimilation, and/or high levels of

internalization afrocentricity). However, due to low statistical significance, further

studies need to be conducted to determine if this association will hold. One respondent's

feedback on his or her upbringing may shed light on this possible combination of

variables:

Its amazingto [sic] me that I hold no hard feelings towards White people, unlike colleagues or friends that face similiar issues. I think my background and upbringing is the factor. I was raised in a town with all White people and didn't begin going to school with other Black children until I was in 7th grade. Living around White people so long, I many times feel "Bi-cultural". I understand how to read through the lines of what is really being said and know the etiquette rules and what's seen as "threatening" or miscues, whereas some of the folks I know don't have this "inside info" and pay the price educationally, vocationally and socially. I do my best to be an advocate, mentor others and help them along the way. All of this has not made me bitter, but thorough in my approach and keep it 100% professionally and respectful, but I don't tolerate ignorance or racism.

As previously noted, the participants were asked to discuss their experience with the identified supervisee and if it was typical or atypical of their experiences with other White supervisees. The majority of the respondents ($n = 23$) provided feedback about their experiences (see Appendix K). The content of their experiences was reviewed for similarities and differences by this researcher and an expert in the field of counseling supervision, and several themes emerged. It is noted that the purpose of this study was not to identify themes in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships, but it is important to acknowledge the richness of the feedback that the participants provided and how their experiences were not singular events.

Supervisees Novelty of Multicultural Exposure

Several of the participants explained that their supervisees had limited experience in dealing with issues related to multiculturalism. As a result, it appears as though the supervisors took into account the supervisees' lack of multicultural exposure to

106

understand some of the dynamics that presented in the supervision relationship. One

participant explained,

> This supervisee seemed a bit immature when it came to multicultural
> issues. I dont [sic] think she suggested interventions that were
> inappropriate, but she did suggest things that she was not familiar with.
> For example, she would suggest that the client become more independent
> from other members of the family. However, the client was African
> American and distancing himself from his family members was not
> something that would be accepted by those family members. The
> supervisee seemed to have a hard time not only accepting this but she also
> struggled with suggesting other methods for the client. Although she had
> taken a multicultural course, it seemed as if she had gained the knowledge,
> but was now in the process of applying multicultural principles and
> understanding to her experience as a counselor-in-training.

Another respondent, who had multiple supervisory experiences with White

supervisees, brought up several issues that related to the supervisees' lack of

multicultural awareness, stating,

> I have also supervised White students in their clinical internship, as well
> as additional White students in their practicum. There seems to be a
> transcendent naivete and ignorance regarding race, my motives towards
> them as a Black supervisor (i.e. attacking them when really only giving
> sound feedback about their performance), and disinterest in openly
> exploring their own racial heritage and/or their client's... like there's a
> privilege of not needing to concern themselves with racial matters [sic].

An additional supervisor also acknowledged the importance of multicultural

training in counselor education programs, stating,

> Even after a multi cultural [sic] course many supervisee's have no idea on
> how to relate and interact with people of different cultures. I believe all

CACREP multicultural classes (Masters and Doctorate) should include a practicum of interacting with different cultures.

Overall, it is evident that continued multicultural training is necessary to help combat race-related issues in counseling and counseling supervision.

Multicultural Issues Not Addressed in Supervision

Some of the respondents shared that multicultural issues were not discussed or addressed in supervision sessions with the identified supervisee. One participant stated,

> I've only had one supervisee, so I am unable to compare my experience with other supervision experiences. The fact that we were both youn [sic] and female added to our easy ability to build a supervision relationship. Her training was limited during the time we worked together and race/ethnicity issues were not addressed because they were not issues surrounding the needs of the clients. My supervision training is limited as well, so this may account for the lack of discussion related to race and ethnicity.

Similarly, another respondent simply explained, "There were no indications of racial concerns with the supervisees."

Although several participants indicated that multicultural issues were not addressed in supervision sessions, a few participants provided insight on how they initiated conversations related to race and ethnicity with their supervisees. One respondent, in particular, provided the following detailed outline of the steps taken to address issues of race and culture in the supervision process:

> I always broach the issue of racial identity at the beginning of any supervision dyad or triad to open the door for discussion with my

108

superviseee [sic] regarding themselves or their clients. As well, I make it known that part of my responsibility as their supervisor is to bring forth topics that can sometimes be uncomfortable and are often avoided in counseling supervision like race, gender, sexual orientation and other forms of diversity they may encounter with clients. Finally, I inform my supervisees that a large part of my job as their supervisor is to make them aware of multicultural and advocacy issues throughout our supervision relationship. Finally, I provide my supervisees with a copy of the multicultural counseling competencies and the ACA Advocacy Competencies and inform them about how these competencies will be incorporated into our supervision sessions.

This respondent's approach to discussing race and culture in supervision is echoed in the literature on cross-cultural counseling supervision, which stresses that it is the supervisor's responsibility to broach these issues in cross-racial counseling supervision relationship (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004), early and often (Borders & Brown, 2005).

Supervisees Dismissed/Feared Supervisors

Much of the feedback provided by the participants seemed to focus on how the supervisees personally interacted with them, in general, and in supervision. Four of the respondents felt as though their supervisees had negative perceptions of them as Black supervisors, and in turn, treated them differently. One male respondent indicated, "I have had students tell me in class that they were either afraid of me as a black male of [sic] who questioned or challenged my teaching style." Additionally, a participant provided a passionate description of her experiences, describing how supervisees

Always underestimate that what I say to "true" [sic] or "in accordance to guidelines". In other circumstances, when I have a white assistant -

109

> superviseeswill go to the white assistant to "check" whether what I told
> them was true. Supervisees will speak openly to White faculty or fellow
> supervisors about whether what I am saying is "right" - although in many
> situations, except a faculty member - I have "seniority" on the person they
> are asking. Interestingly enough, when I come into the room where a
> bunch of "supervisees" are sitting, they many times assume I am a student
> on their level - or was even thought to be the clinic receptionist once.

Another respondent, who endorsed moderate levels of racial microaggressions ($x = 14$) in the identified supervisory relationship and higher levels of the supervisory working alliance (scores ranged from 73 to 75) provided a general overview of his experiences with White supervisees, noting,

> I have found that White supervisees I have worked with have either been
> overall somewhat apprehensive working with me as an African American
> Male supervisor or were quite comfortable. There were no overt actions
> that indicated feelings of apprehension, but one can sense or feel when
> someone is a bit nervous around you. This type person often avoided
> multicultural issues and would seem frustrated if I brought such issues up.
> On the other end of the spectrum was a supervisee who was very
> comfortable being around an African American male and their body
> language and interaction were proof of this. Although they were more
> comfortable in my presence, multicultural issues raised were met with
> apprehension as well. However, in this case the apprehension seemingly
> came from a place of not wanting to say the wrong thing or offend me. In
> either case I felt it was my ethical duty to try and broach these issues with
> each supervisee to ensure their growth as counselors and my growth as a
> supervisor.

