WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:47:24" NOTE recognizability:0.774

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:07.557 For the. For the invitation and for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:00:07.557 --> 00:00:10.920 opportunity to discuss a topic that I really

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:10.920 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.418$  like to talk about and that's making.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:00:15.420 --> 00:00:17.622 Treatments evidence based

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:17.622 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.558$  treatments more specifically fit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:20.560 \longrightarrow 00:00:22.552$  For the diverse populations who who

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:22.552 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.809$  I would argue need them the most,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:24.810 \dashrightarrow 00:00:28.178$  and nowadays I'm also much more open about

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:28.178 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.598$  my personal motivations for doing this work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:00:31.600 --> 00:00:35.735 Umm, my younger brother had

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}00{:}35.735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}38.652$  significant mental health. Um.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}00{:}38.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40.380$  Behavioral substance use problems

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.034$  as a kid and then later as an adult

 $00:00:44.034 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.086$  and spent many of his years in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}00{:}47.086 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}51.018$  public mental health system and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:51.018 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.576$  criminal justice system and a few years

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:00:55.576 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.946$  ago committed suicide while while

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}00{:}57.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}00.345$  in carcerated and I don't blame

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:00.345 \longrightarrow 00:01:02.764$  our public mental health system for

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:02.764 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.254$  for that his trajectory and outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:05.260 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.794$  but I I can't help but wonder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:07.800 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.936$  That if the if the system had

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:10.936 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.000$  been more responsive to his.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:13.000 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.516$  And to his needs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:14.516 \longrightarrow 00:01:17.659$  whether he might still be with us or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:01:17.660 --> 00:01:19.820 I I forgot kind of starting

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:19.820 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.260$  with the depressing note,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}01{:}21.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}22.924$  but I I think that kind of context

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:22.924 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.800$  is is important just to kind of

00:01:24.800 --> 00:01:26.779 understand how how I entered this work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:01:26.780 --> 00:01:30.560 but I I forgot the disclosure statement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:30.560 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.980$  just wanted to quickly show this to you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:01:36.980 --> 00:01:39.179 Nothing to disclose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:39.179 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.310$  so let let me real things back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:44.310 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.750$  Bit and talk about another kind of stream

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:47.750 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.409$  of motivation for this sort of work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:50.410 \longrightarrow 00:01:52.585$  It was back in Graduate

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:01:52.585 --> 00:01:54.325 School when Antonio Polo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:54.330 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.671$  fellow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:01:54.671 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.058$  graduate student of mine in my lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}01{:}57.058 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.003$  and and I started to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}02{:}00.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}02.188$  whether psychotherapies work for ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:02.263 --> 00:02:04.518 minorities and what role culture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:04.520 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.035$  Played,

 $00:02:05.035 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.640$  and we started grad school at UCLA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:08.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.984$  working with John Weiss,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:09.984 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.000$  who was in the psychology department

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:12.062 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.779$  at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:12.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.580$  And it was also a time when the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:15.580 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.969$  empirically validated treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:16.969 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.284$  movement in psychology was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:19.284 --> 00:02:22.148 kind of picking up and moving forward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:22.150 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.190$  and we were a cognitive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:23.190 --> 00:02:24.342 behaviorally oriented program,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:24.342 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.646$  so it was a good fit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:26.650 --> 00:02:29.488 For our program, but, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:29.490 --> 00:02:30.706 I'm I'm African American.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:30.706 --> 00:02:33.230 If you had discerned that Antonio Polo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.230$  my fellow grad students,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:35.230 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.070$  is Mexican American,

 $00:02:36.070 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.710$  and as we were learning to be clinicians,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:38.710 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.130$  we we were learning CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:41.130 --> 00:02:44.130 But we also kind of intuitively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:44.130 --> 00:02:46.985 given our own personal narratives

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:46.985 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.127$  and experiences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:48.130 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.518$  felt that culture was an important

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:50.518 --> 00:02:52.110 consideration when we're working

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:52.170 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.250$  with culturally diverse population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.750$  So as we were being trained,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:55.750 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.280$  we were also doing things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:02:57.280 --> 00:02:57.984 Suddenly enough,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:02:57.984 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.096$  so subtly in terms of tweaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:00.100 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.572$  adapting, modifying,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:03:01.572 --> 00:03:03.780 integrating cultural issues

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:03.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:08.285$  and into our clinical.

 $00:03:08.285 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.512$  Processes and and this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:10.512 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.780$  this mode that we sort of took

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:12.859 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.104$  on an intuitively was consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:15.104 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.850$  with arguments that a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:03:17.850 --> 00:03:19.940 prominent scholars at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}03{:}19.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21.782$  including Stan and Sue who is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:21.782 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.459$  in our department had concerning

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

00:03:23.459 --> 00:03:25.739 how important culture was and he

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00{:}03{:}25.739 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}28.053$  he coined something called the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:28.053 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.718$  cultural responsiveness hypothesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:29.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.860$  And what's something like this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.764$  There are potential problems

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:33.764 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.668$  with conventional therapies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:35.668 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.300$  that that includes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:37.300 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.558$  He's so, so-called evidence based therapies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.320$  They were developed for White,

 $00:03:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.120$  Western, English speaking individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84545299

 $00:03:45.120 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.920$  For the most part.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:03:46.920 --> 00:03:49.368 The majority of clinicians were at

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:03:49.368 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.268$  that time and still are white and

