AN EXAMINATION OF PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SELF-EFFICACY AMONG SUPERVISORS WHO CONDUCT CROSS-RACIAL SUPERVISION: SOCIAL INFLUENCE, RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDES, AND GENDER SELF-CONFIDENCE

by

LaTonya M. Summers

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Counselor Education and Supervision

Charlotte

2018

Approved by:

_____

Dr. Jack Culbreth

_____

Dr. Pamela Lassiter

_____

Dr. Lyndon Abrams

_____

Dr. Claudia Flowers

_____

Dr. Jonathan Crane

ABSTRACT

LaTonya M. Summers. An examination of predictive factors of self-efficacy among supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision: Social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence (Under the direction of DR. JACK CULBRETH)

The counseling profession has become diverse and it is not uncommon for a person of color to be included in the supervisory dyad. Therefore, counselor supervisors are required to become competent in supervising people who are racially different from themselves (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999; Young, 2004). Most cross-racial supervision literature examines the supervisory working alliance, but the purpose of this study was to investigate the predictability of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence on supervisors' self-efficacy to work with racially-different supervisees. The sample in this study included 149 supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision. The complete assessments were the Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale, the Interpersonal Power Inventory, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, the Hoffman Gender Scale, and a demographic questionnaire.

Multiple regressions were conducted to analyze the data. Findings indicated that: (a) supervisors with flexible attitudes toward power usage and gender self-confidence conducted cross-racial supervision with more efficacy, (b) supervisors with rigid attitudes toward race and power usage broached race more than their counterparts with flexible attitudes, and (c) African-American supervisors broached race less when they worked

with racially-different supervisees. Knowledge regarding predictors of supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervision is essential for counselor educators and supervisors. The outcomes of the study beg for a more in-depth examination of the issues surrounding self-efficacy in cross-racial supervision, particularly with ethnic minority supervisors.

DEDICATION

To Ethel Louise Wallace, my paternal grandmother and first educator.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"With God, all things are possible." Matthew 19:26.

I would like to acknowledge the support of my dissertation chair, Dr. Jack Culbreth. I chose rightly for support that was unwavering, undiluted, and unflinching during our many discussions about power, race, and gender. I am gratefully transformed by his expertise, thoughtfulness, and wicked sense of humor.

Anything that Dr. Culbreth and I missed was readily recommended by my amazing committee members: Drs. Lyndon Abrams, Pamela Lassiter, Claudia Flowers, and Jon Crane. I thank each of them for their time, support, and advisement.

When I did not feel worthy of academe, Dr. Clare Merlin-Knoblich did not hesitate to take me under her wings. I thank her for her for always knowing what to say. I also thank her and Drs. Furr and Culbreth for making me shine on paper with their glowing letters of recommendations. I would like to thank Dr. Sejal Foxs. It was her instruction that led me back to Blackness.

I would not have survived the doctoral journey without the Fighting 15. I was blessed to walk alongside Ami Camp, Merry Leigh Dameron, Carolina Benitez, Derrick Johnson, Sara Andrews, and Erica Merrill. I thank them for holding space for me to rise and fall without judgment. Many hugs and kisses to my four best friends outside of academia who kept it "real," and kept me grounded and sane.

A special thanks to the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) for changing the trajectory of my graduate journey by honoring me as a 2016 NBCC

Minority Fellow. Their acknowledgement of my work with minority populations gave me the courage and finances to create the inaugural Black Mental Health Symposium. I am indebted to UNC-Charlotte and the Graduate School. There is no way I could have started or finished this journey without their financial undergirding.

I would also like to thank former staff members, referral sources, and clients of the LifeSkills Counseling & Consulting Group for 10 life-changing years of service. I thank them for holding up LifeSkills when I could not, and for conceding when I let it go to finish my doctoral journey.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family of origin for always believing that my future would be greater than my past and for giving me the love and space to make it so. A heartfelt thanks to Nathan, my husband and our children who for 3 years lovingly permitted my role as a scholar to supersede the roles of wife and mom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Background and Overview

The counseling profession has become diverse and it is not uncommon for a person of color to be included in the supervisory triad. This racial transformation requires counselor supervisors to become competent in supervising people who are racially different from themselves (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999; Young, 2004). The profession's commitment to multiculturalism and diversity in counseling and supervision is evidenced by the adoption of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (Arredondo et al.,1996) and the ACES Best Practices in Clinical Supervision (Borders et al., 2014). However, a gap between counselor supervisors' knowledge of multicultural competencies and best practices, and the demonstration of associated skills persists.

Although existing literature includes substantial evidence of proven best practices for promoting multicultural competence in cross-racial supervision, supervisors continue to facilitate supervision that is harmful (Wong, Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013). Perhaps broader conditions associated with supervisor competency need to be considered. In addition to strategies that emphasize knowledge and skills, research suggests that a supervisor's sense of self-efficacy impacts competency (Barnes, 2004; Steward, 1998). This means that well-intentioned interventions may not prove beneficial if the outcomes do not increase a supervisor's self-efficacy to successfully navigate cross-racial supervisory relationships. In order words, the beliefs supervisors have about preparing racially-different counselors need to be examined.

Cross-Racial Supervision

The background for some of the problems encountered in cross-racial supervision might stem from race relations of the United States. The more diverse our profession becomes, the more reflective it is of the country's racial tensions (Sue & Sue, 2007). This assertion is realized in the abundance of existing literature on cross-racial supervision where the perspectives of ethnic minority supervisors have been inadvertently excluded. Most empirical studies and articles on the topic are written to increase the competency of White supervisors who work with minority supervisees. Few articles or studies examine cross-racial supervisory relationships when ethnic minority supervisors work with White supervisees. When the profession is not informed about such cross-racial supervisory dyads, it perpetuates a one-dimensional and colorblind approach to supervision where there is denial, distortion, or minimization of race or racism (Neville et al., 2000).

Colorblindness in the literature on cross-racial supervision perpetuates the cultural mistrust that permeates the U.S., and it ignores the country's impending demographic shift from White-predominance. Based on the Pew Research Center's (2016) longitudinal study of immigrant and birth trends, minority births have outnumbered White births for the past five years. Although the Census Bureau projects that minority people will outnumber White people by 2044, Pew predicts that it will occur closer to 2055 (Cohn, 2016).

One might deny or minimize the predicted demographic shift's impact on the counselor educator profession since an educational gap has persisted. But, according to the National Center for Education Statistics (2016), the educational gap in the U.S. is

narrowing. The percentage of Black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian students increased between 1976 and 2014, while college enrollment fell from 84% to 58% for White students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016).

Specific to counselor education, all but two of the existing CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling programs are housed on predominantly White campuses (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], n.d.). The University of Texas at San Antonio and St. Mary's University, also located in San Antonio, are the two exceptions as they are Hispanic Servicing Institutions (United States Department of Education [USDOE], n.d.). This means that ethnic minority students who are entering doctoral programs in the counseling field are highly likely to supervise counselors-in-training who are White (Barnes, 2011).

A fast-changing population brings many implications for the counseling profession, especially for counselor supervisors as they are responsible for providing culturally competent care to supervisees who are racially-different from them, and they are liable for the quality of care supervisees provide to clients. Expanding the literature on cross-racial supervision by including perspectives of diverse groups of supervisors might reduce the prevalence of racial microaggressions and the likelihood of harmful supervision.

Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy

Examining psychological factors such as the self-efficacy of counselor supervisors might also improve cross-racial supervisory outcomes. Self-efficacy is defined as one's belief about his or her ability to accomplish a goal (Bandura, 1982).

How one perceives his or her competency is a strong determinant of the outcome of a person's efforts (Bandura, 1991). Although self-efficacy is one of the most studied constructs in counselor education, it has not been widely applied to counselor supervisors (Barnes, 2004). Current literature mostly examines the impact of supervision on the self-efficacy of counselors-in-training.

Researchers agreed that counselor self-efficacy increased after receiving regular supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001), and that supervision with a multicultural focus increased counselor self-efficacy for multicultural counseling (Constantine, 2001). Persons with strong counseling self-efficacy believe they are highly able to counsel and expect positive outcomes, and those with lower self-efficacy believe they do not have the skills to conduct counseling and predict poorer outcomes (Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998; & Barnes, 2004). There are far fewer studies that evaluate the self-efficacy of supervisors (Barnes, 2004; Steward, 1998).

It is a common belief that counselor self-efficacy is synonymous with supervisor self-efficacy (Steward, 1998). Research has shown that counselors can have high self-efficacy and low competence (Larson, 1998) and the same could be true for counselor supervisors (Steward, 1998). Examining the efficacy of supervisors is important because past studies show that few counselor supervisors received training in counseling supervision (Steward, 1998; Goodyear, 1998), and supervisee's self-efficacy might correspond to the self-efficacy of their supervisors. To broaden the utility of self-efficacy theory, this study will apply it to supervisors who provide cross-racial supervision by

examining psychological constructs such as social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence.

Social Influence

Social influence is another word for *power* and is defined as one's "potential to be a significant change agent in" another's life (Anderson & Levitt, 2015; p. 281). Closely related, Bernard and Goodyear (2014) defined power as the capacity to influence another person's behavior. Social influence exists in the supervisory relationship, as evidenced by the influencing role of the supervisor (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). Supervisor influence is enhanced by the fact that they designate where supervision takes place, they set forth the expectations, roles, and tasks associated with the supervisory process, and evidence of their expertise is displayed by diplomas and licenses in their office (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). Some studies have used qualitative and grounded theory methods to allow participants to reflect upon their own definitions of social influence and power (Murphy & Wright, 2005). Barnes (2002) noted that social influence might be a potential source of self-efficacy enhancement. In this study, the researcher seeks to understand how well a supervisors' use of social influence predicts his or her perceived competence as a supervisor when working with racially-different supervisees.

Racial Identity Attitudes

Racial identity development is a psychological factor emerging in literature examining cross-racial and cross-cultural supervision. The concept is defined as one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors concerning oneself, others within one's racial group, and those outside of that racial group (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004). Chang et al.,

(2004) and Estrada, Frame, and Williams (2004) reported that racial identity is salient to counseling, and proposed that a supervisor and supervisee's racial identity be assessed. Chang, Hays, and Shoffner (2004) reported that not addressing racial identity may have a negative impact on the supervisory relationship. Not discussing racial and cultural issues upfront in supervision minimizes the salience of race, and demonstrates to supervisees that race is not important to address in counseling with their clients. It also perpetuates the myth of sameness (Young, 2004). This study seeks to understand the relationship, if any between supervisors' racial identity attitudes and their judgments about the ability to competently supervise trainees of a different race.

Gender Self-Confidence

Gender self-confidence is another psychological factor that will be examined in the study. Hoffman et al. (2000) defined gender self-confidence as "one's intensity of belief that one meets one's own personal standards for femininity (femaleness/masculinity (maleness)" (p. 359). Like racial identity, gender self-confidence is more than one's race or gender. Simply stated, gender self-confidence assesses one's attitudes and beliefs about being a male or female. It is the assessment of an individual's sense of adequacy as a male or female (Hoffman, 2006). Hoffman et al., (2001) conceptualized gender self-confidence using two constructs, gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance, where individuals present with either strong gender self-definition and low gender self-acceptance, or high gender self-acceptance and low gender self-definition. For example, individuals who place a high value on their maleness or femaleness have strong gender self-definition. On the other hand, individuals who view

themselves positively as males and as females but do not view their gender as a critical component of their identity are gender self-accepting. Gender self-acceptance is positively correlated to one's well-being (Hoffman, 2006), to theoretical orientation such as Feminist Supervision (Worthington & Dillon, 2003), and intersects with racial identity (Hoffman, 2006).

There is an abundance of research in counseling that assesses gender role attitudes. Researchers agree that one's perception about gender roles impact the supervisory working alliance (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). This study aims to understand how supervisors' gender role attitudes impact their ability to supervise people who are racially-different, an important area of investigation within the larger body of self-efficacy and cross-racial supervision research.

Statement of the problem

Counselor supervisors are expected to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes and beliefs reflective of culturally skilled professionals (Arredondo et al., 1996). Additionally, they are admonished to recognize all supervision as multicultural supervision and to infuse multicultural strategies into supervisory approaches (Borders et al., 2014). While focusing on the demonstration of knowledge and skills is critical to evaluating outcomes in cross-racial supervision, research suggests that attitudes and beliefs, specifically self-efficacy must be addressed (Barnes, 2002; Steward, 1998). Social cognitive theorists assert that an individual's sense of self-efficacy plays a strong role in expected outcomes. According to Bandura (1993), self-efficacy is defined as individuals' beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance

that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Research suggests that the self-efficacy of counselor supervisors needs further exploration, especially when current strategies have not proven entirely effective. As noted by Barnes (2004), researchers need to assist supervisors beyond strategies for skill improvement, they must also provide supervisors with tools to assist them in altering poor self-judgments.

Themes of current literature reflect a more established empirical research base around the positive impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy, however, the amount of empirical data available describing counselor supervisor self-efficacy is limited, and no literature is available on supervisors' self-efficacy and cross-racial supervision. Social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence have been identified as factors impacting counseling outcomes. These same factors have also been associated with supervision outcomes; however, there is little research detailing how supervisors' perceptions of competence to conduct cross-racial supervision are impacted by these factors. In response to the needs outlined above, this study aims to help supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision enhance self-efficacy by concentrating efforts beyond traditional best practices and examining the impact of factors such as their use of social influence, and their attitudes about racial and gender identity.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to use Albert Bandura's (1982) social cognitive theory to uncover psychological factors associated with supervisor competency in cross-racial supervision. With an aim to help supervisors improve self-efficacy, efforts will be

concentrated beyond traditional best practices, by examining the impact of factors such as social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence.

Significance and Need for the Study

As the counseling profession becomes more diverse, it is imperative to expand existing literature to shape counselor supervisors' competency when issues of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence arise in cross-racial supervision. Researchers have focused on the harm of not addressing such issues, and have recommended strategies to help supervisors address issues upfront (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004; Day-Vines, Wood, Grothaus, Craigen, Holman, Dotson-Blake, & Douglas, 2007; Pendry 2012). However, none of the studies focused on supervisors' experiences with factors impacting the facilitation of cross-racial supervision.

An examination of how perceptions of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence impact counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial dyads has a three-prong purpose: to (a) help researchers gain insight into the psychological factors that impact supervisors' facilitation of cross-racial supervision and how they might influence supervisees, (b) explore predictive factors that might help supervisors develop skills to address issues of power, race, and gender in cross-racial supervision, thereby reducing potential conflict, and (c) to enhance counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial dyads. These experiences can inform counselors, educators, and supervisors of additional variables supervisors encounter when providing supervision to people who are racially-different from themselves.

This study addressed the following question:

1. To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict self-efficacy in a sample of counselor supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?
2. To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict supervisors' broaching style?
3. To what extent are supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles correlated in a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?
4. What differences, if any, are there between African-American supervisors' broaching styles and other supervisors in cross-racial supervision?

Statement of Hypotheses

In response to the research questions, I hypothesize the following:

- Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will report positive self-efficacy beliefs about working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.
- Supervisors with rigid attitudes towards social influence, racial identity attitudes and gender self-confidence will report negative self-efficacy beliefs about working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.
- Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will broach race more than supervisors with inflexible attitudes.

- Supervisors with rigid attitudes toward social influence, racial identity attitudes and gender self-confidence will broach race less than supervisors with flexible attitudes.
- Supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles will be moderately to highly positively correlated among a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision.
- African-American supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision will broach race routinely or very often, as opposed to White and other ethnic minority supervisors.

Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made regarding this proposed study: (a) Participants will complete survey honestly and willingly, and respond to each item, (b) the intended respondent will be the one to complete the survey, (c) participants with different degrees of supervisory experience will be included in the study, (d) participants will have supervised racially-different supervisees within the past two years, and (e) participants read and speak English.

Delimitations

The following delimitations have been identified by the researcher: (a) Participants will be counseling supervisors, either in graduate programs or post-licensure, (b) the sampling procedure will be purposive, and (c) information will be obtained via self-report surveys.

Limitations

The following factors are beyond the control of the researcher and may limit the generalizability of the findings of the study: (a) A purposive sample limits the ability of the research to generalize results, (b) self-reported data may not reflect complete accuracy, and (c) social desirability bias is the tendency of participants to answer survey questions in a way they think might be favorably viewed by others. Due to the wording of some of the survey questions, social desirability responses could limit the results of the study

Threats to Internal Validity

Threats to internal validity are related to how the results of a study can be accurately interpreted (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). Two possible threats to the internal validity of this study are instrumentation and social desirability. To address the potential threat of instrumentation, each of the four instruments used in this study have been tested for reliability and validity in previous studies. Social desirability, the desire to be perceived favorably by the researcher, might also threaten the internal validity of this study. To minimize this threat, participants will take comfort knowing that their responses are anonymous, as their email nor IP addresses will be collected.

Threats to External Validity

External validity refers to the extent to which the results of the study can be generalized to the sampled population (Gay, et al., 2009). Two possible threats to the external validity of this study include experimenter effect and measurement of the dependent variable. Based on this researcher's recruitment methods (i.e., recruiting

participants through professional and personal organizations where she is a member), experimenter effect might occur and results may not be generalizable to other situations. Moreover, if the effectiveness of this study depends on the instrument used, then measure of the dependent variable might limit generalizability. To address these threats, the researcher will seek counselor supervisors from across the country in organizations where she is not known, and the researcher used the only known instrument to measure counselor supervisor self-efficacy. This researcher does expect that results will be generalizable to all counselor supervisors.

Operational Definitions:

1. Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy - The counselor supervisor self-efficacy is defined by Barnes (2004) as counselor supervisors' beliefs about their capability to effectively supervise counselors-in-training. It will be operationally defined as the score on two of six subscales (i.e., self in supervision, and multicultural competence) on the Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSSES; Barnes, 2004), an instrument grounded in Bandura's (1982) social learning theory of self-efficacy.

2. Social Influence - Social influence is defined as a supervisor's potential to be a change agent in the supervisee's professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Anderson & Levitt, 2015). In the current study it will be operationally defined as each participant's total score on the Interpersonal Power Inventory (Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998).

3. Gender Self-Confidence - Gender self-confidence is defined as the culturally agreed-on norms for the characteristics of male and females (Anderson & Levitt, 2015).

It will be operationally defined as the total score on the Hoffman Gender Scale (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000).

4. Racial Identity - Racial identity development is defined as one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors concerning oneself, others within one's racial group, and those outside of that racial group (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004). In this study it will be operationally defined by each participant's total score on the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992).