In previous studies, Black faculty in counseling and counseling psychology programs reported similar experiences when working with White colleagues in their respective departments (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owen, 2008). It is evident that helping professions, and specifically counselor education programs, need to continue

to make strides to create a climate that is inclusive and supportive of minority faculty, students, and staff.

Although the results of this study found no significant differences between the experiences of supervisors of male supervisees and supervisors of female supervisors, a few of the respondents mentioned gender in their responses and how the supervisees' gender had an impact on their supervisory relationship. For example, one participant stated, "I think the issue I had with the White male was him attempting to fulfill what society has created as the dominant figure (White male) as opposed to the White females who were more open during the sessions [sic]." In addition to gender differences, respondents identified other variables, outside of the racial differences, that had an effect on the supervisory relationship. One participant stated, "I do not believe the differences I experienced in working with both White supervisees were related to their racial beliefs. I believe they were related to who they were as individuals." Although the findings of this study suggest that perceptions of racial microaggressions have a negative effect on the supervisory working alliance, more research is needed to identify other variables, such as gender or personality constructs, that may contribute to issues in these relationships.

<div align="center">Limitations of the Study</div>

There were several limitations in this study. The most notable limitation is the sample size ($n = 34$). This study focused on the experiences of Black, doctoral-level supervisors (specifically doctoral students and new professionals) in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships with White supervisees. This is a very selective

population; thus, the number of potential participants was inherently small at the onset of the study. Currently there is no existing database that includes the race/ethnicity of counselor educators and students in CACREP programs. Therefore, identifying participants for this study proved to be challenging. The small sample size likely contributed to the lack of significant relationships between the variables.

In addition to having a small sample size, those who did choose to participate may have a vested interest in learning more about issues related to race and ethnicity. Consequently, their level of awareness about issues pertaining to race, such as racial microaggressions, may be more heightened than that of their peers. This heightened awareness may have an impact on how the participants responded to the items on the instruments, especially the Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale and the Cross Racial Identity Scale since these instruments focus on the experiences of Black Americans. Furthermore, the participants in this study endorsed much higher levels of the multiculturalist inclusive racial identity attitude, in comparison to the norm group, which may reflect their advanced training in the field of counseling, where emphasis has been placed on multicultural awareness and competency.

Two methodological considerations should be further evaluated when interpreting the findings from this study. First, self-report data may not reflect complete accuracy. This study focused on the perceptions of the Black supervisor only. The supervisees' perceptions of the supervisory relationship were not investigated. Hence, the perceptions of the Black supervisors may not accurately reflect the overall counseling relationship.

112

Additionally, the Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale was developed for the purpose of this study. The initial psychometric results are promising; however, more studies will need to be conducted to determine if this scale is psychometrically sound.

Implications for Counselor Education

This study has several implications for the field of counselor education. Most notable is that Black supervisors are still experiencing subtle forms of racism in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships. Although it does not appear that these experiences are too bothersome for the supervisors, greater efforts should be taken to better educate supervisees about racial microaggressions and how they can emerge in counseling supervision relationships. This topic not only should be discussed in multicultural counseling courses, but issues related to diversity should be intentionally infused in all graduate coursework.

In addition to educating counseling students about racial microaggressions, department chairpersons and faculty advisors, especially, should be aware of the issues minority doctoral students face in counselor education programs. Faculty should create a safe, supportive environment where minority students can feel comfortable discussing their experiences and concerns. One way to do this would be to initiate genuine conversations with students of color about their experiences within the department.

Finally, counselor education programs in all regions of the United States should increase their efforts to recruit more minorities into doctoral programs. Although it was not the focus of this study, it is noted that several department chairs responded to the

initial request for participation and indicated they did not have any Black doctoral students or faculty in their programs. As doctoral programs become more diverse, it is hoped that the faculty within counselor education programs also will become more diverse.

Direction of Future Research

This is the first study that focused on Black supervisors' perceptions of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships with White supervisees. More studies on the experiences of minority supervisors are needed in order to understand the issues that arise in cross-racial counseling supervision, which will, in turn, lead to faculty being able to better prepare doctoral students. Several areas of study should be considered.

First, the current study should be duplicated with a larger sample. Doctoral-level supervisors from clinical and counseling psychology programs, as well as clinical social work programs, should be considered for participation in an effort to increase the sample size. Researchers could also include the supervisees in the study to get a broader perspective of the dynamics in the supervisory relationship. A similar study also could include the use of a different measure of racial identity, and specifically, an instrument that will produce one global score of racial identity. This will reduce the number of variables in the study and, assuming the sample size is small, yield more meaningful findings. Future studies should also include faculty at all levels of the professoriate and doctoral students in order to compare the groups for significant differences.

114

In addition to duplicating the study, future research on racial microaggressions in supervision relationships with minority supervisors should be conducted by using multiple forms of methodology, including more objective forms of measurement such as direct observation, which has been suggested in the literature (Lau & Williams, 2010). The majority of the data on racial microaggressions is based on self-report data. Direct observation of supervision sessions may provide a more objective perspective on issues that may arise in cross-racial supervision relationships.

Furthermore, a similar study could explore the experiences of supervisors from various culturally diverse groups to gain a better understanding of how microaggressions impact supervision overall. Based on the current literature of microaggressions, it appears as though these acts are directed towards individuals from all racial and ethnic groups, so it is important to learn how these behaviors impact the supervisory relationships of supervisors from various racial and ethnic backgrounds. The Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale could be adapted to be inclusive of all racial and ethnic groups. In addition, other instruments could be used to measure the racial and ethnic identity of the supervisors. Future studies could also investigate perceptions of racial microaggressions and their impact on other areas of higher education, including the experiences of faculty advisors and advisees, as well as faculty in fields outside of the helping professions.

Finally, future research, using focus groups, personal interviews, and other qualitative methods, should identify the coping mechanisms used by minority faculty and doctoral students in counseling programs when facing racial microaggressions in

115

academia. Focus groups, specifically, should be used to explore the coping mechanisms, both positive and negative, to determine what more needs to be done to fully understand the experiences of this population. This information will add breadth to the current data and future doctoral students in counseling may find the information very beneficial as they matriculate through their graduate programs.

Conclusion

Racial microaggressions have been found to be present in multiple facets of the lives of people of color. This study is the first step in identifying racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision between Black supervisors and White supervisees and understanding how they affect the dynamics of the supervisory working alliance. Although the results of this study were informative, there are a number of areas that need to be explored further to determine other factors that have an impact on the supervisory relationship between Black supervisors and White supervisees. It is hoped that the findings of this study will have a significant impact on the field of counseling supervision and, most importantly, on the lives of Black counseling supervisors.

REFERENCES

Bahrick, A. S. (1990). Role induction for counselor trainees: Effects on the supervisory

working alliance (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1989).

Dissertation Abstracts International, *51,* 1484.

Barnes, R. R. (2010). Racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision

between Black supervisors and White supervisees: An initial study. Unpublished

manuscript.