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:03:52.268 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.638$  generally they didn't in a clear,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:03:54.640 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.030$  overt way consider the language beliefs

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:03:58.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.210$  and worldviews of culturally different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}04{:}01.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}03.150$  Individuals and the the argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:03.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.979$  was that if culture is ignored or

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}04{:}05.979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}08.433$  minimized in the clinical context and

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:08.433 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.523$  there are going to be values conflicts

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:11.523 --> 00:04:13.864 between the clinician and the client,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}04{:}13.864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.554$  they're going to be miscommunication

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}04{:}15.554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}17.608$  between the clinician and the client.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:17.610 --> 00:04:20.190 And that's going to, of course,

 $00:04:20.190 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.030$  lead to greater client discomfort

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:24.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.334$  and poor engagement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:26.340 --> 00:04:29.800 In treatment, if clients cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:29.800 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.520$  diverse clients are not engaged,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.440$  well, they're going to drop out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:34.440 --> 00:04:36.071 If they drop out then they're not

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:36.071 --> 00:04:37.520 going to benefit from treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.816$  There's going to be treatment failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:38.820 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.634$  So the the argument was that treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:41.634 --> 00:04:44.700 need to be culturally responsive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:44.700 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.868$  culturally sensitive in some

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:46.868 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.120$  way and or the clinicians need

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:50.217 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.697$  to be culturally competent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:52.700 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.528$  When providing mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:54.528 \longrightarrow 00:04:56.356$  services to diverse populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:04:56.360 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.470$  and this all made sense.

 $00:04:58.470 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.264$  To us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:04:59.264 --> 00:05:01.249 So Antonio and I decided,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:01.250 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.008$  given that we work with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:03.008 --> 00:05:04.810 advisor who did meta analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.072$  we we started to conduct our

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:07.072 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.553$  own meta analysis to try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:09.553 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.345$  answer 3 critical questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:11.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.553$  Concerning treatment outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:12.553 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.157$  with ethnic minority youth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}14.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}15.696$  because we had that particular interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:15.696 --> 00:05:17.512 and we thought we knew the answers

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}17.512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}19.006$  to each of these three questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}19.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.338$  So first, our mental health treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:21.340 --> 00:05:23.520 Affective with ethnic minority youth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.396$  we thought, well,

 $00:05:24.396 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.036$  sometimes maybe, but often not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}26.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27.796$  given who these treatments by

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:27.796 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.809$  and large were developed for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:29.810 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.819$  Do white youth benefit more than ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:31.819 \longrightarrow 00:05:33.460$  minorities from the same treatment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895 00:05:33.460 --> 00:05:33.833 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:33.833 --> 00:05:36.444 of course white youth are going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:36.444 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.669$  benefit more from these standard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:38.670 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.430$  culturally sort of neutral

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:41.430 --> 00:05:44.880 interventions for the most part.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:44.880 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.188$  And then third,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:46.188 --> 00:05:47.932 do cultural adaptations enhance

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}47.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}50.219$  outcomes for ethnic minorities that

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:50.219 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.494$  are thinking was definitely well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:52.500 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.220$  it turns out that the answers to all

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:05:54.220 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.328$  three of these questions were way more

 $00:05:56.328 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.953$  complicated than we initially thought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:05:57.960 --> 00:05:59.816 And given the amount of work we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}05{:}59.816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}02.129$  to do with our initial meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:02.129 --> 00:06:04.293 that was ultimately published in 2008,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:04.293 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.277$  we we actually had to buy a hand

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:07.280 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.270$  go through 1000 plus randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:10.270 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.349$  trials to to call about 30 or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:14.350 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.878$  That that focused sort of primarily or in

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:17.878 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.749$  some significant way on ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:20.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.430$  We we we found some answers

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}06{:}22.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.270$  that surprised us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.894$  So I'm going to sort of in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00{:}06{:}25.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}29.034$  talk for the next 35 minutes or so

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:29.034 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.566$  try to answer four key questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:31.570 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.502$  Are treatments effective with

 $00:06:33.502 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.468$  ethnic minorities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:34.470 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.816$  Are treatment outcomes worse for ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:36.816 --> 00:06:39.030 minorities compared to Euro Americans?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:39.030 --> 00:06:42.160 This cultural tailoring enhance treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:42.160 --> 00:06:44.659 outcomes for ethnic minorities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:44.659 --> 00:06:46.528 And then finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:46.530 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.900$  given some of the skepticism that

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:48.900 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.708$  sort of comes through in my responses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:51.710 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.695$  To those three questions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:53.695 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.051$  does culture matter?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:55.051 --> 00:06:56.734 OK, first question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:06:56.734 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.539$  are therapies effective with ethnic?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895 00:06:59.540 --> 00:06:59.966 Minorities. NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

00:06:59.966 --> 00:07:02.096 Before I dive into this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:07:02.100 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.221$  I need to take about a minute

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:07:04.221 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.612$  to give it an extremely brief

00:07:06.612 --> 00:07:08.476 primer on meta analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:07:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.424$  Some of you may be familiar with it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.787129593157895

 $00:07:10.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.798$  but I I find it's always helpful to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:12.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.931$  say something briefly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:13.931 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.816$  Basically, it's a quantitative review

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:15.816 \longrightarrow 00:07:18.438$  of a literature and in this case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:18.440 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.980$  therapy effects with ethnic minorities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:20.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.769$  and it involves finding all the randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}07{:}26.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.048$  trials you can find that deal with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:30.050 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.066$  Treating for these psychosocial