Summary

Chapter I introduced the overall research problem, purpose, background, and significance of the proposed study. Further, it introduced the proposed research questions and hypotheses that will be tested through the research, including the assumptions, delimitations, and limitations. Chapter II will provide an in-depth review of the related literature, giving a more thorough understanding of what has already been addressed, a critique of the past research, and gaps in the literature that need to be addressed. Specifically, Chapter II addresses literature related to counselor supervisor self-efficacy, cross-racial supervision, social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence. Chapter III will introduce the methodology of the study. Specifically, it will address the research design, participants, procedures, instruments, and the proposed data analysis techniques. Chapter IV will discuss the results of the study, including the demographic information of the study participants, the scale reliabilities, and results of the data analyses. Finally, Chapter V will discuss the meaning of the findings, including

the implications for counselor educators, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this literature review is to introduce the existing literature on the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence and how they relate to the self-perceived competence of counselor supervisors in cross-racial supervisory dyads. These will be explored sequentially. In the first section, cross-racial supervision will be defined and examined to highlight the persistence of racial microaggressions and other reported critical issues, and the implications of continued failure. The second section will review self-efficacy as a theoretical framework, and a conceptual understanding of counselor supervisor self-efficacy along with empirical research will be presented. Then, in the remaining three sections, empirical research related to each of the predictor variables (social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence) and the dependent variable, counselor supervisor self-efficacy will be discussed as a demonstration of the need for this research.

A systematic and retrospective approach was used to obtain relevant literature. The search was conducted by using the university's library research and collections website. Most of the articles and books were found in the PsychARTICLES database, and a few others were found in PsychINFO, Education Full Text, Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print, ERIC, and Education Research Complete. The search terms used included: cross racial, supervision, self-efficacy, social influence, power, racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence. Oftentimes, the terms were combined to narrow the search to more relevant topics. For example, "cross racial" AND "supervision" AND "efficacy." The literature review began broadly and then led to a more focused search for

primary and specific articles through article references. Articles and books were either downloaded from the databases or requested for interlibrary loan through the university's library website. This review is not meant to be a thorough literature review, but the review of current literature is believed to be sufficient for this working proposal.

Cross-Racial Supervision

In clinical supervision, the role of the supervisor is designed to help supervisees develop skills and competencies necessary to provide optimal care to their clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). When there is a difference in racial status between the supervisor and supervisee, the phenomenon is referred to as cross-racial supervision (Norton & Coleman, 2003; Estrada, 2005; Eklund, Aros-O'Malley, & Murietta, 2014). Though in other studies, the terms cross-racial, cross-cultural, and multicultural supervision are often used interchangeably to describe supervisory dyads that consist of ethnically and racially-different supervisors and supervisees (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Utsey, Gernat, & Hammar, 2005; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004), there are subtle distinguishing factors that should be identified to clarify the subject matter.

Cross-racial supervision occurs when there is a racially-different supervisor-supervisee dyad (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Eklund, Amos-O'Malley, & Murietta, 2014); and cross-cultural supervision exists when individuals in the dyad are ethnically, racially, or culturally-different from each other, or are different in all three ways (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999). Religion, sexual orientation, age, ability, and gender are other cultural variables that impact supervisory dyads and constitute cross-cultural supervision.

Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) defined multicultural supervision "as the study of cultural models or patterns of supervision" (p. 310). For example, considering what the supervisory process would look like from the scope of feminism would be within the realm of multicultural supervision.

When the terms multicultural, cross-cultural, and cross-racial are used interchangeably, the salience of race is minimized (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004). Experts agree that using the word "culture" is less anxiety-provoking and is not as emotionally-charged as the term "race" (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004), and that talking about race and racism in counseling and supervision is difficult and sometimes off-limits (Utsey, Garnet, & Hammar, 2005; Day-Vines, et al., 2007; Pendry, 2012). Nevertheless, there is evidence of harmful supervision when discussion of race is ignored (Schroeder, Andrews, & Hindes, 2009; Pendry, 2012; Wong,Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013).

Researchers assert that race and culture should not be ignored and should be discussed upfront (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004; Day-Vines, et al., 2007; Pendry, 2012), but supervisors tend to focus on basic skills first, and attend to cultural issues later (Schroeder, Andrews, & Hindes, 2009). Because the supervisory relationship is hierarchical, with the supervisor being in a position of power, the responsibility to initiate conversations about race is bestowed upon the supervisor (Leong & Wagner, 1994; Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004), although the supervisee should be involved in the process. Research indicates that supervisors perceive they broach conversations about race and culture more often than

supervisees report such occurrences. For example, Gatmon et al. (2001) conducted a study with almost 300 pre-doctoral psychology interns to examine the impact of discussions about race and cultural factors on supervisee satisfaction and the supervisory working alliance. The researchers found that supervisees were more satisfied with their supervisors when the ethnic and racial similarities and differences between them were discussed, and the respondents reported higher levels of working alliance. However, only one-third of the respondents had such discussions with their supervisors. Moreover, when discussions were related to sexual orientation, supervisees initiated those conversations, and not the supervisors.

In the same year, Duan and Roehlke (2001) conducted a similar study on cross-racial supervision, and found similar results. The researchers surveyed 58 White supervisors and their 48 ethnic minority supervisees, with the Cross-Racial Supervision Survey, an assessment developed for the study. Results from the study found that supervisors reported making more efforts to address cultural issues than supervisees perceived. Ninety-percent of the supervisors reported addressing ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation issues, but only 50% of their supervisees acknowledged such discussions. Moreover, 91% of the supervisors felt their supervisory dyad was a good match, and 81% of the supervisees agreed. The study also showed that supervisees were more sensitive to cultural issues than their supervisors were.

Some of the reasons cited for supervisors' hesitancy to discuss racial and cultural issues in counseling and supervision include anxiety (Utsey, Gernat, & Hammar, 2005), their own biases, lack of diversity training (Schroeder, Andrews, & Hindes, 2009), and

considering their ethnic minority supervisees as more culturally competent than themselves (Schroeder, Andrews, & Hindes, 2009; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004). When cultural differences in cross-racial counseling and supervision are not discussed working alliances suffer, supervisors inadvertently communicate that race is not important, and a colorblind approach to supervision is perpetuated (Young, 2004; Day-Vines, et al., 2007; Pendry, 2012). Moreover, supervisees in such relationships considered their supervisors less trustworthy, so they disclosed less and kept negative emotions to themselves (Burkard et al., 2006). They also viewed their supervisors as culturally unresponsive or insensitive, and reported that they were negatively affected, and rated their supervisory working alliance as poor (Burkard et al., 2006).

In a foundational study on the influence of personality, race, and values on supervisee expectations, Vander Kolk (1974) found that Black supervisees expected that their White supervisors would be less empathic, respectful, and congruent. Though some might argue that the study and its findings are outdated, the expectations of those participants were realized in a similar, more recent study conducted by Constantine and Sue (2007). While exploring perceptions of racial microaggressions among Black students in cross-racial dyads, Constantine and Sue (2007) found seven patterns of microaggressions committed by White supervisors when they work with ethnic minority supervisees: (a) invalidating racial-cultural issues, (b) making stereotypic assumptions about Black clients, (c) making stereotypic assumptions about Black supervisees, (d) reluctance to give performance feedback for fear of being viewed as racist, (e) focusing primarily on clinical weaknesses, (f) blaming clients of color for problems stemming

from oppression, and (g) offering culturally insensitive treatment recommendations. These findings might provide more recent support of Vander Kolk's (1974) earlier findings where Black supervisees expected less from their White supervisors.

Other critical incidents, both positive and negative have been reported in cross-racial supervision relationships. Critical incidents are interpersonal experiences in supervision that make an impact on the supervisee's effectiveness (Schroeder, Andrew, & Hindes, 2009). Fukuyama (1994) conducted a pilot study with 18 ethnic minority interns who reported that their supervisors' openness and support, ability to provide culturally-relevant supervision, and creating opportunities to work on multicultural activities as positive critical incidents. Most negative critical incidents were grouped into two categories: supervisors' lack of cultural awareness and questioning supervisee abilities. One respondent reported that his supervisor called him a "jerk," a word that fell outside of his cultural language, and a term generally offensive to any person regardless of ethnicity. Additionally, supervisors were perceived to lack cultural awareness and expertness when they questioned their ethnic minority supervisees' work with another minority client. This kind of dyad, where the supervisee is more knowledgeable about a cultural group than their supervisor is a phenomenon called cross-regressive supervisory relationship (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004).

In cross-regressive supervisory relationships, supervisees report poorer working alliances and oftentimes the supervisory relationship is prematurely terminated (Chang, Hay, & Shoffner, 2004). Working with a supervisor who may not be aware of the importance or impact of racial and cultural issues, poses challenges for the ethnic

minority supervisee. Attempts to sensitize or inform the supervisor may "increase the supervisor's intolerance of person of color groups," (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004; p. 131). This supervisory dyad can be challenging for the supervisor as well. These encounters might force racially unaware supervisors to examine their own racial identity, and cause them to need and seek their own supervision and multicultural competence training.

A similar and more recent study than Vander Kolk (1974) and Constantine and Sue (2007), Wong, Wong, and Ishiyama (2013) surveyed ethnic minority students to explore positive and negative critical incidents in cross-racial supervision. The researchers found five positive themes and five negative themes. The five areas that helped and contributed to "good multicultural supervision" (p. 74) were: (a) personal attributes of the supervisor, (b) adherence to supervision competencies, (c) mentoring supervisees, (d) positive supervisor-supervisee relationship, and (e) adherence to multicultural supervision competencies. The negative critical incidents that contributed to harmful or ineffective supervision were attributed to supervisors' lack of multicultural competence. These themes included: (a) personal difficulties as a visible minority, (b) negative personal attributes of the supervisor, (c) lack of a safe and trusting relationship, (d) lack of adherence to multicultural supervision competencies, and (e) lack of supervision competencies. The results of these studies lend support to the significance of this study where social influence usage, and attitudes towards racial and gender identity will be examined for predictability of supervisory self-efficacy to conduct cross-racial supervision.

In attempt to enhance multicultural competence, Day-Vines, et al. (2007) proposed broaching, a culturally relevant technique used to examine the impact of race and culture upon clients' presenting problems. According to existing literature, when racial and cultural factors are introduced and discussed in sessions (i.e., broaching) counselors appear more credible, and clients report higher satisfaction, disclose more, and are more likely return for follow-up appointments (Day-Vines, et al., 2007; Day-Vines, Bryan, & Griffin, 2013; Jones & Welfare, 2017). As stated previously, it is important to discuss racial and cultural factors early in the counseling and supervision process but Day-Vines, et al. (2007, 2013) assert that broaching should be done continuously throughout the counseling process. The researchers proposed that there is a continuum of five broaching styles and that counselors are either: (a) avoidant, wherein they do not broach the subject of race at all; (b) isolating, in which they broach the subject once and usually obligatorily; (c) continuing/incongruent, where they repeatedly ask about race but are not efficacious enough to explore clients' issues with depth; (d) integrated/congruent, in which broaching is a part of their professional identity where they consistently and effectively consider the impact of race and culture and make accurate interpretations; or (e) infusing, wherein activities like broaching, addressing injustice and inequality, and advocacy is a part of their lifestyle, not just a professional obligation.

To evaluate a counselor's broaching style, Day-Vines, Bryant, and Griffin (2013) developed the Broaching Attitudes and Behavior Survey (BABS). The 43-item instrument is comprised of a 5-point Likert-type scale to assess broaching styles using its strongest four factors (i.e., avoidant, continuing/incongruent, integrated/congruent, and

infusing). The isolating style was not included as a subscale because many of its items overlapped with avoidant. Scores are obtained by summing items in each subscale and dividing by the number of items in that subscale. The subscale with the highest score reflects the respondent's broaching style.

In their exploratory study, Day-Vines et al. (2013) found that White counselors are more likely to be avoidant and continuing/incongruent when working with people who are racially-different from themselves, a finding consistent with previous studies on cross-racial supervision (Wong, Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013; Utsey et al. (2005). The researchers also found that in comparison to counselors with 6 to 10 years of experience and those with more than 15 years of experience, novice and inexperienced counselors rated themselves higher on continuing/incongruent attitudes and behaviors. The researchers concluded that confidence to broach race and culture increases with more experience. It is also interesting to note that there was no difference in broaching styles among counselors with 0 to 5 years of experience and those with 11 to 14 years of experiences. The researchers implied that counselors might engage in a recycling process where they re-experience a sense of awkwardness when they deal with more complex issues related to race.

Counseling outcomes are enhanced when counselors demonstrate an ability to consider the impact of race on a client's presenting problem (Day-Vines et al, 2007, 2013; Jones & Welfare, 2017). Therefore, assessing counselors' broaching styles is an important multicultural competence tool. This researcher intends to expand the utility of broaching to supervision, by assessing supervisors' broaching style with a quantitative

question on the demographic questionnaire. Examining how often supervisors broach race in supervision will help us understand how to enhance their self-efficacy when working with people who are racially-different from themselves.

Otherwise, the continued failing of supervisees in cross-racial supervisory relationships will be detrimental to the profession, the communities it serves, and a country that is increasingly becoming diverse. Based on the outcomes cited in the review of cross-racial supervision literature, the well-intentioned interventions offered for best practices have not proven to be beneficial. Rather than focusing on cognitive and behavioral factors related to why supervisors are hesitant to initiate discussions about the influence of race, or their personal challenges with giving difficult feedback when they work with people who are racially different from themselves, examining psychological and affective factors might be a better way to narrow the gap between what supervisors know to do and what they actually do. It is not enough to know how to perform cross-racial supervision, but believing that one is capable to successfully carry out such duties is just as important (Barnes, 2002). Assessing supervisors' perceived competency to conduct cross-racial supervision, and offering strategies to enhance their self-efficacy will better equip them to navigate the supervisory process when it requires them to work with people who are racially-different.

Self-Efficacy as a Theoretical Framework

In his seminal work on self-efficacy, Albert Bandura (1977) moved away from his roots as a behaviorist to focus on behavioral changes produced by psychological means (Hibbs, 2012). Rather than emphasizing classical response-outcome expectancies,

Bandura believed that one's perceptions about his or her ability to perform a task mediates the effort he or she puts forth and leads to an expected outcome (Bandura, 1977). In other words, one's outcome is determined by how successful he or she believes he or she will be at reaching a goal. This is known as one's self-efficacy.

Bandura included self-efficacy theory under the umbrella of his social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997; Barnes, 2004; Hibbs, 2012). With social cognitive theory, Bandura refuted the notion that human behavior is unidirectional—wherein it is shaped or controlled by environmental factors or inherent qualities (Bandura, 1999). Instead, Bandura saw behavior as an interdependent and interactional process known as "triadic reciprocal causation." In this light, behavior is shaped by three things: (a) personal agency factors (cognitive and affective processes), (b) behavior, and (c) the environment. According to Bandura, behavior is regulated by self-perceptions developed by this ongoing interplay. In other words, people's behaviors are not fixed. This is a ray of hope for the counseling and supervision profession. If the harmful supervision demonstrated in the literature on cross-racial relationships is tied to supervisors' low-self efficacy, then educators can play a vital role in improving the learning conditions and self-beliefs of these supervisors and their supervisees.

Using a social cognitive analysis, Bandura (1977) posited that self-efficacy is informed by four major sources of information (listed in order of decreasing potency): (a) performance accomplishments, (b) vicarious experience, (c) verbal or social persuasion, and (d) emotional arousal (Bandura, 1997, 1999; Barnes, 2002). Mastery of experience is the most influential source of efficacy information, because self-efficacy increases when

individuals experience successful outcomes (Bandura, 1977, 1999; Hibbs, 2012). Conversely, repeated failures lessen self-efficacy. Vicarious experience, when one's efficacy is raised by seeing someone else triumph over difficulties, is less dependable than directly experiencing triumph but it is still influential (Bandura, 1977, 1999). Of lesser potency is verbal or social persuasion, when self-efficacy is impacted by negative and positive words, or expertness (Bandura, 1977, 1999). Positive words tend to increase efficacy, while negative words inversely affects one's efficacy. Though emotional arousal is the weakest of the four, it still informs self-efficacy. This source is marked by a person's reliance on his or her physiological state (i.e., level of anxiety, vulnerability to stress, etc.) to assess their likelihood of success or failure (Bandura, 1977, 1999). For example, a person's high anxiety level might serve as a cue to not undertake a task.

Considering that self-efficacy was conceptualized as a theory to analyze changes achieved in fearful and avoidant behavior (Bandura, 1977), it is fitting to use self-efficacy theory as a framework for this study. Existing literature on cross-racial supervision amply documents counselor supervisors' fearful and avoidant behavior related to initiating discussion about race (and other cultural variables) in cross-racial supervision, and their difficulty to give difficult but critical feedback supervisees need to enhance their own self-efficacy. Self-efficacy theory posits that people who see themselves as inefficacious to handle potentially threatening situations become anxious, think about calamitous outcomes, and avoid them (Bandura, 1986). Perhaps, the harmful and ineffective outcomes that supervisees experience and endure in cross-racial supervisory dyads is related to the perceived self-inefficacy of their supervisors. Thus, it will be more

beneficial, progress-wise to examine sources of the harmful supervision through the lens of self-efficacy.

Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy

Though the impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy has been well-documented, literature on counselor supervisor self-efficacy is in an infancy stage of development. There are few studies attending to the self-efficacy of counselor supervisors. The lack of counselor supervisor self-efficacy research might be attributed to the faulty assumption that having been supervised or having professional counseling experience implies supervision efficacy (Steward, 1998). When licensing boards approve counselors as supervisors based on number of years of counseling experience, supervisors' self-efficacy is not considered.

Larson (1998) used Bandura's (1977) social cognitive learning model to conceptualize the Social Cognitive Model of Counselor Training (SCMCT) for counselors. The manualized training for counselor self-efficacy enhancement is noteworthy, and was praised by Goodyear, (1998). However, Goodyear pointed out that the model failed to consider the impact of supervisor self-efficacy on supervision. He posited that supervisors vary in levels of self-efficacy and that variation could impact supervision. He noted that a supervisee's state of wellbeing and safety might match the supervisor's self-efficacy. Steward (1998) asserted that attending to supervisor self-efficacy might improve outcomes in counselor self-efficacy and competence.