Bernard, J. M. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook,

Priest, and Fukoyama. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *34*, 159-171.

Bhat, C. S., & Davis, T. E. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial

identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. *Journal of Multicultural

Counseling and Development, 35,* 80-91.

Borders, L. D. & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision.*

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bordin, E. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working

alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, *16*, 252-260.

Bordin, E. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling

Psychologist*, *11*(1), 35-42.

Burkard, A. W., Juarez-Huffaker, M., & Ajmere, K. (2003). White racial identity

   attitudes as a predictor of client perceptions of cross-cultural working alliances.

   Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31, 226-244.

Burkard, A. W., Ponterotto, J. G., Reynolds, A. L., & Alfonso, V. C. (1999). White

   counselor trainees' racial identity and working alliance perceptions. *Journal of*

   Counseling and Development, 77, 324-329.

Capodilupo, C. M., Nadal, K. L., Corman, L., Hamit, S., Lyons, O. B., & Weinberg, A.

   (2010). The manifestation of gender microaggressions. In D. W. Sue (Ed.),

   Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact (pp.

   193-216). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling

   supervision: Operationalizing a practical framework. In D. B. Pope-Davis & L. K.

   Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education*

   and training, and supervision (pp. 310-324). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage

   Publications.

Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions against African American clients in

   cross-racial counseling relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 1-16.

Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., & Owens, D. (2008). Racial

   microaggressions against Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A

   central challenge in the multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of*

   Counseling and Development, 86, 348-355.

Constantine, M. G., & Sue, D. W. (2007). Perceptions of racial microaggressions among

    Black supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,*

    142-153.

Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education and*

    Supervision, 34, 132-141.

Corrigan, J. D., & Schmidt, L. D. (1983). Development and validation of the Counselor

    Rating Form. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30,* 64-75.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (n.d.).

    CACREP directory. Retrieved January 26, 2010, from

    http://www.cacrep.org/directory/directory.cfm.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.

    Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971, July). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. *Black World*,

    13-27.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity.*

    Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revising the Cross model. In J.

    G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of*

    multicultural counseling (pp. 93-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cross, W. E., Jr., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory and measurement:

    Introducing the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). In J. G. Pontertotto, J. M.

Casas, L. M., Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural counseling (2nd ed., pp. 371-393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daniels, J., D'Andrea, M., & Kim, B. S. K. (1999). Assessing the barriers and changes of cross-cultural supervision: A case study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *38*, 191-204.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction.* New York: New York University Press.

Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive 'snapshot' of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *29*, 131-146.

Estrada, D., Frame, M. W., & Williams, C. B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32,* 307-319.

Fukuyama, M. (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to.. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *34*(2), 142-151.

Goodstein, R. (2008). What's missing from the dialogue on racial microaggressions in counseling and therapy. *American Psychologist*, *63*,276-277.

Harris Jr., R. (2008). Racial microaggression? How do you know?. *American Psychologist*, *63,* 275-276.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1991). Relationships of White and Black racial identity

    attitudes and demographic similarity to counselor preferences. *Journal of*

    Counseling Psychology, 38, 446-457.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Helms, J. E. (1994). Racial identity and career assessment. *Journal of Career Assessment,*

    2, 199-209.

Helms, J. E. (1995b). An update of Helms' White and People of Color racial and identity

    models.

    In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.),

    Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 181-191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (2002). *The White Racial Identity Attitudes scale.* Unpublished manuscript.

    Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race, and Culture, Boston College.

Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory

    racial

    identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and

    supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36,*

    284-304.

LaFromboise, T. D., Coleman, H. L. K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and

    factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. *Professional*

    Psychology: Research and Practice, 22, 380-388.

Larsen, D. L., Attkisson, C. C., Hargreaves, W. A., & Nguyen, T. D. (1979). Assessment of client/patient satisfaction: Development of a general scale. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 2,* 197-207.

Lau, M. Y. & Williams, C. D. (2010). Microaggression research: Methodological review and recommendations. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact* (pp. 313-336). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Leong, F., & Wagner, N. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know?. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *34*, 117-131.

Logan, J. N. (2011). The relationship between supervisors' and supervisees' race and racial attitudes in the supervisory working alliance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 2010). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 71,* 7729.

Morgan, D. (1984). Cross-cultural factors in the supervision of psychotherapy. *Psychiatric Forum*, *12*, 61-64.

Michael-Makri, Stella. (2010). Racial and ethnic minority graduate student experiences with racial microaggressions in CACREP-accredited programs (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2010). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 71,* 1196.

Pierce, C. (1970). Offensive mechanisms. In F. B. Barbour (Ed.), *The Black Seventies* (pp. 265-282). Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers.

Priest, R. (1994). Minority supervisor and majority supervisee: Another perspective of clinical reality. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *34*(2), 152-160.

Redmond, R. E. (2009). *Experiences of Black Supervisors Scale.* Unpublished scale.

Remington, G., & DaCosta, G. (1989). Ethnocultural Factors in Resident Supervision: Black Supervisor and White Supervisees. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *43*, 398-404.

Schacht, T. (2008). A broader view of racial microaggression in psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*, 63, 273.

Schecter, R. (1992). Voice of a hidden minority: Identification and countertransference in the cross-cultural working alliance. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *52*, 339-349.

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, *69*, 60-73.

Solórzano, D. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Higher Education, 11,* 121-136.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L, et al. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62,* 271-286.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., & Holder, A. M. B. (2008). Racial microaggressions in the life experience of Black Americans, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39,* 329-336.

Sue, D. W, Nadal, K. L., Capodilupo, C. M., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., & Rivera, D. P. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black Americans: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 86,* 330-338.

Thomas, K. R.(2008). Macrononsense in multiculturalism. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 274-275.

Toporek, R., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 66-83.

Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Burrow, A. L. (2010). Racial microaggressions and psychological functioning among highly achieving African-Americans: A mixed-methods approach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29,* 1074-1099.

Tracey, T. J., & Kokotovic, A. M. (1989). Factor structure of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 1,* 207-210.

Tsong, Y. V. (2005). The roles of supervisee attachment styles and perception of supervisors' general and multicultural competence in supervisory working

alliance, supervisee omissions in supervision, and supervision outcome (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, *65,* 3291.

United States Department of Education. (n.d.). Lists of post-secondary minority institutions. Retrieved January 26, 2010, from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinst.html.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross., W. E., Jr., Worrell, F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2002). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 71-85.

Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., Fhagen-Smith, P. E., Worrel, F. C., Swim, J., & Caldwell, L. (2000). *The Cross Racial Identity Scale.* State College, PA: Author.

Ward, E. (2003). Cultural competence, cultural mistrust, working alliance and racial and ethnic minority clients' experience of counseling: A mixed method study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63,* 5542.

Wong, E. C., Beutler, L. E. , & Zane, N. W. (2007). Using mediators and moderators to test assumptions underlying culturally sensitive therapies: An exploratory example. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 169-177.

