Diversity and social justice training at the postdoctoral level: A scoping study and pilot of a self-assessment.

4 authors, including:

Emily Treichler
VA San Diego Healthcare System

25 PUBLICATIONS **76** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   Collaborative Decision Skills Training View project

Diversity and Social Justice Training at the Postdoctoral Level: A Scoping Study and Pilot of a Self-Assessment

Emily B. H. Treichler
VA Desert Pacific Mental Illness Research, Education and
Clinical Center (MIRECC), VA San Diego Healthcare System,
San Diego, California; and University of California, San Diego

Jennifer N. Crawford, Alexandra Higdon, and
Autumn L. Backhaus
University of California, San Diego and VA San Diego
Healthcare System, San Diego, California

Postdoctoral training provides an opportunity to solidify diversity and social justice-related competencies before independent practice. This training period is an excellent time to integrate knowledge and skills into professional identity and practice, including translating social justice theory into advocacy and other aspects of practice. Effectively assessing training needs and tailoring curriculum for a professionally and personally diverse fellowship cohort is difficult. This article presents 2 interrelated studies that aim to capture diversity and social justice training needs at the postdoctoral level. First, we conducted a scoping study of associated literature, resulting in development of a new self-assessment to identify gaps in social justice training. Second, we piloted this self-assessment among incoming psychology postdoctoral fellows in an American Psychological Association accredited program. Findings from each of these studies were broadly congruent, indicating that although training programs and incoming fellows are invested in diversity and social justice training, there are notable and consistent gaps in training. We offer a set of recommendations to improve diversity and social justice training among incoming fellows including continued use of the piloted assessment in research and training; identification of a best practices training model; increased prioritization of social justice advocacy training experiences and other active training approaches; and intentional cultivation of 'safe brave' spaces to facilitate effective discussions about diversity and social justice topics.

Public Significance Statement
Competency in diversity and social justice is essential for clinical psychologists. Postdoctoral training is an excellent time to consolidate these skills and integrate them into professional activities including clinical practice, advocacy, and research. This study identifies that a current gap in research on this topic and makes recommendations for future research and training.

Keywords: postdoctoral psychology training, diversity, social justice, scoping study, self-assessment

Supplemental materials: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000281.supp

ⓘ EMILY B. H. TREICHLER, PhD, is a postdoctoral fellow in the VA Desert Pacific Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Center (MIRECC) at the VA San Diego Healthcare System and the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California, San Diego. Her research and professional interests include recovery-oriented services, collaborative decision-making, serious mental illness, and social justice.

JENNIFER N. CRAWFORD, PhD, was a postdoctoral fellow at the VA San Diego Healthcare System and Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego at the time of this research. She is now affiliated with the Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Her research and professional interests include sexual trauma, women's health, health services research, and behavioral health integration.

ALEXANDRA HIGDON, PsyD, is a postdoctoral fellow at the VA San Diego Healthcare System and the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California, San Diego. Her research and professional interests include multiculturally-informed clinical care, social justice, and trauma-informed interventions.

AUTUMN L. BACKHAUS, PhD, is a staff psychologist at the VA San Diego Healthcare System and assistant clinical professor in the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California, San Diego, where she serves as the Military Sexual Trauma Coordinator and the Clinic Coordinator of La Jolla Primary Care Mental Health Integration and Behavioral Medicine Program. Her research and professional interests include health psychology, trauma, diversity and social justice, and training.

RESEARCH REPORTED IN THIS PUBLICATION was supported by the Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Academic Affiliations Advanced Fellowship Program in Mental Illness Research and Treatment and Advanced Fellowship in Women's Health.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THIS ARTICLE should be addressed to Emily B. H. Treichler, VA Desert Pacific Mental Illness Research, Education and Clinical Center (MIRECC), c/o Tania Ritter, 3350 La Jolla Village Drive, San Diego, CA 92161. E-mail: emily.treichler@gmail.com

Psychology training programs must include diversity training relevant to their specialty focus to meet American Psychological Association (APA) accreditation standards (APA, 1997). These standards allow training programs to tailor educational activities to meet programmatic and individual trainee goals. In 2017, APA updated their multicultural guidelines to broaden the focus of multicultural competency to include contextual factors and intersectionality, rather than simply race/ethnicity group identities (APA, 2017). Embedded in these new guidelines is an emphasis on social justice advocacy as central to the role of psychologists. Social justice includes "scholarship and professional action designed to change societal values, structures, policies, and practices, such that disadvantaged or marginalized groups gain increased access to these tools of self-determination" (Goodman et al., 2004).

In the context of psychology training, we particularly focus on aspects of social justice that inform competencies and activities of a psychologist, including: awareness of cultural and systemic power and privilege; the provision of accessible and effective mental health care to all; and the use of professional advocacy to promote justice (Brady-Amoon, 2011; Goodman et al., 2004). We conceptualize diversity training as broad and knowledge-focused, providing the foundation to specific, action-focused areas including multicultural competence and social justice. Having knowledge about differences and inequalities because of group membership is essential to being able to provide culturally competent clinical care and promote justice at the institutional level.

Postdoctoral training is an ideal time to build and solidify social justice-related competencies and cultivate a professional identity that includes social justice advocacy. However, in our roles providing and receiving postdoctoral training, we have found it difficult to effectively assess training needs and tailor curriculum for professionally and personally diverse fellowship cohorts. We suspect that this is complicated by underprioritization of social justice training at the predoctoral level, so that fellows often need fundamental training in social justice theory and advocacy despite their advanced training status.

Therefore, we sought to study diversity and social justice (DSJ) training needs at the postdoctoral level to improve our own training series, as well as to provide recommendations and tools for postdoctoral training broadly. DSJ captures fundamental diversity knowledge and training experiences in addition to specific social justice training experiences. We explore this issue by presenting two interrelated studies: first, a scoping study of associated literature, resulting in development of a new assessment to identify gaps in DSJ training; and second, by piloting this assessment among incoming psychology postdoctoral fellows in an APA-accredited program.

Study 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to conduct a scoping study of the current literature related to DSJ training among postdoctoral psychology fellows. A scoping study casts a broad net to gather a comprehensive picture of current literature, and aims to rapidly organize key aspects of a research area (Mays, Roberts, & Popay, 2001). As opposed to systematic reviews, a scoping study does not use systematic review or ratings processes, or require an exhaus-

tive review of available literature. Instead, a scoping study focuses on review of relevant literature to develop a general understanding of current and relevant literature to inform research questions. The purpose of a scoping study can vary (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005); in our case, we sought to (a) understand the current status of the literature on DSJ training for postdoctoral psychology fellows, and (b) identify knowledge gaps that should be filled to improve DSJ training among fellows.

