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Cultural competence is imperative for ethical and effective practice in applied sport psychology. Nevertheless, research assessing the cultural competence of sport psychology practitioners (SPPs) is scarce. The purpose of the current study was to explore the cultural awareness, beliefs, and behaviors of SPPs. A total of 193 SPPs, both students and professionals, completed a survey on the influence of their cultural identities on their work and their beliefs and behaviors about working with diverse populations. Participants stated that they were generally unaware of how their cultural identities could influence their work. Moreover, SPPs reported they rarely work with diverse populations without multicultural training and that they believed working with diverse populations without proper training would be somewhat unethical. This study sheds light on the areas of improvement for cultural competence. It appears that awareness of one’s identities needs to be further addressed to develop culturally competent professionals.
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Sport is a diverse arena filled with athletes and helping professionals from diverse backgrounds (Hanrahan, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan 2009). Athletes, coaches, and sport-related staff – including sport psychology professionals (SPPs) – are pursuing transnational careers (Stambulova & Ryba, 2013; Vosloo & Quartiroli, 2014). With the globalization of sport psychology as well as the growing numbers of racial/ethnic minorities in sport (Parham,
2009), the need for SPPs to understand cultural differences and similarities among diverse groups seems imperative.

Despite popular belief that sport is a meritocratic space where “if you can play, you can play” (http://www.youcanplayproject.org/), sport is a microcosm of society where social issues such as racism and sexism manifest themselves (Ryba, Schinke, & Tenenbaum, 2010). For example, researchers have found that athletes of color often struggle with institutional biases and are often expected to assimilate to white values and worldviews (e.g., Bosse, 2007; Brown, Brown, Jackson, Sellers, & Manuel, 2003; Melendez, 2008). Some researchers have also found that discriminatory comments about one’s identities (e.g., race, gender) have been normalized as “trash talk” and considered a part of the game within sporting contexts (Kniffin & Palacio, 2018; McGannon, Schinke, Ge, & Blodgett, 2018; Rainey, 2012; Rainey & Granito, 2010). Furthermore, researchers have revealed that even mental health providers hold personal biases and perpetuate institutional biases that harm, rather than help, those whom they aim to serve (Hook et al., 2016; Owen, Tao, Imel, Wampold, & Rodolfa., 2014; Robinson, 2012). As helping professionals, it is important that SPPs develop cultural competence to address personal and institutional biases and competently meet the unique needs of clients from diverse backgrounds. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine SPP’s awareness, beliefs, and behaviors regarding cultural competence.

What is Cultural Competence?

The International Society of Sport Psychology (ISSP) published a position stand on cultural competence in 2013 outlining three domains in which practitioners should develop competencies. The identified cultural skills are: “(a) cultural awareness and reflexivity, (b) culturally competent communication, and (c) culturally competent interventions” (Ryba, Stambulova, Si, & Schinke, 2013, p. 13). For cultural awareness and reflexivity, practitioners need to reflect on the cultural factors that influence one’s sport psychology practice such as the cultural backgrounds of their clients or the cultural background and assumptions associated with their own personal identities. With cultural awareness and reflexivity “about what, how, and why of what they do with their clients on the basis of each person’s cultural background” (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 13), practitioners are better equipped to engage in culturally competent communication. Because differences in cultural expectations or norms may hinder communication, cultural communication requires
SPPs to work collaboratively with their clients to develop “meaningful dialogue” (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 13) and sharable knowledge. Rather than taking an expert approach, SPPs are encouraged to take a collaborative approach to explore client’s perspectives and “develop a shared ‘cultural code’ with specific cultural elements and regulations relevant to the local setting” (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 13). SPPs may even invite clients to bring a community representative with them to initial sessions if that could facilitate effective cultural communication. Cultural awareness, reflexivity, and communication also inform culturally competent interventions. Ryba and colleagues (2013) described culturally competent interventions as: “(a) inseparable from recognizing the client and the self as cultural beings, (b) free from stereotyping clients based on their belonging to particular sociocultural groups, (c) taking an idiosyncratic approach to the client, and (d) standing for social justice” (p. 14). These three areas serve as the foundational cultural skills necessary for a more localized and culturally competent sport psychology practice.