Just as Larson (1998) used Bandura's (1997, 1999) tenet of triadic reciprocal causation to conceptualize counselor self-efficacy through the SCMCT, Barnes (2002)

extended its use to articulate the development of counselor supervisor self-efficacy. Barnes (2002) demonstrated that the ongoing interplay between behavior, personal agency factors (cognitive and affective processes), and the environment work in concert with supervisors' self-regulatory mechanisms (i.e., self-observation, judgment, and self-reaction; Bandura, 1998)), which all shape self-efficacy. In other words, self-efficacy beliefs along with the intervening affective, behavioral, and cognitive processes serve as the link between knowing what to do and doing it (Larson, 1998).

The above ties in to how well supervisors fulfill their three primary duties: (a) modeling experiences, (b) social influence, and (c) provision of feedback (Larson, 1998; Goodyear, 1998; Barnes, 2002). When done well, these functions produce a safe, supportive environment and positive learning outcomes for counselors. As noted earlier, when not done well, supervisees, their clients, and the supervisory working alliance suffer (Larson, 1998). Barnes (2002) proposed that inefficacious supervisors would be less likely to perform the primary functions well. For example, supervisors with a low sense of self-efficacy are not likely to take risks, and would be hesitant to model complex skills. If they model any skills at all, it would be a small range of skills, ones they are sure they could successfully demonstrate. The fear or hesitancy these supervisors operate with might cause supervisees to fear trying out new skills, as Steward (1998) pointed out in her assertion that supervisees' self-efficacy corresponds to the self-efficacy of a supervisor.

Social influence, the ability to persuade or motivate supervisees, is the second function of a supervisor, and less efficacious supervisors do not use it well. It is the third

most potent factor of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1998; Barnes, 2002). Supervisors with a low sense of self-efficacy are less likely to see themselves as experts, and are less likely to be seen as credible by supervisees. Inefficacious supervisors do not display excitement and motivation, and are unable to excite or motivate their supervisees (Barnes, 2002).

The final task, provision of feedback is an evaluative function in supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Self-inefficacious supervisors view the feedback function as threatening. Their inability to give or receive critical feedback may stunt or hinder their supervisees' growth.

As can be seen, measuring counselor supervisor self-efficacy is a critical component to competent supervision in cross-racial supervisory dyads. To measure counselor supervisor self-efficacy, Barnes (2002) used Bandura's (1997) recommendations for self-efficacy scale construction, and developed the Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSSES). Using a 10-point Likert-type scale, the 39-item tool assesses six factors that represent supervisor self-efficacy: (a) Theories and Techniques (14 items), (b) Group Supervision (5 items), (c) Supervisory Ethics (8 items), (d) Knowledge of Legal Issues (3 items), (e) Self in Supervision (5 items), and (f) Multicultural Competence (4 items).

Barnes reported that the CSSES may be most useful to supervisors when combined with other social cognitive variables, such as competence, perceptions of outcome expectancy, and anxiety (Barnes, 2008). Thus, further research on the relationship between supervisor self-efficacy and supervisors' perceptions about their use of social influence would be helpful (Mijin, 2009). Therefore, this study seeks to fill those gaps by examining the impact of psychological factors of social influence, racial

identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence on supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervision.

Social Influence

Social influence is one's ability to persuade another person to do something the person would have not done otherwise (Raven Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998). Though the terms social influence and power are used interchangeably, Raven, et al (1998) differentiated the two during their process of conceptualizing an interactional model of interpersonal influence. In their distinction, they noted that social power is the resources one has available to persuade another person to do something, but social influence is actually using the resources to get the person to comply. In other words, social power is about potential, and social influence is the actual use of power (Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998). For example, a counselor supervisor by position alone has the potential to get supervisees to comply to requests and suggestions (i.e., social power), but supervisees are not likely to comply unless they believe the supervisor will impose consequences (i.e., social influence).

At its original conception, social influence was broken up into five power bases (Raven, 1959): coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, expert power, and referent power. Upon further elaboration, Raven (1965) distinguished informational power from expert power, and used informational power as a sixth basis for power. In a later expansion of the social bases, Raven (2002) further differentiated the power bases by dividing them into positive and negative forms, resulting in a total of 14 power bases. The expert power base was divided into negative and positive expert. Reward and

coercive power bases were split into distinct impersonal and personal forms, and became personal reward and impersonal reward. Informational became direct and indirect informational power bases. Legitimate power received the most attention and was further subdivided into four separate forms: legitimate position, legitimate reciprocity, legitimate equity, and legitimate dependence (see Table 1 for a brief description of each power base).

Some researchers argued for a simpler way to discuss and categorize the power bases (i.e., Bass, 1981; Yukl & Falbe, 1991). In two separate studies, Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) and Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, and Ashuri (2001) conducted factor analyses studies and broke the 14 power bases up into two distinct and meaningful factors: soft and harsh power bases. Harsh power bases are stereotypically regarded as coercive, overt, and heavy-handed whereas soft power bases are seen as more subtle, indirect, and noncoercive.

To measure social influence, Raven, et al (1998) created the Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI), an instrument that examines the use of power bases in a supervisor-subordinate dyad. Of Raven's 14 power bases, the IPI only measures 11. Indirect information, negative expert, and negative referent are not included because their abstract nature makes them inherently difficult to measure. Accordingly, the 11 power bases measured by the IPI are: reward power (personal and impersonal), coercive power (personal and impersonal), legitimate power (position, reciprocity, equity, and dependence), positive expert power, positive referent power, and direct informational power.

Table 1. *Definitions of Raven's (1992) Social Power Bases.*

Social Power Base	Definition
Positive expert[a]	Target complies because the agent is an expert in the field.
Positive Referent[a]	Target complies because s/he wants to be associated with or be viewed as similar to the agent.
Impersonal Reward[b]	Target complies because s/he perceives that the agent can provide a tangible reward.
Personal Reward[a]	Target complies because s/he believes the agent will approve or like him/her.
Impersonal Coercion[b]	Target complies because s/he perceives that the agent has the power to punish him/her.
Personal Coercion[b]	Target complies because s/he believes that the agent will disapprove or dislike him/her.
Direct Informational[a]	Target complies because the information provided by the agent makes logical sense.
Legitimate Position[b]	Target complies because the agent holds a position of authority.
Legitimate of Reciprocity[b]	The target complies after the agent has done something positive for the target. The target feels a need to reciprocate this prior good deed.
Legitimate of Equity[b]	The target complies as a way to compensate for prior hard work or suffering on the part of the agent.
Legitimate of Dependence[a]	Target complies because the agent is unable to do it himself or herself.

a Identified as a soft power base
b Identified as a harsh power base

The IPI, a critical-incident instrument, is composed of 44 individual items (i.e., four items for each of the 11 power bases). Individuals are asked to respond using a seven-point Likert-type scale about how likely they are to comply to supervisor requests. A response of one indicates that the item is not a likely reason for compliance, while a response of seven indicates that the item is a likely reason for compliance. An example of the IPI will appear in Appendix E.

Because most studies using the IPI examine the supervisor-subordinate dyad (the relationship it was designed to study), the inventory is widely used in organizational psychology (OP), and the study of power bases is central to OP's identity. However, use of the IPI is expanding to the social sciences. Erchul, Raven, and Ray (2001) modified the IPI to examine the use of social power in the school psychologist consultant-teacher dyad. The modified instrument was called the IPI-Form Consultant (i.e., IPI-Form CT), and each item asked the respondent to rate a reason with respect to how likely it would influence a teacher to comply with a consultant's request. Those researchers found that teachers were more likely to comply with requests made using softer power bases, rather than harsh.

Later, Wilson, Erchul, and Raven (2008) modified the IPI-Form CT to the IPI-Form Consultant Usage (i.e., IPI-Form CT-U) where the respondents were asked to judge the likelihood of using a power base, rather than asking them to judge the perceived effectiveness of a power base. The purpose of the study was to examine school psychologists use of power during consultations with teachers about students who had learning and adjustment problems. With a sample of 352 school psychologists (mostly

White, mostly female) from across the nation, the researchers found that (a) school psychologist consultants were more likely to use softer power strategies, (b) that there were no gender differences in use of power bases (whereas Erchul et al. (2004) showed that men tended to use harsh power bases more than women), and (c) that consultants rely on direct informational and positive expert power strategies to cause compliance.

Social Influence and Counselors

More recently, the IPI was modified for use in counselor education. In 2015, Anderson and Levitt changed some of the wording of items on the instrument to reflect the counselor-client dyad. With a sample of 161 counselors from the Midwest, the researchers investigated the impact of counselors' use of social influence, gender self-confidence, and their biological sex on the working alliance (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). The researchers found that soft power bases, and acceptance of one's gender (rather than gender being a critical component of one's identity) promoted a stronger working alliance. Gender self-definition (where one's identity is defined by gender), and harsh power bases were negatively related to work alliances.

Social Influence in Clinical Supervision

It is critical to examine the use of social influence in clinical supervision because the nature of the supervisor-supervisee relationship is hierarchical. The supervisor is deemed as the change agent in the supervisory dyad, and is expected to affect the supervisees' behaviors and attitudes by modeling, providing feedback, and evaluation (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Evidence of the supervisor's social influence is marked by years of experience, education, and credentials (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). The

supervisor's ability to designate where supervision takes place, how much it costs, and the tasks associated with the supervisory process further ascribes social influence to him or her. Supervisors who do not use collaborative models of supervision where supervisory dyads are egalitarian (i.e., Feminist Supervision Model, Szymanski, 2003) could benefit from assessing their use of social influence.

Akin to the use of power in supervisory relationships, Killian (2001) found that supervisees from non-Western cultural backgrounds are less likely to challenge their supervisors' authority. Supervisees who have the most difficulty addressing their needs or concerns, asking for more structure, or questioning their supervisors even when the supervisors made faulty generalizations about their culture were from Asian countries (Killian, 2001). This might be congruent with Nillson and Dodd's (2009) study where they reported that more discussion of cultural issues in supervision happened when international supervisees worked with supervisors of color compared to when they worked with White supervisors.

Dorn (1985) was among the first scholars to apply the social influence theory to clinical supervision. By using Strong's model of interpersonal influence, Dorn (1985) asserted that supervisees are more receptive to feedback they receive from supervisors they perceive as experts, attractive, and trustworthy (i.e., expert and referent power bases). Supervisees seek supervision when they have difficult cases, and feel that there are factors beyond their control. To help supervisees move from feeling stuck to a more active state of being, supervisors who use a social influence framework work to reattribute case difficulties to factors within the supervisees' control. However, some

supervisees do not initially respond positively. The discrepancy between their attitudes about the case and the supervisors' recommendations leads to dissonance. In an attempt to reduce the discomfort, supervisees will either discredit the supervisor, minimize the problem, try to change the supervisor's opinion, or accept the supervisor's recommendations for reattribution. Only supervisees who see their supervisors as experts, attractive, and trustworthy are able to accept the reattributions. Dorn (1985) suggested that supervisors use interpretation to set the stage for giving reattributions and supervisee behavior change. He surmised that supervisors who used interpretive statements were perceived to be more expert and trustworthy than supervisors who used declarative statements.

Although the importance of examining social influence in clinical supervision is well-documented, most existing studies were conducted between 1981-1988, and then ten years later from 1998-1999. There are a few recent studies, including Schulz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson and Bardos' (2002) use of the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI; Rahim, 1988) to assess rehabilitation counselor supervisors' perceived use of social influence. The researchers found that rehab counselor supervisors tended to use their expertness and attractiveness (referent power, a soft power base) and had stronger working alliances with their supervisees. This finding is consistent with other recent studies where soft power bases were found to positively correlate to job satisfaction and job commitment (Koslowsky et al., 2001), and teacher compliance (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001).

In her 2009 dissertation study on the relationship between international supervisors' self-efficacy and social influence variables in cross-cultural supervisory dyads, Mijin (2009) found that supervisor self-efficacy was positively correlated with social influence variables but was not related to acculturation. More specifically, international supervisors' self-efficacy was positively related to perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness in cross-cultural dyads of clinical supervision. The supervisors in Mijin's (2009) study were more acculturated (i.e, bicultural), had spent more than 12 years in the U.S., were pursuing doctorate degrees, and may have more experience with supervision. This aligns with Barnes (2002) and Steward (1998) who asserted that perceived expertness increases as supervisors gain specialized training, knowledge, confidence, and professional credentials through their doctoral training and clinical experiences.

Social Influence and Self Efficacy

Social influence is the second of three primary functions supervisors perform to enhance supervisee self-efficacy (Barnes, 2002; Larson, 1998; Goodyear, 1998). Larson (1998) outlined eleven optimal conditions for enhancing the social influence process in counseling, and Barnes (2002) included five of them in her adaptation of the SCMCT for supervisors. Barnes (2002) asserted that a supervisor is more likely to influence supervisees when there is (a) a high amount of motivation from supervisees to process the supervisor's messages, (b) an ability to cognitively process information received from the supervisor, (c) a perception that the supervisor is credible and knowledgeable regarding the content of the message, (d) the supervisees' understanding of the counseling or

supervision task, and (e) favorable contextual variables (i.e., supervisory relationship, environment).

A supervisor's self-efficacy could also affect his or her social influence capabilities (Barnes, 2002). In other words, a supervisor who does not believe he or she can competently conduct cross-racial supervision, may not see him or herself as an expert, and probably will not be viewed as an expert by the supervisee. A self-inefficacious supervisor may negatively influence supervisees' self-efficacy and motivation toward the profession and its work. Steward (1998) proposed that a high level of self-efficacy could not be expected from supervisees' without a high level of supervisor self-efficacy. That assumption was one of five assumptions Steward (1998) made when she expanded the definition of supervision, and challenged the profession to use the assumptions to "enhance supervisor self-efficacy and competence with the intent of indirectly influencing [supervisees]" (p. 290). Recent studies on social influence suggest that it is still relevant and should continue to guide research efforts (Mijin, 2009; Anderson & Levitt, 2015). This study aims to provide a more recent contribution to the literature on social influence in supervision.

Racial Identity

There is a distinction between race and racial identity. Race is viewed as one's identification with a collective group based on the perception of a shared common heritage, while racial identity attitudes encompasses one's feelings, thoughts, and behaviors concerning oneself, one's racial group, and others outside of that racial group (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004). To explain racial identity development and associated

attitudes scholars developed development models, and to assess identity development, scholars designed specific assessment tools. Many racial identity models exist but they fall into one of three categories: general identity models, culture-specific, or minority identity. Racial identity models communicate to individuals how their conceptualization of race originates, develops, and impacts their lives (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2004).

Cross (1971) was among the first scholars to study racial identity development with his five-stage Negro-to-Black conversion experience, which he later revised and renamed as the Model of Psychological Nigrescence (also known as the Nigrescence Model) (Cross, 1991). The Nigrescence Model explains African-Americans' shifts in racial identity attitudes. The first stage describes the identity and worldview to be changed (Preencounter Stage), the event or series of events that trigger change (Encounter), a transition stage during which the old and emergent identities struggle for dominance (Immersion-Emersion), the phase where the new identity takes hold and is internalized and habituated (Internalization), and a fifth stage wherein the person's new frame of reference becomes a platform and personal resource for sustained, long-term collective action with others (Internalization-Commitment). Later, Cross (1991) revised the model to better capture the nuances in Black identity through the identification of subtypes of preencounter, immersion-emersion, and internalization expressions.

Similarly, Szapocznik, Kurtines, and Fernandez (1980) proposed a racial identity model for Hispanic-Americans and developed an instrument to assess the developmental process from monoculturalism to biculturalism. The researchers postulated that biculturalism is healthiest for Hispanic-Americans rather than involving oneself in just

one culture (i.e., Hispanic-American or Anglo-American). The Bicultural and Involvement Questionnaire is 33-item assessment tool with a 5-Point Likert-type scale.

Contrarily, Helms (1984) asserted culture-specific models were one-sided and made minorities look like problems that White counselors needed to be trained to work with. She proposed that even White counselors' racial identity needed to be considered before entering cross-racial counseling relationships. Helms (1984) declined to use prejudice to define White racial consciousness and instead focused on the evolution towards a positive acceptance of themselves and others. Reminiscent of Cross' Nigrescence Model, Helms (1984) explained the development of White racial identity through five stages (later known as ego statuses). The first stage describes the attitudinal choices a White person makes when encountering Blacks—either avoid or approach (Contact Stage), the event or series of events that challenges Whiteness and the role the person chooses to play (Disintegration), a stage marked by the salience of race and its relevance to power, whereby Whites are positively biased toward own group and hostile towards Blacks (Reintegration), the passive phase where Blacks are intellectually (maybe not affectively accepted) and some cross-racial interactions might occur (Pseudo-Independence), and a fifth stage where one is secure in his or her culture and appreciates the cultural diversity of others (Autonomy). To assess one's progression along the development continuum, Helms and Carter (1991; Helms, 1995b) developed the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS).

Later, Helms (1995a) postulated that all people, regardless of race go through stepwise processes toward consciousness of their race. Thus, she created the People of Color

Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS; Helms, 1995a). It should also be noted that she developed the Black Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS-B; Helms, 1984).

Broaching and Racial Identity

Day-Vines et al. (2007) proposed that a counselor's broaching style parallels his or her racial identity development and the researchers assert that their broaching styles continuum align with Helms (1990) White Racial Identity Development (WRID) model. According to the researchers, counselors in the Contact status, the first stage of racial identity minimize the impact of race on clients' presenting problems and they are less likely to broach race or issues related to it. Thus, their broaching style is avoidant. Counselors in the disintegration status experience some conflict and their beliefs about race are challenged. That dissonance may cause them to vacillate between avoidant and isolating broaching styles. Like their counterparts in disintegration, counselors in the reintegration status who are not able to resolve dissonance are likely to waffle between avoidant and isolating styles, too.

Counselors who attempt to resolve dissonance by developing a nonracist identity are in the pseudo-independence status, and their intellectualized acceptance of race causes them to operate with a continuing/incongruence broaching style. Counselors at the immersion/emersion status understand that race impacts clients' presenting problems and they effectively and consistently use broaching to help identify culturally relevant interventions. Having identified a nonracist identity, counselors at the autonomy status of racial identity value diversity and they operate with an infused broaching style.

Other Racial Identity Attitudes Models

Other examples of minority identity models include the Asian-American Model of Identity (Kim, 1981), and the Chicano Identity Model (Arce, 1982). Using Arce's (1982) survey results, Garcia (1982) constructed a 31-item Chicano identity and ethnicity measure. Measures for other groups include Jewish Americans (Zak, 1973), Greek (Constantinou & Harvey, 1985), and Chinese-Americans (Ting-Tommey, 1981).