Method

Although our primary aim was to collect literature specifically about DSJ training among postdoctoral psychology fellows, we anticipated that there would be little research available on this topic; therefore, we also included literature on DSJ training among graduate students in psychology and closely related fields. Google Scholar was searched for relevant peer-reviewed literature. Four searches were conducted to maximize coverage based on various key words: (a) "social justice" AND ("training" OR "education" OR "teach") AND ("psychology" OR "clinical" OR "counseling" OR "therapy") AND ("graduate" OR "internship" OR "fellowship" OR "residency" OR "doctoral"), for all years; (b) "diversity" AND ("training" OR "education" OR "teach") AND ("psychology" OR "clinical" OR "counseling" OR "therapy") AND ("graduate" OR "internship" OR "fellowship" OR "residency" OR "doctoral"), for all years and then only for 2008–2018; (c) postdoctoral psychology training, for all years; and (d) ("diversity" OR "cultural" OR "multicultural") AND postdoctoral training, for all years. A general Google search was conducted to collect other, nonpeer reviewed sources, using the key words: "psychology postdoctoral training diversity." Lastly, three journals, *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*; *The Counseling Psychologist*; and *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, were each searched to identify additional articles. First, these journals were searched using the keywords ("diversity" "multicultural" OR "social justice") for all time periods. Second, all articles from these journals published in the last 10 years were individually reviewed to identify any relevant and recent articles missed by the keyword search. We chose to include additional searches of the last 10 years to ensure that we identified the most current and, therefore, most potentially relevant, literature on this topic in case the time-unlimited searches missed any of that literature.

The literature collated by this search were then reviewed and organized by topic. Literature was deemed pertinent if it directly informed either of our study questions, outlined above, or would provide useful context about DSJ training more broadly that would indirectly inform our study questions (e.g., DSJ training at the predoctoral level). Literature that was not pertinent to our aims was culled during this process. Organization was based on level of training (i.e., graduate school, internship, and postdoctoral fellowship), and focus of training (e.g., research, clinical work, and supervision), with a separate category for theory. The first and second authors contributed to searching for literature. The first author performed the primary review and organization, which was reviewed and approved by all authors.

Results

The Google Scholar searches and the general Google search yielded over 10,000 search results each. These results were sorted

by relevance according to Google's algorithm, and the first 100 results from each search were reviewed closely. Relevance of results decreased significantly at this point, and given that the purpose of a scoping study is to rapidly collect a range of relevant literature and is not intended to be exhaustive, we elected to not review further in these searches. The time-unlimited searches for Training and Education in Professional Psychology; The Counseling Psychologist; and Journal of Counseling Psychology yielded 278, 481, and 121 results, respectively; the additional 2008–2018 searches in these journals yielded 411, 590, and 643 search results, respectively. Most articles yielded were not directly relevant to our study aims (e.g., about other aspects of graduate or postdoctoral training; about a minority population but not training relevant to working with that population). A total of 266 items were initially identified as potentially relevant to our study aims during the search process, and178 remained after further review. These items were organized into nine categories (see Table 1). Although some articles correspond with multiple categories, we elected to assign a single primary category to eliminate redundancy in characterizing the body of literature. Primary categories were assigned based on the primary focus of the article; for example, Kuo and Arcuri's (2014) article describing a therapy training model for treating refugees fits best into *Training and Development Models* given the focus on describing a specific training model, although it could also fit into the *Therapy* subsection of the *DSJ Considerations in Psychological Practice* category.

DSJ training among psychology fellows. Only one peer-reviewed article was identified on the central topic, *DSJ training among psychology fellows*. The study (Kauth, Shipherd, Barrera, Ortigo, & Jones, 2016) examined the perceptions of psychology postdoctoral fellows who completed a Veterans Affairs fellowship in lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) Health. The authors found that fellows were satisfied with their training, gained significant experience working with interprofessional teams, and developed new clinical offerings for LGBT veterans. There were also six nonpeer reviewed professional sources on this topic. All were online materials (e.g., brochures, fellowship websites) describing fellowship programs focused on diversity, multiculturalism, or recruitment of underrepresented trainees. Although these materials indicated investment in DSJ training at the postdoctoral level, they did not specifically address methods of training or evidence of training effectiveness.

Table 1
Number of Sources Found During Scoping Study by Topic

Topics	Peer reviewed sources	Other professional sources
DSJ training during psychology fellows	1	6
DSJ training during graduate students	40	4
DSJ training during interns	7	1
DSJ theoretical and applied training models	32	0
DSJ considerations in psychological practice		
Assessment	7	0
Therapy	32	0
Research	16	0
Supervision	25	0
Social Justice Advocacy	7	0

Note. DSJ = diversity and social justice.

The remaining categories, discussed below, include sources focused on topics adjacent to the central topic of DSJ training during postdoctoral fellowship. These sources are not exhaustive, representing only those identified while targeting our primary study topic. Literature in each category is discussed briefly to provide an overview of DSJ training literature that has potential to inform postdoctoral DSJ training. A complete list of sources is presented in online supplemental material 1.

DSJ training among graduate students and interns. The scoping study identified 44 sources on DSJ training during graduate school generally and another eight sources about training during the internship year specifically. A recent systematic review (Benuto, Casas, & O'Donohue, 2018) assessed 17 outcome studies on graduate training in cultural competency, concluding that although these studies often found significant improvements in knowledge, evidence of improvements, or developments in attitudes, awareness, and skill were mixed. One assessment of trainee perceptions after DSJ training found that 36% of trainees reported increased knowledge, 34% reported increased awareness, 17% reported changes in their attitudes, and 13% reported behavioral change (Sammons & Speight, 2008). These trainees reported having a better understanding of their own privilege, and gaining increased awareness of the biases of other trainees, faculty, and institutions.

Although many training approaches rely on lecture and discussion, other pedagogical approaches including immersive experiences and ethnographic fiction show promise (Chung & Bemak, 2013; Heppner & Wang, 2014; Pieterse, Evans, Risner-Butner, Collins, & Mason, 2009). Some types of discussion may be more impactful than others; a qualitative self-study of faculty reported that facilitating racial dialogues positively impacts students of all backgrounds if the environment is 'safe brave' (Chung, Bemak, Talleyrand, & Williams, 2018). A 'safe brave' space supports learning within an emotional context through explicit and student-determined behavioral guidelines; careful, introspective, and boundary-protective facilitation by faculty; and use of faculty education and group processes to examine and correct student resistance to examining difficult topics. These interactions with faculty can be essential to growth, as students report that the influence of important others and exposure to injustice were the most critical factors in their social justice development (Caldwell & Vera, 2010). An expansion of training topics was also recommended by a group of nearly 500 graduate students, who reported satisfaction with race/ethnicity and gender-focused training but narrow exposure to, and satisfaction with, training in other areas (Green, Callands, Radcliffe, Luebbe, & Klonoff, 2009).

Research indicates that DSJ training improves multicultural awareness for White trainees, but not for trainees of color (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2011). However, one qualitative study of 17 trainees of color reported that all benefited from a diversity course (Curtis-Boles & Bourg, 2010), noting that while these trainees often experienced pain and frustration, particularly in regards to confronting discriminatory beliefs about their racial/ethnic group and interacting with White trainees, they also experienced increased empowerment and agency. Benefits for trainees of color may vary by institution. For example, one study found that African American social work graduates from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) reported higher mean scores on a measure of diversity content areas compared with African American

students who attended Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs) before and after establishment of accreditation standards (Bowie, Hall, & Johnson, 2011). The authors suggested that the HBCUs did a better job integrating diversity and multiculturalism content than the TWIs, potentially because of having more African American faculty and appreciation for diversity and its infusion into various curricula.