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

00:07:33.066 --> 00:07:35.722 interventions ethnic minority populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:35.722 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.466$  where you have at least one active

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}07{:}38.466 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}40.587$  treatment compared to a control condition

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:40.587 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.930$  in the context of a randomized trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:42.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.682$  And we. Call from these studies

 $00:07:47.682 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.572$  something called an effect size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:49.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.087$  which is basically the the average outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:53.087 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.880$  for those in the treatment condition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:07:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.249$  say for depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:00.250 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.532$  And you subtract from that treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:03.532 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.320$  condition average the average outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:06.320 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.374$  for those in the control condition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:09.380 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.859$  so treatment outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}08{:}13.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}17.574$  Average minus the control outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:17.574 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.754$  average divided by something called

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}08{:}19.754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22.009$  the pooled standard deviation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:22.010 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.510$  which I am not going to get into and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:25.598 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.928$  gives you this effect size essentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.206$  And basically an effect size of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:32.210 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.440$  .8 is what we're shooting for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:33.440 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.230$  It's really what we want.

 $00:08:34.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.962$  We want a robust,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}08{:}35.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38.127$  strong effect of our psychotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:38.130 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.104$  We want it to be pretty powerful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:40.110 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.734$  but a medium effect is pretty good too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:41.740 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.390$  And the psychotherapy outcome literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:44.390 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.670$  broadly, medium effects are the norm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:46.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.983$  So if we get something around .5 or so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

00:08:48.990 --> 00:08:50.586 we're, we're, we're, we're in good shape,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.470$  we're happy there .2 or thereabouts or below.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:55.470 \dashrightarrow 00:08:59.020$  This is kind of a small effect if we get.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:08:59.020 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.286$ .2 or thereabouts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

00:09:00.286 --> 00:09:02.955 where I guess that's OK, but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}02.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}04.720$  we're not going to be as happy with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.502$  So .2 ish or so, small effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:08.502 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.872$ .5 medium effect and .8

 $00:09:10.872 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.800$  and above largest effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175 00:09:12.800 --> 00:09:13.095 OK. NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}13.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}15.160$  So that I think that's basically what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:15.160 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.229$  you need to know to understand the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:17.229 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.360$  rest of what I'm going to present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

00:09:19.360 --> 00:09:21.916 So I'm going to now present

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:21.916 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.422$  some meta analytic data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:23.422 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.976$  a lot of it from my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.068$  but also from other scholars is as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:29.070 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.574$  When you see bolded names that those are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}31.574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}34.687$  just my current and former graduate students.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:34.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.090$  I just want to give them more credit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}37.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38.854$  now in in my presentations to let

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

00:09:38.854 --> 00:09:41.069 them know I don't do this work alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.996$  but I have a lab for the grad students

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}42.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}44.796$  who really helped make this work

 $00:09:44.796 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.326$  as well as other collaborators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.858$  So this is data from 5 meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}09{:}49.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}53.151$  that are published or that are in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:53.151 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.128$  progress or kind of in in the pipeline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:57.130 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.496$  And you can see there's a range.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:09:59.500 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.890$  The highest affect size that we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:02.890 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.004$  found with a particular population

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:05.004 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.851$  is one that we published in 2018

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:07.851 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.975$  focused on treatment outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:09.975 \dashrightarrow 00:10:12.099$  with Asian American population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:12.100 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.116$  So a .72 effect, almost a large effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}10{:}16.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}20.490$  The lowest that we found for a kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}10{:}20.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}23.440$  of is .37 like for ethnic minorities

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}10{:}23.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.120$  with substance use problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:25.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.716$  But overall, if you average across these,

 $00:10:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.700$  you get an effect size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:27.700 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.308$  About .5 in the medium range.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:32.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.355$  And this is taking this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:35.355 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.709$  figure taken from a summary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:37.710 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.972$  Graph that we published in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:39.972 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.636$  paper in the annual review of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:42.636 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.410$  clinical psychology in 2014.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00:10:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.046$  Synthesizing info from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8015444175

 $00{:}10{:}48.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}50.500$  database that we collected up to

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:10:50.574 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.010$  that time and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}10{:}52.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}55.684$  you see a lot of variation in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:10:55.684 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.552$  effect sizes for particular problems with

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:10:58.552 \longrightarrow 00:11:01.549$  focused on ethnic minority populations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}11{:}01.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}03.881$  so that the largest effect sizes we

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:03.881 --> 00:11:06.322 found were for treatment of anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}11{:}06.322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08.099$  related problems and psychosis.