Expanding the literature beyond race, Phinney (1996) asserted that assessing ethnic identity was just as important as assessing race. Phinney (1996) defined ethnicity as the value and emotional significance attached to membership in a particular group. Examples include involvement in activities, language usage, political affiliation, religion, cultural traditions and practices, and that these are relevant to every group, including White people (Phinney, 1989). Phinney (1992) developed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) to measure ethnic identity achievement. Unlike the racial identity measures, the MEIM is not culture-specific and was normed on African-American, Hispanic-American, Asian, and White people (Phinney, 1989).

Racial Identity Attitudes and Counselor Supervisors

Since there was a parallel process between literature on cross-racial counseling and cross-racial supervision, Cook (1994) surmised that a natural course to make in the 1990s was to explore racial identity attitudes in supervision. Using Helms' (1995a) five ego statuses identity model for White people and People of Color, Cook (1994) explained how supervisors might approach race in supervision. Applying Helms and Carter's (1991) racial identity interactive model, Cook (1994) proposed that when a supervisor and supervisee were in the same racial identity stage, they were parallel. But, when one

of them was in a different stage, they shared a crossed supervisory dyad. The crossed relationships were either progressive, when the supervisor was in a higher ego status than the supervisee; or regressive when the supervisor was in a lower ego status than the supervisee. Cook (1994) noted that the supervisor's power needed to be considered because his or her racial identity attitudes might shape the racial attitudes and behaviors of the supervisee and, indirectly the client.

Ten years later, Chang, Hays, and Shoffner (2004) furthered Cook's (1994) challenge by proposing a developmental model for cross-racial supervision that included the incorporation of racial identity attitudes. Their three-step developmental approach included: (a) assessing the racial identity status of the supervisor, (b) assessing the racial identity status of the supervisee, and (3) considering the interaction between the two racial identity statuses. Based on the assessments, the supervisory pair would fall into one of three relationships: they both exhibit similar racial identity attitudes (parallel), the supervisor would be at a more advanced status than the supervisee (cross-progressive), or the supervisee would be at a more advanced status than the supervisor (cross-regressive).

Several empirical studies on assessing racial identity attitudes in counseling have been conducted (Hays, Chang, & Havice, 2008; Utsey & Gernat, 2002). However, none have been conducted in supervision. This study will be among the first to examine racial identity attitudes in supervisory relationships.

Gender Self-Confidence

Gender self-confidence is a construct that focuses on a person's perception of himself or herself as a gendered being (Hoffman, 2006). It is the extent to which a person

feels competent as a male or female, and whether they believe they live up to the standards of maleness or femaleness. Hoffman (1996) proposed gender self-confidence as a construct that respects diversity, rather than focusing on stereotypical sex-role perspectives of masculinity and femininity. The researcher borrowed the term from Lewin (1984) who argued that it was meaningless to dichotomize gender traits as masculine or feminine, while at the same time asserting that men and women can possess both traits. When Lewin (1984) and Spence (1985) suggested that masculinity and femininity should be categorized by less stereotypical, objective viewpoints and seen as more subjective, they reconceptualized gender identity by proposing phenomenological perspectives and by using terms like maleness and femaleness to reflect the conviction, confidence, and self-concept one holds about being a male or female (Hoffman, Hattie, & Borders, 2005).

In her dissertation, Hoffman (1996) expanded Lewin's (1984) work on gender self-confidence and Spence's (1985) work on gender identity by theorizing that gender self-concept was grounded in one's gender identity. Her theory suggested that one's gender self-concept could be incongruent with his or her gender identity. For example, an individual could see himself as a male, and have related attitudes, feelings, and behaviors (gender self-concept) but not possess a secure sense of his maleness (gender identity). More simply, this individual's self-concept could be intact even though he does not believe he is meeting personal or self-defined standards for masculinity (or maleness) because he believes he is too sensitive, too loving, or excessively possesses another

societally prescribed attribute for women. This might be similar for a woman who believes she is too independent.

This work led Hoffman, et al (2000) to develop the Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS; Hoffman, 1996; Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000), to measure individual's beliefs about his or her competence as males and females. Factor analyses of the instrument split gender self-confidence into two constructs: gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition. Gender self-definition describes how strong one's identity is tied to gender. Individuals with strong self-definition place a great deal of importance on their maleness or femaleness, which they see is central to who they are. On the other hand, gender self-acceptance describes how comfortable one is with being a member of his or her gender without being defined by it. Individuals with strong gender self-acceptance see themselves positively as males and females, but gender is not central to their identity.

In a recent study, Hoffman (2006) used the HSG to explore intersections between women's gender identity constructs (i.e., gender self-acceptance, gender self-definition, feminist, and womanist) and ethnic identity. The researcher argued that previous conceptualizations of female identity ignored race and ethnicity because of the emphasis on White women, and created an "unbalanced and exclusionary approach to identity research," (Hoffman, 2006; p. 358). The author noted the works of Ossana, Helms, and Leonard (1992) and Parks, Carter, and Gushue (1996) as exceptions, but also noted that those studies focused on Black and White women, and neglected to include Latina/Hispanic and Asian women.

The study included 361 female students from a southern California university who completed the HGS (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000), the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Bargard & Hyde, 1991), Women's Identity Development Scale (WIAS; Ossana et al., 1992), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM: Phinney, 1992); and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR Version 6—Form 40A; Paulhus, 1984). The study yielded four main results:

- gender self-definition (where women see gender as a critical component of their identity) is related to female identity development statuses that reflect a struggle to construct a positive female identity and the status that reflects a commitment to antisexist society and this correlation might indicate a crisis period in female identity development and gender self-definition;
- women with high gender self-acceptance (where women see being female is positive) were related to the Achieved Female Identity status;
- there is a parallel process between gender self-acceptance and ethnic identity where women with achieved gender identity possess an achieved ethnic identity; and
- gender self-definition was negatively related to achieved female identity indicating that women who achieved ethnic identity may experience a crisis with feminine identity. Hoffman explained that experiencing the growth process regarding ethnicity might be an asset to the women, making the process easier as they go through it again in relation to their

> gender, especially women of color (Hoffman, 2006). “Black women’s struggle to achieve an internalized female identity follows the same pattern as their struggle to achieve an internalized racial identity; in both cases, they are members of a nondominant group,” (Hoffman, 2006; p. 367).

Gender Self-Confidence and Counselors

Though conceptualized in the 1990s (Hoffman, 1996), gender self-confidence is still a relatively new construct in counseling. Hoffman (1996, 2001, 2006) and peers (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000; and Hoffman, Hattie, & Borders, 2005) made the greatest contribution to the counseling literature in this domain. The most recent study on the subject was conducted by Anderson and Levitt (2015). As previously mentioned, the researchers investigated qualities of counselors that affect their working alliance with clients. The researchers focused on counselors’ gender self-confidence, their biological sex, and use of social influence in sessions. Biological sex was the only variable that did not have a statistically significant beta weight. It explained 11.8% of the variance in working alliance. The researchers noted that the finding supported statements made by Hinkelman and Granello (2003) regarding the overutilization of biological sex as a variable in research (Anderson & Levitt, 2015). However, gender self-acceptance was positively related to working alliance. In other words, the more counselors felt they were able to live up to their personal beliefs regarding femininity and masculinity the better able they were to build strong working alliances with their clients. On the other hand,

counselors whose masculinity and femininity are of utmost importance had poorer working alliances with their clients (Anderson & Levitt, 2015).

No other studies on gender self-confidence and counseling could be located, and none related to supervision were available. This study will be the first to examine gender self-confidence in counselor supervision. Examining supervisors' judgments about gender will help us understand how gender biases impact their work with supervisees.

Chapter Summary

The preceding review of literature revealed the importance of examining counselor supervisors' self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory dyads. As previously reviewed, the U.S. is becoming more diverse, and more information on understanding the professional development needs of counselor supervisors when they work with people who are racially different is necessary. Since supervision is understood as a process of influence, more information is needed about specific qualities of supervisors that might affect cross-racial supervision and supervisees. Examining psychological factors such as social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence might hold critical answers to understanding how to improve supervisory outcomes in cross-racial dyads.

To date, there is a lack of research on supervisors' confidence to successfully conduct cross-racial supervision, and research on racial identity attitudes in cross-racial supervisory dyads is unidimensional and unbalanced as it focuses on the professional development needs of White supervisors who work with minority supervisees. Moreover, the literature on social influence is outdated, the current studies are few; and the concept of gender self-confidence is new and has not yet been applied to supervision.

The current study has been designed to fill these gaps in the literature by examining the relationships between supervisors' use of power, their racial and gender identity development statuses, and their self-efficacy as supervisors in cross-racial dyads.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study investigated psychological factors associated with counselor supervisors' competency to facilitate cross-racial supervision. Specifically, this study examined whether supervisors' self-efficacy was impacted by their racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence, and their use of power when they supervise people who are racially different from them. The goal was to see which factors predicted counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships. This chapter will describe the methodology of the study. Included within the methodology will be a description of participants, procedures, instruments that will be used, and the research design along with data analysis.

Research Questions

The study addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict self-efficacy in a sample of counselor supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?
2. To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict supervisors' broaching style?
3. To what extent are supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles correlated in a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?
4. What differences, if any, are there between African-American supervisors' broaching styles and other supervisors in cross-racial supervision?

Statement of Hypotheses

In response to the research questions, I hypothesize the following:

- Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will report positive self-efficacy beliefs about working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.
- Supervisors with rigid attitudes towards social influence, racial identity attitudes and gender self-confidence will report negative self-efficacy beliefs about working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.
- Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will broach race more than supervisors with inflexible attitudes.
- Supervisors with rigid attitudes toward social influence, racial identity attitudes and gender self-confidence will broach race less than supervisors with flexible attitudes.
- Supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles will be moderately to highly positively correlated among a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision.
- African-American supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision will broach race routinely or very often, as opposed to White and other ethnic minority supervisors.

Research Methods

This study implemented a nonexperimental, correlational design to explore the relationships between the dependent variable of counselor supervisor self-efficacy and three independent variables: social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence. The researcher used Dillman's Tailored Design Method to enhance sample size and to distribute the survey. Data was accessed through a spreadsheet produced through the SurveyMonkey website and SPSS REGRESSION was used for data analysis.

Participants

Participants in the proposed study included a non-random purposive sample of counselor supervisors from several areas of the country who conduct cross-racial supervision. Various methods of recruitment will be described later in the chapter, in the sampling strategies section below. The researcher extended an invitation of participation to 500-600 counselor supervisors who met the following inclusion criteria: (a) provide clinical supervision to counselors-in-training, (b) have at least a Master's Degree in Counseling, and (c) have supervised a racially-different supervisee within the past two years. An a priori power analysis for multiple regression based on a medium effect size of 0.15 (Cohen, 1988), alpha of .05, and power of .95 suggested a sample size of 118, indicating that the proposed sample size for this study would have adequate power when all other assumptions are met.

Measurements

The four instruments used in the study was combined into one electronic survey using SurveyMonkey. The researcher contacted the creators of each of each instrument to

obtain permission to create electronic versions of each instrument. Participants responded to the self-reported survey inclusive of the electronic versions of the following instruments: Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSSES; Barnes, 2002), Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM, Phinney, 1992), Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS; Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000), and a demographic form. The complete survey was a total of 81 questions.

Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale

The Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSSES; Appendix D) was developed by Barnes (2002) to measure supervisors' confidence to perform specific supervisory tasks. It was developed in three phases of study (Barnes, 2002). Phase 1 focused on item development and content validation utilizing six experts to help refine the scale and prepare it for pilot testing. The initial scale included 87 items but 18 were removed and 6 were added based on reviewers' feedback, resulting in 39 items. The pilot study occurred in phase 2 wherein 18 clinical supervisors completed the pilot version of the CSSES. Items with associated p-values greater than .10 were eliminated, and others were discarded based on respondents' feedback. The final phase was the main study where 287 supervisors completed and returned the study packet.

The current CSSES has 39 Likert-type items where respondents choose from 0 (not confident at all) to 9 (completely confident). The middle score of 5 indicates "moderately confident." The CSSES assesses six factors that represent supervisor self-efficacy: (a) Theories and Techniques (14 items), (b) Group Supervision (5 items), (c)

Supervisory Ethics (8 items), (d) Knowledge of Legal Issues (3 items), (e) Self in Supervision (5 items), and (f) Multicultural Competence (4 items). The CSSES was based on Bandura's (1997) recommendations for self-efficacy scale construction. A total score is obtained by summing all scores, with higher scores indicating a higher level of self-efficacy. Scores range from 0-351.

The evidence of reliability for the CSSES is indicated by a high alpha coefficient of .97 for the total score. Alpha coefficients for the six factors ranged from .78 - .94, indicating a high level of internal consistency and item interrelatedness (Barnes, 2002).

Examples of subscale items include item 1, "Select supervision interventions congruent with the theory/model being used" for Theories and Techniques; item 38, "Offer adequate support to all members during group supervision" for Group Supervision; item 24, "Conduct supervision in strict accordance to the ethical standards governing my profession" for Supervisory Ethics; item 14, "Encourage a supervisee to share his/her negative feelings about supervision without becoming defensive" for Self in Supervision; item 17, "Address a supervisee's race or ethnic identity as a counseling process variable" for Multicultural Competence; and item 20, "Describe the legal liabilities involved in counseling minors" for Knowledge of Legal Issues (Barnes, 2002). In this study, the Multicultural Competence and Self in Supervision subscales were summed to analyze collected data.

The Interpersonal Power Inventory

The Interpersonal Power Inventory (IPI; Appendix E) was used to measure social influence, another word for "power." Raven, Schwarzwald, and Koslowsky (1998)

defined social influence as the resources a person uses to influence another person to do what that person would not have done otherwise. The IPI is a critical-incident questionnaire designed to measure eleven subscales (or power bases) split between two factors (IPI Soft Power Base and IPI Harsh Power Base). For example, the five subscales under soft power bases include (a) expert power—when the supervisor relies on his or her supervisor knowledge to get the supervisee to comply, (b) referent power—power the supervisor has based on the supervisee's desire to be associated with him or her, (c) informational power—power the supervisor has when he or she presents persuasive material or logic, (d) legitimate power of dependence—when a supervisor uses his or her right to influence, and (e) personal reward power—power a supervisor has through his or her ability to provide rewards. Within the harsh dimension, the following subscales can be found: (a) legitimate power of reciprocity—power the supervisor has to get the supervisee to comply after doing something positive for the supervisee, (b) impersonal coercive power—power the supervisor has based on the supervisee's belief that he or she will be punished, threatened, rejected, or dismissed, (c) legitimate power of equity—when supervisees comply based on an obligation to help the supervisor because he or she was harmed, wronged, or suffered in some way, (d) impersonal reward power—power a supervisor has based on the supervisee's belief that he or she will receive rewards or promises made, (e) personal coercive power—power the supervisor has related to the his or her ability to fire or punish the supervisee, and (f) legitimate power of position—power bestowed upon a supervisor because the position requires compliance. There are four questions per subscale, resulting in 44 items. There are two forms of the instrument,

one for the supervisor and the other for the supervisee. Respondents in this study were given the supervisor's form.

Items are rated on a 7-point Likert type scale from Much Less Likely to Comply (1) to Much More Likely to Comply (7). Items include statements such as "He/she likes me and my approval is important to him/her," "He/she sees me as someone he/she can identify with," and "It is my job to tell him/her how to handle this situation."

Raven et al. (1998) examined reliability issues by using coefficient alphas to measure internal consistency, among two samples, American and Israeli respondents. Coefficient alphas for the individual factors in the U.S. sample ranged from .67 to .86 and accounted for 60% of the variance in the soft/harsh dichotomy. There was not much difference in the alphas for the Israeli sample, with a range from .63 to .88, and accounting for 59% variance in the two-factor solution.

Concurrent validity was demonstrated by comparing IPI responses to the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MJSQ). Results showed that the soft power bases were related to job satisfaction, and harsh power bases were not. In other words, data analyses that compared IPI responses to MJSQ responses showed that the harsh/soft power bases distinguished workers with high and low job satisfaction. In this study, the total of the eleven subscale scores was used to analyze data.

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

Developed by Phinney (1992), the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Appendix G) measures two constructs: (a) Ethnic Identity Search, and (b) Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment. The Ethnic Identity Search subscale assesses the

exploration and resolution of racial identity issues (items 1, 2, 4, 8, 10); and the Affirmation, Belonging, and Commitment subscale assesses positive attitudes and sense of belonging (items 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12). The MEIM is a 15-item Likert-type scale where respondents rate items (1 = "Strongly Disagree" to 4 = "Strongly Agree").

Examples include statements such as, "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs," "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group," and "I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background." The last three items are used only for purposes of identification and categorization by ethnicity. Question 15 is an example of such question, "My mother's ethnicity is _____." The preferred scoring is to take the means of the item scores for an overall score. Higher scores mean stronger ethnic identification.

The scale is widely used and is one of the earliest studies conducted with a sample of 417 ethnic minority high school and 136 college students. Cronbach's alpha was used to ascertain an overall reliability that ranged from .81 to .90 (Phinney, 1992). The total scale was used to analyze data in this study.

Hoffman Gender Scale

The Hoffman Gender Scale (HGS; Hoffman, 1996; Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000) is a 14-item measure that assesses gender self-confidence (one's belief about meeting personal standards for masculinity and femininity). There are two 7- item subscales: gender self-definition (how strongly one's identity is tied to gender) with statements such as "Being a female (or male; as indicated on the form for individuals who identify as men) is a critical part of how I view myself," and gender self-acceptance

(how comfortable one is with being a member of the female or male group) with statements such as, “I am happy with myself as a male.”

Respondents use a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). Scoring yields two subscales mean scores ranging from 1 to 6, with higher scores indicating stronger levels of the particular construct; or the total mean score could be used for gender self-confidence. At the top of the HGS, respondents are asked to answer one phenomenological question, “What do you mean by masculinity/femininity?” The researchers suggest that this question helps respondents conceptualize the constructs (Hoffman, 2015).

Supervisors rated each quantitative statement using a range from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6), with high scores indicating higher perceptions of that aspect of the gender self-confidence construct. It has been demonstrated that 7 of the 14 items consistently and reliably load on the self-definition factor (1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 14) and 7 on the self-acceptance factor. For scoring, separate mean scores can be determined for the two different subscales or mean scores can be calculated on the larger construct of self confidence in gender identity. For this study, the researcher is interested in the highest mean score between the two subscales. Respondents’ high scores on the gender self-acceptance scale indicate that they are comfortable being male or female and that they accept themselves as members of the male or female gender, but gender is not central to their identity. On the other hand, respondents’ high scores on the gender self-definition scale indicate that they feel their maleness or femaleness is a critical component of their identity. Having supervisors assess their degree of self-definition or

self-acceptance is pivotal to this study because those whose who hold rigid, stereotypical perceptions about their gender identity (i.e., gender self-definition) might hold rigid thinking about race and use of social influence which might affect their efficacy when working with people who are culturally different from them. On the other hand, supervisors whose perception about gender self-confidence is flexible (i.e., gender self-acceptance), might also demonstrate flexibility in their thinking regarding race and use of power, and are more efficacious when working with racially different people.