DSJ theoretical and applied training models. There were 32 peer-reviewed sources that described DSJ training models. Although there was significant overlap across theoretical bases (e.g., critical race theory, social justice, and feminism), general training aims (e.g., awareness, identification of privilege, and empowerment), and specific training activities (e.g., readings, experiential activities, and group discussion), there was also significant variance. Models included the cultural context model (Hernandez, 2004), the cultural self-awareness assessment curriculum (Roysircar, 2004), two developmentally focused models (Lewis, 2010; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991), a practical skills model (Alberta & Wood, 2009), a psychological safety-based model (Buckley & Foldy, 2010), the relationship-centered advocacy training model (Goodman, Wilson, Helms, Greenstein, & Medzhitova, 2018), and the supportive-confrontational model for White trainees (Kiselica, 1998). Six articles presented examples of training models in practice. Four of these focused on clinical training experiences with diverse populations (Biever, Gómez, González, & Patrizio, 2011; Fondacaro & Harder, 2014; Kuo & Arcuri, 2014; Park-Taylor et al., 2009); one presented a mentorship model from the University of Missouri (Heppner, 2017); and one presented Boston College's social justice and diversity training curriculum (Goodman et al., 2004).

DSJ considerations in psychological practice.

Therapy. There were 32 sources focused on issues of DSJ in the context of therapy. These sources focused on multicultural counseling theory and competency, often oriented toward working with racial minority clients (44%) and racial minority clients without focus on multicultural counseling theories (25%). These studies included Tao, Owen, Pace, and Imel's (2015) meta-analysis of multicultural competency, which concluded that while competency is associated with both therapy process and outcome, the strongest relationship was between competency and therapy process. Four of these studies focused on White trainees' understanding of race in the context of therapy and how racial identity may impact minority clients. While White trainees are often aware of their Whiteness in that context, they often avoid or minimize associated conversations with clients and supervisors (Utsey, Gernat, & Hammar, 2005). Greater internal desire to be nondiscriminatory was associated with better understanding of racism (Gushue, Walker, & Brewster, 2017), but motivation to appear nonracist can lead trainees to choose optics over substantive antiracist action (Langrehr et al., 2016). Client-assessed level of therapist cultural humility is an important indicator of effective therapy with minority clients, and is associated with better working alliance and fewer therapist microaggressions (Hook, Davis, Owen, Worthington, & Utsey, 2013; Hook et al., 2016). Other work in this area focused on specific underrepresented groups (Santos, Goldstein, & Tracey, 2017), the relationship between multicultural therapy and iatrogenic therapy (Wendt, Gone, & Nagata, 2015),

and the relationship between multicultural therapy and common factors (Fischer, Jome, & Atkinson, 1998).

Assessment. The seven works on assessment focused largely on multicultural assessment strategies and providing new frameworks to improve accuracy of assessment for minority groups. Lonner (1985) reviews issues that arise when assessing members of minority groups, with particular attention to the bias inherent in common measures, while Krishnamurthy and colleagues (2004) identify the need for training in culturally specific measures that avoid these biases. Three articles from the same issue of *The Counseling Psychologist* (Constantine, 1998; Ridley, Hill, & Li, 1998; Ridley, Li, & Hill, 1998) focus on using the Multicultural Assessment Procedure to better integrate cultural factors into the assessment process, leading to more comprehensive and accurate interpretations and recommendations. Finally, two studies focused on culturally competent suicide risk assessment (Chu et al., 2017; Rogers & Russell, 2014).

Research. There were 16 peer-reviewed sources on psychological research and DSJ. These sources spanned four general topics: status of the field reviews (e.g., Delgado-Romero, Galván, Maschino, & Rowland, 2005); methodological approaches to study DSJ topics (e.g., Moradi et al., 2017); White researchers conducting multicultural or race-related research (e.g., Spanierman, Poteat, Whittaker, Schlosser, & Arévalo Avalos, 2017); and improving research mentorship for minority students (e.g., Jeste, Twamley, Cardenas, Lebowitz, & Reynolds, 2009). Regarding the latter, Jeste and colleagues (2009) note that the demographics of the academy do not reflect the general population, and that increasing the accessibility and culturally relevant training of mentors for minority students could facilitate those students' greater success in academia. Similarly, Evans and Cokley (2008) argue that creating diverse mentorship teams may help African American women in particular attain effective and productive research training experiences.

Supervision, mentorship, and teaching. The 25 articles on DSJ issues in the context of supervision, mentorship, and teaching largely focused on the impact of supervisors' and supervisees' racial identities on supervisory processes (62.5%). A special issue of *Training and Education in Professional Psychology* presented perspectives from a Black female supervisor, Asian American female supervisor, a Latina supervisor, and a Latino supervisor (Butler-Byrd, 2010; Lo, 2010; Lowe & Davis, 2010; Millán, 2010; Reynaga-Abiko, 2010). Racial minority supervisors matched with racial minority supervisees discuss race more often, with a positive result reported by supervisees about 50% of the time (Goode-Cross, 2011; Jernigan, Green, Helms, Perez-Gualdron, & Henze, 2010). Supervisees tend to benefit from culturally responsive supervision regardless of race, but both Black and White supervisors vary in their feedback style based on supervisee race, and White supervisees are more likely to receive culturally responsive supervision (Burkard et al., 2006, 2014). Being female, being a training director, and having more supervision experience was associated with better multicultural supervision competence among White supervisors (Gloria, Hird, & Tao, 2008). Other topics covered included group supervision processes (Kaduvettoor et al., 2009), feminist multicultural supervision (Arczynski, 2017), and multicultural teaching competency (Mena & Rogers, 2017).

Social justice advocacy. Seven articles focused on institution- and system-level social justice action, including support of social

movements like Black Lives Matter (Hargons et al., 2017) and recent women's rights movements (Miville, 2018). Articles tended to be focused on spurring greater focus toward social justice advocacy and integrating that role into typical expectations of psychologists (Kozan et al., 2018; Vera et al., 2003).

Summary

This scoping study resulted in only one peer-reviewed article focused on DSJ training at the postdoctoral level. Although there is a large body of literature on DSJ training for psychology trainees broadly, this literature does not clearly coalesce around a specific, evidence-based training model or framework that could inform postdoctoral training. Outcome studies indicate that trainees' knowledge improves, but results were mixed regarding attitudes, awareness, and behavior (Benuto et al., 2018). The effectiveness of training varies by institution and by trainee and supervisor identity. Our study suggests that DSJ training may be more beneficial for White trainees and more distressing for trainees of color (e.g., Burkard et al., 2006; Chao et al., 2011; Curtis-Boles & Bourg, 2010), congruent with theoretical arguments that the training process itself promotes disparities among trainees (e.g., Chung et al., 2018; Evans & Cokley, 2008; Spanierman & Smith, 2017).

Regarding modalities of training, although readings, lectures, and group discussions are most common, active engagement with diverse populations and application of diversity-related topics to one's personal and professional identity is essential for effective training (Caldwell & Vera, 2010). However, this kind of engagement is difficult for both trainees and trainers (Chung et al., 2018; Curtis-Boles & Bourg, 2010; Utsey et al., 2005), and there is evidence that White trainees tend to receive more active training (Burkard et al., 2006). However, trainees of color tend to discuss race more often and receive more support when they receive supervision from supervisors of color (Goode-Cross, 2011; Jernigan et al., 2010).

Students reported being satisfied with race/ethnicity- and gender-related training, but found that other equally important aspects of DSJ were less frequently addressed (Green et al., 2009). This report mirrored the results of the current scoping study, which found that most articles addressing a specific topic or population were focused on race/ethnicity. Race/ethnicity is an essential topic for DSJ training, and current literature indicates that the discipline has not yet solidified best practices for training in this area. Meanwhile, other topics are comparatively less assessed, indicating significant gaps and areas for improvement in DSJ training. For example, although there are a number of articles that emphasized the importance of social justice and system-level advocacy, training curricula that actively address social justice were rare.