 $00:11:08.099 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.962$  The smallest effects that we found were

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}11{:}10.962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}13.210$  from miscellaneous other problems and

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:13.210 --> 00:11:15.038 substance use problems essentially,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:15.040 --> 00:11:16.420 but again, if you average across.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143 00:11:16.420 --> 00:11:19.390 All of these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:19.390 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.692$  Uh, problem areas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:20.692 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.420$  You get about a medium effect size and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.709$  this is a figure that we just created for a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:27.710 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.665$  a new paper that's impressed at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:31.670 --> 00:11:34.380 annual review of clinical psychology

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:34.380 --> 00:11:37.090 focus just on cognitive behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:37.175 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.764$  treatments and meta analysis that

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}11{:}39.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}42.500$  look at CBT for ethnic minorities

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:42.582 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.270$  and you find a lot of variations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.450$  So the lowest effect size

00:11:47.450 --> 00:11:49.030 was about point O one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:49.030 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.910$  but that's an outlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:11:51.910 --> 00:11:55.342 You take that one out and basically you

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:55.342 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.730$  get effects that are small to very large.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:11:58.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.607$  And this is across 13 treatment outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:01.607 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.838$  meta analysis that we we've done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:03.838 \longrightarrow 00:12:06.344$  So a lot of variation but generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:06.344 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.098$  these meta analysis focus just on

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}12{:}09.098 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}12{:}11.058$  cognitive behavioral treatments suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:11.058 --> 00:12:14.287 that you get pretty consistent positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:14.287 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.012$  effects for psychotherapies when you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:17.012 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.820$  treating ethnic minority populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:18.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.760$  So it turns out that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:21.837 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.187$  lots of evidence based treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:24.190 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.698$  in the literature now focused on

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:26.698 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.030$  ethnic minorities with a diverse.

 $00{:}12{:}29.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}31.850$  Free of mental health problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:31.850 --> 00:12:34.714 And lots, if you just focus on kids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:34.720 --> 00:12:36.430 that's kind of my my specialty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:36.430 --> 00:12:38.548 So family systems therapies and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:38.548 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.666$  personal psychotherapy, lots of CBT's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:41.666 --> 00:12:43.270 motivational interviewing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:43.270 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.828$  play therapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}12{:}43.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}45.223$  which I was somewhat skeptical

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:45.223 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.729$  of in my early years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:46.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.392$  But if you look at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:48.392 --> 00:12:49.223 treatment outcome literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:49.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.778$  the the data is pretty positive

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:12:50.778 --> 00:12:52.390 in terms of plate the rapies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}12{:}52.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}54.646$  not just for ethnic minorities but

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:12:54.646 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.750$  for Euro American kids as well.

00:12:56.750 --> 00:12:58.525 What's interesting is that modality

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}12{:}58.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}00.693$  doesn't seem to matter much when

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:00.693 --> 00:13:02.338 it comes to treatment outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:02.340 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.519$  For ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:03.519 --> 00:13:05.877 So some folks have argued that

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:05.877 --> 00:13:07.679 group based interventions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:07.680 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.768$  family based interventions might

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}13{:}09.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}12.378$  be particularly helpful for ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:12.378 --> 00:13:15.082 minorities because it allows you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:15.082 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.192$  intrinsically and implicitly bring the

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:17.259 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.139$  cultural context into your therapy process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}13{:}20.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}22.708$  But but when you look at the randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:22.708 --> 00:13:24.798 trials that do direct comparisons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:24.800 --> 00:13:28.692 so parent plus child versus child only

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:28.692 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.900$  family intervention versus individual group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:31.900 --> 00:13:32.743 Treatment versus individual,

00:13:32.743 --> 00:13:34.710 you find that for the most part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.829$  it doesn't matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}13{:}35.829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}37.694$  The outcomes are similar across

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:37.694 --> 00:13:39.290 different sorts of modalities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.342$  even those that's implicitly allow you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:42.342 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.328$  bring culture into the treatment context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:45.330 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.748$  OK, so the first question do

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:47.748 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.250$  treatments work for ethnic minorities?

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:13:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.930$  The answer as well?

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:51.930 --> 00:13:55.170 Yeah, regardless of how you slice it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}13{:}55.170 --> 00{:}13{:}57.250$  we get pretty good,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:13:57.250 --> 00:13:58.290 pretty reliable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00{:}13{:}58.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}00.374$  pretty consistent positive effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:00.374 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.937$  for ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.250$  Not in every single trial,

 $00:14:03.250 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.528$  not not by a long shot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:14:04.530 --> 00:14:07.386 But if you average across all these trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:07.390 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.456$  the the data looks pretty good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:10.460 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.686$  So just because treatments are effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:12.686 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.831$  for ethnic minorities doesn't mean that

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:14.831 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.341$  they're as effective for minorities

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:16.341 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.259$  as they are for your American.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

00:14:18.260 --> 00:14:20.045 So our treatment outcomes worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.858007027857143

 $00:14:20.045 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.830$  for ethnic monitors compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.670185926666667

 $00:14:21.889 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.192$  Euro Americans. So is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.670185926666667

 $00{:}14{:}24.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26.116$  differential effectiveness so we

NOTE Confidence: 0.670185926666667

 $00:14:26.116 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.462$  we looked at this initially in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.670185926666667

 $00:14:29.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.226$  2008 review and meta analysis and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.670185926666667

 $00:14:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:14:36.214$  Bill Miller did the same thing with adults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:38.660 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.910$  In in a substance use context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:40.910 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.073$  And both of those reviews found that

00:14:43.073 --> 00:14:46.141 for the most part there were no ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}14{:}46.141 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}47.797$  differences in treatment effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:47.800 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.431$  And if you look at other reviews

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:49.431 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.740$  they find the same thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:50.740 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.360$  mostly no effects, ethnicity effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:55.360 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.956$  And then when you do find effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:14:56.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.880$  a decent number of studies seem to suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}14{:}58.880 \to 00{:}15{:}00.738$  that ethnic minorities might benefit more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:00.740 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.873$  In fact, we we have a couple of trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}15{:}02.873 \longrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04.816$  that we've done that suggests this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784888813333333

