An Assessment of Multicultural Competence in Supervision: Implications for Continuing Education

URL: www.profdevjournal.org　　　　　　　　　**Email: www.profdevjournal.org/contact**

An Assessment of Multicultural Competence in Supervision: Implications for Continuing Education

Sharon Hines Smith, PhD

Understanding the many ways in which culture influences human functioning and the skill to apply that knowledge in practice is fundamental to ethical standards of efficacy in professional social work. The attention given to cultural competency in social work education, research literature and professional codes of ethics is evidence of the importance of this topic (Compton & Galway, 1994; Devore & Schlesinger, 1996; Hepworth, Rooney & Larsen, 1997; Lum, 2000; NASW, 1999; Proctor & Davis, 1994; Raheim, 2002). Increasing racial-ethnic diversity combined with an aging demographic trend makes cultural competence in social work practice with elderly consumers particularly important for successful outcomes in service delivery. In the year 2000, 34.4 million persons were 65 years of age or over in the United States (U.S.), of which 16.1% were minorities, a percentage projected to increase by 9.3% (25.4%) in the year 2030 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000).

Multicultural competencies in all aspects of social work practice within aging service networks are therefore necessary for a variety of reasons. These reasons include enhancement of professional credibility with clients, upholding professional ethics, and facilitation of effective collegial relationships in the workplace among practitioners from diverse backgrounds. Yet, lesser attention in empirical and research literature has been given to multicultural competencies in supervision. This lesser attention is problematic considering the importance of supervision in the education and training of social workers. Supervision provides a medium in which complex multicultural interpersonal dynamics occur when the supervisor, supervisee, and client are each from differing cultural backgrounds. Consequently increased attention to multicultural competence within supervision is warranted through continuing education and training venues to meet the needs of a culturally diverse, aging consumer population and workforce. This study examines a multicultural supervision competency self-assessment process with 37 supervisors in the New Jersey aging services network in an effort to address lack of attention to this area in empirical literature.

Theoretical Framework

The interactional model conceptualizes supervision as an interpersonal process influenced by multiple factors including cultural ones (Shulman, 1993). Supervisors are depicted as interacting with a number of vital systems specifically those of the client, supervisee, colleagues, and agency administrators (Munson, 1993; Shulman, 1993). From this perspective the function of supervision is effective mediation between worker, client and agency systems (Munson, 1993; Shulman, 1993). To successfully accomplish this aim, educative, supportive, and administrative tasks between supervisee-client-agency systems must be carried out utilizing interpersonal skills (Kadushin, 1992; Shulman, 1993). Consequently the interactional supervision process involves applying skills such as sessional tuning in, sessional contracting, elaboration skills, empathy, self-disclosure, demand for work, pointing out obstacles, sharing data, and ending skills (Shulman, 1993). Supervision models where supervisory authority is grounded in interpersonal competencies and experience, rather than the position of supervisor, proved more satisfying for supervisors and supervisees alike in studies by Munson (1993). Although multicultural competencies are not specifically addressed in this model, they are implied in its attention to interpersonal dynamics within supervision.

Sharon Hines Smith, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Work at Rutgers–The State University, Camden, NJ.

Correspondence should be addressed to:

Sharon Hines Smith, PhD, School of Social Work, Rutgers–The State University, 327 Cooper Street, Camden, NJ 08102.
E-mail: sash@camden.rutgers.edu.

Specifically interpersonal styles in supervision are significantly influenced by factors such as personality, upbringing, cultural background, and life experiences. Although some aspects of these influences are apparent to individuals others are not. Cultural influences particularly can be subtle in how they manifest themselves in interactions with others. According to studies by Handley (1982) interpersonal supervision styles not only affect the nature of relationships with supervisees but their competency and job satisfaction as well. Theoretically the successful supervisor is one who is aware of the influence of culture on their interpersonal style, understands its strengths and weaknesses, is flexible enough to adapt that style in interpersonal processes with supervisees from diverse cultural backgrounds, and is able to help supervisees understand and apply multicultural skills in practice (Cook & Helms, 1988; McNeill, Horn, & Perez, 1995; Sue & Sue, 1990; Wong & Wong, 1998).