The HGS was developed in two studies. The researchers initially designed the instrument to assess gender self-confidence, but found that the construct accounted for 50% of the variance, and that the second factor (gender identity) did not produce any high loadings. The original 20-item instrument showed that gender confidence was bi-directional, and it validated the gender self-definition factor. Because of those findings, statistically redundant items were dropped, and other items were adjusted or added to better discriminate between gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition. The original study included 146 undergraduate student participants, where the reported internal consistency coefficient alphas for the HGS were .94 for females and .94 for males with no overall mean differences for the two groups.

The second study (also Hoffman et al., 2000) tested the two-factor structure that emerged in the first study. Additionally, the researchers used the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) to test the construct validity of the HGS. The revised 14-item instrument was administered to 371 undergraduate students, and both factors (gender self-definition and gender self-acceptance) accounted for 62% of the total variance for

both gender groups. Reliability estimates for the female sample yielded alphas of .88 on the self-definition subscale and .90 on the self-acceptance subscale. For men, the coefficients reported were .93 for self-definition and .80 for self-acceptance. MANOVA analyses revealed that there were no significant differences between gender groups on any of the items on either of the two subscales. The HGS was further validated by Hoffman in 2006, with coefficient alphas of .87 to .90.

Responses to the qualitative question at the top of the HGS have been used in a qualitative study (Hoffman, Hattie, and Borders, 2005) where the researchers analyzed the personal definitions of self-concept. Three hundred and seventy-one participants (273 women, and 98 men) completed the HSG, and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) (the study also served a second purpose, as the researchers assessed for construct/discriminant validity). Using inductive analysis, two of the three researchers coded 50 randomly selected responses into 14 categories. Then, all the responses were coded. Results showed that women characterized themselves as expressive and relational (i.e., nurturing, caring, motherly, loving, caressing, and gentle) and men characterized themselves as forceful and assertive (i.e., being strong with decisions, not backing down from a challenge, and having dominion over women), which indicated that some stereotypical thinking about gender was present. Moreover, the study showed that men with higher self-definition (gender is a central component to their identity) defined themselves as forceful and assertive. Just as women with strong self-definition see themselves as expressive and relational. This means that people who define themselves by their identity think stereotypically about who they should be. Interestingly, both men

and women put biological sex at the top of the list when defining masculinity and femininity; but instead of this positively correlating to gender self-definition it had a negative correlation. The researchers inferred that the respondents were not thinking about their maleness or femaleness in stereotypical ways (Hoffman, Hattie, & Borders, 2005). A copy of the HGS will be presented as Appendix F.

Demographic Questionnaire

The Demographic Questionnaire collected descriptive information about the participants. The survey questions address participants' age, education level, socioeconomic status, marital status, work setting, years of supervisory experience, and whether they have supervised a racially-different supervisee. It will be included in the proposal as Appendix C.

Procedures

The principal researcher obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for the study from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. After receiving IRB approval from the University, the principal researcher recruited participants utilizing various sampling strategies.

Sampling Strategies

Because the proposed study was designed to target counselor supervisors in cross-racial supervisory dyads, the researcher used non-random purposive sampling strategies, including snowballing to identify participants. Purposive strategies are advantageous in situations where the focus is on difficult to reach subgroups with multiple eligibility requirements for participation (i.e., counselor supervisors from various ethnicities with

racially-different supervisors). Disadvantages of snowball methods include the use of non-probability samples and the associated potential for bias in conclusions drawn; however, for the proposed study, the potential gains associated with the use of snowball techniques provide a rationale for reliance upon this method (Browne, 2005; Sadler et al., 2010). Snowball sampling inherently engenders trust through its reliance on social and personal networks, established groups, and word of mouth, and can therefore be useful in accessing more closeted members of a population (Browne, 2005; Sadler et al., 2010). Sadler et al., (2010) recommended utilizing public venues such as health fairs and events aimed at specific groups as well as group email memberships as adaptations of snowball strategies that can be effective in increasing sample size when working with difficult to reach populations.

The proposed study employed several recruitment strategies to obtain the most representative sample of counselor supervisors in cross-racial supervisory dyads possible within practical and financial limitations. The researcher recruited participants by working with cooperating organizations, and by employing personal and professional contacts.

Cooperating Organizations. The researcher contacted several local and national groups associated with counselor supervisors and shared a brief overview of the purpose and scope of the proposed study. When agreements were reached with these groups regarding participant recruitment via group email distribution lists, the researcher initiated recruitment. Examples of cooperating organizations include the Association for Counselor Educators and Supervisors (ACES) and the North Carolina Association for

Counselors (NCCA) where the researcher is a member, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) where the researcher is the student chair of the research committee, and the Licensed Professional Counselors Association of North Carolina (LPCANC) where the researcher serves as secretary.

Social Media. The researcher is well connected to various personal and professional social media contacts and will be able to obtain the cooperation of several groups and individuals who will agree to post (or permit the researcher to post) the invitation and link to the proposed study on social media sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn. Examples include Facebook groups such as Best Practices for Supervision, a group for supervisors that the researcher created in 2014 where there are 100 members; and Black Therapists Rock! an online group where there are 15,000 African-American counselors, social workers, psychologists, and supervisors. With an informal solicitation to the Black Therapists Rock online group, the researcher obtained 132 email addresses of African-American supervisors who were willing to participate in a cross-racial supervision study. The Charlotte Therapist/SW Facebook group is another viable group that contains supervisors who might have been willing to participate. The researcher is an administrator of that group of 2,000 members. Lastly, the researcher extended an invitation of participation via Counselor Education and Supervision Network (CESNET-L) and Aces Technology Interest Network (ACESTIN), online listservs of counselors, students, educators, and supervisors.

Print and Online Publications. The researcher proposed to but did not write brief, introductory articles on cross-racial supervision for online publications such as UNCC's

The Lamplighter, NCCA's Carolina Counselor, and the LPCANC's newsletter. An example of such article would be what helps and hinders in cross-racial supervision based on previous presentations the researcher has facilitated. The articles would have included an invitation and link to the study materials.

Recruitment via Counseling Conferences. The researcher organizes the Black Mental Health Symposium, an annual conference that attracts 300+ mental health professionals (including supervisors) from across the country. The researcher attends other annual conferences such as the LPCANC, NCCA, ACA, ACES/SACES and a recruitment protocol approved by the UNCC IRB permitted for collection of email addresses to create a database of supervisors interested in receiving information about the study via email in the future. However, none of the aforementioned conference fell within the time of this study.

Personal Network Recruitment. Finally, the researcher distributed the study materials via email to personal and professional contacts who are counselor supervisors, or know of counselor supervisors. The researcher has a Constant Contact email listserv of approximately 100 supervisors from across North Carolina. These individuals were asked to participate, or forward the information to appropriate persons within their own social networks.

Survey Procedures

Although the researcher used Dillman's (2007) Tailored Design Method as a guide to gather survey data, a two-tiered survey approach model was proposed to be used to enhance response rate. The first tier of surveys will be sent to populations with fixed

numbers of members who are eligible to participate. Then, the second tier of surveys will be sent to other populations by using snowballing-oriented methods. The following steps will be administered:

1. In attempt to reach 1000 supervisors, a recruitment email to counselor supervisors in ACES, CESNET to inform them of the forthcoming research study, its goals, processes, and financial incentives;
2. Within 24 hours, the link to the survey will be sent to supervisors where they will find: (a) an informed consent form, (b) the survey, (c) an opportunity to participate in a drawing for four $25 gift cards, (d) a thank you letter, and (e) a "forward" link where supervisors can send the study to peers they think might be interested in participating.
3. A midpoint encouragement email will be sent at 7 days to supervisors who have not completed the survey; and
4. A final request will be emailed at the 10th day to supervisors who have not completed the survey.

The researcher emphasized Dillman's (2007) use of a respondent-friendly questionnaire, use of a pre-notice letter, reminder letters, thank you letter, personalized correspondence (in the form of thoughtful letters written) and token financial incentives. The time frame for sending out the four emails was two weeks from first email to last, each email went out approximately one week apart. The researcher closed the survey after the two -week period. Since the researcher obtained more than the recommended

number of participants using the first-tier approach, she did not have to implement the second tier of recruitment/.

The survey included the demographic questionnaire and instruments used for the study. The 81-item instrument averaged 14 minutes to complete and was completed using a SurveyMonkey link. The survey remained open for two weeks and collected data was kept secure on a password-protected drive.

Threats to Internal Validity

Internal validity is the degree to which any changes in a dependent variable are the direct result of changes in the independent variable (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009), which may interfere with the results of the research. For this study, two threats to internal validity have been identified and measures taken to decrease its impact on the results. To address the potential threat of instrumentation, each of the four instruments used in this study have been tested for reliability and validity in previous studies. To minimize the effects of social desirability, this researcher maximized opportunities to keep respondents' participation confidential and anonymous.

Threats to External Validity

External validity is related to how well treatment results are generalizable to the population. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that the sample of supervisors is representative of the population of supervisors. However, this reduces control and might pose a threat to the internal validity of the study (Gay et al., 2009; Mertens, 2015). To enhance generalizability, supervisors will be sought from across the country, rather than in one specific location or region. Additionally, ethnic minority supervisors will be

sought. A huge limitation cited in most existing studies on cross-racial supervision is the lack of ethnic diversity in participants. Moreover, this researcher used the only known instrument to measure counselor supervisor self-efficacy.

Data Analysis

An examination of demographic variables was conducted using descriptive statistical analysis in the SPSS software. This software was used to screen data, provide descriptive analysis and to conduct the regression analysis. Data was screened for missing data and outliers as well as assumptions of a multiple regression which include normality, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A multiple regression analysis was conducted by utilizing SPSS REGRESSION. The researcher determined multiple regression analyses as the appropriate method due to a small set of predictor variables and uncertainty of which predictor variables will create the best prediction equation.

Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the proposed methodology that was used to test the research questions outlined in the first chapter. In it, the research questions were reviewed, participants and procedures were discussed, and information about the different instruments being used were included. Additionally, the rationale for a non-experimental correlational design and information about how the data was analyzed was also provided.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter will present an overview of the study results. The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the predictability of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence on supervisors' self-efficacy to work with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves. As described in the literature review, research suggests that mastery of experiences is the most influential source of self-efficacy, hence this self-efficacy study assessed supervisors' broaching style (i.e., whether they broached race or not, and how often). The overarching research question that guided the study was: To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict supervisors' self-efficacy to broach race in their cross-racial supervisory dyads?

Participant Demographics

This researcher did not use the two-tiered participant recruitment approach as proposed in Chapter III, because participants were successfully obtained by using the first-tiered approach. Emails were sent to 5,867 counselors who subscribe to counseling-specific listservs (i.e., CESNET, LifeSkills professional development), and an electronic invitation was sent to 132 African-American mental health supervisors who are members of Black Therapists Rock! an online platform for African-American mental health practitioners. Following Dillman's (2007) Tailored Design Method to enhance response rate, the initial email, a reminder email, and a final email were sent to prospective participants within the survey's two-week active period. In this study, 149 of 5,999 individuals completed the electronic survey. A true response rate cannot be determined

because there are no existing listservs specific for counselor supervisors, and it is impossible to know how many surveys were distributed to counselor supervisors in each of the aforementioned counselor educator listservs.

Selected demographics of the participants are listed in Table 2. Of the 149 participants whose responses were included in the data analysis, 89% (*n* = 132) were female, 10% (*n* = 15) were male, and 1% did not report gender (*n* = 2). The majority of the respondents described themselves as African-American (54%, *n* = 80), with most others self-identifying as Caucasian (28%, *n* = 41), except for those who identified as biracial or "other" (18%, *n* = 26), and one unidentified participant (1%, *n* = 1). Most participants were between 36 to 45 years of age (37%, *n* = 55) and had zero to five years of supervisory experience (47%, *n* = 70). All of the participants held graduate degrees, including 61% (*n* = 91) with a Master's degree, and 38% (*n* = 56) with a doctorate degree, except for one participant who reported a high school education as the highest education level (1%, *n* = 1).

In terms of training related to supervising people who are racially-different, most participants relied on continuing education workshops that emphasized multicultural sensitivity, awareness (28%, *n* = 42), with another 22% relying on training they received from multicultural counseling courses in their graduate programs (*n* = 33). Another 15% (*n* = 23) of the participants received training from supervision continuing education courses that discussed multiculturalism, while another nine percent reported that they taught themselves or learned from life and work experience, and 16% (*n* = 24) had no or very little formal training. All participants carried current supervisory caseloads that

included supervisees who were racially-different from themselves. Twenty-eight percent (n = 42) of them carried supervisory caseloads that were 81 to 100 percent racially-different from themselves, with the second highest percentage (24%, n = 36) carrying caseloads that were one to 20 percent racially-different. Most supervisors (54%, n = 81) routinely broached race throughout the supervisory process with their racially-different supervisees, 24% (n = 36) of the participants broached race very often and considered advocacy as a part of their lifestyle, while 11% (n = 17) only broached race when their supervisees brought it up, another 5% (n = 7) only brought race up at the beginning of the supervisory relationship, and four percent of the participants (n = 6) never discuss race.

Data Preparation and Screening

As discussed in Chapter III, four instruments were used in this study. The raw data were computed into scale scores for each variable. One scale score (from two of six subscales) was computed to measure supervisor self-efficacy to conduct cross-racial supervision using the CSSES, the total score for eleven subscales from the IPI was used to examine which power bases supervisors use when they work with racially-different supervisees, two scale scores from the MEIM to assess supervisors' racial and ethnic identity attitudes, and two scale scores from the HGS to ascertain whether supervisors are living up to the self-imposed standards they set for themselves related to gender.

Table 2. *Participant Demographics*

Variables	*n*	%
GENDER		
Male	15	10.1
Female	132	88.6
Not reported	1	1.3
RACE/ETHNICITY		
African-American	80	54.1
Caucasian	41	27.7
Other Ethn/Biracial	26	17.6
Not reported	1	.7
AGE		
Younger than 35	30	20.1
36-45	55	36.9
46-55	36	24.2
Older than 56	26	17.4
Not reported	2	1.3
EDUCATION		
High school	1	.7
Master's	91	61.1
Doctorate	56	37.6
Not reported	1	.7
SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE		
0-5 years	70	47.0
6-10 years	44	29.5
11-15 years	14	9.4
More than 16	20	13.4
SOURCE OF MC TRAINING		
None to little	24	16.1
Graduate courses	33	22.1
MC continuing ed	43	28.2
Supervision cont ed	23	15.4
Other (i.e., self-study)	14	9.4
Not specific	7	4.7
BROACHING		
Never	6	4.0
When supervisees bring it up	17	11.4
1-2x beginning	7	4.7

Routinely	81	54.4
Very often and advocate	36	24.2
Not reported	2	1.3

The data were screened for missing data, outliers, and normality. One participant failed to complete the survey and was not used in the analysis. Normality was screened by assessing kurtosis and skewness scores ±1 standard deviation from zero for each scale. SPSS EXPLORE found two outliers greater than two standard deviations above the mean. When the outliers were removed, the normality fell within normal ranges. For ease of reading, Table 2 contains the abbreviations for each variable studied. Table 3 follows and includes descriptive statistics.

Table 3. *Abbreviations for Study Variables*

Variables	Abbreviations	Meaning
Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy	CSSES	Feel competent to work with racially-different supervisees
Social Influence	IPI-Soft	Supervisors use soft power bases
	IPI-Harsh	Supervisors use harsh power bases
Racial Identity Attitudes	MEIM-ABC	Supervisors have achieved racial identity
	MEIM-EIS	Supervisors have not resolved racial identity
Gender Self-Confidence	HGS-SA	Supervisors positively accept gender
	HGS-SD	Supervisors rigid attitudes toward gender

Prior to conducting reliability analyses, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between Black supervisor and non-Black supervisors and their self-perceptions of self-efficacy. There was a weak positive significant difference between African-American and non-African-American supervisors' self-efficacy, $F(1, 147) = .259$, $p < .001$. African-American supervisors scored slightly higher on the CSSES, with a mean of 7.82, and non-African-American supervisors scored a mean of 7.72.

The CSSES consists of six subscales, and as proposed only two of which were used for this study: self in supervision and multicultural competence. Internal reliability for each subscale was measured using Cronbach's α and was reported at .81 and is consistent with previous studies. A previous study reported alpha coefficients for the six factors ranging from .78 - .94, and .97 for the total score (Barnes, 2002). The mean scores on the two CSSES subscales in this study were almost identical to the previous study involving counselor supervisors (Barnes, 2002). The respondents in that study endorsed that they were near "completely competent" to address multicultural issues in supervision ($M = 7.5$), as did the respondents in this study ($M = 7.7$; $SD = 1.12$). Respondents in the previous study appeared near "completely confident" to receive feedback about their actions and abilities in supervision and to respect individual differences ($M = 7.8$), as did the respondents in this study ($M = 7.85$).

Table 4. *Sample Score Ranges, Means, and Standard Deviations of Instruments*

	Range	Range	Mean	SD
CSSES	2 - 9	2 - 9	7.77	1.12
IPI				
IPI-Soft	1 - 7	1 - 7	1.00	.146
IPI-Harsh	1 - 7	1 - 7	1.00	.146
MEIM				
MEIM-EIS	1 – 4	1 - 4	3.15	.62
MEIM-ABC	1 – 4	1 -4	3.40	.63
HGS				
HGS-SA	1 - 6	3 - 6	5.30	.68
HGS-SD	1 - 6	2 - 6	4.03	1.1

Cronbach's α was calculated for the eleven subscales of the IPI. Previous studies have reported reliabilities ranging from .63 to .88 with an Israeli sample, and .67 to .86 with an American sample (Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998). To reduce the number of measures, a principal factors extraction with varimax rotation was conducted on participants' responses to the 11 scales of the IPI. The PCA was exploratory in nature and as presented in Table 4, two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 emerged. Together these two factors accounted for 64.45% of the variance. The two labeled factors, presented in order of variance accounted for, were: (a) harsh power (consisting of legitimate equity, impersonal coercion, legitimate reciprocity, impersonal reward, legitimate power, personal coercion, and legitimate dependence); and (b) soft power (consisting of positive referent, positive expert, informational, personal reward). The harsh power factor accounted for 50.92% of the variance in supervisors' responses on the

IPI and the soft factor accounted for 13.53% of the variance. Interestingly, the obtained factor composition differs slightly from that of earlier research; specifically, legitimate dependence loaded more highly as a harsh power strategy.