The need for cultural competence is incorporated into the ethics codes of numerous sport psychology-related professional organizations around the world (e.g., Association for Applied Sport Psychology, British Psychological Society, Chinese Psychological Society, European Federation of Sport Psychology, International Society of Sport Psychology). For example, the Association for Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) Ethics Code states that members must be aware of differences related to social identities, develop skills to work with “certain populations,” and try to reduce bias (AASP, 2011). Ethical Standard three (a) also states that “AASP members working with specific populations have the responsibility to develop the necessary skills to be competent with these populations or they make appropriate referrals” (AASP, 2011). The British Psychological Society (BPS) Ethics Code states that members should respect differences and avoid prejudice and unfair practices (BPS, 2009). The Chinese Psychological Society (CPS) Code of Ethics states that members should not discriminate based on social identities and “take reasonable precaution to prevent inappropriate conducts due to their own potential biases or the limitations of their competencies and the techniques they use” (CPS, 2007, p. 1). The European Federation of Sport Psychology (FEPSAC) also states within their position stand that members “should be sensitive to the sub/cultural norms in which they practice or research” (FEPSAC, 2011, p. 3) and avoid bias. These are just a few examples of how the importance of being culturally competent is embedded within the ethics codes and position stands of SPP related organizations across many cultures and regions of the world.
Awareness of Cultural Identities

Although cultural competence is multifaceted, cultural awareness and reflexivity are foundational to developing cultural competence. Sue and Sue (2015) described practitioner “awareness of one’s own assumptions, values, and biases” (p. 56) as the first step toward the development of cultural competence. This means helping professionals must recognize that their lens is a cultured one and that every encounter, even with those who possess similar cultural backgrounds, is a multicultural encounter (Hanrahan, 2010). One area that appears to have been relatively neglected in discussions of cultural awareness in sport psychology, however, refers to how our personal awareness of our own cultural identities such as race or gender, consciously or sub-consciously, shape and influence our work and experience (Gill & Kamphoff, 2010).

There are two primary reasons why cultural identities can influence one’s sport psychology work. First, a practitioner’s cultural identities and background can influence how they view others. Second, the cultural identities and backgrounds of others can influence how they view practitioners. To address the first point, Schinke and Moore (2011) stated:

Cultural identity is part of how the practitioner of sport psychology constitutes her/himself; it can work as a form of self-interest, it can bias one’s pedagogical approach, and for certain, if left unacknowledged, it can become a potential limitation in the scope of one’s craft. (p. 290)

For example, mainstream sport psychology theories and practices are based on Eurocentric assumptions and do not work for all populations (Ryba et al., 2010; Schinke & Moore, 2011). In fact, cultural sport psychology (CSP) researchers have found that culture can influence all aspects of sport psychology from theory to expectations for appropriate attire or body language to what constitutes a valid form of emotional expression (Hanrahan, 2010; Joy, Kuan, & Tenenbaum, 2016). However, if SPPs do not recognize themselves as cultural beings, they may also mistake their approaches as universal rather than culturally bound, which could lead SPPs to take a culturally-blind and one-size-fits-all approach to sport psychology.

Despite the growth in CSP literature, research examining practitioner cultural identities and the effects of identities on one’s practice have been limited. In one of the few articles on practitioner identities, Schinke, Fisher, Kamphoff, Gould, and Oglesby (2015) reflected on the ways their own cultural identities and backgrounds influenced their sport psychology practice. In his reflection, Schinke noticed how the shift in the socioeconomic status of his client influenced their relationship, which could have led Schinke to feel
as if he had to assert more power over the client to regain feelings of power and authority. Oglesby, recognized how her position as a cultural outsider who did not speak the language of her clients required her to renegotiate her position as the lead consultant and be more strategic and collaborative with her co-consultants, who were cultural insiders. If these SPPs had been unaware that their approach was from a particular cultural vantage point, they would not have tailored their approaches to best suit their clients.