Background Literature

Increasing knowledge regarding diverse cultural perspectives, cultural competencies fundamental to client empowerment in practice, and models of ethnic-sensitivity in direct practice are dominant themes related to multicultural competencies found in empirical social work research and practice literature (Compton & Galway, 1994; Devore & Schlesinger, 1996; Lum, 2000; Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavies, 1992). The need to command a knowledge base regarding diverse cultural worldviews is considered necessary for social workers to successfully engage and intervene with clients who increasingly in the United States are from varied racial-ethnic groups. Cultural sensitivity is therefore a key component of the person-environment concept of social work practice with caveats regarding applying cultural knowledge in stereotypical manners. Interdisciplinary studies of social-health care delivery systems also emphasize the need for command of a knowledge base inclusive of diverse cultural worldviews to support effective

intervention decisions and treatment planning (Center for Cross-Cultural Health, 1997; Green, 1995). Cultural competence, however, is differentiated from the process of acquiring knowledge regarding cultural diversity.

As defined by Green (1995) cultural competence refers to the ability of professionals to conduct work in such a way that is consonant with the behavior of members of distinct groups and the expectations that groups have of one another. Further studies by Fong (2002) and Raheim (2000) maintain that professional ethics and values of client empowerment and self-determination are only attainable if practitioners are culturally competent. Without attention to cultural competence, practice interventions may be ineffective at best and harmful at worst if social workers lack specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes in cross-cultural situations (Lonner, 1997; Pinderhughes, 1983; Raheim, 2002). Consequently acquiring knowledge regarding cultural diversity is a step toward accomplishing cultural competence but not sufficient to achieve competency in and of itself. Conducting work of the profession in a culturally competent manner requires the ability to integrate knowledge and skill through the medium of a helping relationship.

Various models of ethnically sensitive social work intervention, counseling, and human service systems are discussed in practice literature (Devore & Schlesinger, 1996; Lum, 2000; Ridley, Chih, & Olivera, 2000). These models describe processes of integrating cross-cultural knowledge and skill with practice interventions. There are some important distinctions, however, between models. For example, Lum (2000) stresses social worker understanding of the historical oppression of ethnic-racial minorities, principles of ethnic sensitivity, and differences among people of color in his process model of culturally sensitive social work practice. Devore and Schlesinger (1996), in their approach to ethnic-sensitive practice address stages of intervention that recognize individual and collective client histories, attends to systemic concerns, acknowledges ethnici-

ty as a source of cohesive identity that may be a strength or source of strain, and adopts practice skills responsive to varied ethnic groups and social classes. Other approaches to cross-cultural work emphasize specific skill and sensitivities in clinical diagnosis, relationship building, and idiographic assessment to minimize bias and enhance the effectiveness of assessment and treatment efforts (Proctor & Davis, 1994; Ridley, Chih, & Olivera, 2000). While the importance of cultural sensitivity in social work practice is evidenced by the attention this topic has received in practice literature, lesser attention has been given to cross-cultural dynamics in social work supervision.

According to Kadushin (1992), a social work supervisor is an agency administrative staff member to whom authority is delegated to direct, coordinate, enhance, and evaluate on-the-job performance of supervisees for whose work h/she is held accountable. In actualizing these responsibilities supervisors perform administrative, educational, and supportive tasks within the context of a supportive relationship with supervisees (Brown & Bourne, 1996; Kadushin, 1992). The supervisor's ultimate objective is to deliver to agency consumers the best possible service in accordance with agency policies and procedures (Brown & Bourne, 1996; Kadushin, 1992). The importance of the supervisory role to accomplishing agency objectives, particularly the training of professional social workers and maintenance of quality service standards is inherent in the way supervision is conceptualized here. However, in spite of supervision's importance, scant attention has been given to the complex multicultural dynamics that occur within the context of supervision. Multicultural competence in supervision requires awareness of the client and supervisees' worldviews (Fellin, 2000; Wong & Wong, 1998). In addition understanding of how cultural differences impact supervisor-supervisee-client relationships, awareness of harm that may occur to client and supervisees due to cultural bias, and the crippling affect cultural bias may have on an orga-

nization's ability to function effectively are also important requisites for effective cross-cultural supervisory performance (Cook & Helms, 1988; Gutierrez, Yeakley, & Ortega, 2000; Jacobs, 1991; Kurland & Salmon, 1992).