Table 5. *Factor Loadings and Coefficient Alphas for the Use of the Individual Power Bases*

Factor	Power Base Content	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings
Harsh			
	Legitimate Equity	.82	
	Impersonal Coercion	.82	
	Legitimate Reciprocal	.73	
	Impersonal Reward	.70	
	Legitimate Power	.67	
	Personal Coercion	.67	
	Legitimate Dependence	.60	
Soft			
	Positive Referent		.84
	Positive Expert		.82
	Informational		.81
	Personal Reward		.62

Internal reliability for both subscales of the MEIM in the previous study was measured using Cronbach's α and was reported at .76 to .86 for MEIM-ABC, and .69 to .80 for MEIM-EIS. In this study, the alpha coefficient is reported as .87. The range of scores and the means of each subscale of the MEIM were slightly different in this study than those in a previous study involving high school and college students (Phinney, 1992). In the previous study, college students reported higher ethnic identity search (EIS) and higher ethnic affirmation, belonging, and commitment (ABC) behaviors than high

school students (*M* = 2.90, *M* = 3.36, respectively). As can be seen in Table 5, participants in this study reported higher on affirmation, belonging, and commitment, but slightly lower ethnic identity search (*M* = 3.40, *M* = 3.15).

Table 6. *Means Comparisons: Multigroup Ethnicity Identity Measure*

MEIM Subscales	Sample Mean	*SD*	Phinney, 1992
MEIM-EIS	3.15	.621	3.36
MEIM-ABC	3.40	.632	2.90

This study used both subscales of the HGS: gender self-acceptance and gender self-definition. Internal reliability for each subscale was measured using Cronbach's α and was reported at .60, much lower than the alpha coefficients of .87 to .90 reported in a previous study (Hoffman, 2006). The mean scores on the two HGS subscales in this study were almost identical to the previous study involving counselor supervisors (Hoffman, Borders, & Hattie, 2000). The respondents in that study endorsed that they "tend to agree" that gender is central to their identity (*M* = 3.98 for females; *M* = 3.99 for males), as did the respondents in this study (*M* = 4.03). However, respondents in the previous study scored higher on the gender self-acceptance subscale whereby they "agreed" that gender is not central to their identity and they are comfortable with their maleness and femaleness (*M* = 5.42 for females; *M* = 5.46 for males), as did respondents in this study (*M* = 5.30).

Testing of Research Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to investigate the predictability of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence on supervisors' self-efficacy to work

with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves. This researcher developed four research questions and directional hypotheses to understand these relationships. In the following section, results yielded by the performed statistical analyses are presented to answer the question and substantiate these hypotheses.

Research Question 1

To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict self-efficacy in a sample of counselor supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?

H1: Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will report positive self-efficacy beliefs about working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.

Pearson product-moment correlational analyses were performed to analyze each of the relationships. Table 6 provides an overview of the relationships between counselor supervisor self-efficacy, social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence. Overall, there were weak positive linear relationships between counselor supervisor self-efficacy and racial identity achievement (.176, $p < .05$), counselor supervisor self-efficacy, and counselor supervisor self-efficacy and gender self-acceptance (.295, $p < .01$). In other words, as hypothesized, respondents who adopted flexible attitudes regarding social influence, and racial and gender identity reported a higher level of supervisor self-efficacy when working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves. Interestingly, when a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between counselor supervisor self-

efficacy and the individual power bases, there was a statistical significant relationship between counselor supervisor self-efficacy and legitimate dependence power (.166, $p < .05$).

A linear multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive relationship between social influence, racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence, and counselor supervisor self-efficacy. The unstandardized regression coefficients (*B*) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), and semipartial correlations (sr_i) are reported in Table 7. The variance accounted for (R^2) equaled .20 (adjusted R^2 = .11), which was significantly different from zero (F = 2.13, p = .012).

Table 7. *Correlational Matrix*

	CSSES	IPI-Soft	IPI-Harsh	MEIM-EIS	MEIM-ABC	HGS-SA	HGS-SD
(1) CSSE	1.00	.122	.050	.111	.176*	.295**	.029
(2) IPI-Soft		1.00	.007	-.030	-.029	.050	.142
(3) IPI-Harsh			1.00	.136	.119	.002	.014
(4) MEIM-EIS				1.00	.772**	.104	.165*
(5) MEIM-ABC					1.00	.182*	.190*
(6) HGS-SA						1.00	.483**

(7) HGS-SD		1.00

Note: * are significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** are significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Results indicated that three of the six independent variables (or predictor variables) contributed significantly to the prediction of supervisor self-efficacy. Gender self-acceptance had the largest positive standardized beta and semipartial correlation coefficient. Gender self-definition was negatively related to supervisor self-efficacy and was statistically significant with a negative standardized beta and semipartial correlation coefficient. This indicates that the more flexible supervisors' attitudes were towards power usage and gender self-confidence, the more efficacious they were to work with racially-different supervisees. In comparison, the higher supervisors scored on the HGS-SD (i.e., held rigid attitudes) the less self-efficacious they were to work with racially-different supervisees. Interstingly, when a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if any of the individual power bases were predictive of counselor supervisor self-efficacy, the use of legitimate dependence power had a high positive standardized betas and semipartial correlation coefficients.

Table 8. *Multiple Regression: Predictors of Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy*

Variables	*B*	*β*	sr_i	*t*	*p*
IPI-Soft	-.15	.14	.09	1.69	.09
IPI-Harsh	.04	.04	.66	.43	.66

MEIM-EIS	-.04	-.02	-.01	-.16	.87
MEIM-ABC	.21	.12	.08	.91	.37
HGS-SA	.62	.37	.33	3.94	<.01
HGS-SD	-.21	-.21	-.19	-2.22	.03

Research Question 2

To what extent do the use of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence predict supervisors' broaching style?

H2. Supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will broach race more than supervisors with inflexible attitudes.

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between social influence, racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence, and broaching styles. Table 8 provides an overview of the relationships between broaching, social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence. Overall, there were weak positive linear relationships between broaching and racial identity achievement (.197, $p < .05$), and broaching and personal coercion power usage (.165 $p < .05$). In other words, results did not support the hypothesized relationship. Respondents who adopted flexible attitudes regarding social influence, and racial and gender identity did not broach race more than supervisors with rigid attitudes when working with supervisees who are racially-different from themselves.

Table 9. *Correlational Matrix*

	BROCH	IPI-Soft	IPI-Harsh	MEIM-EIS	MEIM-ABC	HGS-SA	HGS-SD
(1) BROCH	1.00	.085	.032	.197*	.018	.039	.039
(2) IPI-Soft		1.00	.007	-.030	-.029	.050	.42
(3) IPI-Harsh			1.00	.136	.119	.002	.014
(4) MEIM-EIS				1.00	.772	.104	.165
(5) MEIM-ABC					1.00	.182	.190
(6) HGS-SA						1.00	.483
(7) HGS-SD							1.00

Note: * are significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** are significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A linear multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive relationship between social influence, racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence, and broaching styles. The unstandardized regression coefficients (*B*) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), and semipartial correlations (sr_i) are reported in Table 9. The variance accounted for (R^2) equaled .23 (adjusted R^2 = .14), which was significantly different from zero (F = 2.52, p = .003).

Results indicated that two of the three independent variables (or predictor variables) contributed significantly to the prediction of broaching styles. Racial identity attitudes (specifically, MEIM-EIS which means supervisors who had not yet resolved their racial identity issues) had the largest positive standardized beta and semipartial correlation coefficient. Racial identity achievement (MEIM-ABC) was negatively related to broaching and was statistically significant with a negative standardized beta and semipartial correlation coefficient. This indicates that supervisors with rigid attitudes towards racial identity and social power usage broached race more than supervisors with flexible attitudes.

Table 10. *Multiple Regression: Predictors of Broaching Styles*

Variables	*B*	*β*	sr_i	*t*	*p*
IPI-Soft	.09	.09	.09	1.08	.28
IPI-Harsh	-.16	-.15	-.12	-1.37	-1.16
MEIM-EIS	.28	.42	.28	3.28	.001
MEIM-ABC	-.22	-.33	.22	-2.56	.012
HGS-SA	.02	.02	.03	.16	.873
HGS-SD	.01	.27	.01	.13	.895

Dependent Variable: Broaching styles

Research Question 3

To what extent are supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles correlated in a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision?

H3. Supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles will be moderately to highly positively correlated in a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision.

This researcher ran a Pearson-product-moment correlation to determine the relationship between supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles. Results somewhat supported the hypothesis as there was a weak positive linear relationship between supervisor self-efficacy and broaching, which was statistically significant (r = .166, n = 149, p = .044).

Research Question 4

What differences are there, if any, between the frequency African-American supervisors' broaching styles and other supervisors in cross-racial supervision?

H4. African-American supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision will broach race routinely or very often, as opposed to White and other ethnic minority supervisors.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between how often African-American supervisors broach race and other racial groups of supervisors and a significant difference was found. Results indicated that African-American supervisors broached race "once or twice at the beginning" (M = 3.68; SD = 1.16) of the supervisory relationship, $F_{(1, 148)} = 6.05$, p = .01,

while White and other ethnic minority supervisors broach race routinely (*M* = 4.1; *SD* = .926).

Table 11. *ANOVA Broaching Styles of Supervisors*

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*	Partial n^2
Between groups	6.74	1	6.74	6.05	.015	.04
Within groups	163.84	147	1.11			

Summary

In this chapter, demonstrated results of the study were presented. Demographics of the sample were described. Results of preliminary analyses, including instrument reliabilities and descriptive statistics were provided. Selected subgroups were compared in terms of mean scores and standard deviations on all the study variables. Data analyses for each hypothesis and the results were reported as follows:

1. The hypothesis that there would be statistical significance between supervisors' flexible attitudes towards social influence, racial identity attitudes, gender self-confidence and counselor supervisor self-efficacy was supported at $p < .05$.
2. The hypothesis that supervisors with flexible attitudes toward social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence will broach race more than supervisors with inflexible attitudes was not supported.

3. The hypothesis that supervisor self-efficacy and broaching styles will be moderately to highly positively correlated among a sample of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision was somewhat supported at $p < .05$.
4. The hypothesis that African-American supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision will broach race routinely or very often, as opposed to White and other ethnic minority supervisors was not supported.

Overall, results indicated that racial identity achievement, gender self-acceptance, and legitimate dependence power usage was significantly related to counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships. Gender self-acceptance was found to significantly predict counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships. In a separate analysis, the use of legitimate dependence power was also found to predict counselor supervisor self-efficacy. Gender self-definition, an inflexible attitude negatively predicted self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships. Thus, the hypothesized relationship between flexible attitudes and self-efficacy to work with racially-different supervisees was supported. Results also indicated that supervisors whose attitudes towards power usage, gender and racial identity were rigid tended to broach race more than supervisors with flexible attitudes. Thus, the hypothesized relationship between flexible attitudes and broaching styles was not supported. Results indicated that African-American supervisors only broach race one to times at the beginning of the cross-racial supervisory relationship. In comparison, White supervisors and other ethnic minority supervisors broach race routinely. Among the 11 power bases, supervisors in this study viewed legitimate dependence as the power base available to

them to increase the likelihood of getting racially-different supervisees to comply. Results integrated with previous literature, limitations, and directions for future research, and implications for counselor educators are discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This quantitative study examined the predictability of social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence on counselor supervisor self-efficacy to work with racially-different supervisees among a sample of 149 supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision. Four research questions and directional hypotheses were formulated to determine if or to what extent the variables were related to self-efficacy and broaching styles scores in this sample. First, the relationships between the three independent variables were investigated to be sure that they measured three distinct constructs. Secondly, the relationship of each of the three variables to the dependent variable was examined to determine if a relationship existed between them and respondents' self-efficacy and broaching styles scores. Finally, a relationship between self-efficacy and broaching was explored, and the differences between African-American supervisors and non-African-American supervisors' broaching styles were also explored.

Results of the analyses indicated that supervisors' self-efficacy to work with supervisees who were racially-different from themselves was positively correlated to variables of social influence, racial identity, and gender self-confidence. Only one aspect of social influence, legitimate dependence power, was significantly correlated to supervisor self-efficacy. The hypothesis that supervisors with flexible attitudes towards use of social influence, racial identity, and gender identity was supported. There were no discrepancies between correlations and gender self-confidence, and legitimate dependence power were found to be significant predictors of counselor supervisor self-efficacy in this sample of 149 self-efficacious supervisors who conduct cross-racial

supervision. In addition, results indicated that supervisors with rigid attitudes towards social influence usage, and racial and gender identity attitudes broached race more than their counterparts with flexible attitudes. A positive relationship between broaching and supervisor self-efficacy was found, and results indicated that non-African-American supervisors broached race with their racially-different supervisees than African-American supervisors. This final chapter will review the statement of the problem and the methodology and then will summarize the results of the study in light of previous research. The chapter concludes with limitations of the study and recommendations for practice and further research.

Interpretation of the Study Findings

This was the first empirical study of the relationship between self-efficacy and social influence among supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision. Social influence exists in all social relationships, especially the supervisory one where the supervisor is tasked to be the change agent. Moreover, social influence is one of three primary functions supervisors fulfill (Barnes, 2002). As expected, counselor supervisors' self-efficacy to conduct cross-racial supervision was positively related to the use of a soft power base. This finding is consistent with Anderson and Levitt's (2015) study where they found that counselors use soft, noncoercive power bases to demonstrate respect for clients as they assist them in making positive changes in their lives. In the current study, legitimate dependence had a stronger relationship than the other 10 power bases. In other words, supervisors used legitimate dependence to get their racially-different supervisees to comply.

Legitimate dependence is a form of power from among the “soft” power bases. Interestingly, in this study it loaded as a “harsh” power base. French and Raven (1998) asserted that legitimate dependence is based on a norm for social responsibility and defined it as a form of power “which obliges one person to assist another who is in need of assistance.” Supervisors who use this form of power believe that the only way to get their supervisees to comply is to make a request by appealing for help. Such supervisor might say to their supervisee, “It would help me a great deal if you did this,” or “"I know I cannot make you do this, but it would mean everything to me if I could depend on you to get it done.” This form of power has been coined as the “power of the powerless,” (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964), a term of significance to this study considering that 55% of its respondents were African-American females. Because of the US’ racial tensions, a supervisee of color with a White supervisor and a supervisor of color with a White supervisee, both might attribute power to the dominant race (Young, 2004). Moreover, entering cross-racial supervisory relationships with perceptions of powerlessness might be common among African-American females since they are minority members of two groups—gender and race (Parks, Carter, & Gushue, 1996). Thus, it can be said that the African-American supervisors in this study believed that the only way to get racially-different supervisees to comply was to shift power to them and make requests by appealing for help.

The minor discrepancy in factor structure (i.e., legitimate dependency loading as a harsh factor rather than a soft factor, as in previous studies) could be due to the specific judgments participants were asked to make. In Raven, Scwarzwald, and Koslowsky

(1998), subordinates were asked to rate the degree of likelihood to comply with their supervisees requests. In this study, supervisors were asked to indicate the degree to which certain considerations would have made their racially-different supervisees more or less likely to comply.

The literature on cross-racial supervision admonishes supervisors to acknowledge existing power-differentials between them and supervisees (Hays & Chang, 2003; Szymanski, 2003; Eklund et al., 2014; Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999) and puts the responsibility of broaching race upon them since they assume the position of power. As expected, the supervisors in this study do broach race routinely and another 24% broach race "very often" and see broaching as more than a professional obligation but consider addressing race and racial inequality as a part of their lifestyle. However, when a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between how African-American supervisors broach race and other racial groups of supervisors a significant difference was found. Results indicated that African-American supervisors broach race "once or twice at the beginning" of the supervisory relationship while Whites and other ethnic minority supervisors broach race routinely and very often.

There are no previous studies to compare this finding to, as the existing literature on cross-racial supervision is written from the perspective of White supervisors who work with ethnic minority supervisees. Currently, there is no existing literature that includes the experiences of African-Americans who conduct cross-racial supervision. Thus, the existing literature becomes a privileged discourse where superiority of the

supervisory position is inadvertently specified for White supervisors, disarming the power of ethnic minority supervisors (Markham & Chiu, 2011). So, this surprising finding where African-American supervisors do not broach race routinely might be reflective of the unacknowledged power-differential between African-American supervisors and White supervisees where the power presumably rests with the supervisor but is shifted to the supervisee who is of the dominant culture.

Another explanation for African-American supervisors' reticence to broach race more frequently might be due to working with White supervisees who do not feel comfortable talking about race in supervision. Previous studies have found that such supervisees struggle with effectively managing the intense feelings they experience when race or racial issues are brought up in supervision (Utsey & Gernat, 2002; Utsey, Gernat, & Hammar, 2005). Further, Utsey and Gernat (2002) asserted that challenging White supervisees to face their own beliefs about race and racism might evoke feelings of anger and frustration toward ethnic minorities. This in turn might led to doubt, worry, and reticence among ethnic minority supervisors who work with White supervisees.

Similarly, an Asian-American supervisor described this phenomena of adopting a passive role as an ethnic minority in a White dominant culture by writing, "Discourses around being the good Asian American can influence me to establish images of myself as easy-going, ready-to-please, modest, nontroublemaking, obedient, and polite in relationships with others," (Marhum & Chiu, 2011, p. 512-513). All of these cultural and contextual influences might explain why the African-American supervisors in this study only broached race once or twice at the beginning of the supervisory relationship, and not

on an ongoing basis. It is also reasonable to expect that participants of this study perceived themselves as powerless, or having less power than their supervisees and did not broach race as much as others because most of them were new supervisors, with 0 to 5 years of experience.

Despite the lack of broaching among African-American supervisors in this study, the group scored higher on the supervisor self-efficacy scales than any other racial group, which means they perceived themselves near "completely competent" to address multicultural issues in supervision and receive feedback about their actions and abilities from racially-different supervisees. This finding is consistent with previous studies by Holcomb-McCoy and Meyers (1999) and Barnes (2002) where White counselors and supervisors scored lower than persons of color on self-efficacy scales. The findings of this study indicate that African-American supervisors have the efficacy to address multicultural issues in supervision but perceive that they lack the power or authority to do so. This might be related to the findings of a previous study where African-American supervisors did not broach race with White supervisees, but they routinely broached race and discussed racial issues with ethnic minority clients (Burkard et al., 2003). Perhaps the stigma of seeking counseling disempowers African-American clients and they shift power to the African-American supervisor. Thus, the African-American supervisor is empowered to broach and explore race and related issues.