Although research on cultural identities in SPP is limited, research in SPP-related fields indicate that a lack of cultural awareness of one’s identities could also lead practitioners to, unknowingly, perpetuate discriminatory acts towards their clients. Researchers examining implicit bias suggest that counselors are not immune from holding subconscious biases against traditionally marginalized populations. For example, in a study of 105 counselor trainees, Boysen and Vogel (2008) found that, despite their self-belief that they were culturally competent, trainees held negative implicit biases towards African Americans, lesbians, and gay men. If trainees are unaware they hold negative biases towards certain cultural groups, they may unknowingly act on, and perpetuate, these biases. In another example, research on microaggressions, which are subtle communications of slights or put-downs (Sue, 2010), found that counselors also perpetrate microaggressions, which could negatively influence the therapeutic relationship. Owen et al. (2014) found that more than half of 120 racial and ethnic minority counseling clients reported that their therapist perpetrated a racial microaggression, which negatively affected their perception of their therapeutic alliance. Hook et al. (2016) also found that 81.7% of 2,212 surveyed counseling clients experienced at least one racial microaggression during a counseling session. Therefore, understanding cultural identities and associated assumptions and biases is foundational to developing cultural competence.

Researchers also found that the cultural identities of SPPs could influence, and hinder, their work due to how others perceive them (Carter & Davila, 2017; Yu, Nguyen, & Petrie, 2016). Not only could SPPs hold assumptions and biases towards their clients, but clients could also hold assumptions and biases toward the SPP based on their perception of the SPP’s identities. For example, the cultural identities of SPPs associated with traditional majority groups (e.g., white, male, heterosexual) could offer opportunities as well as challenges in applied practice. Researchers found that minority clients may hold a “cultural mistrust” (Bell & Tracey, 2006, p. 2) and a “healthy paranoia” (Sue, 2010, p. 103) towards a practitioner whom they perceived as not sharing their cultural background (Bernhard, 2014; Kontos & Breland-Noble, 2002; Sue & Sue, 2015). Moreover, it appears that
clients may even have preferences for certain SPP identities over others. For example, Naoi, Watson, Deaner, and Sato (2011) found that Japanese athletes preferred to work with SPPs who were similar to them in terms of cultural background and identities (e.g., race, gender, sport) compared to American athletes. Although American athletes did not have strong preferences for SPP identities, American female athletes were more likely to prefer a consultant of the same gender compared to male athletes. Additionally, American athletes of color were more likely to prefer consultants of the same race who also had experience working with diverse populations compared to their White counterparts. Lubker, Visek, Watson, and Singpurwalla (2012) also found that American athletes did not have strong preferences for SPP identities. Despite not rating SPP identities as important, athletes did report preferring female consultants and consultants who are the same race/ethnicity as them over other identities.

SPPs associated with traditionally marginalized groups could also experience opportunities as well as challenges due to their clients’ perceptions of their identities. For example, Yu and colleagues (2016) found that Asian SPPs could be viewed as less credible or relatable for coaches and athletes in North America. In a study of Black SPPs’ experiences in the United States, Carter and Davila (2017) also found that Black professionals experienced a myriad of racial microaggressions perpetrated by their clients ranging from the questioning of their expertise to blatantly racist comments. These findings illustrate how cultural identities can influence one’s work regardless of one’s personal intentions and consciousness. Thus, understanding one’s own cultural lens and the influences of one’s own cultural identities on their work is vital to culturally competent and ethical practice.

Cultural Competence Training in Sport Psychology

Within the past decade, SPPs have made great strides to infuse and centralize culture in sport psychology research, teaching, and practice. CSP researchers have suggested that SPPs should not use a one-size-fits-all approach to practice, because not only is it ineffective, but could also contribute to reproducing inequitable power and potentially harm clients (Ryba et al., 2010; Schinke & Moore, 2011). Major sport psychology professional organizations have also started to require cultural competence development as part of their practitioner certification. AASP started requiring a course on cultural competence in order to become an AASP Certified Mental Performance Consultant (CMPC) in June 2018 (AASP, 2018). FEPSAC is also cre-
ating a European certification for Specialists in Applied Sport Psychology and will require a demonstration of cultural competence as part of their certification process (FEPSAC, n.d.). ISSP is also creating a registry for ISSP consultants and will require applicants to demonstrate specific cultural skills related to the country and region the consultant is serving, which requires an awareness of both one’s self and client(s) (ISSP, n.d.).