Worrell, F. C., Vandiver, B. J., & Cross, W. E., Jr., (2004). *The Cross Racial Identity Scale: Technical manual -- 2nd. edition.* Berkley, CA: Author.

Worrell, F. C., Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2004). The

    reliability and validity of Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) scores in a sample of

    African American adults. *The Journal of Black Psychology, 30*, 489-505.

WORKING ALLIANCE INVENTORY-SUPERVISOR'S FORM

The following sentences describe some of the different ways a person might think or feel about his or her supervisee. As you read the sentences, mentally insert the name of a White counseling student you have supervised in practicum or internship in place of _____ in the text.

For each statement, there is a 7-point scale.

If the statement describes the way you always feel (or think), click the word "Always"; if it never applies, click the word "Never". Use the terms in between to describe the variations between these extremes.

Please work fast: Your first impressions are the ones we would like to have. PLEASE DO NOT FAIL TO RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM.

1. I feel uncomfortable with _____.

   Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

2. _____ and I agree about the steps to be taken to improve his/her work as a therapist.

   Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

3. I have some concerns about the outcome of these sessions.

   Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

4. _____ and I both feel confident about the usefulness of our current activity in supervision.

   Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

5. _____ and I have a common perception of her/his goals.

   Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

6. I feel I really understand _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

7. _____ finds what we are doing in supervision confusing.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

8. I believe _____ likes me.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

9. I sense a need to clarify the purpose of our sessions for _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

10. I have some disagreements with _____ about the goals of these sessions.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

11. I believe that the time _____ and I are spending together is not spent efficiently.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

12. I have doubts about what we are trying to accomplish in supervision.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

13. I am clear and explicit about what _____'s responsibilities are in supervision.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

14. The current goals of these sessions are important for _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

15. I find that what _____ and I are doing in supervision is unrelated to his/her current concerns.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

16. I feel confident that the things we do in supervision will help _____ to accomplish the changes he/she desires.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

17. I am genuinely concerned for _____'s welfare.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

18. I am clear as to what I expect _____ to do in these sessions.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

19. _____ and I respect each other.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

20. I feel that I am not totally honest about my feelings toward _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

21. I am confident in my ability to help _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

22. We are working toward mutually agreed upon goals.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

23. I appreciate _____ as a person.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

24. We agree on what is important for _____ to work on.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

25. As a result of these sessions, _____ is clearer as to how he/she might be able to improve his/her work as a therapist.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

26. _____ and I have built a mutual trust.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

27. _____ and I have different ideas on what his/her learning needs are.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

28. Our relationship is important to _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

29. _____ has some fears that if she/he says or does the wrong things I will stop working with him/her.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

30. _____ and I have collaborated in setting goals for these sessions.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

31. _____ is frustrated by what I am asking him/her to do in supervision.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

32. We have established a good understanding between us of the kind of changes that would be good for _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

33. The things that we are doing in supervision don't make much sense to _____.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

34. _____ doesn't know what to expect as the result of supervision.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

35. _____ believes the way we are working with his/her issues is correct.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

36. I respect _____ even when she/he does things I do not approve of.

Never   Rarely   Occasionally   Sometimes   Often   Very Often   Always

APPENDIX B

CROSS RACIAL IDENTITY SCALE

Read each item and indicate to what degree it reflects your own thoughts and feelings, using the 7-point scale below. There are no right or wrong answers. Base your responses on your opinion at the present time. To ensure that your answers can be used, please respond to the statements as written, and select your response from the drop-down box under each question.

1. As an African American, life in America is good for me.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

2. I think of myself primarily as an American and seldom as a member of a racial group.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

3. Too many Blacks "glamorize" the drug trade and fail to see opportunities that don't involve crime.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

4. I go through periods when I am down on myself because I am Black.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

5. As a multiculturalist, I am connected to many groups (Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Whites, Jews, gays & lesbians, etc.).

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

6. I have a strong feeling of hatred and disclaim for all White people.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

7. I see and think about things from an Afrocentric perspective.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

8. When I walk into a room, I always take note of the racial make-up of the people

   around me.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

9. I am not so much a member of a racial group as I am an American.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

10. I sometimes struggle with negative feelings about being Black.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

11. My relationship with God plays an important role in my life.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

12. Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

13. I believe that only those Black people who accept an Afrocentric perspective can

   truly solve the race problem in America.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

14. I hate the White community and all that it represents.

Strongly   *Disagree*   *Somewhat*   *Neither agree*   *Somewhat*   *Agree*   *Strongly*
Disagree   *disagree*   *nor disagree*   *agree*   *agree*

15. When I have a chance to make a new friend, issues of race and ethnicity seldom play

   a role in whom that person might be.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

16. I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a multicultural perspective,

   which is inclusive of everyone (e.g., Asians, Latinos, gays & lesbians, Jews, Whites,

   etc.).

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

17. When I look in the mirror at my Black image, sometimes I do not feel good about

   what I see.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

18. If I had to put a label on my identity, it would be "American" and not African

   American.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

19. When I read the newspaper or a magazine, I always look for articles and stories that

   deal with race and ethnic issues.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

20. Many African Americans are too lazy to see opportunities that are right in front of

   them.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

21. As far as I am concerned, affirmative action will be needed for a long time.

   | *Strongly Disagree* | *Disagree* | *Somewhat disagree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Somewhat agree* | *Agree* | *Strongly agree* |

22. Black people cannot truly be free until our daily lives are guided by Afrocentric values and principles.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

23. White people should be destroyed.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

24. I embrace my own identity, but I also respect and celebrate the cultural identities of other groups. (e.g., Native Americans, Whites, Latinos, Jews, Asian-Americans, gays & lesbians, etc.).

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

25. Privately, I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

26. If I had to put myself into categories, first I would say I am an American, and second I am a member of a racial group.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

27. My feelings and thoughts about God are very important to me.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

28. African Americans are too quick to turn to crime to solve their problems.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |

29. When I have a chance to decorate a room, I tend to select pictures, posters, or works of art that express strong racial-cultural themes.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

30. I hate White people.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

31. I respect the ideas that other Black people hold, but I believe that the best way to solve our problems is to think Afrocentrically.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

32. When I vote in an election, the first thing I think about is the candidate's record on racial and cultural issues.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

33. I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a multicultural perspective, because this connects me to other groups (Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Whites, Jews, gays & lesbians, etc.).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

34. I have developed an identity that stresses my experiences as an American more than my experiences as a member of a racial group.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

35. During a typical week in my life, I think about racial and cultural issues many, many times.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

36. Black people will never be free until we embrace an Afrocentric perspective.

*Strongly
Disagree*   *Disagree*   *Somewhat
disagree*   *Neither agree
nor disagree*   *Somewhat
agree*   *Agree*   *Strongly
agree*

37. My negative feelings toward White people are very intense.

*Strongly
Disagree*   *Disagree*   *Somewhat
disagree*   *Neither agree
nor disagree*   *Somewhat
agree*   *Agree*   *Strongly
agree*

38. I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.

*Strongly
Disagree*   *Disagree*   *Somewhat
disagree*   *Neither agree
nor disagree*   *Somewhat
agree*   *Agree*   *Strongly
agree*

39. I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.

*Strongly
Disagree*   *Disagree*   *Somewhat
disagree*   *Neither agree
nor disagree*   *Somewhat
agree*   *Agree*   *Strongly
agree*

40. As a multiculturalist, it is important for me to be connected with individuals from all cultural backgrounds (Latinos, gays & lesbians, Jews, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, etc.).