 $00:15:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.700$  So this is an intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:06.700 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.000$  We did what we randomly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:08.000 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.051$  Nine, 270 or or so young women at

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:12.051 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.547$  risk for eating disorders to an online

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:15.547 \longrightarrow 00:15:17.743$  Internet based dissonance oriented

00:15:17.743 --> 00:15:19.555 intervention of Internet based

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:19.555 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.820$  cognitive behavioral treatment or no

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:21.887 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.215$  treatment and and the this dissonance

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:24.215 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.186$  based intervention focus on having

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:26.186 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.334$  women argue in different ways against

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:28.334 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.550$  this thin ideal that's prevalent in

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:30.550 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.830$  Western media and Western social mores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:32.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.454$  And what we found is that at post

NOTE Confidence: 0.7848888133333333

 $00:15:36.454 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.170$  treatment this distance based on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:15:38.170 --> 00:15:39.745 Prevention and CBT were more

NOTE Confidence: 0.7848888133333333

 $00{:}15{:}39.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}41.029$  effective than no treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:41.030 \longrightarrow 00:15:43.182$  reducing symptoms and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:43.182 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.258$  body dissatisfaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784888813333333

 $00:15:44.260 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.250$  No surprise there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:15:45.250 --> 00:15:47.230 But more important for this talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:47.230 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.342$  we found that ethnic minorities

 $00:15:49.342 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.482$  benefited more than you're Americans

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}15{:}51.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}53.773$  from the active intervention in

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:53.773 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.688$  terms of lower eating pathology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:15:55.690 --> 00:15:58.315 less depression and and we found no

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:15:58.315 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.920$  effects for for white participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:00.920 \longrightarrow 00:16:02.060$  So why is this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:16:02.060 --> 00:16:04.190 Well we we don't know for sure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.590$  but we we did speculate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}16{:}06.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}09.358$  And by the way we didn't expect this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}16{:}09.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}12.335$  We we sort of speculated post hoc

NOTE Confidence: 0.784888813333333

00:16:12.335 --> 00:16:14.870 that given that this ethnic minority

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:14.870 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.558$  sample was really predominantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}16{:}16.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}18.519$  Asian Asian American students,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:16:18.520 --> 00:16:20.650 Asian American women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:20.650 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.653$  and previous research found that East

 $00:16:23.653 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.690$  Asian women tend to prefer a lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:25.754 \longrightarrow 00:16:27.588$  body weight and and that they tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:27.588 \longrightarrow 00:16:29.789$  to be more critical of their bodies

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:29.789 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.817$  than than you are American women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:31.820 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.192$  What we argued that it's possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:35.192 \longrightarrow 00:16:38.300$  that the Asian women experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:38.300 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.205$  more psychological discomfort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:16:40.210 --> 00:16:41.950 Then then whites when when prompted

NOTE Confidence: 0.7848888133333333

 $00:16:41.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:43.968$  to argue against this, then ideal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:43.968 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.542$  And that may have resulted in

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}16{:}46.542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}48.631$  greater dissonance which we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:48.631 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.947$  trying to evoke and therefore a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:50.947 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.979$  superior intervention response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.784888813333333

 $00:16:52.980 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.373$  So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:53.373 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.124$  but my larger point is that sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:16:56.124 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.570$  when you do find differences,

 $00:16:58.570 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.685$  sometimes they seem to favor Euro Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:01.690 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.670$  but other times they favor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}17{:}04.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07.148$  I think minorities and we looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:07.148 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.214$  this in a bigger way in this sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:10.214 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.930$  of ongoing review of meta analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.324$  so kind of like a mega analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:15.324 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.764$  we're we're synthesizing other

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:16.764 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.858$  meta analysis that have been done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:18.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.678$  a former student are doing that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}17{:}20.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}23.032$  And what what we found across these

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:23.032 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.082$  29 meta analysis that look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:25.082 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.343$  ethnicity effects is that we find the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}17{:}27.417 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}29.832$  same general pattern generally no

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:29.832 \longrightarrow 00:17:32.184$  ethnicity effects about 62% showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:32.184 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.584$  no effects about 14% of these men analysis.

00:17:35.584 --> 00:17:37.294 So that whites benefit more,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:37.294 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.887$  but then about 17%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:38.887 \longrightarrow 00:17:42.469$  so that ethnic minorities benefit more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:42.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.342$  And so overall there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:44.342 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.150$  there the evidence suggests that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00{:}17{:}47.237 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50.047$  are no consistent ethnicity effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:50.050 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.130$  When you're looking at, say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:17:52.130 \longrightarrow 00:17:54.030$  ethnicity as a moderator of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:17:54.030 --> 00:17:54.790 treatment effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:17:54.790 --> 00:17:57.806 mostly minorities and Euro

NOTE Confidence: 0.7848888133333333

00:17:57.806 --> 00:18:00.068 Americans benefit equally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

00:18:00.070 --> 00:18:01.498 Sometimes there are differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78488813333333

 $00:18:01.498 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.283$  but when there are differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.050$  it seems that ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:05.050 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.594$  Are just as likely to benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:07.594 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.692$  more than than you're Americans.