Despite the recent growth and articulation of CSP, this trend may not be fully reflected in the training of professionals. In an interview of 12 sport psychology graduate students, Alleyne (2007) found that participants received little to no cultural competence training through their graduate programs. In a survey of 35 anglophone sport and exercise psychology graduate programs, Lee (2016) found that the majority of surveyed graduate programs offered some type of formal opportunity for students to develop cultural competence. Nevertheless, only 31.4% of programs made formalized cultural competence training mandatory for their students. Although these studies have a small sample size, there are no other studies that have explored cultural competence training for SPPs. The limited research makes it difficult to discern whether SPPs are receiving cultural competence training and, more importantly, practicing with cultural competence. If cultural competence has been shown to be important to the practice of sport psychology, it is imperative to examine SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors related to cultural competence training.

Recently, researchers also examined SPPs’ perceptions of their own cultural competence as well as examined which factors influenced the development of this cultural competence (Quartiroli, Vosloo, Fisher, & Schinke, 2019). Approximately half of the respondents reported receiving formalized training in cultural competence in the form of topic-specific courses and workshops or through information embedded in their content-based educational curriculum. However, participants reported that this training was only moderately effective. Moreover, the authors found that racial minorities were more likely to report higher levels of cultural awareness and competence compared to their white counterparts or to those who did not disclose their racial identity. These findings are interesting because formalized training did not seem to fully predict practitioners’ levels of cultural competence.

Problem Statement and Purpose Statement

Although research within the broad area of CSP has emerged in the past decade (e.g., Ryba, 2017; Schinke, Stambulova, Si, & Moore, 2018), the contributions have largely been theoretical and conceptual. Research examining
whether SPPs are embracing the newly emerging CSP research and practicing in a culturally competent way has been absent from the sport psychology literature. Given that cultural awareness is a foundational step of cultural competence, it seems timely to examine how aware SPPs are of their cultural identities and of the influence that cultural identities have on their work. Moreover, if cultural competence has been shown to be important to the practice of sport psychology, it is imperative to examine SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors related to cultural competence. Therefore, the purposes of this study were to examine SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors regarding cultural competence-related issues in our field. Specifically, we inquired about: (a) the degree of awareness that SPPs had of themselves as cultural beings and (b) SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors regarding multicultural training. The findings of this study could help determine whether SPPs are integrating CSP knowledge into practice. Examining how aware SPPs are and how they are behaving can help the field improve multicultural training sessions to address current SPPs’ areas for improvement, inform future updates to codes of ethics, and guide the integration of multicultural training into certification and licensure requirements.

Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited using convenience sampling through professional listservs, social media, and personal contacts. A total of 225 participants started the survey, but only 193 participants completed the survey. Ninety-nine participants identified as male (51.3%) and 94 participants identified as female (48.7%). These participants’ age ranged between 22 and 72 years of age (M = 36.7; SD = 12.3). Most respondents identified as White (n = 170, 88.1%) with a few participants identifying as Asian (n = 8, 4%), Hispanic (n = 6, 3%), Pacific Islander (n = 1, 0.5%), American Indian (n = 1, 0.5%), and other (n = 2, 1%). About half of the participants held a doctoral or post-doctoral degree (48.08%), while about a third held a master degree (31.6%). For the majority of these participants, the main areas of expertise were performance enhancement (n = 96; 53.6%), counseling/psychology (n = 32, 17.9%), and health and exercise psychology (n = 26; 14.5%). Half of these professionals worked in academic settings (n = 90; 49.5%), and the remaining participants reported working in private practice (n = 26; 14.3%) or sport organizations (n = 15; 8.2%). Participants spent 11.99 hours per week on average engaging in applied work (SD = 13.92), 14.44 hours per week (SD = 14.62) engaging in research, and 12.81 hours per week (SD = 13.84) engaging in teaching-related tasks. The majority of participants had received their highest degree in the United States (n = 151, 82.96%) and were currently working in the United States (n = 160, 82.9%).
MEASURES

The study was conducted as part of a larger 94-item survey on SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors regarding ethics and supervision, which was modified from Etzel, Watson and Zizzi’s (2004) 121-item instrument. Among other modifications, 21 new items specifically developed to examine SPPs’ cultural competence were added to the original survey. What follows is a discussion of information regarding this subsection of items associated with cultural competence. Two separate types of questions regarding cultural competence were created.