Based on this scoping study, we came to six primary conclusions: (a) there is a dearth of literature about DSJ training at the postdoctoral level; (b) given the variability of existing literature, it is unclear which topics and skills a typical fellow will already have sufficient training in; (c) it is likely that prior training will be limited in range of topics addressed, types of pedagogical approaches, or both; (d) although engaging actively and deeply with DSJ issues is key for development, both trainees and trainers struggle with this; (e) minority trainees may have less beneficial and more distressing experiences in DSJ training, particularly if trainers are White; and (f) though social justice advocacy is a key

aspect of training for psychologists, it is underrepresented in current curricula and research. Therefore, assessment of past DSJ training experiences among incoming postdoctoral fellows is needed to better understand training needs and to inform development of an evidence-based postdoctoral level training model. Broad assessment is necessary given the current dearth of information about the typical experiences and knowledge sets incoming postdoctoral fellows already have. We developed a self-assessment of past DSJ training experiences to meet this need.

Study 2

The purpose of Study 2 was to develop and pilot an assessment of predoctoral DSJ training experiences among incoming postdoctoral psychology fellows. Using the results of the scoping study in Study 1, several areas of assessment were included: (a) interest in postdoctoral-level DSJ training, (b) exposure to a variety of DSJ training modalities, (c) exposure to specific DSJ content areas, (d) experiences in diversity training settings, and (e) views of social justice advocacy roles in professional psychology. Capturing these domains allows for identification of past exposure to diversity training topics and experiences, which may provide a foundation for social justice-focused postdoctoral training. The goal of the assessment was to characterize past DSJ training among *incoming* postdoctoral fellows from *diverse* training backgrounds.

This measure differs from multicultural competency assessment in two primary ways: (a) it captures a continuum from foundational, knowledge-based diversity training to action-based social justice training, rather than specific focus on multicultural competency within the context of clinical care; and (b) it captures exposure to specific DSJ training experiences, rather than perception of competency with regard to clinical work with minority populations. The specificity of the assessment allows for identification of individual and group-level gaps in training and, therefore, facilitates tailored and targeted postdoctoral training. The program under study routinely uses pre- or postself-assessment of multicultural competency using the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale, but this measure does not provide information on specific knowledge or level of training even while it remains an important outcome measure (Gamst et al., 2004). The complete assessment, the San Diego Diversity and Social Justice Training Self-Assessment (SD-DSJT), is available in online supplemental material 2.

Method

The postdoctoral program at the San Diego VA Healthcare System includes 13 1-year clinical and 9 first-year clinical-research postdoctoral fellows (22 total incoming fellows). Fellows were invited to complete the SD-DSJT during the first required meeting of a year-long diversity training seminar to aid program evaluation and planning for future meetings. Fellows could opt out without any consequences. Advanced fellows in the program with no evaluative role with first-year fellows (Emily B. H. Treichler and Jennifer N. Crawford) explained the purpose of the self-assessment and the voluntary nature of participation (including ability to skip any or all questions); the faculty facilitator of the diversity seminar (Autumn L. Backhaus) was purposely not present during this meeting. Identifying information was not collected

given the small sample and potential for identifying fellows based on their responses. All 16 postdoctoral fellows present at the meeting completed the pilot assessment in 20–30 min. Six fellows were not present at the meeting because of scheduling conflicts and variable start dates. Verbal feedback on the structure and content of the assessment was elicited after assessment completion.

The final assessment includes four sections and a total of 17 questions. The first section assesses views of postdoctoral DSJ training generally (Items 1–3), the second focuses on past training experiences (Items 4–9), the third on experiences in training settings (Items 10–16), and the fourth on social justice advocacy specifically (Item 17). Additional information regarding question format is included with the descriptions of responses that follow; see online supplemental material 2 for final version.

Interest in postdoctoral DSJ training. Based on feedback given to the diversity training director (Autumn L. Backhaus), past cohorts of postdoctoral fellows have expressed concern that postdoctoral training often repeats content from graduate and predoctoral internship training without increasing relevance to the current setting or training level. Given this, we included two questions related to past helpfulness and purpose of diversity training, as well as one question about current interest in postdoctoral diversity training (see online supplemental material 2). All fellows indicated that diversity training in graduate school was either somewhat or very helpful on a 4-point scale (1 = *very unhelpful* to 4 = *very helpful*; M = 3.56). The most commonly identified purposes of diversity training in graduate school were instrumental (e.g., filled accreditation requirement [100%] or graduation requirement [93.75%]) or related to clinical training (i.e., helped me become a better clinician [93.75%]). Also common were personal benefits (i.e., helped me in personal goals (e.g., ability to understand personal diversity issues [75%]; was interesting to me [81.25%]). Becom[ing] a better researcher (68.75%) and meeting other professional goals (e.g., becoming an advocate; 56.25%) were the least identified roles of graduate-level diversity training.

Current interest in postdoctoral diversity training was gauged with a yes or no question asking fellows if they would opt out of postdoctoral diversity training if possible, 13 of 15 (86.7%) responders said no. One participant did not respond to this question.

Past training experiences.

Training modalities. Benuto et al. (2018) identify the most commonly discussed modalities of diversity training in their review of graduate-level training research. These were included, along with others identified in the scoping study or from the authors' own past experiences, to create a broad range of training modality options. Participants indicated which of 11 training modalities (e.g., lecture, group discussion, supervision, service learning, etc.) they had experienced in graduate-level diversity training. All 16 fellows reported exposure to empirical and theoretical literature related to diversity, with lecture and group discussion being the second and third most common modalities (see Table 2). The least common modalities were journaling, role playing, and service learning. Fellows identified three additional modalities: department quality improvement projects, group projects, and advocacy or activism for oppressed groups.

Respondents were also asked to rank the modalities they had experienced from most to least helpful. One respondent did not complete this item. Table 2 provides a relative percentage of

Table 2
Training Experiences and Rankings of Helpfulness

Training modalities	Experienced (% of 16)	Relative % top ranked	Relative % low ranked
Reading literature	16 (100)	42.85%	35.7%
Group discussion	15 (93.75)	66.67%	20%
Lecture	14 (87.5)	30.77%	46.15%
Self-reflections	13 (81.25)	36.36%	18.18%
Supervision	13 (81.25)	58.33%	25%
Case scenarios	11 (68.75)	27.27%	27.27%
Cultural immersion	11 (68.75)	25%	50%
Engagement with diverse individuals	10 (62.5)	50%	20%
Role plays	6 (37.5)	n/a	n/a
Journaling	4 (25)	n/a	n/a
Service learning	2 (12.5)	n/a	n/a
Other	3 (18.75)	n/a	n/a

Note. Relative percentages for high and low rankings are only calculated for modalities experienced by at least 50% of participants to avoid overly inflated rankings.

top-rankings (i.e., ranked in the top three by a respondent) and low-rankings (i.e., ranked last by respondent, up to three items) for each modality experienced by at least 50% of participants. Among modalities that had been experienced by at least 50% of respondents the most frequently identified as helpful were group discussion and supervision, while lecture and cultural immersion were most frequently identified as unhelpful. Reading empirical/theoretical literature was the third most common helpful as well as the third least helpful modality, indicating a mixed response to the only modality experienced by all fellows.