*Strongly
Disagree*   *Disagree*   *Somewhat
disagree*   *Neither agree
nor disagree*   *Somewhat
agree*   *Agree*   *Strongly
agree*

RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS IN SUPERVISION SCALE-SUPERVISOR'S

FORM (VERSION 1)

The statements below are intended to represent some of the situations or events that may have transpired over the course of your supervision sessions. Using the scale below, please rate your supervisee with regard to the following situations or events during supervision. Please note that the term "cultural" used in each of the statements refers specifically to racial or ethnic issues.

0	1	2
This never happened.	*This happened, but it did not bother me.*	*This happened and I was bothered by it.*

Rating	Item
	1. My supervisee sometimes avoided discussing or addressing racial or cultural issues that I thought were important.
	2. At times, my supervisee was insensitive about my racial or cultural background(s).
	3. My supervisee sometimes questioned my qualifications as a supervisor.
	4. My supervisee sometimes denied or minimized having racial or cultural biases or stereotypes.
	5. My supervisee may have thought at times that I was overly sensitive about racial or cultural issues.
	6. My supervisee sometimes seemed unaware of the realities of race and racism.
	7. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about me.
	8. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have some unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about his/her clients.
	9. I sometimes felt offended in supervision because of my supervisee's racial or cultural insensitivity.
	10. My supervisee sometimes minimized the importance of racial or cultural issues in our supervision meetings.

	11. My supervisee often was very knowledgeable about racial and cultural issues with regard to counseling.
	12. My supervisee at times seemed reluctant to discuss or process racial or cultural issues with me.
	13. My supervisee sometimes seemed hesitant to give me feedback about my work as a supervisor, possibly for fear of being seen as racist.
	14. My supervisee occasionally suggested culturally inappropriate treatment conceptualizations or strategies that may not have fully considered their client's racial or cultural background(s).
	15. My supervisee at times may have either overestimated or underestimated my capabilities or strengths based on my racial group membership.
	16. In general, I did not trust my supervisee because of his or her cultural biases or insensitivities.

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION TO USE RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS IN SUPERVISION CHECKLIST

From: "Constantine, Madonna"<constantine@exchange.tc.columbia.edu>
To: "Rachelle Redmond REREDMON" <REREDMON@uncg.edu>
cc:
Sent: 06/09/2008 06:43PM
Subject: RE: Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist.

Dear Rachelle,

Thank you for your interest in our research and in the scale. There is not
a supervisor's version of the scale, but you can feel free to use and/or
adapt any items from the original scale for your research.

I wish you all the best with your dissertation. Take care.

mgconstantine

-----Original Message-----
From: Rachelle Redmond REREDMON [mailto:REREDMON@uncg.edu]
Sent: Fri 6/6/2008 3:37 PM
To: mc816@columbia.edu
Subject: Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist.

Dear Dr. Constantine,

I am a third year doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and
Educational Development at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
 Dr. DiAnne Borders is the chair of my dissertation committee.

I have read your articles on racial microaggressions in counseling and
counseling supervision and found them very intriguing. In addition, I was
able to relate to the experiences of those in your studies. Currently, I
would like to explore the incidences of racial microaggressions in
counseling supervision when the supervisor is Black and the supervisee is
White for my dissertation study.

Have you conducted any recent or unpublished research looking at the
experiences of the Black supervisor in cross-racial counseling supervision
dyads in regards to racial microaggressions? Is there a supervisor's
version of the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist?

I am very interested in using this scale, with permission from you and Dr. Sue, for my dissertation. If there is not a supervisor's version, I would appreciate your permission to reword some of the items of the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist to make them more relevant to the experiences of Black supervisors.   I would, of course, share my results with you once they are complete.

I truly appreciate you taking the time to consider this request. Should you have any questions for me regarding my dissertation, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Shelly Redmond

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO EXPERTS FOR REVIEW OF RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS IN

SUPERVISION SCALE-SUPERVISOR'S FORM

December 15, 2008

Dear Professor _____,

       I am a doctoral student currently working on a study of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships. Dr. L. DiAnne Borders is my dissertation committee chair. Racial microaggressions are subtle, yet offensive, racially-charged actions that may cause the receiver to feel shame and embarrassment about their racial and ethnic background. Specifically, I am focusing on the experiences of Black supervisors who work with White supervisees in practicum or internships. I am contacting you because of your expertise and experience in counseling and supervision.

       With the permission of Madonna Constantine, I am adapting the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Checklist and I would truly appreciate any feedback you are able to give me regarding this adapted scale.

       Enclosed you will find the Racial Microaggressions in Supervision Scale-Supervisor's Form. Reviewing the scale should take no longer than 15 to 20 minutes of your time. An additional form has been included for you to use to provide any feedback regarding this scale. Specifically, I am interested in determining if the wording and concepts are understandable. Additional feedback regarding the instructions, rating scale, and ease of taking the survey would be helpful, as well. I am particularly interested in your responses to Questions 3 and 4 in Section III, based on your expertise and your experience as a supervisor.

       Thank you, in advance, for your help. I truly appreciate your support as I work toward completing my dissertation research. I certainly will acknowledge your help in the dissertation document. In addition, I would be glad to send you a summary of the results of the dissertation study. Just check below if you wish to receive a summary.

       I would appreciate it if you would return this form by **January 9, 2009,** via email to reredmon@uncg.edu. If you prefer, you also can mail it to the following address: Rachelle Redmond, Department of Counseling and Educational Development, The

141

University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 228 Curry Building, P.O. Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (336) 334-5751.

Sincerely,

Rachelle E. Redmond, MS, CRC
Doctoral Student
Department of Counseling and Educational Development
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

___Please send me a summary statement of your dissertation study results. Send this to the following email or other address:

Racial Microaggressio*n*s Scale-Supervisor's Form

Section I

Please rate each item on the ***appropriateness* of the co*nt*ent** using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all appropriate	Somewhat inappropriate	Neutral	Somewhat appropriate	Very appropriate

Item/Rating	Comments
1. _____	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	

5. _____	
6. _____	
7. _____	
8. _____	
9. _____	
10. _____	
11. _____	
12. _____	
13. _____	
14. _____	
15. _____	
16. _____	

Section II

Please rate each item on the ***clarity* of the content** using the following scale:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all clear	Somewhat clear	Neutral	Clear	Very clear

Item/Rating	Additional Feedback
1. _____	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	
5. _____	
6. _____	
7. _____	
8. _____	
9. _____	
10. _____	
11. _____	
12. _____	
13. _____	
14. _____	
15. _____	

16. _____	

Section III

Please also answer the following questions about the Racial Microaggressions Scale-Supervisor's Form.