Awareness of cultural identities. The first set of seven questions were designed to have participants rate, on a 4-point Likert-type scale, how some of their cultural identifiers (i.e., race, gender, socioeconomic status, age, nationality, sexual orientation, religious background) influenced their work (1 = “not at all” to 4 = “profoundly”) based on the stem, “To what extent does your own ___ (e.g., race, gender, nationality) influence your work?”

Beliefs and behaviors regarding multicultural training. The next set of 14 items asked participants to rate their beliefs and behaviors regarding multicultural training in sport psychology consulting. In this section, participants were prompted with the following statements, “Working with people of diverse (i.e., ethnic/racial background, socioeconomic background, gender identities, age, religious backgrounds, sexual orientations, nationalities) without multicultural training or consultation” and asked to rate, on a 5-point Likert-type scale, the degree to which they believed the statement to be ethical (i.e., 1 = “unquestionably not ethical” to 5 = “unquestionably ethical”) as well as the degree to which they engaged in that action (i.e., 1 = “never” to 5 = “very often”).

Demographics. To help understand the background of the respondents, a series of demographic questions were also included in the survey. These demographic questions inquired about respondents’ age, gender and ethnic identity, student status, level and focus of training, country of training and practice, academic and professional credentials, estimated workloads (i.e., hours of teaching, researching, practicing), and approximate monthly income.

PROCEDURE

Once the final version of the survey was drafted, the authors conducted a feasibility study by asking three graduate students and faculty to complete a draft of the survey. These respondents made note of the time necessary to complete the survey (approximately 15 minutes) as well as taking note of flow, inconsistencies, and any concerns or problems with the questions. Minor changes to the wording and flow were made based on the feedback obtained from this feasibility study.

Upon approval from West Virginia University’s Institutional Review Board, the survey was distributed via email through two primary listservs related to sport, exercise, and performance psychology: SPORTPSYCH listserv hosted by Temple University, USA, and the American Psychological Association Division 47 listserv. The recruitment email was sent on three separate occasions two to four weeks apart. Furthermore, sport and exercise psychology graduate program coordinators (n=210) listed within the 11th edition of the Directory of Graduate Programs in Applied Sport Psychology (Burke, Sachs, & Schweighardt, 2015) were sent recruitment emails. These graduate program coordinators were asked to forward the online survey to their students, alumni, faculty, and colleagues. A survey recruitment request was also posted on the Facebook pages of the AASP student group page and the European Network
for Young Specialists in Sport Psychology. In an effort to recruit additional practitioners from outside the United States, the authors reached out to international colleagues and asked them to complete, and forward, the study. Recipients of the emails were provided with a link to the web page that contained the online informed consent form as well as the online survey. The online survey was created using Qualtrics survey technology (Qualtrics, Provo, UT).

DATA ANALYSIS

Once data collection was completed, the data were then analyzed using R version 3.6.1 (MASS package; Venables & Ripley, 2002). To answer the first research aim regarding SPPs’ awareness of their own cultural identities, a descriptive analysis was conducted. Next, a cluster analysis was conducted to identify possible clusters based on the respondent’s degree of awareness of their own cultural identities. Finally, a multinomial logistic regression was conducted to examine whether there were demographic factors (i.e., gender, age, formal supervision, level of training, professional credentials) that predicted greater levels of cultural awareness. To answer the second research aim, a descriptive analysis was conducted followed by chi-square tests.