The few studies examining cultural issues in social work supervision focus on tensions and resistance in the supervisor-supervisee relationship stemming from differences in gender, age, years of experience, life style orientation, and or race-ethnicity (Davis & Proctor, 1989; Gant, Nagada, Brabson, Jayairaine, Chess, Singh, 1993; Greene, 1991; Kadushin, 1992; Munson, 1993; Shulman, 1993). Studies of supervision within aging settings discuss unique problems related to transference, and ageism that supervisors must address when working with young, inexperienced supervisees who unintentionally may foster client dependency through these attitudes and behaviors (Burack-Weiss & Brennan, 1991; Greene, 1991; Munson, 1993). Religious differences between residents and social workers in nursing home facilities as a point of cultural difference that may influence the acceptability of helping interventions that supervisees need to understand are also addressed in this literature (Greene, 1991). The complex interpersonal dynamics that occur within the context of supervision when the supervisor, supervisee, and client are each from different cultural backgrounds, however, has not been examined as fully as other cultural aspects.

Wong and Wong (1998) suggest that the culturally insensitive supervisor risks harming the professional development of minority practitioners and compromise the ability of majority practitioners to acquire cross-cultural competencies. It is within the context of a supportive relationship that a culturally competent supervisor is able to educate supervisees in integrating cross-cultural knowledge and skill, consequently insuring that attention to cultural diversity is a factor in individualizing client services. The development of multicultural competencies in practice occurs primarily through a supportive

relationship, from this interactional perspective, between a multiculturally competent supervisor and their supervisee (Kaiser, 1992; Shonfeld-Ringel, 2001). Yet few studies have examined ways in which supervisors facilitate a process whereby supervisees develop multicultural competencies or how their competencies are assessed other than through measures of client satisfaction. This study addresses this gap in practice literature by administering a multicultural self-assessment checklist to a group of supervisors participating in aging services during a leadership training workshop offered through a university sponsored social work continuing education program.

Method

Participants

The subjects were 37 supervisees from two senior service agencies in New Jersey that provided case management and/or housing services. All subjects were participants in a three-day supervision leadership skills training program sponsored by a university school of social work continuing education program. One module of this training program addressed multicultural dynamics in supervision. The training program goal was to enhance supervisors' knowledge and skills in the area of leadership. Participants assessed their own style of supervision and were presented with an overview of leadership theories focusing on the interaction between the leader, the task and the group. The focus was on strategies that can be used to influence workers, superiors, and peer supervisors. Effective delegation was practiced in on-the-job situations. A model of supervision sensitive to ethnicity of the worker, client and supervisors was also discussed and put into practice through the use of case studies.

Background characteristics of participants were varied including men and women, ranging in age from their middle twenties to sixty years of age, from urban and suburban areas of New Jersey. In terms of racial-ethnic background most participants were Caucasian. Others included seven African

Americans and three Hispanic individuals. Bachelor's degrees were held by 25 participants, the remaining 12 had masters degrees in social work or public administration. Most participants had been supervisors for 12 months or more prior to attending the training program, five participants were newly promoted (less than six months) to supervisory positions. The majority (95%) held job responsibilities that could be classified as first level supervisory positions where the participant directly supervised a small number of workers. Approximately 5% were upper level supervisors having direct responsibilities to administrators for an entire component or cluster of agency services in addition to a number of workers providing those services.

Measure

The multicultural supervision self-assessment checklist was adapted from the Multicultural Supervision Competency Questionnaire (MSCQ) of Wong and Wong (1998). The checklist instructions directed participants to rate their degree of multicultural competence in response to 12 items across four domains, specifically knowledge, attitudes, relationship, and skills. A 5-point Likert scale was used, where 1= Rarely/Never, 2= Sometimes, 3= Occasionally, 4=Most of the Time, and 5=Always. Scoring was in the positive direction such that scores of 4 or greater indicated the consistent presence of cross-cultural supervision competence.

The multicultural content domains of knowledge, attitude, skills, and relationship were selected as the foundation for development of Wong and Wong's MSCQ (1998) and consequently the self-assessment checklist as well. Domain content was based on empirical studies that identified a link between differences in values, worldviews, and communication styles with cultural conflicts and interpersonal difficulties (Pedersen, 1997; Sue, Arrendondo & McDavies, 1992). Relationship content was also included based on study findings that positive relational characteristics specifically effective interpersonal interaction skills are neces-

sary for effective supervision to occur (Bradley, 1989; Holloway, 1995; Shulman, 1993; Sodowsky, Tuffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994). The ability to develop a good relationship in supervision was therefore considered integral to promoting cross-cultural competence (Rubin, Kim, & Peretz, 1990; Wong & Wong, 1998). The self-assessment checklist content in this study addresses all of the pertinent multicultural supervision competency domains identified in the background literature. Specific statements used by their domain category in the checklist were as follows:

Domain– Knowledge
Statements
1 I am aware of my own implicit cultural biases and how they impact my performance as a supervisor.
2 I consult or refer resources available in ethno-cultural communitites.
3 I make use of knowledge to increase supervisees' multicultural competence in practice.