1. Are the directions clear and easy to understand? Any suggested changes?

2. Does the Likert scale seem appropriate? What suggestions, if any, do you have regarding the anchors for the Likert scale?

3. Are there any items that you believe should be omitted? Is so, please explain.

4. Are there any experiences that you believe are missing from the scale? Is so, please explain.

5. Please provide additional comments regarding any aspects of the scale.

Many thanks for sharing your expertise and helping me with my study!

RACIAL MICROAGGRESSIONS IN SUPERVISION SCALE-SUPERVISOR'S

FORM (VERSION 2)

The statements below are intended to represent some of the situations or events that may have transpired over the course of your supervision sessions. Using the scale below, please rate the supervisee you identified earlier (i.e., a White counseling student in practicum or internship). Write your rating (0, 1, or 2) in the blank space in front of each item. Please note that the term "cultural" used in each of the statements refers specifically to racial or ethnic issues.

0	1	2
This never happened.	*This happened, but it did not bother me.*	*This happened and I was bothered by it.*

Rating	Item
	1. My supervisee sometimes avoided discussing or addressing racial or cultural issues.
	2. At times, my supervisee was insensitive about racial or cultural background(s).
	3. My supervisee sometimes questioned my qualifications as a supervisor due to my racial or cultural background.
	4. My supervisee sometimes denied or minimized having racial or cultural biases or stereotypes.
	5. At times my supervisee communicated that I was overly sensitive about racial or cultural issues.
	6. My supervisee sometimes seemed unaware of the realities of race and racism.
	7. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about me.
	8. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have some unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about his/her clients.
	9. I sometimes felt offended during supervision because of my supervisee's racial or cultural insensitivity.
	10. My supervisee sometimes minimized the importance of racial or cultural issues in our supervision meetings.

	11. My supervisee at times seemed reluctant to discuss or process racial or cultural issues with me.
	12. My supervisee sometimes seemed hesitant to give me feedback about my work as a supervisor, possibly for fear of being seen as racist.
	13. My supervisee occasionally suggested culturally inappropriate treatment conceptualizations or strategies that may not have fully taken into consideration his/her client's racial or cultural background(s).
	14. My supervisee at times may have either overestimated or underestimated my capabilities or strengths based on my racial group membership.
	15. In general, I felt some distrust of my supervisee due to his or her cultural biases or insensitivities.

CONSENT FORM

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT

Project Title: Racial Microaggressions, Racial Identity, and Working Alliance in Cross-Racial Counseling Supervision Relationships between Black Supervisors and White Supervisees
Project Directors: L. DiAnne Borders, Rachelle E. Redmond

What is the study about?
This study is designed to gain a better understanding of the impact of racial microaggressions in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships.

Why are you asking me?
Participants are being asked to be in this study due to their experiences as a counseling supervisor. Additional inclusion criteria for participants are as follows: self-identification as Black, enrolled as a student in a CACREP-accredited doctoral program in counseling or employed as a faculty member (less than two years post-doctorate) in a CACREP-accredited counseling program, and has served as a supervisor of a White supervisee within the past two years.

What will you ask me to do if I agree to be in the study?
Participants will be asked to think about one White supervisee and complete several surveys about their experiences in this specific counseling supervision relationship. Participation should take no longer than 30 minutes.

What are the dangers to me?
Participants in this study may become uncomfortable when responding to race-related questions. In addition, they may experience a variety of feelings when thinking about previous experiences in cross-racial supervisory relationships, especially if the experience was a negative one. Participation is voluntary and participants may end their participation at any time during the study. If you have any concerns about your rights or how you are being treated please contact Eric Allen in the Office of Research and Compliance at UNCG at (336) 256-1482. Questions about this project or your benefits or risks associated with being in this study can be answered by L. DiAnne Borders, Ph.D., who may be contacted at (336) 334-3425 or borders@uncg.edu, or by Rachelle E. Redmond, MS, CRC, who may be contacted at (336) 334-5751 or reredmon@uncg.edu.

Are there any benefits to me for taking part in this research study?
Individuals who participate in this study may gain a better understanding of the multiple variables that may have had an impact on current or past supervisory relationships. The results from this study may provide participants with information that would be helpful when teaching and discussing issues related to cross-racial supervision.

Are there any benefits to society as a result of me taking part in this research?
The field of counselor education will benefit from this study because it will provide initial information about the experiences Black doctoral students and doctoral-level counselor educators have in supervision with White students/supervisees. By identifying some of the issues that may evolve in these types of relationships, counselor educators will be better prepared to teach doctoral students about these issues and provide support if these students encounter some of the issues in their supervisory relationships.

Will I get paid for being in the study? Will it cost me anything?
Participants will not receive compensation for their participation in this study and there is no cost for participating. Participants will have the opportunity to enter in a drawing to win one of six $50 gift cards or one of two $100 gift cards to Barnes & Noble. After completing all of the questionnaires, participants will be prompted to send an email to reredmon@uncg.edu to register for the drawing. Participants' contact information will not be linked to their responses.

How will you keep my information confidential?
Participants will complete the assessments through a secure format on the website Survey Monkey. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. Absolute confidentiality of data provided through the Internet cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. Please be sure to close your browser when finished so no one will be able to see what you have been doing.

What if I want to leave the study?
You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any of your data which has been collected be destroyed unless it is in a de-identifiable state.

What about new information/changes in the study?
If significant new information relating to the study becomes available which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By consenting to participate, you agree that you read and fully understand the contents of this document and are openly willing to consent to take part in this study. All of your

questions concerning this study have been answered. By consenting, you are agreeing that you are 18 years of age or older and are agreeing to participate in this study described to you by the principal investigator. Please print a copy of this form for your records.

EXPERIENCES OF BLACK SUPERVISORS SCALE

The statements below are intended to represent some of the situations or events that may have transpired over the course of your supervision sessions. Using the scale below, please rate the supervisee you identified earlier (i.e., a White counseling student in practicum or internship). Write your rating (0, 1, or 2) in the blank space in front of each item. Please note that the term "cultural" used in each of the statements refers specifically to racial or ethnic issues.

0	1	2
This never happened.	*This happened, but it did not bother me.*	*This happened and I was bothered by it.*

Rating	Item
	1. My supervisee sometimes avoided discussing or addressing racial or cultural issues.
	2. At times, my supervisee was insensitive about racial or cultural background(s).
	3. My supervisee sometimes questioned my qualifications as a supervisor due to my racial or cultural background.
	4. My supervisee sometimes denied or minimized having racial or cultural biases or stereotypes.
	5. At times my supervisee communicated that I was overly sensitive about racial or cultural issues.
	6. My supervisee sometimes seemed unaware of the realities of race and racism.
	7. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about me.
	8. My supervisee sometimes seemed to have some unconscious racial or cultural stereotypes about his/her clients.
	9. I sometimes felt offended during supervision because of my supervisee's racial or cultural insensitivity.
	10. My supervisee sometimes minimized the importance of racial or cultural issues in our supervision meetings.
	11. My supervisee at times seemed reluctant to discuss or process racial or cultural issues with me.