Results

Sport Psychology Professionals’ Awareness Of Themselves As Cultural Beings

Descriptive summary. Participants in this study reported a limited perception of how some of their cultural identifiers influenced their work (see Table I). For example, although some respondents recognized how their age (M = 2.22; SD = 0.77) and gender identity (M = 2.2; SD = 0.77) somewhat to very much impacted their work, participants reported other identifiers such as race, social economic status, religion, sexual orientation, and nationality as having little to no influence on their work. Although not statistically significant, there were observed mean differences in cultural awareness depending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The stem of the question read: Please rate the extent to which the following factors influence your work. Participants answered along a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 = Not at all to 3 = Profoundly
on the participant’s level of training. Across all cultural identifiers with the exception of age, participants with a higher level of training (i.e., doctorate/post-doctorate) reported slightly higher awareness of the effect of cultural identifiers than those with lower levels of training. However, participants with a master’s degree reported a greater amount of awareness for how age influenced their work compared to participants with other levels of training (Table II). No statistically significant differences were found across gender identification in terms of awareness of one’s own cultural identities (Table III). Although not statistically significant, women did report slightly higher levels of cultural awareness compared to their male counterparts.

**Cluster analysis.** Aiming to identify possible clusters based on the degree of awareness respondents had on the influence of cultural identities on their applied work, a cluster analysis was performed. The clusters were based on SPPs’ awareness of seven cultural identifiers: racial and gender identity, social economic status, age, religion, sexual orientation, and nation-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural ID</th>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The stem of the question read: Please rate the extent to which the following factors influence your work. Participants answered along a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 = Not at all to 3 = Profoundly.
Running a hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward’s method, a three-cluster solution was identified, which revealed three distinct profiles: cultural-high, cultural-low, and cultural-moderate impact. No groups displayed unique combinations of cultural factors that were more impactful than others. In this three-cluster model, the high impact group \((n = 29, 15.4\%)\) scored all cultural factors at least one standard deviation above the mean, with sexual orientation approaching two standard deviations above the mean. Just under half of the sample was found in the low impact group \((n = 81, 43.1\%)\), which scored all cultural factors at about one half to three-quarters of a standard deviation below the mean. Finally, the moderate impact group \((n = 78, 41.5\%)\) scored all cultural factors just above the mean perceived impact values for the sample. The three-cluster model described above can be seen graphically in Figure 1.

**Multinomial logistic regression.** A multinomial logistic regression followed the cluster analysis to examine if there were demographic factors that predicted greater levels of cultural awareness. The cultural impact cluster was the dependent variable, using the cultural-low impact group as the baseline group, and formal supervision, highest degree area, licensure/certification credentials, age, and gender were used as predictors. Formal supervision, highest degree area, and licensure credentials were not significant predictors of cultural impact cluster \((\chi^2(3) = 1.80, p = .61; \chi^2(1) = 0.18, p = 0.67; \chi^2(5) = 4.93, p = 0.42)\). The demographic features of age and gender also did not exhibit significant relationships with the cultural impact cluster \((\chi^2(1) = 0.09, p = 0.77; \chi^2(1) = 0.82, p = 0.37)\).
Sport Psychology Professionals’ Beliefs and Behaviors Regarding Multicultural Training

Descriptive summary. SPPs in the present study considered the possibility of delivering services to clients from a different cultural background without specific training to be somewhat of an ethical grey area. Twenty-seven percent of the participants considered providing services to clients from traditionally marginalized groups without multicultural training as unethical and 36% perceived this to be ethical only in rare circumstances. Moreover, the majority of study participants seemed to lean toward a more conservative practical approach by avoiding working with populations for which they have not received specific training. Over half of the study respondents reported that they never worked with diverse populations without the proper training (57.5%) and 24% of participants reported that they rarely work with diverse populations without proper training.

Chi-square analysis. Chi-square analyses were conducted to assess differences in participants’ beliefs and behaviors regarding multicultural training. For each cultural identifier, significant differences were found between belief and behavior for these participants (Table IV).
Discussion

The purposes of this study were to assess (a) the degree of awareness that SPPs had of themselves as cultural beings and (b) SPPs’ beliefs and behaviors regarding multicultural training.

Sport Psychology Professionals’ Awareness of Themselves as Cultural Beings

The participants in this study reported having a relatively low awareness of how their cultural identities influenced their sport psychology practice. The mean scores of the eight cultural identities (i.e., race, gender, socioeconomic status, age, nationality, sexual orientation, religious background) ranged from 1.45 to 2.22 on a 4-point Likert-type scale. This means that participants responded that their cultural identities influenced their work only moderately.