Domain–Attitude
Statements
1 I make an effort to understand the culture and value system of culturally different supervisees and clients.
2 I am able to avoid racial stereotypes.
3 I respect other cultures without overly identifying self with minority culture or being paternalistic.

Domain–Relationship
Statements
1 I make an effort to establish a relationship of trust and acceptance with culturally diverse supervisees.
2 I make use of a support network that includes minorities.
3 I am able to overcome cultural and linguistic barriers in working with culturally diverse supervisees and clients.

Domain–Skills
Statements
1 I actively reduce cultural bias and discriminatory practices.
2 I am able to clarify presenting problems and arrive at culturally relevant case conceptualizations with clients from different cultural and racial backgrounds.
3 I encourage discussion of cultural differences in supervision (Source: Wong & Wong, 1998).

Face validity and criterion validity of the multicultural supervision checklist were established through subjective appraisal of the measure by social work supervisors who were non-participants in the study and comparison of the measure in relationship to participant self-reports. Reliability of the checklist has not been determined, however, an alpha of .99 has been reported for the MSCQ from which the checklist was developed.

Procedure
Participants were asked to rate themselves on the 12 items reflecting some aspect of knowledge, attitude, skill or relationship on the multicultural supervision self-assessment checklist. All 37 supervisors completed the checklist individually and turned them in to the workshop trainer at the conclusion of the multicultural issues in supervision training session. Before the checklist was distributed, the voluntary nature of their participation was explained to each participant, their right to not complete the form emphasized, and the anonymity of their responses assured.

Results and Discussion
As can be seen in Table 1, results indicate that participants rated themselves highly competent in cross-cultural knowledge, attitudes, and relationships where mean scores were 4.0 or higher (X>4.0). However, mean scores for items related to the application of cross-cultural skills in supervision contexts were lower (X<4.0) indicating a mini-

Table 1: Multicultural Competency in Supervision Content Areas and Means

Content Area	No. of Items	Mean	SD
Knowledge	2	4.27	.64
Attitude	4	4.25	1.00
Relationship	2	4.14	.90
Skills	4	3.07	.87
Total	12	3.93	.85

mal degree of cross-cultural competence since 3.0 was used as the mid-point in the Likert scale of responses.

The overall multicultural competence mean of 3.93 ($X=3.93$) reflects a lesser self-rating of competency generally by the participants. Specifically participants rated themselves low on skill domain items asking them to assess their ability to clarify presenting problems and arrive at culturally relevant case conceptualizations with clients, and to assess the degree to which they encourage discussion of cultural differences in supervision. Comments of participants provided some insight into their differences in perceptions of multicultural competencies across domain items as well. Many participants believed that educating supervisees regarding broadening their knowledge of cultural diversity, becoming more self-aware, and stressing consumer engagement through the establishment of a collaborative relationship would bode them well in competent cultural social work supervision. While these beliefs have validity, the multicultural issues in supervision training session and self-assessment checklist encouraged participants to reflect on adopting a broader view of multicultural competencies to include sensitivity to power differentials, and awareness of the fact that color blindness is not equal to good professional supervision. Failure to acknowledge the roles power differences and color blindness can play as obstacles to effec-

tive cross-cultural supervision can contribute to problematic performance outcomes making skill sets to address these areas in supervisory communication most important. Reflection on these multicultural supervision issues was a new experience for many participants, and hence, may have contributed to the lesser self-assessment ratings on skill domain items. These findings may be indicative of a larger problem that supervisors do not have adequate multicultural competence due to their inability to translate knowledge and personal awareness of cultural diversity into culturally responsive practice techniques within the context of supervision. Failure to conceptualize and evaluate multicultural supervisory performance beyond acquisition of knowledge regarding diverse cultures and self-awareness of prejudicial attitudes and biased beliefs in practice settings may be one reason for this shortcoming.