	12. My supervisee sometimes seemed hesitant to give me feedback about my work as a supervisor, possibly for fear of being seen as racist.
	13. My supervisee occasionally suggested culturally inappropriate treatment conceptualizations or strategies that may not have fully taken into consideration his/her client's racial or cultural background(s).
	14. My supervisee at times may have either overestimated or underestimated my capabilities or strengths based on my racial group membership.
	15. In general, I felt some distrust of my supervisee due to his or her cultural biases or insensitivities.
	16. My supervisee discusses our supervision meetings with White faculty in the department to validate or discredit my feedback.

DEMOGRAPHICS FORM-PILOT STUDY

1. Are you male or female?
> Male
> Female

2. What is your age?

> [　　　　　　　　]

3. Were you born in the United States?
> Yes
> No

4. What is the race/ethnicity of your mother?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

> [　　　　　　　　]

5. What is the race/ethnicity of your father?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

> [　　　　　　　　]

6. What race/ethnicity do you believe others perceive you to be?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

> [　　　　　　　　]

7. How do you self-identify your race/ethnicity?

> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

[   ]

8. In which geographical region is your current university located?

> New England (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
> Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania)
> South (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Florida)
> Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin)
> Great Plains (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma)
> Rocky Mountains (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming)
> Southwest (Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah)
> West (Washington, Oregon, California)
> Pacific (Alaska, Hawaii)

9. How many years have you been a counselor educator? Please use whole numbers.

[   ]

10. To your knowledge, has the supervisee you identified taken a multicultural counseling course?

> Yes
> No

11. Please indicate the course in which you were supervising the identified supervisee.

> Practicum
> Internship
> Other (please specify)

[   ]

12. Was your experience with this supervisee typical or atypical of your experiences with White supervisees in general? Please explain.

[   ]

DEMOGRAPHICS FORM-MAIN STUDY

1. Are you a doctoral student or a counselor educator?
> Doctoral Student
> Counselor Educator

2. Are you male or female?
> Male
> Female

3. What is your age?

> [   ]

4. Were you born in the United States?
> Yes
> No

5. What is the race/ethnicity of your mother (select all that apply)?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

> [   ]

6. What is the race/ethnicity of your father (select all that apply)?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)
> American Indian or Alaska Native
> Hispanic or Latino
> Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
> Other (please specify)

> [   ]

7. What race/ethnicity do you believe others perceive you to be (select all that apply)?
> Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
> White (non-Hispanic)

155

American Indian or Alaska Native
Hispanic or Latino
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
Other (please specify)

<div style="border:1px solid;width:200px;height:30px"></div>

8. How do you self-identify your race/ethnicity (check all that apply)?
Black or African American (non-Hispanic)
White (non-Hispanic)
American Indian or Alaska Native
Hispanic or Latino
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
Other (please specify)

<div style="border:1px solid;width:200px;height:30px"></div>

9. In which geographical region is your current university located?
New England (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode
Island, Vermont)
Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York,
Pennsylvania)
South (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North
Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Florida)
Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio,
Wisconsin)
Great Plains (North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma)
Rocky Mountains (Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming)
Southwest (Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah)
West (Washington, Oregon, California)
Pacific (Alaska, Hawaii)

10. How many years have you been a doctoral student or a counselor educator? *"Please
use whole numbers"* will be prompted if respondent does not provide a whole
number.

<div style="border:1px solid;width:200px;height:30px"></div>

11. Is the supervisee you identified male or female?
Male
Female

12. To your knowledge, has the supervisee you identified taken a multicultural
counseling course?
Yes

156

No

13. Please indicate the course in which you were supervising the identified supervisee.
Practicum
Internship
Other (please specify)

```
[                    ]
```

14. Please rate how typical or atypical your experience with this supervisee was in comparison to your experiences with White supervisees in general.

Very Atypical	Atypical	Somewhat Atypical	Neither Typical or Atypical	Somewhat Typical	Typical	Very Typical

Please explain.

```
[                                                                 ]
```

15. Please share any additional information about your experiences working with White supervisees that you think would be informative for conducting research on this topic.

```
[                                                                 ]
```

APPENDIX K

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES [SIC]

Item: Please rate how typical or atypical your experience with this supervisee was in comparison to your experiences with White supervisees in general. Please explain.

"My other supervisees were open and willing to learn and grasp any information I gave them. They enjoyed the interventions we completed and the feedback that was given to them when reviewing their tapes."

"In my doctoral cohort of 6 who supervised master's practicum students, 3 of us self-identify as African American. The other two African American doctoral students also supervised White master's practicum students. From the sharing of experiences in supervision of supervision, it was clear that the other two African Americans with White supervisees had experiences which were far more racially aggressive and culturally insensitive than mine. Therefore, I must label my experience as atypical compared to that of the other two African American doctoral students in my cohort."

"I've only had one supervisee, so I am unable to compare my experience with other supervision experiences. The fact that we were both youn and female added to our easy ability to build a supervision relationship. Her training was limited during the time we worked together and race/ethnicity issues were not addressed because they were not issues surrounding the needs of the clients. My supervision training is limited as well, so this may account for the lack of discussion related to race and ethnicity."

"The student that I thought of was one of the more trusting and open students. The other supervisee's would have been rated very differently because they are typically more of a challenge to work with (in regards to racial issues)."

"The supervisee was gregarious and overly confident at times, which made the experience typical; however, supervision was atypical because his client was an African American male and the supervisee became attached and emotional with his client. During supervision, we openly talked about race, where he was totally comfortable with addressing the obvious and what was uncomfortable for him during sessions, and approaches he may have needed to modify. Additionally, the supervisee respected my opinion and feedback as an African American woman."

"There were no indications of racial concerns with the supervisees."

"Always underestimate that what I say to "true" or "in accordance to guidelines". In other circumstances, when I have a white assistant – superviseeswill go to the white assistant to "check" whether what I told them was true. Supervisees will speak openly to White faculty or fellow supervisors about whether what I am saying is "right" - although in many situations, except a faculty member - I have "seniority" on the person they are asking. Interestingly enough, when I come into the room where a bunch of "supervisees" are sitting, they many times assume I am a student on their level - or was even thought to be the clinic receptionist once."

"The supervisee and I were able to establish a working relationship characterized by genuineness, empathy, and positive regard. I felt as though she was comfortable in discussing various issues related to client care, ethics, legal issues, etc... However, she was counseling with a population primarily including Latino/as and African-Americans of lower socio-economic status. I do not believe she was uncomfortable in these environments, but, she often expressed her frustrations in working with people in a poverty culture. She and I explored interventions and case conceptualization based on a multicultural perspective. However, I believe her frustrations may have been due to a lack of cultural knowledge and I should have explored this deeper."