Through cluster analysis, three different clusters were identified that represent the level of cultural awareness SPPs have about the impact cultural identifiers have on their work. The high cluster group included SPPs who perceived that all their cultural identifiers highly/profoundly impacted their work. The moderate cluster group included SPPs who perceived that their cultural identifiers only somewhat impacted their work. The low cluster pro-
professionals perceived that their cultural identifiers have little or minimal impact upon their work. Only 15.4% of survey respondents in this study were in the high impact group. The majority of respondents in this study were either in the marginal impact group (41.5%) or the low impact group (43.1%). This may mean that the majority of respondents in this study lacked cultural awareness of how cultural identities are relevant to their work in sport psychology. This finding seems to support the idea that “sport and exercise psychology professionals recognize sport and physical activity as multicultural contexts but often regard them from the unchallenged position of an ethnocentric (white, male, heterosexual, middle-class) way of knowing” (Ryba et al., 2013, p. 14). Although all sport psychology practice and theory are culturally-bound and informed, it appears that the majority of the respondents of this study lacked awareness of this fact.

The results from our multinomial logistic regression suggested that there were no demographic factors (i.e., gender, age, formal supervision, level of training, professional credentials) that helped predict what type of training or discipline was more likely to lead to greater cultural awareness of one’s own cultural identities. There were no statistically significant differences found in the responses of those trained in sport psychology compared to those trained in counseling/psychology. Receiving formal supervision or having a professional license or certification or higher levels of training did not necessarily result in higher levels of cultural awareness. This is an interesting finding because training does not seem to result in greater cultural awareness. Therefore, future research should not only examine how SPPs are developing their cultural competence, but what the training entails as well as examine whether it is effective in ensuring that SPPs are competently and ethically serving athletes from various cultural groups.

The fact that respondents reported a relatively low level of cultural awareness about their identities is somewhat concerning. Being aware and reflexive of how we are all cultural beings and how every encounter is a multicultural encounter is the first step towards improving cultural competence (Schinke et al., 2015; Sue & Sue, 2015). Not being aware that their own identities are always influencing their work could imply that these SPPs may be taking an identity-blind approach to their applied practice. Schinke and Moore (2011) observed that this “skills ‘transcend’ cultures” (p. 285) approach to sport psychology where sport psychology skills are believed to transcend cultural influences to be universally applicable acts as a barrier to developing a culturally-informed approach to sport psychology. A one-size-fits-all approach to sport psychology could lead to SPPs developing culturally insensitive as well as ineffective interventions in their applied work.
There may be several reasons why surveyed participants reported a relatively low level of cultural awareness. The data collection for this study occurred before AASP included cultural competence as a requirement for CMPC. Moreover, research that has been instrumental in explaining and proposing changes to sport psychology such as the ISSP Position Stands was just emerging. Therefore, it may be that the CSP praxis was still relatively new for many professionals in the field. With the advancement of CSP and its embrace by various professional organizations through position stands, coursework requirements, and CEU designations, it is possible that results will differ in future studies. With cultural competence being required as part of one’s sport psychology training, we predict that SPPs will be more aware of their cultural identities and how it influences one’s practice.

Sport Psychology Professionals’ Beliefs and Behaviors Regarding Multicultural Training

Respondents from this study reported that, on average, they considered working with diverse populations without multicultural training to be unquestionably not ethical or ethical only under rare circumstances. This seems to imply that participants are mostly aware of the fact that the need for cultural competence is embedded in the ethics codes of various professional organizations (e.g., CPS, ISSP). For example, within the North American context, where most of the respondents of this study were trained and resided, the AASP’s Ethics Code states that members “working with specific populations have the responsibility to develop the necessary skills to be competent” (AASP, 2011). Nevertheless, a small number of participants reported that they may consider practicing without multicultural training to be an ethical gray area. Given the importance of ethics, further education of professional organizations’ ethics codes may be necessary. The recent move by AASP to require members to take a certification exam that includes questions related to diversity and culture, and the requirement for individuals to have received multicultural training to become a CMPC may increase practitioners’ familiarity with the AASP ethics code and the foundational skills necessary for sport psychology practice. The cultural competence requirement of FEPSAC and ISSP applied practitioners could also assist in cultural competence being seen as an ethical responsibility and a part of all SPPs’ training and practice.