As expected, supervisors who held flexible attitudes towards social influence usage, racial identity, and gender identity would indicate higher self-efficacy to work with racially-different supervisees. Overall, this hypothesis was supported as the majority

of participants in this study endorsed higher scores on the counselor supervisor self-efficacy scales, and higher scores on the racial identity achievement subscale (MEIM-ABC), gender self-acceptance subscale, and they subscribed to legitimate dependence, a soft power base. There were no previous studies on self-efficacy and supervision to compare these results to, but this finding is consistent with Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy whereby people who perceive themselves as efficacious "show greater cognitive resourcefulness and strategic flexibility" (Bandura, 1999; p. 34) and such people are able to foresee challenges and successfully navigate through them.

The finding that supervisors in this study scored high on the racial identity scale is consistent with other findings where counselors of color perceived themselves as more multiculturally competent than their White counterparts (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999); and White counselors scored lower on ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). This is believed to be true because counselors of color are more likely to have contact with people from the predominant race and other minorities thereby increasing their confidence to address multicultural issues in counseling and supervision (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999; Barnes, 2002). Moreover, supervisors in this study scored higher on the racial identity achievement subscale (MEIM-ABC), indicating that they have reached latter stages of Phinney's (1992) model of ethnic identity development whereby they have resolved ethnic identity conflicts, accepted their membership in minority culture, and are open to other cultures.

Most supervisors in this study demonstrated flexible attitudes by higher scores on the gender self-acceptance subscale. Respondents who are gender self-accepting do not

consider gender as a critical aspect of their identity (Hoffman, 2006). In other words, they do not define themselves by gender. They positively accept themselves as members of their gendered group and are satisfied with their maleness or femaleness (Hoffman, 2006). This is consistent with findings from a previous study wherein a parallel process occurred between women's gender identity and their racial identity (Hoffman, 2006). Hoffman's (2006) study showed that women with an achieved female identity had also achieved ethnic identity. Thus, the women in this study indicated that they were comfortable with their ethnic identity as African-Americans and they were also comfortable with their identity as women. The size of the sample of men in this study was too small to make meaningful inferences.

Participants who scored lower on the counselor supervisor self-efficacy scales, scored higher on the racial identity search subscale (MEIM-EIS) and the gender self-definition subscale. This finding indicates that supervisors whose attitudes are rigid toward racial and gender identity see themselves as less efficacious to work with racially-different supervisees. There were no previous studies on self-efficacy and supervision to compare these results to, but this finding might be consistent with a previous study conducted by Anderson and Levitt (2015) where their results indicated that counselors who held rigid and stereotypical perceptions about gender (i.e., they scored higher on the gender self-definition subscale) had poorer working alliances with their clients. Those researchers also reported that working alliances suffered when counselors used harsh, coercive power bases. This might align also with Bandura's (1986) theory of self-efficacy

whereby people who perceive themselves as inefficacious to manage potential threats "view threats anxiously, conjure up possible calamities…and avoid them" (p.1390).

Thus, the second hypothesis, that supervisors with flexible attitudes towards social influence usage, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence would broach race more was not supported. In this study, supervisors who scored higher on the MEIM-EIS also reported higher scores on the HGS-SD, indicated that they held rigid and stereotypical thinking related to racial and gender identity. These supervisors broached race more than their counterparts with flexible attitudes. Moreover, supervisors who broached race routinely with their racially-different supervisees were non-African-Americans. This finding could indicate that non-African-American supervisors who have not yet achieved racial identity are still searching and are willing to learn from their supervisees who are racially-different. Moreover, since most of the supervisors in this study relied on training they received from their graduate courses and they are fairly new supervisors, it may be that their graduate programs reinforced the importance of broaching race in supervision.

Interestingly, supervisors with rigid attitudes toward racial identity were more likely to use three harsh and coercive forms of power and one soft power base when broaching race with racially-different supervisees. The harsh power bases included impersonal reward (where the supervisor relied on his or her power to provide a tangible reward), legitimate reciprocity (where the supervisor did something positive for the supervisee and relied on the supervisee's perceived obligation to reciprocate the prior good deed) and legitimate dependence (where the supervisors rely on the power to get

supervisees to do something they were unable to do themselves). The aforementioned supervisors with rigid attitudes toward racial identity also used referent power, a soft power base when broaching race. Supervisors used referent power when they relied upon power attributed to them by racially-different supervisees because they wanted to be associated with or be viewed as similar to their supervisors.

Specific to broaching styles, Day-Vines et al. (2007) reported that counselors at latter stages of racial identity development are more likely to broach difficult topics with clients such as race more than those who are earlier stages. This is demonstrated in this study since most of the supervisors (regardless of race) in this study reported that they have achieved racial identity and 54% of them "routinely" broached race. Those who routinely broach race utilize a broaching style that Day-Vines et al. (2007) called "integrated/congruent." Integrated/congruent broaching is the fourth of five broaching styles and it characterizes counselors who broach effectively and have incorporated broaching into their professional identity. The fifth broaching behavior is called "infusing," and these supervisors believe that broaching race is more than a professional obligation, it is a part of their lifestyle. They consider themselves as advocates and are committed to social justice and equality. Twenty-four percent of the supervisors in this study fell into this category. In this study, most of the supervisors scored on the higher end of racial identity development but the integrated/congruent and infusing supervisors were non-African-American as stated before.

As hypothesized, there is a positive relationship between broaching styles and counselor supervisor self-efficacy, albeit a weak one. Supervisors who broach race

routinely throughout the supervisory relationship felt efficacious to conduct cross-racial supervision.

Limitations of the Study

This dissertation research attempted to address some of the limitations from the previous research in this area. Yet, several important limitations still remain. Increasing the diversity of the sample of supervisors, and studying psychological factors associated with supervisor self-efficacy was important to this researcher. Additionally, decreasing the length of this study's instrument was of importance so only two subscales of the CSSES were used. Thus, several limitations should be considered in interpreting results of the present study.

First, it was important to this researcher to study psychological factors (i.e., power usage, race, and gender) that might impact supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial relationships. Since all of the instruments are constructed based on self-perceptions and administered in a self-report format, possible social desirability might be involved in participants' responses. Thus, this may cause overrated scores on the study variables reflecting inaccurate respondent characteristics. In order to alleviate this limitation, no identifying information about participants was collected. Safe data collection was thoroughly explained on the informed consent.

Second, it was also important to this researcher to contribute scholarly work that included a more diverse sample of supervisors. The researcher did not anticipate that most of the participants in this study would be African-American supervisors, which is not reflective of the demographics of counselor supervisors. This high number of

minority participants may impact the ability to generalize these results to a larger population. Moreover, a predominant ethnically-diverse sample may have contributed to the higher scores on the racially identity achievement subscale of the MEIM (MEIM-ABC). Further, supervisors who chose to participate may have a vested interest in learning more about issues related to race and ethnicity in cross-racial relationships. Consequently, their level of awareness about issues pertaining to race may be more heightened than that of their counterparts. This heightened awareness may have an impact on how the participants responded to the items on the instruments, especially the MEIM.

The researcher also hoped for a sample of supervisors that included gender diversity. Thus, the study's inadequate representation of male counselor supervisors is a third limitation. Though the general population of counselors, counselor educators, and counselor supervisors is predominantly female, the population of males is presumably higher than the 10% of male representation in this study's sample. Therefore, while the researcher hoped that response rates for both demographic groups would prove comparable to those represented in the general population of counselor supervisors in the United States, this did not occur. As a result, further research to ascertain the perceptions of social influence usage, racial identity, and gender identity attitudes with male supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision is indeed indicated.

Fourth, in attempt to shorten the study's instrument, the researcher only included two of six subscales of the CSSES, and chose a shorter measurement to assess racial identity attitudes (MEIM). However, The MEIM subscales were initially designed to

measure ethnic identity and not racial identity. Thus, the MEIM may not measure preferred and specific racial identity attitudes and development of various supervisors, Moreover, it was normed on adolescents and young adults and this study included adults whose average age range was 36 to 45. Furthermore, the participants in this study endorsed much higher levels of racial identity achievement 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. This could explain why racial identity was not a statistically significant predictor for supervisory self-efficacy in cross-racial relationships.

A fifth limitation includes instrumentation. The researcher received at least five emails from participants regarding the IPI. The 44-item instrument was the longest of the four, was positioned second, and made up the bulk of the survey. Overall, participants felt "confused" as to how to answer the items and some did not feel that the items were related to what they do as supervisors. One email read," the second supervisor survey was a bit confusing. I wasn't clear about what I was being asked," and another read, "…but many of those questions don't connect to my experiences as a supervisor to anyone, including racially-different supervisees."

Sixth, this study focused on the perceptions of supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision. The supervisees' perceptions of the supervisory relationship were not investigated. Hence, the perceptions of the supervisors may not accurately reflect the overall supervisory relationship. Further, the researcher did not ask participants to identity the race of the supervisees who were racially-different from themselves.

Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the African-American supervisors in this study worked with White supervisees, and vice versa.

Nevertheless, the results of this study provided the first insights into self-perceptions of supervisors about their work with racially-different supervisees. These results provide some meaningful directions for future research in examining predictive factors which impact supervisors' self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships.

Directions for Future Research

This dissertation research is simply a piece of an ongoing investigative agenda that concerns the relationship between psychological factors such as social power bases, gender and racial identity attitudes, and supervisor self-efficacy. This research is unique because it examines these factors within the context of cross-racial supervisory relationships. In order to further our understanding of supervisor self-efficacy as it relates to working with racially different people, it is necessary to further explore these factors.

One direction for future research would be to conduct this study using different methodologies. By exploring the aforementioned psychological factors more directly and during actual supervision sessions, researchers will gain a better and more complete understanding of what actually occurs in cross-racial supervisory relationships and not what people think or perceive happens. Direct observation provides a more objective measurement, which has been suggested in the literature (Lau & Williams, 2010) when examining race and racial issues. The majority of the studies on cross-racial supervision is based on self-report data.

Furthermore, this study should be replicated with a sample that represents the counseling profession. Namely, a sample that includes more White, and more male supervisors than the sample in this study. Exploring a more representative sample would help researchers gain a better understanding of how social influence usage, and attitudes about racial and gender identity impact supervisor self-efficacy in cross-racial supervisory relationships. Researchers might find that a more reflective sample might use a different power base (i.e., soft or harsh), and might choose another form of power to get racially-different supervisees to comply (i.e., personal reward, or legitimate position).

Future researchers could replicate this study using different instruments to measure power or social influence, racial identity, and gender identity attitudes. Since this researcher received emails from participants about the IPI, other researchers may choose to focus solely on the soft power bases since this study and previous studies (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001; Anderson & Levitt, 2015) have found that counselors tend to use soft power bases. Utilizing the soft power bases would also shorten the instrument to 15 items, and participants may not report as much confusion or dissatisfaction.

Implications for Counselor Educators and Supervisors

Although much still stands to be gained from further research in this area, there are important implications of the present findings for counselor educators and supervisors. Most notable is that African-American supervisors perceive that they have less power than the racially-different supervisees they work with; and supervisors who have not achieved racial identity use harsher forms of power when working with supervisees who are racially-different. Greater efforts should be taken in counselor

education to attend to power differentials that exist not only by position, but also by race and gender. When power differentials are not attended to, those who are in power might inadvertently silence the minorities they educate, supervise, or counsel (Markhum & Chiu, 2013). When counselor educators incorporate teaching about power usage and power differentials, and create learning environments that are egalitarian where power is shared, students who are supervisors-in-training will learn that their minority status is an asset rather than a liability. Counselor educators might consider the feminist model of supervision (Szymanski, 2003) where such strategies are discussed for practical usage.

To enhance the self-efficacy of African-American supervisors, counselor educators might use Bandura's (1977, 1979) framework for self-efficacy. Bandura posits that self-efficacy is enhanced by four things: (a) performance accomplishments (i.e., not grouping minority students together but creating opportunities for them to work with racially-different people and providing supervision specific to cross-racial relationships); (b) vicarious experience (i.e., having a faculty team that is representative of the student population so that students can learn how to navigate cross-racial relationships vicariously; or bring in speakers who represent students' racial and ethnic backgrounds); (c) verbal or social persuasion (i.e., using positive words when supervising minority students, even when giving difficult or negative feedback); and (d) emotional arousal (i.e., normalizing minority students' anxiety, fear, or doubt to increase likelihood of successful outcomes to combat the failure they self-perceive).

Although counselor educators should encourage all students to publish their research, increased efforts should be made to recruit work from minorities. If the

literature informs our profession, it is no wonder African-Americans perceive themselves as powerless to broach race in cross-racial supervision because their voices have not been included. They are silent in the literature and in their supervisory relationships. In turn, minority supervisors might use different and healthier strategies to gain trust and compliance from racially-different supervisees rather than reducing themselves to positions of helplessness.

Conclusion

This study has provided the first quantitative empirical examination of psychological factors that predict counselor supervisor self-efficacy in cross racial supervisory relationships. Results indicated that gender self-confidence predicts supervisor self-efficacy to work with racially-different supervisees. Specifically, the more flexible a supervisor's attitude is related to their gender, the more self-efficacious they perceive themselves to be in their cross-racial supervisory work. Similarly, the more rigid supervisors are about their standards for gender, the less efficacious they believe they are to work with racially-different people. Another significant predictor of supervisor self-efficacy emerged, the use of legitimate dependence power. Namely, the African-American supervisors in this study believed that the only way they could get their racially-different supervisees to comply was to appeal to them for help. The findings did not indicate that racial identity was a statistically significant predictor of supervisor self-efficacy, although there a positive relationship existed.

However, racial identity was more predictive of broaching styles. Supervisors who held rigid and stereotypical attitudes toward racial identity broached race more than

their counterparts with flexible attitudes. And, they used more harsh, coercive forms of power when they broached race with racially-different supervisees. The findings did not indicate that gender self-confidence was a statistically significant predictor of broaching styles, and there was no positive relationship.

Although the limitations of the present study may be considerable, this issue is fairly common in this complex area of research. Most of the limitations noted are shortcomings consistent with much of the other literature in this field, such as lack of diversity among the sample, self-reported data, and instrumentation. However, the affirmative and significant nature of the results of this study that indicate a significant relationship between gender self-confidence and social power usage and supervisor self-efficacy has much to offer this field. There are relevant implications for both counselor educators with minority students and supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision.

In summary, this study has expanded the focus of cross-racial supervision by not focusing on skill development or multicultural competence but by attending to psychological factors that impact supervisors' abilities and actions when they work with racially-different people. Inadvertently, this study contributes to a better understanding of African-American supervisors' experiences in cross-racial supervisory relationships by providing direction for future research and practical recommendations for their professional development.

.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R., & Levitt, D. (2015). Gender self-confidence and social influence: Impact on working alliance. *The Journal of Counseling & Development, 93*(3), 280-288.

Arce, C. (1981). A reconsideration of Chicano culture and identity. *Daedulus, 110*, 171-191.

Arredondo, P., Toporek, M.S., Brown, S., Jones, J., Locke, D.C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). *Operationalization of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies*. AMCD: Alexandria, VA.

Barnes, K. L. (2004). Applying self-efficacy theory to counselor training and supervision: A comparison of two approaches. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 56-69.

Bargad, A., Hyde, J.S. (1991). Women's studies: A study of feminist identity development in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 181-201.

Bandura, A. (1986). Fearful expectations and avoidant actions as coeffects of perceived self-inefficacy. *American Psychologist*, 1389-1391.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational Psychologist, 28(2), 117-148. Doi: 1O.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*, 21-41.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 248-287.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura. A. (1982). The assessment and predictive generality of self-percepts of efficacy. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 13*(3), 195-199.

Barnes, K. L. (2002). *Development and initial validation of a measure of counselor supervisor self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Microform (Accession Number: 3045772).

Barnes, R. (2011). *Racial microaggressions, racial identity, and working alliance in cross-racial counseling supervision relationships between Black supervisors and White supervisees* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/Barnes_uncg_0154D_10835.pdf.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership* (Rev. ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology, 42*, 155-162.

Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. (1964). Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm: Effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68(3)*, 275-281.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Borders, D., Glosoff, H., Welfare, L., Hays, D., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D.M., Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor, 33*(1), 26-44. doi: 10.1080/07325223.2014.905225 2014

Brown, M. T., & Landrum-Brown, J. (1995). Counselor supervision: Cross-cultural perspectives. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 263–286). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Browne, K. (2005). Snowball sampling: using social networks to research non-heterosexual women. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8* (1), 47-60.

Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Madson, M. B., Pruitt, N. T., ContrerasTadych, D. A., & Kozlowski, J. M. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(3), 288–301. doi:10.1037/ 0022-0167.53.3.288.

Cashwell, T., & Dooley, K. (2000). The impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*(1), 39-47.

Chang, C., Hays, D., Shoffner, M. (2004). Cross racial supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 121-138. doi: 10.1300/J001v22n02_08.

Chung, M. (2009). *International supervisors' social influence, self-efficacy, and acculturation in cross-cultural dyads of clinical supervision* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/Chung_uncg_0154D_10273.pdf.

Constantine, M. (2001). Perspectives on multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 99-101.

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

supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54* (2), 142-153. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.142

Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34,*132-141.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). 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.

Danet, B. (1971). The language of persuasion in bureaucracy: "Modern" and "Traditional" appeals to the Israel customs authorities. *American Sociological Review, 36,* (5), 847-859.

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

Day-Vines, N., Bryan, J., & Griffin, D. (2013). The Broaching Attitudes and Behavior Survey (BABS): An exploratory Assessment of its dimensionality. *Multicultural Counseling and Development, 41*, 210-223.

Day-Vines, N., Wood, S., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Holman, A., Dotson-Blake, K., & Douglass, M. (2007). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture during the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 85*, 401-409.

Dillman, D. (2007). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Dorn, F. (1984). The social influence model: A psychological approach to counseling. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62*(6), 342-345.

Downing, N.E., & Roush K. L. (1985). From passive acceptance to active commitment: A model of feminist identity development. *The* Counseling Psychologist, 13, 695-709.

Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive "snapshot" of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*(2), 131–146. doi:10. 1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00510.x.

Eklund, K., Aros-O'Malley, M., & Murietta, M. (2014). What difference does difference make? *Contemporary School Counseling, 18*, 195-204.

Erchul, W. P., Raven, B. H., & Ray, A. G. (2001). School psychologists' perceptions of social power bases in teacher consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 12*, 1–23.