"I just look at her life experiences. I cannot control that."

"Tend to relate well as a supervisor with all supervisees regardless of race. Further despite only being in the program for 3 years, I had supervisory experience prior to starting my doctoral studies."

"The supervisee had also taken a course with me in multicultural counseling at a university where I am employed on a 3/4 basis. As a result, he had prior knowledge of my teaching, emphasis and personality. He was a white male student, 27 years old form a western state."

"Although the instructions were to selected one specific supervisee, I find that my answers apply to pretty much all of my White supervisees at one time or another during the course of the class. Whereas, when I first encountered this type of behavior I was surprised and extremely irritated, I now come to expect it. I believe this has helped to decrease some, but certainly not all, of the intensity that usually accompanies the negative feelings, thoughts and emotions that I experience."

"I have had various experiences with White supervisees but they have all been open, respectful, and worked with me collaboratively."

"I have found that working with White female supervisees bring about similar experiences. I have not worked with a White male supervisee."

"Even after a multi cultural course many supervisee's have no idea on how to relate and interact with people of different cultures. I believe all CACREP multi-cultural classes (Masters and Doctorate) should include a practicum of interacting with different cultures."

"This supervisee seemed a bit immature when it came to multicultural issues. I dont think she suggested interventions that were inappropriate, but she did suggest things that she was not familiar with. For example, she would suggest that the client become more independent from other members of the family. However, the client was African American and distancing himself from his family members was not something that would be accepted by those family members. The supervisee seemed to have a hard time not only accepting this but she also struggled with suggesting other methods for the client. Although she had taken a multicultural course, it seemed as if she had gained the knowledge, but was now in the process of applying multicultural principles and understanding to her experience as a counselor-in-training."

"I was this supervisee's supervisor in practicum and we had a bad experience then. This was my most cut off supervisory relationship with a White Student. Other White Students and I seemed to have a better flow in supervision."

"I have also supervised White students in their clinical internship, as well as additional White students in their practicum. There seems to be a transcendent naivete and ignorance regarding race, my motives towards them as a Black supervisor (i.e. attacking them when really only giving sound feedback about their performance), and disinterest in openly exploring their own racial heritage and/or their client's... like there's a privilege of not needing to concern themselves with racial matters."

"This student did not understand, acknowledge or appreciate her white privaledge and how that fact plays a role and has an impact on her counseling sessions with clients of other racial backgrounds. In fact, her White privaldge has an impact on our supervisor/supervisee relationship as well. She wanted me to coddle her and I refused to do that. I don't coddle any of my supervisees. She was very sensitive to directions I would give her and critiques I would make when listening to her session tapes. She tried to make my critiques into a personal "attack", when in fact it was nothing like that."

"I always broach the issue of racial identity at the beginning of any supervision dyad or triad to open the door for discussion with my superviseee regarding themselves or their clients. As well, I make it known that part of my responsibility as their supervisor is to bring forth topics that can sometimes be uncomfortable and are often avoided in counseling supervision like race, gender, sexual orientation and other forms of diversity they may encounter with clients. Finally, I inform my supervisees that a large part of my

job as their supervisor is to make them aware of multicultural and advocacy issues throughout our supervision relationship. Finally, I provide my supervisees with a copy of the multicultural counseling competencies and the ACA Advocacy Competencies and inform them about how these competencies will be incorporated into our supervision sessions."

"At this level, she was my first white supervisee. However, when I was not a student, I supervised white counselors and case managers."

"My experience overall has been wonderful, however I chose to use my experience with my most recent supervisor. In the past, I had a supervisor that every positve question I answered could be the opposite."

Item: Please share additional information about your experiences working with White supervisees that you think would be informative for conducting research on this topic.

"I think the issue I had with the White male was him attempting to fulfill what society has created as the dominant figure (White male) as opposed to the White females who were more open during the sessions."

"You topic is awesome and I enjoyed your survey."

"Discussing that one's White supervisees have a racial identity (White racial identity) is essential. I also believe it is necessary to initially address any race concerns, issues, and biases that supervisees may perceive having during supervision as it relates to having an African American male/female supervisor."

"I do not believe the differences I experienced in working with both White supervisees were related to their racial beliefs. I believe they were related to who they were as individuals."

"Its amazingto me that I hold no hard feelings towards White people, unlike colleagues or friends that face similiar issues. I think my background and upbringing is the factor. I was raised in a town with all White people and didn't begin going to school with other Black children until I was in 7th grade. Living around White people so long, I many times feel "Bi-cultural". I understand how to read through the lines of what is really being said and know the etiquette rules and what's seen as "threatening" or miscues, whereas some of the folks I know don't have this "inside info" and pay the price educationally, vocationally and socially. I do my best to be an advocate, mentor others and help them along the way. All of this has not made me bitter, but thorough in my approach and keep it 100% professionally and respectful, but I don't tolerate ignorance or racism"

"Overall, I enjoyed our experience. I feel we had a great working relationship and I felt she was comfortable discussing various issues. However, I believe that racial issues may have been uncomfortable for her to discuss. At the end, she provided me with a thank you card discussing her experience and thanking me for being someone who she felt she could be open with."

"As a African American female I sometimes resent the fact that I am responsible to teach my supervisees how to counsel ethnic/sexual/religious groups. I understand that is part of being a doc student, but it is not my fault that they have not exposed themselves to other groups. I have by choice and by force. As an African American person in America, I don't get that privledge."

"I have had students tell me in class that they were either afraid of me as a black male of who questioned or challenged my teaching style."

"I have found that White supervisees I have worked with have either been overall somewhat apprehensive working with me as an African American Male supervisor or were quite comfortable. There were no overt actions that indicated feelings of apprehension, but one can sense or feel when someone is a bit nervous around you. This type person often avoided multicultural issues and would seem frustrated if I brought such issues up. On the other end of the spectrum was a supervisee who was very comfortable being around an African american male and their body language and interaction were proof of this. Although they were more comfortable in my presence, multicultural issues raised were met with apprehension as well. However, in this case the apprehension seemingly came from a place of not wanting to say the wrong thing or offend me. In either case I felt it was my ethical duty to try and broach these issues with each supervisee to ensure their growth as counselors and my growth as a supervisor."

"I have worked with several caucasian supervisee's and colleagues. I find that often, I am seen as the expert on "All things Black". That makes me uncomfortable. I find my annoyance is heightened when I know they have taken a course in multicultural issues and they still have these biases."

"Because of the geographical area in which our counselor education program is located (Southern Appalachia), the student who enter our masters program are often majority White and have an undeveloped lens of experiences with other cultures than their own. However, our program is very cognizant of this issue and proactively infuses the multicultural counseling and ACA advocacy competencies throughout the curriculum as a method or awareness and self examination for these counselors in training."