Training content areas. To capture the broadest characterization of past training experiences possible, we identified 59 topics divided into two categories (and two questions): (a) dimensions of human identity and experience (27 items; e.g., race/ethnicity groups, gender, and religion) and (b) diversity-related concepts (32 items; e.g., racism, privilege, and acculturation). Respondents were asked to identify their relevant experience in relation to each topic, ranging from attending a lecture or completing a related assessment to providing related supervision, conducting related research, teaching a related course, and engaging in social justice activities (see online supplemental material 2 for all items). On average, fellows reported having some level of exposure to 43.56 of the 59 total topics (73.83%). However, there were some topics for which more than 30% ($n > 4$) of fellows did not report any training (see Table 3).

Participants were asked to identify three diversity-related areas in which they feel most and least confident in their current level of competency (see Table 4) using two short-answer questions. Confidence was operationalized as feeling comfortable addressing the area independently in clinical, research, consultation, supervision, and teaching contexts. Responses tended to parallel fellows' past training experiences; that is, they were more confident in content areas in which they reported higher levels of training. Fellows generally reported confidence addressing issues related to sexual orientation or gender minorities; veterans; women and sexism; race/ethnicity and racism; White privilege; and aging. Fellows reported least confidence addressing topics non-Christian religions; culture-specific assessment and culture informed case con-

Table 3
Training Content Areas With Lowest Exposure Among Fellows

Human identity and experience	Report no experience	Diversity concepts	Report no experience
Hinduism	12 (75%)	Participatory research	11 (68.75%)
Nontraditional relationships	10 (62.5%)	Internalized misogyny	9 (56.25%)
Buddhism	9 (56.25%)	Social justice theory	8 (50%)
Visual impairment	9 (56.25%)	Allyship	7 (43.75%)
Illiteracy	9 (56.25%)	Culture-informed case conceptualization	7 (43.75%)
Deaf/hard of hearing	7 (43.75%)	Professional advocacy	7 (43.75%)
Islam	6 (37.5%)	Power imbalance in mental health care	7 (43.75%)
Rural/frontier	6 (37.5%)	White guilt	6 (37.5%)
Non-English speakers	6 (37.5%)	Masculinity	6 (37.5%)
Judaism	5 (31.25%)	Intersectionality	6 (37.5%)
		Collectivism	5 (31.25%)
		Cultural formulation interview	5 (31.25%)
		Self-stigma	5 (31.25%)
		Cultural adaptation of EST	5 (31.25%)
		Culture-specific diagnoses	5 (31.25%)

Note. EST = evidence-supported treatment.

ceptualization; physical conditions including visual impairment; and concepts including intersectionality and social justice. Despite fellows' reported training experiences, some fellows reported least confidence with racism in general as well as with Native/Indigenous groups and immigrants and refugees in particular.

Experiences in diversity training settings. Based on the scoping review, we sought to characterize past levels of comfort during diversity training. Seven questions were used in this section with the goal to broadly assess past discomfort and reasons for such discomfort in diversity training settings. The first five questions were developed to maintain anonymity while still allowing fellows to identify as a member of a minority group. Fellows first reported their level of comfort engaging with diversity topics by discussing their own "knowledge and perceptions," using a 4-point scale (4 = *very comfortable* and 1 = *very uncomfortable*). Then using the same scale, reported their level of comfort sharing personal experiences in diversity-related discussions where they represent a minority group and in situations where they represent a majority group; they also reported their level of comfort sharing profes-

sional experiences in each of those contexts. Overall, fellows were somewhat comfortable engaging in diversity-related topics when discussing their own knowledge and perceptions ($M = 3.06$). On average, those identifying as representing a minority group ($n = 13$) reported a slightly higher level of comfort engaging in diversity-related discussions when sharing their professional experiences ($M = 3.0$) than when sharing their personal experiences ($M = 2.69$) in training settings. All respondents ($N = 16$) identified as representing a majority group in some training contexts and overall reported nearly equal levels of comfort using both professional ($M = 2.93$) and personal ($M = 2.87$) experiences to engage with diversity-related topics in those settings.

The sixth question in this section (Item 15) allowed respondents to check all reasons for feeling somewhat or very uncomfortable if they had endorsed feeling so in any of the previous five questions. The most common reasons endorsed for discomfort engaging in diversity-related discussions or training, regardless of minority or majority status in the setting were: not wanting to disclose personal information (37.5%), presence of power differential between respondent and others in the setting (31.25%), worry that others would judge the respondent (31.25%), and a belief that the respondent did not know enough about the topic (31.25%).

The final question in this section (Item 16) provided an opportunity to elaborate on causes of discomfort. Among these open-ended responses, several respondents expressed concerns about the "forced" or "superficial" nature of diversity related discussions in settings where trainees may feel unrepresented, invalidated, or "fearful of judgment." Some fellows noted that a lack of "visible ethnic diversity among postdocs and staff" and "agreed upon language and norms for discussion" create an environment in which they feel less comfortable engaging in the discussion. One fellow's comment illustrates both the desire for more depth in diversity training discussion, but also for a more explicit structure through which to engage in discussions effectively:

> In my professional experiences, diversity lectures and discussions have often stayed at a superficial level (given general suggestions of good practice like be considerate, ask about identities, without spe-

Table 4
Areas of Most and Least Confidence Among Fellows

Most confidence	n	Least confidence	n
Sexual orientation and gender minorities	6	Race and racism	3
Veterans	4	Non-Christian religions	3
Women's issues/sexism	3	Culture/diversity and assessment	3
White privilege	3	Native/indigenous	3
Cognitive impairment	3	Religion	2
Aging/older adults	2	Internalized misogyny	2
Racism	2	Social justice	2
Race/ethnicity	2	Acculturation	2
African Americans	2	Rural/frontier	2
Stigma	2	Intersectionality	2
Privilege	2	Adapting ESTs	2
Socioeconomic status	2		
Adapting ESTs	2		

Note. EST = evidence-supported treatment.

cifics supported by evidence of how to engage with these topics). Discussions have been conflicted: grad students fearful of judgment or impact on career, often stay superficial; yet, even when folks said openly racist/sexist/etc. things, they were not called out on it. And minorities in the room felt targeted, not supported within the field.

Social justice advocacy. The final item of the SD-DSJT asked respondents how they believe social justice advocacy will fit into their professional roles following fellowship. Respondents were provided with a definition of social justice and examples of social justice advocacy in the field of psychology and given space to respond to the open-ended question (see online supplemental material 2). Nine (56.25%) respondents provided brief answers. The following key points were identified: (a) recognizing social justice as important; (b) including social justice advocacy in: supervision, consultation, clinical work, and research; and (c) using program development and social justice advocacy to positively impact institutions. Additionally, the following comment illustrates the need for social justice advocacy training at the postdoctoral level:

> Up until this point I have done this [social justice advocacy] in my personal life, but I would like to make this more central in my professional identity. I am not 100% where to start.