On average, participants also reported that they rarely worked with diverse populations without multicultural training. This is an interesting finding because there appear to be limited opportunities for multicultural
training in sport and exercise psychology. Some researchers observed that sport and exercise psychology graduate programs may not be adequately offering multicultural training (Alleyne, 2007; Lee, 2016). Moreover, multicultural training became a mandatory component in AASP certification in the summer of 2018 (AASP, 2018) and the cultural competence requirements for ISSP and FEPSAC have not gone into effect yet. Therefore, we wonder where SPPs are receiving multicultural training to be able to report that they never, or rarely, practice without multicultural training.

One possibility is that SPPs are receiving multicultural training through related disciplines such as counseling or psychology. This is because multicultural training, at least in the United States, is a requirement for accredited counseling and psychology training programs (American Psychological Association, 2018; Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, 2015). Nevertheless, in this study, there were no significant differences in participants’ cultural awareness of one’s own cultural identities based on the discipline or training. Thus, future research should examine how cultural competence is being developed and examine the effectiveness of this training.

Limitations

Despite efforts to recruit a large, diverse and international sample, the low response rate, led to a sample primarily formed by SPPs who identified as White Americans. The small size of the sample and its fairly homogenous nature limits the ability of these findings to be generalized to the entire population of SPPs. Future research should strive to identify ways to recruit a larger, more diverse and international sample of professionals. It will also be important for researchers engaging in this line of inquiry to explore potential group differences and examine the influence of professional organizations and training in the development of cultural competence.

Practical Implications and Future Directions

This study provides for several practical implications and suggestions for future research. SPPs were generally aware that they should receive multicultural training and that this is an ethical responsibility. Nevertheless, it appears that practitioners are unfamiliar with foundational concepts for why multicultural training is needed. Specifically, study participants reported a
low level of awareness for how their cultural identities influence their work. Therefore, this foundational skill should be integrated in all cultural competence training. Practitioners should be challenged to be more reflective of their identities, their cultural backgrounds, and of their work. One suggestion could be to facilitate critical reflective practice (Knowles & Gilbourne, 2010). Critical reflective practice, in addition to tactical and practical reflections, can help practitioners reflect on how they influence their work and how their work is situated in larger social structures and power dynamics (Knowles & Gilbourne, 2010). Knowles and Gilbourne also proposed autoethnography as a potential research methodology that could facilitate critical reflective practice in applied sport psychology.

Moreover, CSP that explicitly discusses the influences of intersecting cultural identities on practitioners’ and clients’ lives should be more integrated in the training of SPPs, primarily in graduate program curricula. Graduate programs should encourage students to be familiar with, and practice, based on the articulation of cultural competence found in the ISSP Position Stands. The ISSP Position Stand on Cultural Competence summarized how to be culturally competent in research and practice (Ryba et al., 2013) in nine postulates, which can be taught and integrated in graduate training. For example, the authors urged SPPs to be culturally reflexive in their practice as well as research and examine the numerous ways one shapes one’s own practice. In addition to examining one’s taken for granted (ethnocentric) assumptions, the authors also urged SPPs to examine and recognize inherent power dynamics embedded in knowledge production and to “focus on meaning (instead of cause)” (p. 15) when considering issues of difference. They also introduced different specific research designs SPPs could adopt to be reflexive in their research as well and design culturally competent research projects. These three designs are a cross-cultural psychology project, a cultural psychology study, and a cultural praxis project. These strategies could be adopted by graduate programs to develop more culturally competent SPPs.

The Position Stands and adding cultural competence requirements for practitioners certified by professional organizations (e.g., AASP, FEPSAC, ISSP) are positive steps toward developing culturally competence practitioners. Graduate programs and professional organizations should continue to centralize cultural competence as a foundational and ethical obligation for SPPs and encourage cultural praxis of blending theory, practice, and lived experience among practitioners (Ryba, 2017). Finally, researchers should continue to examine whether SPPs are practicing what they preach in terms of cultural competence. Given the recent advancement of CSP, researchers should examine how SPPs are developing their cultural competence and
continue to examine whether SPPs are integrating this knowledge to be culturally informed and safe in their sport psychology practice.
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