00:18:09.692 --> 00:18:12.564 OK, so interventions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}18{:}12.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}16.631$  treatment cycle therapy seemed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:18:16.631 --> 00:18:19.316 work well with ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:19.320 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.085$  They seem to work equally

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:21.085 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.460$  well in many of these trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:23.460 \longrightarrow 00:18:25.970$  and certainly in the research

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.978$  syntheses that that suggested.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:27.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.235$  But that doesn't quite get at whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}18{:}31.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}34.059$  cultural tailoring is important or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:34.060 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.284$  It could be that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:35.284 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.120$  One reason that these interventions work

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:37.174 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.326$  as well as they do for ethnic minorities

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}18{:}39.326 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}41.288$  is because there's a lot of tweaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:18:41.290 --> 00:18:42.140 modifying, adaptation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.265$  cultural enhancement going on within

 $00:18:44.265 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.749$  the context of these interventions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:18:46.750 --> 00:18:48.334 So it's still relevant and important

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:48.334 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.760$  to to try to answer whether tailoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:50.760 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.950$  enhances outcomes for ethnic minorities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:52.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.218$  and there are lots of reasons to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:55.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.712$  To think or believe that culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:18:58.712 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.040$  might be important and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:01.040 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.518$  The the clinical context and and my

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}19{:}03.518 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}06.438$  students and I have done a lot of work

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:06.438 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.839$  on this issue over the past decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}19{:}08.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}10.233$  We had more time I talked about

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:10.233 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.083$  some of the work that we've done

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:12.083 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.287$  looking experimental work we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:13.287 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.399$  done looking at stigma.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:19:14.400 --> 00:19:16.785 But but there's a lot of data out there

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:16.785 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.388$  suggesting that ethnic minorities in

00:19:18.388 --> 00:19:20.302 our cultural context in the United

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}19{:}20.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}22.287$  States tend to see having a mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:22.287 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.044$  health problem as more stigmatizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:19:24.044 --> 00:19:26.354 than you're Americans and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:26.354 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.976$  seeking out treatment for seeking out

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:28.976 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.036$  professional treatments being more more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:31.040 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.550$  Stigmatizing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.506$  Ethnic minorities in general are are

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}19{:}35.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}37.668$  less likely to seek out professional

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:37.668 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.068$  help for their mental health problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:40.070 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.078$  Are are mixed data in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:43.078 \dashrightarrow 00:19:45.970$  extent to which they under utilize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:45.970 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.080$  Mental health services.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:19:47.080 --> 00:19:49.155 Some data, for example, example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:19:49.155 --> 00:19:51.380 suggesting that African Americans tend

00:19:51.380 --> 00:19:53.499 to underutilize outpatient services,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}19{:}53.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}56.540$  but in some ways over utilized

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:56.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.756$  in patient services.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:57.760 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.419$  So kind of a mixed picture there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:19:59.420 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.269$  But but areas of ethnic disparity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}02.269 \to 00{:}20{:}05.335$  and why you might think that culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:05.335 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.810$  would be a salient factor to consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:20:08.810 --> 00:20:11.785 We've looked down a decent amount of

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}11.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14.378$  literature of done a decent amount,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:20:14.380 --> 00:20:16.571 done a decent amount of work looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}16.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.793$  at mental health correlates that might

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:18.793 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.823$  be specific to ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.250$  And immigrants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}23.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}25.420$  So this slide just shows some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:25.420 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.951$  the the work that we've done

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}27.951 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}30.790$  including a meta analysis that we just

 $00:20:30.790 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.190$  did recently looking at something

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}33.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35.110$  called the immigrant paradox.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:20:35.110 --> 00:20:38.146 So how how immigrants have more

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:38.146 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.170$  immigration related stressors but

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:40.249 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.301$  they also seem to have fewer mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:43.301 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.887$  health problems than than native born

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:45.887 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.590$  folks have the same broad cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}48.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}51.340$  background. Lots of data suggesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}51.340 \to 00{:}20{:}53.625$  That certain cultural groups drop

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:53.625 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.370$  out of treatment at higher rates

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:20:56.370 --> 00:20:57.522 than you're Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:20:57.522 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.442$  And then there's data suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00{:}20{:}59.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}01.480$  that ethnic minorities generally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:01.480 --> 00:21:03.816 but Latinos, Native Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:03.816 --> 00:21:07.320 and African Americans more more specifically,

 $00:21:07.320 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.300$  tend to face greater treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:09.300 --> 00:21:11.211 Barriers are relative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:11.211 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.759$  To to Euro Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.860$  So lots of reasons to think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:15.860 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.179$  culture might be important to consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:18.180 --> 00:21:19.998 So what is culture responsive treatment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:20.000 --> 00:21:20.406 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:20.406 --> 00:21:22.970 there's there's no one uniform view here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:22.970 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.500$  A lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:23.500 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.295$  Lots of frameworks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:24.300 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.224$  lots of theories,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

00:21:25.224 --> 00:21:26.148 lots of perspective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:26.150 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.120$  lots of opinions and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80087236

 $00:21:28.120 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.090$  lots of labels that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:30.172 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.620$  are out there too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:31.620 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.270$  So my, my broadly I'm,

00:21:34.270 --> 00:21:37.678 I'm sort of operationalizing a culturally

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:37.678 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.179$  responsive treatment as any effort

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:40.179 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.444$  to make treatments more appropriate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:42.450 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.610$  For ethnic minority populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:46.610 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.490$  Lots of models out there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

00:21:48.490 --> 00:21:51.166 I just have a few here, Larry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