Respondent feedback on pilot assessment. Participants expressed an overall positive response to completing the pilot assessment; several noted it helped them identify areas of strength and weakness in their past training. Gaps in training identified by respondents during discussion included: non-Christian religions especially Buddhism and Hinduism; sensory impairments such as deafness and visual impairment; and issues around masculinity, misogyny, and White privilege. In addition, fellows reported that thinking about levels of training (e.g., attending a lecture vs. considering issues in the course of a clinical case) helped clarify remaining training needs. Based on written responses to the pilot assessment, transphobia and Islamophobia was added to the list of diversity-related topics, bringing the total number to 61. Levels of training were adjusted to include readings and to combine lectures with semester-long courses, because fellows reported often completing courses that covered a range of DSJ topics rather that devoting a semester to a single DSJ topic.

Discussion

We conducted two interrelated studies to characterize DSJ training needs at the postdoctoral level to inform recommendations for postdoctoral training programs. The findings from each study were broadly congruent with each other, indicating that while incoming fellows have a solid foundation in DSJ topics, individual training experiences vary; some areas of study are consistently underrepresented; and application of these training experiences on professional identity and systemic advocacy activities is often limited.

The scoping study revealed a dearth of research related to DSJ training at the postdoctoral level: only one article directly addressed this topic (Kauth et al., 2016). This study found that trainees were satisfied with the VA's Interprofessional LGBT Health fellowship, but it did not report DSJ training-related outcomes. At the graduate level, DSJ training improves knowledge among trainees, but findings regarding improvements in attitude, awareness, and skill are inconsistent (Benuto et al., 2018). The incoming fellows who completed the SD-DSJT reported that their past DSJ training was helpful, but expressed concern that postdoctoral training may be redundant with graduate-level training rather than providing breadth in terms of topics or depth in terms of professional application. This may reflect decreased need for training focused on foundational knowledge about specific minority groups at the postdoctoral level, while significant training needs in integrating past diversity training into professional identity and practice remain. Despite this, fellows in our study had significant buy-in to DSJ training: only 13.3% would opt out of postdoctoral training if given the option.

At the graduate level, there is a range of valuable literature regarding training methods that could inform postdoctoral DSJ training. There are commonalities in the theoretical bases, training aims, and specific training activities of the models presented in the literature, but a consensus in favor of a specific training model has not been reached, likely contributing to the variability of predoctoral DSJ training. Active engagement through dialogue, application to personal and professional identity, and learning from past experiences are highly impactful training strategies, but both trainees and trainers find these approaches more difficult and distressing. Congruently, incoming fellows in our study ranked group discussion, supervision, and reviewing diversity-related literature as the most helpful training modalities, while lecture and cultural immersion were ranked least helpful. However, the most common forms of training were literature, lecture, and group discussion. Training approaches, therefore, appear to be headed in the right direction, but training model identification along with honing of specific training strategies is needed.

Regarding specific DSJ topics, race and ethnicity received the most attention in the training literature. Similarly, 100% of incoming fellow respondents reported learning about race/ethnicity and gender in graduate school. Despite this, race and racism were among the topics fellows were least confident about. A minority of respondents received training in non-Christian religions, internalized misogyny, participatory research, visual impairments, illiteracy, and nontraditional relationships. These findings indicate that larger and more highly researched minority groups are represented most in DSJ training, and suggest that postdoctoral training may be an appropriate time to provide training on smaller or more specialized groups.

DSJ training may benefit White trainees more than trainees of color, and trainees of color may experience more distress during DSJ training (e.g., Burkard et al., 2006; Chao et al., 2011). Prioritizing recruitment, training, and support for supervisors or mentors of color may mitigate these issues. Our study indicates that students who represent a minority or nondominant group in a specific training context (e.g., a Black trainee during discussion of microaggressions) report more comfort engaging in DSJ discussions in those contexts by sharing professional experiences rather than personal experiences. Members representing majority groups in certain training contexts (e.g., a heterosexual trainee during a discussion about homophobia) expressed equal comfort in the sharing of personal and professional experiences. These differences in comfort may impact disclosure decisions and trainee ability to effectively learn and may inform facilitators' methods of engaging fellows in discussion.

Respondents were asked how they planned to integrate social justice advocacy into their professional roles following fellowship. Six respondents left this question blank (37.5%), one stated "un-

clear at this time" in response. Fellows who commented showed an understanding of social justice and its importance, and outlined specific actions they planned to take to integrate social justice into their careers. These actions focused primarily on provision and supervision of culturally competent therapy to diverse groups. One fellow commented that they were invested in social justice but unsure how to integrate it into their practice, which was congruent with fellows' feedback on the pilot assessment. This echoed the literature identified in the scoping study, which rarely focused on social justice and the integration of social justice principles into psychological practice.

Recommendations

Based on our findings, we offer five recommendations to facilitate progression of effective DSJ training at the postdoctoral level.

1. Use the SD-DSJT and other methods to assess past DSJ training experiences and current needs among incoming postdoctoral fellows. The variability in training experiences during graduate school, including training models and outcomes in the current literature, creates difficulties when developing a cohesive postdoctoral DSJ training curriculum. Collecting data across and within training programs will facilitate more appropriate and effective postdoctoral DSJ training. The SD-DSJT can be used by fellowship programs to assess the DSJ training needs of individual fellows, cohorts, and training programs. The SD-DSJT was designed to capture a broad range of past training experiences to inform training; it is not an appropriate tool for determining cultural competency among postdoctoral fellows. Use of the SD-DSJT should not replace measures of multicultural competency but rather complement those measures. Completion of the assessment is an initial step and should be followed by individual and/or group discussions that will inform individual training plans and program-level training decisions. Training programs may choose to add or remove items to reflect priorities in training. Beyond individual training programs, the SD-DSJT can be used in research to identify trends in training gaps among incoming postdoctoral fellows; increase understanding about majority or minority membership and its impact on training experiences; and inform development of DSJ training curricula, particularly those that prioritize action-based social justice experiences.

2. Conduct sufficient research to arrive at a consensus training model for postdoctoral DSJ training. At present, there is no consensus training model at the graduate or postdoctoral level for DSJ training. Using empirical means to determine such a model will support evidence-based and consistent training across fellows and training programs. The scoping study identified a number of existing models that could be applied to fellowship training. These models shared a number of elements, including using existing and empirically supported theories and applying empirically supported pedagogical techniques. We anticipate that one or more of these models may be viable for fellowship training, but further evaluation is needed.

3. Use postdoctoral DSJ training to integrate foundational knowledge into everyday professional practice. Postdoctoral fellowship is the last opportunity for most psychologists to receive sustained structured training, making it an excellent time to solidify professional identity development. DSJ should be a key part of professional identity, but incoming fellows are often unclear about

social justice concepts or about methods to incorporate DSJ into their careers beyond culturally competent therapy practice. Postdoctoral training curricula could be improved by emphasizing social justice concepts and the connection between previously obtained diversity training and systemic elements of psychological practice. Offering opportunities to actively engage in advocacy or other systemic DSJ processes during fellowship may be an effective approach. Use of modeling by training faculty may solidify these concepts and help trainees translate DSJ theory into daily practice (Kozan et al., 2018; Vera et al., 2003).