The lack of multicultural supervision rating scales or assessment instruments is another factor that impedes the adequate evaluation of cultural competencies in this area. To-date few published multicultural supervision competency assessment instruments exist. Wong and Wong's (1998) multicultural supervision instrument addresses this little researched area, however, it is an instrument completed by supervisees and therefore evaluates only one aspect of cross-cultural practice. The self-assessment checklist for supervisors discussed here is an important step toward a more comprehensive perspective in evaluating the relationship between multicultural knowledge, attitude, relationships, skills, and cross-cultural competence outcomes for supervisees and clients. Rather than promoting the use of a specific supervision assessment instrument, this study's findings provide support for the need of a supervisory evaluation process inclusive of multicultural competence as a multifaceted concept.

According to Fong (2002) unintentional racism, power dynamics, communication issues, and trust within the supervisory alliance must be addressed authentically to achieve multicultural competence

within supervision contexts. The results from the administration of the checklist instrument discussed here provide an effective means to comprehensively assess supervisory strengths and limitations across multiple dimensions that reflect effective communication, and authenticity in the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Consequently more precise assessment of multicultural supervision competencies stands to contribute to the development of more viable strategies to enhance professional growth in this area. Specifically programs could be developed through continuing education venues using didactic and/or experiential techniques that address needed competencies based on individual supervisor knowledge and skill levels. In addition, continuing education programs targeting improved multicultural competencies in supervision could facilitate understanding of the importance of interpersonal skills in promoting sensitivity to differentials in power and opportunity structures within service delivery systems. Increased supervisor understanding of the macro and micro influences on the supervisor-supervisee relationship stands to directly impact the quality of service delivered to consumers. The interrelationships between culture, agency environment, supervisor, supervisee and client therefore are important to understand to promote quality in service delivery and best understood or taught in ways that foster integration of knowledge, attitude, skill, and relationship dimensions through case study and role play methods in continuing education and training curricula.

Limitations

Although this study's findings are limited by the small sample size and self-report nature of the checklist, they are important to providing an initial perspective of multicultural competence in supervision across knowledge, attitude, skill and relational dimensions that can be used to develop needed educational and training strategies for supervisees and students in field supervision. This study also contributes to multicultural competencies in supervi-

sion being conceptualized distinctively from those required in direct practice because of unique supervision tasks, and complex interpersonal dynamics that occur in supervision contexts. Further study in this area is warranted to examine relationships between supervisor multicultural competencies and that of supervisees and students under their care. Additional evaluative instruments are needed to assess multicultural competencies inclusive of quantitative measures so that levels and degrees of knowledge and skill in the application of cross-cultural techniques can be determined more precisely.

Conclusion

Considering the increasing racial-ethnic diversity of the aging population, human services work force, and student populations in undergraduate and graduate social work programs, the need for multiculturally competent supervisors will continue to increase as well. These trends present an urgent challenge for social work education and professional training. To keep pace with these demographic changes, supervisors must acquire, implement and maintain multicultural competencies in practice. This study's findings that aging network supervisors surveyed rated themselves as less competent in skills needed to apply cross-cultural knowledge, and less competent generally in cross-cultural competency have important implications for continuing education and training programs that aim to keep pace with changing demographics and standards of quality in the delivery of social services.

The importance of conceptualizing multicultural supervision competence in terms of multiple domains of knowledge, attitude, relationship, and skill, also assessing competency using evaluative tools that encompass those domains to enhance professional growth and development are made apparent by these findings. Consequently quality social service delivery must include cultural competence in supervision to achieve ethical standards for social work practice that specify cultural sensitivity and ethnic competence as practice goals (Dean &

Rhodes, 1998; NASW, 1999). This study represents an important step toward that aim. No where is increased attention to cultural competence in supervision more warranted than in aging service networks where increasing numbers of racial-ethnically diverse consumers and social workers interface in the aging services network. Continuing education programs designed to enhance multicultural competence in supervision stand to make an important contribution to the acceptability and viability of social services in this area for aging consumers.

References:

Bradley, L.J. (1989). *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, practice.* Muncie, IN: Accelerated.

Brown, A. & Bourne, I. (1996). *The social work supervisor.* PA: Open University Press.

Burack-Weiss, A. & Brennan, F. (1991). *Gerontological social work supervision.* New York, New York: Haworth.