00:21:51.166 --> 00:21:53.546 Roger ahead in early model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00{:}21{:}53.550 \rightarrow 00{:}21{:}56.240$  kind of the tripartite model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811943936785714

 $00:21:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:57.460$  Guillermo bernal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:00.130 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.470$  Steve Lopez, one of my colleagues

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:02.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.946$  at USC has this really cool

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}22{:}04.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}06.778$  shifting cultural lenses model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}22{:}06.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10.170$  So and then in a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:10.170 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.230$  In a few review papers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:12.230 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.522$  we we basically argue that there

00:22:14.522 --> 00:22:17.223 are three broad ways of thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:22:17.223 --> 00:22:18.867 about cultural competence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.180$  If you look at the broader

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:21.180 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.071$  theoretical literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:22.071 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.576$  So their skills models these

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:22:24.576 --> 00:22:27.193 prioritize developing it and applying

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}22{:}27.193 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}29.858$  clinician culture knowledge to the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:22:29.860 --> 00:22:30.598 Therapeutic enterprise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:30.598 \longrightarrow 00:22:33.550$  and this is generally what we think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:33.615 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.715$  when we think of cultural competence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:35.720 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.220$  cultural competence sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.220$  of training for clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:39.220 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.635$  And then there are the adaptation models

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}22{:}41.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}44.179$  and this tends to prioritize tweaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:22:44.180 --> 00:22:48.896 adapting or modifying a a treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}22{:}48.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.848$  particularly a manualized treatment.

 $00:22:50.848 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.283$  And then these process models

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:53.283 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.524$  and the this focuses more on like

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:22:56.524 --> 00:22:57.862 therapeutic interactions trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:22:57.862 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.118$  to elicit cultural meanings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:23:00.120 --> 00:23:03.498 And then using that that understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:03.498 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.191$  of those meanings to shape treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:07.191 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.382$  goals and strategies and ways to match

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}23{:}11.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}14.860$  the the worldviews of the client.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:14.860 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.812$  And it turns out that the skills

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}23{:}18.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.976$  models and the process models that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:21.976 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.818$  that there there's the least amount of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}23{:}24.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.237$  rigorous data supporting these and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:27.237 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.330$  lot of the empirical action has been with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.272$  Cultural adaptation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:31.272 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.040$  So even though a lot of theories focus

 $00:23:35.124 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.861$  on skills based models that try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}23{:}37.861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}40.663$  that argue for cultural competence training,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:40.663 \longrightarrow 00:23:43.368$  there's very little data rigorous

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:43.368 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.950$  data looking at that and instead

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:45.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.086$  the the evidence base tends to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:48.160 \longrightarrow 00:23:50.440$  focus more on adaptation models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:50.440 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.861$  So if you look at some broad

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:54.861 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.546$  recommendations that are are made with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}23{:}58.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}59.926$  regard to treating ethnic minorities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:23:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.692$  so some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}24{:}00.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02.216$  And minority recommendations are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:02.216 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.649$  to use short term time limited,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:04.650 --> 00:24:05.160 pragmatic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.200$  directive goal oriented treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.240$  with ethnic minorities being

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:09.240 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.834$  intended to the effects of ethnic

00:24:11.834 --> 00:24:13.446 minority status or discrimination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:13.450 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.185$  trying to validate the clients

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:15.185 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.226$  experiences with racism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:16.230 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.344$  role induction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:17.344 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.243$  basically orienting clients to to the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:21.250 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.438$  The assumption being,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:22.438 --> 00:24:24.814 and it's a valid assumption that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:24.814 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.032$  ethnic minority center has have

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:27.032 --> 00:24:28.784 less experience with therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:28.790 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.242$  they they tend to be less

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:30.242 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.210$  familiar with the culture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:31.210 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.584$  Of therapy, basically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:32.584 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.468$  And then, Umm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:34.468 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.340$  cultural or ethnic match.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:38.340 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.740$  Now the the problem is that there's

 $00:24:39.740 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.167$  not a lot good evidence based

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:41.167 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.733$  for most of these ethnic matches.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:42.740 --> 00:24:43.140 One example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:43.140 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.280$  if we have time we can talk more about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:45.280 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.900$  That literature role induction

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:46.900 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.115$  is an exception.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:48.120 --> 00:24:50.106 There is some actually good data

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:24:50.106 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.376$  suggesting that that might be particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}24{:}52.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54.136$  helpful with ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:54.140 --> 00:24:56.079 And then in terms of specific groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}24{:}56.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57.964$  again these are these are broad

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:57.964 --> 00:24:59.822 recommendations and I'm not necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:24:59.822 --> 00:25:01.460 endorsing these incorporated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:25:01.460 --> 00:25:03.865 Spirituality and face based coping

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00{:}25{:}03.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.270$  selected use of African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:25:06.347 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.149$  Vernacular English or or Black English,

 $00:25:09.150 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.680$  with the caveat that if you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

00:25:10.680 --> 00:25:12.210 not a native speaker yourself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7570921313

 $00:25:12.210 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.506$  as a clinician you might be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

00:25:15.680 --> 00:25:19.439 Maybe not want to use black

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00{:}25{:}19.439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}21.220$  English for Asian Americans or

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:21.220 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.080$  or folks of East Asian descent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:23.080 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.346$  Accepting and tolerating

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

00:25:24.346 --> 00:25:26.034 low levels of expressivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00{:}25{:}26.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}28.128$  avoiding comments construed as

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:28.128 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.738$  critical of disproving for Latinos,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:30.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.475$  involving the family,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00{:}25{:}31.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}32.700$  and treatment using the polite

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:32.700 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.345$  form of you or who stead when

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

00:25:34.345 --> 00:25:35.233 you're working with adults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:35.240 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.629$  So. So again,

00:25:36.629 --> 00:25:39.880 these are just a sampling of the large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:39.880 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.690$  just set of recommendations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:41.690 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.278$  are made by experts out there, OK?