4. Foster comfort with DSJ dialogues through cultivation of safe brave spaces. Cultivating safe brave spaces is needed to foster active and thoughtful engagement in DSJ topics, a key DSJ training component. Creating a foundation of cohesion and trust through student-developed guidelines and normalization of emotional responses is an essential aspect of this goal (Chung et al., 2018). Pilot assessment respondents emphasized the need to set clear, functional guidelines and hold all students accountable to them. Chung and colleagues (2018) recommended that faculty immediately identify and examine resistant, rude, or avoidant behavior by students using an empathetic, educational, and process-focused approach. Trainers or other leaders during DSJ training should work to balance expectations of effort and disclosure across students, and examine their own implicit expectations that minority students should act as content experts or disclose personal experiences. However, given that our respondents reported discomfort discussing DSJ in some contexts because of a power differential between themselves and a supervisor, implementing peer-run discussions, or discussions led by a trainer without direct influence over fellows' training or evaluations may help facilitate feelings of safety. Training instructors could also help diffuse the power differential by sharing their own personal and professional experiences with diversity. Furthermore, trainees of color often experience more distress when DSJ trainers are White, which may contribute to poorer training outcomes among these trainees. Increasing representation of among DSJ trainers may improve comfort while also actualizing the principles of DSJ.

5. Decrease use of lecture-based training approaches in favor of active clinical and research experiences, group-based diversity dialogues, and journal clubs. Lecture-based training approaches are among both the least effective and the most common training approaches. Training programs would benefit from reducing lectures and increasing more active formats including DSJ-focused dialogues and other discussion formats, integration of training into clinical, research, supervision, and advocacy activities, and journal clubs. Because reading empirical or theoretical literature was rated among the most helpful formats by half of the respondents, journal clubs may offer an effective approach. This type of modality (i.e., combining empirical literature with discussion) may help create safe brave spaces by creating boundaries around topics of discussion while providing a common language and empirical background for discussion.

Limitations

A systematic review would be a more rigorous approach to reviewing this topic. We were unable to do this given how little literature exists on this topic thus far; our review included 266 items, but only one peer-reviewed article directly pertained to our

research topic. Our decision to complete a scoping study identified that dearth of literature and informed the development of an assessment based on related literature and our own experiences. These topics are unlikely to be exhaustive, and future uses of the assessment may find that supplemental topics or questions are needed. The resulting assessment, the SD-DSJT, aimed to be inclusive to cover topics that may not receive adequate coverage in DSJ training programs, rather than focusing solely on more common topics. Completion time was reasonable, at 20–30 min, but training programs might elect to shorten the assessment if needed. As with any pilot study, replication and statistical analysis is needed to ensure its generalizability and reliability. The assessment was piloted on a small postdoctoral cohort. Additional research utilizing a larger and more diverse sample of postdoctoral fellows is needed.

Implications

As DSJ is a core competency for psychologists, it is vitally important to provide relevant and evidence-based training at the postdoctoral level. To date, our study is one of two that directly addresses DSJ training needs at the postdoctoral level. Our study has immediate implications for both research and practice. More research on postdoctoral DSJ training is needed to expand understanding of training needs and effective training strategies. Use of the self-assessment developed during this study can aid this cause. Psychologists involved in postdoctoral training should consider our training recommendations as they develop and refine current DSJ training. Postdoctoral training is an excellent time to translate knowledge and skills into core aspects of professional identity and practice. By focusing on active, engaged, and systemic methods of learning and incorporating DSJ into psychological identity and practice, fellows will be equipped to actualize DSJ training as they move into independence.

References

Alberta, A. J., & Wood, A. H. (2009). A practical skills model for effectively engaging clients in multicultural settings. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37,* 564–579. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001100000 8326231

American Psychological Association. (1997). *Diversity and accreditation.* Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/brochures/accreditation.aspx

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Multicultural guidelines: An ecological approach to context, identity, and intersectionality.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines.pdf

Arczynski, A. V. (2017). Multicultural social justice group psychotherapy training: Curriculum development and pilot. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 11,* 227–234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000161

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8,* 19–32. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616

Benuto, L. T., Casas, J., & O'Donohue, W. T. (2018). Training culturally competent psychologists: A systematic review of the training outcome literature. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 12,* 125–134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000190

Biever, J. L., Gómez, J. P., González, C. G., & Patrizio, N. (2011). Psychological services to Spanish-speaking populations: A model curriculum for training competent professionals. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 5,* 81–87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023535

Bowie, S. L., Hall, J. C., & Johnson, O. J. (2011). Integrating diversity into graduate social work education: A 30-year retrospective view by MSW-level African American social workers. *Journal of Black Studies, 42,* 1080–1105. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021934711401259

Brady-Amoon, P. (2011). Humanism, feminism, and multiculturalism: Essential elements of social justice in counseling, education, and advocacy. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 50,* 135–148. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1939.2011.tb00113.x

Buckley, T. R., & Foldy, E. G. (2010). A pedagogical model for increasing race-related multicultural counseling competency. *The Counseling Psychologist, 38,* 691–713. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000009360917

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

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., Clarke, R. D., Phelps, D. L., & Inman, A. G. (2014). Supervisors' Experiences of Providing Difficult Feedback in Cross-Ethnic/Racial Supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 42,* 314–344. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000012461157

Butler-Byrd, N. M. (2010). An African American supervisor's reflections on multicultural supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 11–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018351

Caldwell, J. C., & Vera, E. M. (2010). Critical incidents in counseling psychology professionals' and trainees' social justice orientation development. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 163–176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019093

Chao, R. C-L., Wei, M., Good, G. E., & Flores, L. Y. (2011). Race/ethnicity, color-blind racial attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence: The moderating effects of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58,* 72–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022091

Chu, J. P., Poon, G., Kwok, K. K., Leino, A. E., Goldblum, P., & Bongar, B. (2017). An assessment of training in and practice of culturally competent suicide assessment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 11,* 69–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000147

Chung, R. C-Y., & Bemak, F. (2013). Use of ethnographic fiction in social justice graduate counselor training. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 52,* 56–69. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00028.x

Chung, R. C-Y., Bemak, F., Talleyrand, R. M., & Williams, J. M. (2018). Challenges in promoting race dialogues in psychology training: Race and gender perspectives. *The Counseling Psychologist, 46,* 213–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000018758262

Constantine, M. G. (1998). Developing competence in multicultural assessment: Implications for counseling psychology training and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 922–929. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000098266003

Curtis-Boles, H., & Bourg, E. (2010). Experiences of students of color in a graduate-level diversity course. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 204–212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017985

Delgado-Romero, E. A., Galván, N., Maschino, P., & Rowland, M. (2005). Race and ethnicity in empirical counseling and counseling psychology research: A 10-year review. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33,* 419–448. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000004268637

Evans, G. L., & Cokley, K. O. (2008). African American women and the academy: Using career mentoring to increase research productivity. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 2,* 50–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1931-3918.2.1.50

Fischer, A. R., Jome, L. M., & Atkinson, D. R. (1998). Back to the future of multicultural psychotherapy with a common factors approach. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 602–606. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000098264004

Fondacaro, K. M., & Harder, V. S. (2014). Connecting cultures: A training model promoting evidence-based psychological services for refugees.

Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 8, 320–327. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000071

Gamst, G., Dana, R. H., Der-Karabetian, A., Aragon, M., Arellano, L., Morrow, G., & Martenson, L. (2004). Cultural competency revised: The California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling & Development, 37,* 163–183. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2004.11909758

Gloria, A. M., Hird, J. S., & Tao, K. W. (2008). Self-reported multicultural supervision competence of White predoctoral intern supervisors. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 2,* 129–136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1931-3918.2.3.129

Goode-Cross, D. T. (2011). "Those who learn have a responsibility to teach": Black therapists' experiences supervising Black therapist trainees. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 5,* 73–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023187

Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural principles in action. *The Counseling Psychologist, 32,* 793–836. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000004268802

Goodman, L. A., Wilson, J. M., Helms, J. E., Greenstein, N., & Medzhitova, J. (2018). Becoming an advocate: Processes and outcomes of a relationship-centered advocacy training model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 46,* 122–153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000018757168

Green, D., Callands, T. A., Radcliffe, A. M., Luebbe, A. M., & Klonoff, E. A. (2009). Clinical psychology students' perceptions of diversity training: A study of exposure and satisfaction. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 65,* 1056–1070. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20605

Gushue, G. V., Walker, A. D., & Brewster, M. E. (2017). Motivation and color-blind racial attitudes among White psychology trainees. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 11,* 78–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000146

Hargons, C., Mosley, D., Falconer, J., Faloughi, R., Singh, A., Stevens-Watkins, D., & Cokley, K. (2017). Black lives matter: A call to action for counseling psychology leaders. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45,* 873–901. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000017733048

Heppner, P. P. (2017). Creating mentoring opportunities to promote cultural competencies and social justice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45,* 137–157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000016688781

Heppner, P. P., & Wang, K. T. (2014). A cross-cultural immersion program: Promoting students' cultural journeys. *The Counseling Psychologist, 42,* 1159–1187. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000014548899

Hernandez, P. (2004). The cultural context model in supervision: An illustration. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 15,* 1–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J086v15n04_01

Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60,* 353–366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032595

Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Davis, D. E., DeBlaere, C., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Utsey, S. O. (2016). Cultural humility and racial microaggressions in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 63,* 269–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000114

Jernigan, M. M., Green, C. E., Helms, J. E., Perez-Gualdron, L., & Henze, K. (2010). An examination of people of color supervision dyads: Racial identity matters as much as race. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 62–73. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018110

Jeste, D. V., Twamley, E. W., Cardenas, V., Lebowitz, B., & Reynolds, C. F., III. (2009). A call for training the trainers: Focus on mentoring to enhance diversity in mental health research. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(Suppl. 1), S31–S37. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.154633

Kaduvettoor, A., O'Shaughnessy, T., Mori, Y., Beverly, C., III, Weatherford, R. D., & Ladany, N. (2009). Helpful and hindering multicultural events in group supervision: Climate and multicultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37,* 786–820. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000009333984

Kauth, M. R., Shipherd, J. C., Barrera, T. L., Ortigo, K., & Jones, K. R. (2016). Trainees' perceptions of the Veterans Health Administration interprofessional psychology fellowships in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender health. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 10,* 165–170. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000123

Kiselica, M. S. (1998). Preparing Anglos for the challenges and joys of multiculturalism. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 5–21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000098261001

Kozan, S., & Blustein, D. L. (2018). Implementing social change: A qualitative analysis of counseling psychologists' engagement in advocacy. *The Counseling Psychologist, 46,* 154–189. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000018756882

Krishnamurthy, R., VandeCreek, L., Kaslow, N. J., Tazeau, Y. N., Miville, M. L., Kerns, R., . . . Benton, S. A. (2004). Achieving competency in psychological assessment: Directions for education and training. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60,* 725–739. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20010

Kuo, B. C. H., & Arcuri, A. (2014). Multicultural therapy practicum involving refugees: Description and illustration of a training model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 42,* 1021–1052. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000013491610

Langrehr, K. J., & Blackmon, S. M. (2016). The impact of trainees' interracial anxiety on White privilege remorse: Motivation to control bias as a moderator. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 10,* 157–164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000118

Lewis, B. L. (2010). Social justice in practicum training: Competencies and developmental implications. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 145–152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017383

Lo, H. (2010). My racial identity development and supervision: A self-reflection. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 26–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017856

Lonner, W. J. (1985). Issues in testing and assessment in cross-cultural counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13,* 599–614. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000085134004

Lowe, S. M., & Davis, C. (2010). Sharing wisdom: Ethnic minority supervisor perspectives. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 1–2. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018560

Mays, N., Roberts, E., & Popay, J. (2001). Synthesising research evidence. In N. Fulop, P. Allen, A. Clarke, & N. Black (Eds.), *Methods for studying the delivery and organisation of health services.* London: Routledge.

Mena, J. A., & Rogers, M. R. (2017). Factors associated with multicultural teaching competence: Social justice orientation and multicultural environment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 11,* 61–68. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tep0000143

Millán, F. (2010). On supervision: Reflections of a Latino psychologist. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 7–10. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016977

Miville, M. L. (2018). No rest for the nasty: Mentoring as mobilizing for change and advocacy. *The Counseling Psychologist, 46,* 100–115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000018754323

Moradi, B., & Grzanka, P. R. (2017). Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64,* 500–513. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000203

Park-Taylor, J., Kim, G. S., Budianto, L., Pfeifer, G., Laidlaw, P., Sakurai, M., & Pfeifer, J. (2009). Toward reflective practice: A multicultural competence training model from a community mental health center. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 88–95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013828

Pieterse, A. L., Evans, S. A., Risner-Butner, A., Collins, N. M., & Mason, L. B. (2009). Multicultural competence and social justice training in counseling psychology and counselor education: A review and analysis of a sample of multicultural course syllabi. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37,* 93–115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000008319986

Reynaga-Abiko, G. (2010). Opportunity amidst challenge: Reflections of a Latina supervisor. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,* 19–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017052

Ridley, C. R., Hill, C. L., & Li, L. C. (1998). Revisiting and refining the multicultural assessment procedure. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 939–947. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000098266005

Ridley, C. R., Li, L. C., & Hill, C. L. (1998). Multicultural assessment: Reexamination, reconceptualization, and practical application. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 827–910. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000098266001

Rogers, J. R., & Russell, E. J. (2014). A framework for bridging cultural barriers in suicide risk assessment: The role of compatibility heuristics. *The Counseling Psychologist, 42,* 55–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000012471823

Roysircar, G. (2004). Cultural self-awareness assessment: Practice examples from psychology training. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 35,* 658–666. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.35.6.658

Sabnani, H. B., Ponterotto, J. G., & Borodovsky, L. G. (1991). White racial identity development and cross-cultural counselor training: A stage model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19,* 76–102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000091191007

Sammons, C. C., & Speight, S. L. (2008). A qualitative investigation of graduate-student changes associated With multicultural counseling courses. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36,* 814–838. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316036

Santos, C. E., Goldstein, A. L., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2017). Development and evaluation of the Gender Expression Attitudes Towards Transgender Clients Scale. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45,* 353–386. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000017702966

Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Whittaker, V. A., Schlosser, L. Z., & Arévalo Avalos, M. R. (2017). Allies for life? Lessons from White scholars of multicultural psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45,* 618–650. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000017719459

Spanierman, L. B., & Smith, L. (2017). Roles and responsibilities of White allies: Implications for research, teaching, and practice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45,* 606–617. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000017717712

Tao, K. W., Owen, J., Pace, B. T., & Imel, Z. E. (2015). A meta-analysis of multicultural competencies and psychotherapy process and outcome. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 62,* 337–350. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000086

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000004269058

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 253–272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031003001

Wendt, D. C., Gone, J. P., & Nagata, D. K. (2015). Potentially harmful therapy and multicultural counseling: Extending the conversation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 43,* 393–403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000015576801