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

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

Garcia, J. (1982). Ethnicity and Chicanos: Measurement of ethnic identification, identity, and consciousness. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4*(3), 295-314.

Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., &

Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*(2), 102– 113. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00508.x.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009*). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Goodyear, R. (1998). Research and practice implications of the SCMCT: Observations and comments. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2), 274-284.

Hays, D., & Chang, C. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*, 134-145.

Hays, D., Chang, C., & Havice, P. (2008). White racial identity statuses as predictors of White privilege awareness. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 47*, 234-246.

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*(4), 153-165.

Helms, J.E. (1990). Toward a model of White racial identity development. In J.E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity development: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 49-66). New York: Greenwood Press.

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. (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.

Hibbs, D. (2012). *An investigation of the self-efficacy beliefs of Black and Hispanic students that have experienced success or failure in mathematics* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2843&context=dissertations.

Hinkelman, L., & Granello, D. H. (2003). Biological sex, adherence to traditional gender roles, and attitudes toward persons with mental illness: An explanatory investigation. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *25*, 259-170.

Hoffman, R. M. (1996). Beyond the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: A reconceptualization of the constructs of masculinity and femininity and a re-examination of their measurement. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(05), 3449B. (UMI No. 9315947)

Hoffman, R.M. (2006). How is gender self-confidence related to subjective well-being? *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 45*, 186-197.

Hoffman, R.M., Borders, L.D., & Hattie, J.A. (2000). Reconceptualizing femininity and masculinity: From gender roles to gender self-confidence. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *15*, 475-503.

Hoffman, R. M., Hattie, J. A., & Borders, L. D. (2005). Personal definitions of masculinity and femininity as an aspect of gender self-concept. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 44*, 66-83.

Jones, C., & Welfare, L. (2017). Broaching behaviors of licensed professional counselors: A qualitative inquiry. Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling, 38, 48-64.

Killian, K. D. (2001). Differences making a difference: Cross-cultural interactions in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 12*, 61-103.

Kim, J. (1981). Processes of Asian American Identity Development: A study of Japanese American Women's Perceptions of their struggle to achieve positive identities as Americans of Asian ancestry AS (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI8118010/.

Knox, S., Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A., Suzuki, L. A., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2003). African-American and European American therapists' experiences of addressing race and cross-racial psychotherapy dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 466–481.

Koslowsky, M., Schwarzwald, J., & Ashuri, S. (2001). On the relationship between subordinates' compliance to power sources and organizational attitudes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*, 455–476.

Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, & Pannu (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*(4), 284-304.

Larson, L. (1998). The social cognitive model of counselor training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2), 219-173.

Larson, L. M., & Daniels, J. A. (1998). Review of the counseling self-efficacy literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 179-218.

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

Levin, M. (1984(. Psychology measures femininity and masculinity, 2: From 13 gay men to the instrumental-expressive distinction. In M. Lewin (Ed.)., *In the shadow of the past: Psychology portrays the sexes* (pp. 179-204). New York: Columbia University Press.

Murphy, M., & Wright, D. (2005). Supervisee's perspectives of power use in supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 31*(3), 283–295.

Neville, H. A., Worthington, R. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2001). *Race, power, and multicultural counseling psychology: Understanding White privilege and color-blind racial attitudes*. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M.

Alexander (Eds.), Handbookof multicultural counseling (2nd ed., pp. 257–288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nilsson, J. E., & Dodds, A. K. (2006). A pilot phase in the development of the International Student Supervision Scale. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*, 50-62

Norton, R. A., & Coleman, H. L. K. (2003). Multicultural supervision: the influence of race-related issues in supervision and outcome. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. K. Hardin, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies: in counseling and psychology* (pp. 114–134). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ossana, S. M., Helms, J. E., & Leonard, M. M. (1995). Do "womanist: identity attitudes influence college women's positive self-esteem and perceptions of environmental bias? *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 402-408.

Parks, E. E., Carter, R. T., & Gushue, G. V. (1996). At the crossroads: Racial and womanist identity development in Black and White women. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 624-631.

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component model of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 598-609.

Pendry, N. (2012). Race, racism, and systemic supervision. *Journal of Family Therapy, 34*, 403-418. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6427.2011.00576.x

Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 9*, 34–49.

Phinney, J. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.

Phinney, J. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development. In M. Bernal & G. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Formation and transformation among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 61-79). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Phinney, J. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40,* 143-152.

Rahim, M. A. (1988). The development of a leader power inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23,* 491–503.

Raven, B. (1959). Social influence on the opinions and communication of related content. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 58*(1), 119-128.

Raven, B., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 28*(4), 307-332.

Sadler, G. R, Lee, C., Lim, & Fullerton, J. (2010). Recruitment of hard-to-reach population subgroups via adaptations of the snowball sampling strategy. *Nursing and Health Sciences, 12,* 369–374.

Schroeder, M., Andrews, J., & Hindes, Y. (2009). Cross racial supervision: Critical issues in the supervisory relationship. *Canadian Journal of Counseling, 43*(4), 295-310.

Schulz, J. C., Ososkie, J. N., Fried, J. H., Nelson, R. E., & Bardos, A. N. (2002). Clinical supervision in public rehabilitation counseling settings. *Rehabilitation Counseling*

Bulletin, 45, 213-222.

Spence, J. T. (1985). Gender identity and its implications for the concepts of masculinity and femininity. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Psychology of gender* (pp. 59-96). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Steward, R. (1998). Connecting counselor self-efficacy and supervisor self-efficacy: The continued search for counseling competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2), 285-294.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Szapocznik, J., Kurtinos, W., Fernandez, T. (1980). Bicultural involvement and adjustment in Hispanic-American youth. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 4, 353-365.

Szymanski, D. (2003). The feminist supervision scale: A rational/theoretical approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 221–232.

Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics , 5th ed.* Boston : Pearson.

Utsey, S. O., & Gernat, C. A. (2002). White racial identity attitudes and the ego defense mechanisms used by White counselor trainees in racially provocative counseling situations. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 475–483.

Utsey, S. O., Gernat, C. A., & Hammar, L. (2005). Examining White counselor trainees' reactions to racial issues in counseling and supervision dyads. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 449–478.

Vander Kolk, C. J. (1974). The relationship of personality, values and race to anticipation of the supervisory relationship. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 18*, 41-4

Wilson, K., Erchul, W., & Ray, B. (2008). The likelihood of use of social power strategies by school psychologists when consulting with teachers. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 18*, 101-123.

Wong, L., Wong, P., & Ishiyama, F. (2013). What helps and what hinders in cross-cultural clinical supervision: A critical incident study. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*(1), 66-85.

Worthington, R. L., & Dillon, F. R. (2003). The Theoretical Orientation Profile Scale–Revised: A validation study. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 36*, 95–105.

Young, R. (2004). Cross cultural supervision. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 32*(1), 39-49.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 525–535.

Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. Psychological Reports, 33(3), 891-900.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

To: Latonya Summers
Counseling

From: Office of Research Compliance

Date: 2/13/2018
RE: Notice of Approval of Exemption with No End Date
Exemption Category: 2.Survey, interview, public observation
Study #: 17-0495

Study Title: Examining Predictor Variables of Counselor Supervisor Self Efficacy in Cross-Racial Dyads: Social Influence, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Gender Self-Confidence

This submission has been reviewed by the Office of Research Compliance and was determined to meet the Exempt category cited above under 45 CFR 46.101(b). This determination has no expiration or end date and is not subject to an annual continuing review. **However, you are required to obtain IRB approval for all changes to any aspect of this study before they can be implemented.**

The Investigator Responsibilities listed below applies to this study only. Carefully review the Investigator Responsibilities.

Study Description:

The U.S. is becoming more diverse, and more information on understanding the professional development needs of counselor supervisors when they work with people who are racially different is necessary. Since supervision is understood as a process of influence, more information is needed about specific qualities of supervisors that might affect cross-racial supervision and supervisees. Examining psychological factors such as social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence might hold critical answers to understanding how to improve supervisory outcomes in cross-racial dyads.

Your approved consent forms (if applicable) and other documents are available online at http://uncc.myresearchonline.org/irb/index.cfm?event=home.dashboard.irbStudyManagement&irb_id=17-0495.

Investigator's Responsibilities:

The above-cited determination has no expiration or end date and is not subject to annual continuing review.

However, the Principal Investigator needs to comply with the following responsibilities:

1. Modifications **must** be submitted for review and approval before implementing the modification. This includes changes to study procedures, study materials, personnel, etc.
2. Data security procedures must follow procedures as approved in the protocol and in accordance with ITS Guidelines for Data Handling.
3. Promptly notify the IRB (uncc-irb@uncc.edu) of any adverse events or unanticipated risks to participants or others.
4. Complete the Closure eform via IRBIS once the study is complete.
5. Be aware that this study is now included in the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) **Post-Review & Post-Approval Monitoring program** and may be selected for post-review monitoring at some point in the future.
6. Reply to ORC post-review monitoring and administrative check-ins that will be conducted periodically to update ORC as to the status of the study.
7. Three years (3) following this Exemption determination, ORC will request a study status update (active/not active).

Please be aware that approval may still be required from other relevant authorities or "gatekeepers" (e.g., school principals, facility directors, custodians of records).

CC:
John Culbreth, Counseling

APPENDIX B

UNC CHARLOTTE
College of Education

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT/FLYER

Research Participants Needed!

Do you conduct supervision with supervisees who are racially-different from you?

If so, please help me examine factors that might influence supervisors who work in cross-racial supervisory dyads.

Participation involves completing a consent form, a one-page demographic survey, and a 81-item online survey that should take no longer than 15-20 minutes to complete. In all, the study should require no more than 20 minutes of your time. The project is under the supervision of Dr. Jack Culbreth (jculbreth@uncc.edu) in the Department of Counseling at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

If you would like to participate, you may go directly to the survey at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/K6RZFR9.

Or, if you would like more information about the study please contact LaTonya Summers at lsummer5@uncc.edu or 704-246-9871.

Thank you in advance for your participation in helping us to help us better understand implications related to cross-racial supervision.

APPENDIX C

UNC CHARLOTTE
College of Education

Department of Counseling
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704-687-8962 http://education.uncc.edu

Informed Consent Agreement

Dear supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision,

In an effort to understand the factors that impact supervisors in cross-racial supervisory dyads, you are being asked to participate in a study. This study entails completing this online informed consent, a demographic questionnaire, and a survey. More details are below. This study is entirely voluntarily, and you are free to choose not to participate in the study.

Purpose of the survey: The purpose of this study is to examine factors that impact supervisors who supervise people who are racially-different from themselves.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. You may decline participation or discontinue participation at any time. Participation includes: completing this online informed consent, demographics form, and survey.

Time required: The entire study will require no longer than 30 minutes of your time. The demographic questionnaire will take approximately 5 minutes, and the 81-item survey will take no longer than 20 minutes.

Risks: There are no known or anticipated risks in this study.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this research study at this time. However, your participation may help contribute to an understanding of the factors that impact supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision.

Compensation: There is no compensation for participating in this study, but you may enter to win a $10 gift card by clicking the link at the end of the study.

Confidentiality: All data you provide in this study will remain confidential. Only the researchers (Mrs. LaTonya Summers, Dr. Jack Culbreth) will have access to your survey and all data will be stored on password-protected computers or in locked cabinets in locked offices. Please note that our email correspondence is not confidential.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: Your electronic signature indicates your voluntary consent to participate in this study. If you would like to discontinue your participation in this study, you may do so at any time. If you have questions about this study please contact LaTonya Summers at lsummer5@uncc.edu; or Dr. Jack Culbreth at jculbreth@uncc.edu; or the UNC Charlotte Office of Research Compliance at 704-687-1871 and uncc-irb@uncc.edu.

_____Yes, I choose to participate in this study

APPENDIX D

Participant Demographic Form

Occupation setting (agency, hospital, jail, private practice, etc.):

_____

Indicate the setting in which you work:
 Urban
 Rural
 Suburban

Years of clinical experience: _____ Years of supervisory experience: _____

Highest Education Level Completed:
 High School
 Associate's Degree
 Bachelor's Degree
 Master's Degree
 Education Specialist
 Doctorate

Percentage of current caseload that is cross-racial:
_____

What training have you had to work with clients who are racially different from you?

How often do you discuss race with racially-different supervisees?
 Never only when supervisees bring it up once or twice at the beginning routinely throughout sessions very often and I engage in advocacy and systemic change efforts

Race/Ethnicity: African American/Black
 Asian/Pacific Islander
 Caucasian/White
 Hispanic/Latino
 Native American
 Multi-racial _____
(please specify)
 Other _____(please specify)

Your age: _____
Your gender: _____

APPENDIX E
Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale

Directions: Each of the items listed below is related to a task performed in counselor supervision. Circle the number that reflects your confidence level as a supervisor when working with supervisees who are racially-different from you. Please answer every question, regardless of whether you have actually performed the corresponding activity.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not confident at all Somewhat confident Completely confident

1. Assist a supervisee to include relevant cultural variables in case conceptualization
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. Solicit critical feedback on my work as a supervisor from either my peers or an evaluator
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. Encourage a supervisee to share his/her negative feelings about supervision without becoming defensive
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. Address a supervisee's race or ethnic identity as a counseling process variable
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. Facilitate a supervisee's cultural awareness
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. Receive critical feedback from a supervisee on my performance as a supervisor without becoming defensive or angry
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. Demonstrate respect for a supervisee who has a different worldview from myself
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. Assess a supervisee's multicultural competencies
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. Demonstrate respect for various learning styles and personal characteristics within supervision 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

APPENDIX F
Interpersonal Power Inventory

(A) Much more likely to comply	(B) More likely to comply	(C) A bit more likely to comply	(D) No effect	(E) A bit less likely to comply	(F) Less likely to comply	(G) Much less likely to comply

Please indicate the degree to which the following considerations would have made your racially-different supervisee more or less likely to comply.

The supervisee has realized that:

1. A good evaluation from me could lead to an increase in pay or other benefits.
   A B C D E F G
2. After all, I am the consultant, and the supervisee should feel some obligation to go along.
   A B C D E F G
3. He/she probably feels I know the best way to handle the situation.
   A B C D E F G
4. Once I point it out, he/she can see why the change is necessary.
   A B C D E F G
5. He/she admires or respects me and does not wish to disagree.
   A B C D E F G
6. I can give the supervisee undesirable job assignments.
   A B C D E F G
7. I have done some nice things for supervisees in the past and so he/she does this in return.
   A B C D E F G
8. He/she likes me and my approval is important to him/her.
   A B C D E F G
9. It is clear that I really depend on the supervisee to do this for me.
   A B C D E F G
10. He/she does not want me to dislike him/her.
    A B C D E F G
11. By doing so, he/she can make up for some difficulties he/she may have caused in the past.
    A B C D E F G
12. For past considerations he/she has received, he/she feels obliged to comply.
    A B C D E F G
13. I can make things unpleasant for supervisees.
    A B C D E F G
14. It makes the supervisee feel better to know I like him/her.
    A B C D E F G
15. He/she sees me as someone he/she can identify with.
    A B C D E F G
16. He/she knows that unless he/she does so, my job will be more difficult.
    A B C D E F G

17. I have carefully explained the basis for this request.
    A B C D E F G
18. It would be disturbing for the supervisee to know that I disapprove of him/her.
    A B C D E F G
19. He/she feels I probably know more about this particular situation.
    A B C D E F G
20. It is my job to tell him/her how to handle this situation.
    A B C D E F G
21. Complying helps make up for things he/she has not done so well previously.
    A B C D E F G
22. I can help the supervisee receive special benefits.
    A B C D E F G
23. I may be cold and distant if he/she does not do as requested.
    A B C D E F G
24. I gave the supervisee good reasons for changing how he/she handled the situation.
    A B C D E F G
25. He/she understood that I really needed his/her cooperation on this.
    A B C D E F G
26. He/she trusts me to give him/her the best direction.
    A B C D E F G
27. We are both part of the same work group and should see eye to eye on things.
    A B C D E F G
28. I have the right to request that he/she handle the situation in a particular way.
    A B C D E F G
29. I make the supervisee feel more valued when he/she does as requested.
    A B C D E F G
30. He/she has made some mistakes and therefore feels that he/she owes this to me.
    A B C D E F G
31. I can make it more difficult for him/her to get a promotion.
    A B C D E F G
32. I can help him/her get a promotion.
    A B C D E F G
33. I have previously done some good things that he/she has requested.
    A B C D E F G
34. It makes the supervisee feel personally accepted when he/she does as asked.
    A B C D E F G
35. As a supervisee, he/she has an obligation to do as I say.
    A B C D E F G
36. He/she looks up to me and generally models his/her behavior accordingly.
    A B C D E F G
37. He/she has not always done what I have asked so this time feels he/she should.
    A B C D E F G
38. He/she feels that I probably have more knowledge about this than he/she does.
    A B C D E F G
39. I can make it more difficult for him/her to get a pay increase.
    A B C D E F G
40. He/she realizes that a consultant needs assistance and cooperation from supervisees.

A B C D E F G

41. He/she expects some favorable consideration from me for going along on this.
    A B C D E F G
42. He/she now understands why the recommended change is for the better.
    A B C D E F G
43. I have let the supervisee have his/her way earlier so he/she feels obliged to comply now.
    A B C D E F G
44. He/she would be upset knowing that he/she was on the bad side of me.
    A B C D E F G

APPENDIX G
Hoffman Gender Scale

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Tend to Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

1. When I am asked to describe myself, being female/male is one of the first things I think of
   1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I am confident in my femininity/masculinity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I meet my personal standards for femininity/masuclinity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
4. My perception of myself is positively associated with my biological sex.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I am secure in my femininity/masculinity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I define myself largely in terms of my femininity/masculinity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
7. My identity is strongly tied to my femininity/masculinity.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I have a high regard for myself as a female/male.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Being a female/male is a critical part of how I see myself.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I am happy with myself as a female/male.
    1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I am very comfortable being a female/male.
    1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Femininity/masculinity is an important aspect of my self-concept.
    1 2 3 4 5 6
13. My sense of myself as a female/male is positive.
    1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Being a female/male contributes a great deal to my sense of self-confidence.
    1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX H
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(4) Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

_____ 1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
_____ 2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
_____3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.
_____4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
_____ 5.I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
_____6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
_____ 7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
____ 8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
____ 9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.
____10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.
____11- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
_____12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

____ 13- My ethnicity is
(1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
(2) Black or African American
(3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
(4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
(5) American Indian/Native American
(6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
(7) Other (write in): _____

____14- My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
____15- My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)