Center for Cross-Cultural Health (1997). *Caring across cultures.* Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Compton, B. & Galaway, B. (1994). *Social work processes* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Cook, D.A., & Helms, J.E. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35,* 268–274.

Davis, L. E. & Proctor, E. K. (1989). *Race, gender, and class: Guidelines for practice with individuals, families, and groups.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dean, R. & Rhodes, M. (1998). Social constructionism and ethics: What makes a "Better" story? *Families in Society,* 254–262.

Devore, E. & Schlesinger, E. (1996). *Ethnic-sensitive social work practice* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Fellin, P. (2000). Revisiting multiculturalism in social work. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36,* 23–43.

Fong, R. (2002). Empowering multicultural clients by using cultural values and biculturalization of interventions. In M. O'Melia and K. Miley (Eds.), *Pathways to Power Readings in Contextural Social Work Practice* (pp. 202–213). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gant, L, Nagada, B., Brabson, H., Jayaraine, S., Chess, W. & Singh, A. (1993). Effects of social support and undermining on African American workers' perceptions of coworker and supervisor relationship and psychological well-being. *Social Work, 38,* 158–164.

Green, J.W. (1995). *Cultural awareness in the human services.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Greene, R. (1991). Supervision in social work with the aged and their families. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 17,* 139–144.

Gutierrez, L., Yeakley, A., & Ortega, R. (2000). Educating students for social work with Latinos: Issues for the new millenium. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36(3),* 541–557.

Handley, P. (1982). Relationship between supervisors' and trainees' cognitive styles and the supervision process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29,* 508–515.

Hepworth, D., Rooney, R., & Larsen, J. (1997). *Direct social work practice* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks Cole.

Holloway, E.L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jacobs, C. (1991). Violations of the supervisory relationship: An ethical and educational blind spot. *Social Work, 36,* 130–135.

Kadushin, A. (1992). *Supervision in social work* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Columbia University.

Kaiser, T. (1992). The supervisory relationship: An identification. Of the primary elements in the relationship and an application of two theories of ethical relationships. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 18,* 283–296.

Kurland, R. & Salmon, R. (1992). When problems seem overwhelming: Emphasis in teaching, supervision, and consultation. *Social Work, 37,* 240–244.

Lonner, W.J. (1997). Three paths leading to culturally competent psychological practitioners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21(2),* 195–212.

Lum, D. (2000). *Social work practice and people of color: A process stage approach* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McNeill, B.W., Hom, K.L., & Perez, J.A. (1995). The training and supervisory needs for racial and ethnic minority students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23,* 246–258.

Munson, C. (1993). *Clinical social work supervision* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Haworth.

NASW Delegate Assembly (1999). *NASW Code of Ethics.* Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers Press.

Pinderhughes, E. (1983). Empowerment for our clients and for ourselves. *Social Casework, 31,* 214–219.

Pedersen, P. B. (1997). *Culture-centered counseling interventions: Striving for accuracy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Proctor, E.K. & Davis, L.E. (1994). The challenge of racial difference. Skills for clinical practice. *Social Work, 39(3),* 314–323.

Raheim, S. (2002). Cultural competence: A requirement for empowerment practice. In M. O'Melia and K. Miley (Eds.), *Pathways to Power Readings in Contextual Social Work Practice* (pp. 95–107). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Ridley, C., Chih, M., & Olivera, R. (Jan. 2000). Training in cultural schemas: An antidote to unintentional racism in clinical practice. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70,* 65–72.

Rubin, J., Kim, S., Peretz, N. (1990). Expectancy effects and negotiation. *Journal of Social Issues, 46,* 125–139.

Shonfeld-Ringel, S. (Spring 2001). A re-conceptualization of the working alliance in cross-cultural practice with non-western clients. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 29,* 53–64.

Shulman, L. (1993). *Interactional supervision.* Silver Springs, MD: NASW Press.

Sodowsky, G.R., Tuffe, R.C., Gutkin, T.B., & Wise, S.L. (1994). Development of a multicultural counseling inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 137–148.

Sue, D.W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R.J. (1992). Multicultural competencies/standards: A pressing need. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70(4),* 477–486.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* New York, NY: Wiley.

United States Census Bureau; *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin 1995–2050;* <http://www.census.gov/prod/1/pop/p25-1130/

Wong, P., & Wong, L. (1998). *Assessing multicultural supervision competencies.* Paper presented at the XIVth International Congress of the Interactional Association for Cross-Cultural Studies.