

**STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF MULTICULTURAL TRAINING & PROGRAM CLIMATE IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**

**Samantha J. Gregus, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>**, Kimberly T. Stevens, Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>, Nicholas P. Seivert, Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>, Raymond P. Tucker, Ph.D.<sup>4</sup>, & Jennifer L. Callahan, Ph.D.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wichita State University, <sup>2</sup>Institute of Living/Anxiety Disorders Center, <sup>3</sup>Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, <sup>4</sup>Louisiana State University, <sup>5</sup>University of North Texas

**INTRODUCTION**

Clinical psychology graduate students have reported dissatisfaction with the quality of their diversity training (Green et al., 2009). Given recent requirements to integrate diversity into graduate psychology education (e.g., APA 2018 SoA), the goal of the current study was to gather an updated assessment of student perceptions' of diversity training and climate.

**METHOD**

Participants were 397 students from clinical psychology graduate programs in the U.S. The majority identified as female (84.1%), heterosexual (83.9%), racially White (81.4%), and non-Hispanic (90.2%). Participants completed the Multicultural Environmental Inventory-Revised (MEI-R; Pope-Davis et al., 2000) assessing satisfaction with multicultural training in curriculum/supervision, climate and comfort, honesty in recruitment, and research.

**DISCUSSION**

Findings are consistent with previous literature indicating Black students report lower satisfaction with their training programs (Ellis, 2001) and are underrepresented in clinical psychology doctoral programs (Callahan et al., 2018). Data indicate the potential importance of visible and active diversity committees. Programs should continue examining differences with intersectionality and adopt climate surveys to understand how to best support their graduate students.

Students' perceptions of multicultural training and program climate were less favorable among respondents who identified as Black, bisexual, and who endorsed membership in 2+ underrepresented or marginalized groups. Perceptions were more favorable among students from programs with diversity committees.



**RESULTS**

Table 1. MEI-R Scores by Participants with and without a Diversity Committee (DC)

	DC (n=234)	No DC (n=161)	t	H's g
MEI-R total	98.19 (19.53)	89.70 (17.83)	4.40***	.45

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 2. MEI-R Scores by Students who Identified as White, Black, Asian, and Multi-Racial

	White (n=306)	Black (n=24)	Asian (n=25)	Multi-racial (n=21)
MEI-R Total <sup>abc</sup>	96.87 (18.75)	72.67 (17.06)	93.32 (15.48)	96.48 (17.36)

<sup>a</sup> Black compared with non-Hispanic White, p<.05,

<sup>b</sup> Black compared with Asian, p<.05,

<sup>c</sup> Black compared with Multiracial, p<.05

Table 3. MEI-R Scores by Students who Endorsed Membership in 2+ Underrepresented or Marginalized (UR/M) Groups

	UR/M (n=167)	No UR/M (n=230)	t	H's g
MEI-R total	90.22 (19.06)	97.88 (18.91)	3.97***	.40

\*\*\*p<.001

Table 4. MEI-Scores by Sexual Orientation

	Heterosexual (n=306)	Gay/Lesbian (n=24)	Bisexual (n=25)
MEI-R Total <sup>a</sup>	95.07 (19.05)	101.14 (16.01)	87.30 (20.54)

<sup>a</sup>Gay/Lesbian compared to Bisexual, p<.05