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:44.278 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.868$  So let's let's that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:45.868 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.140$  that was the context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:47.140 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.078$  Now let's get to the evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

00:25:49.080 --> 00:25:50.683 It turns out that if you look

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:50.683 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.000$  at the current literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00{:}25{:}52.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.712$  research has been published

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:53.712 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.610$  over the past 20 years or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00{:}25{:}56.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58.985$  Most ethnic minority focused treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:25:58.985 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.863$  in the context of randomized trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

00:26:01.863 --> 00:26:04.437 are culturally tailored in some way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:26:04.440 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.064$  one way or another.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:26:06.064 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.094$  So that's increasingly the norm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:26:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.508$  My dog is barking.

00:26:09.508 --> 00:26:11.620 I need to let her out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125

 $00:26:11.620 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.068$  Give me 30 seconds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68729377125 00:26:13.068 --> 00:26:13.430 Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6809458

00:26:40.470 --> 00:26:44.070 Ethnic minority focus. Totally tailor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:26:46.270 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.690$  So we in our 2014 paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:26:51.690 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.946$  we basically synthesized 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:26:53.946 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.330$  meta analysis that looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:26:57.427 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.187$  effectiveness of culturally tailored

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:01.187 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.006$  interventions for ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:03.006 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.466$  And all of them all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.213$  Ten of them showed that culturally tailored

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:27:06.213 --> 00:27:07.709 treatment was better than no treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:07.710 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.610$  placebo, and treatment as usual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:10.610 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.015$  But but that doesn't quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:27:12.015 --> 00:27:13.420 answer the question of whether

 $00:27:13.469 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.798$  culture tailored treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}27{:}14.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}17.700$  Much better than generic treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}27{:}17.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}20.020$  standard treatments that don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:20.020 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.200$  necessarily consider the cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:22.200 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.858$  mores of the client population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:26.860 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.932$  So when we look more specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}27{:}29.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}33.819$  at the adapted tweet tailored

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:27:33.819 --> 00:27:36.678 treatment versus generic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}27{:}36.680 --> 00{:}27{:}38.000$ you know our own lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:38.000 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.926$  we find these really mixed results

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}27{:}39.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42.178$  and I'll just give you 2 examples

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:42.178 \longrightarrow 00:27:44.292$  of two meta analysis that that take

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:27:44.361 --> 00:27:46.296 you in two different directions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:46.300 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.508$  So this is the one that we published

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:49.508 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.568$  in 2008 and we looked at culturally

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:52.568 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.760$  responsiveness in two different ways.

 $00:27:54.760 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.685$  We we it was a more conservative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:56.690 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.415$  Definition where if in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:58.415 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.795$  context of the randomized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:27:59.800 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.236$  published,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:00.236 --> 00:28:02.416 randomized trial they mentioned tweaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:02.420 --> 00:28:03.960 adapting, or something like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:03.960 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.920$  then it was culturally responsive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.016$  But we also used a more liberal definition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:08.020 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.510$  We went to treatment manuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:09.510 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.238$  we went to chapters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}28{:}11.238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14.300$  we we got some other info from

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:14.300 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.764$  from the treatment developers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:15.764 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.931$  and if they if there was any info

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:18.931 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.643$  suggesting in those secondary sources that

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:21.643 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.149$  the intervention was closely responsive,

 $00:28:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.192$  then we we defined it a more liberal way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:27.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.210$  Either way you slice slice it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:29.210 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.298$  conservative versus liberal definition

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:31.298 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.386$  standard and culture responsive

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:33.386 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.197$  interventions were equally effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:35.197 \longrightarrow 00:28:37.309$  in our meta analysis for kids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.130$  But then in our meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:40.130 --> 00:28:42.010 focused on Asian Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:42.010 --> 00:28:43.834 specifically East Asian

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:43.834 --> 00:28:46.266 Americans and SE Asians,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}28{:}46.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}49.240$  we found this interesting gradient

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:49.240 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.616$  where those interventions tailored

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:51.616 --> 00:28:53.780 specifically for East Asian

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:53.780 --> 00:28:55.768 subgroups like Chinese Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:28:55.770 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.614$  Korean Americans had the most robust

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:28:58.614 --> 00:29:00.530 effects and then those tailored

00:29:00.530 --> 00:29:02.330 broadly for Asian Americans had

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:02.330 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.310$  kind of a more moderate effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:04.310 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.295$  And those tailored broadly for

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:06.295 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.883$  minorities are not tailored.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}07.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}10.445$  All had the lowest or smallest effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:29:10.450 --> 00:29:12.760 So in our own work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.154$  what we're finding kind of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:29:15.154 --> 00:29:16.750 sort of different possibilities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:16.750 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.890$  different findings in terms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:29:19.890 --> 00:29:21.465 Cultural tailoring effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}21.465 \to 00{:}29{:}24.894$  And then the most rigorous way to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:24.894 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.336$  at this is to look at those studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}27.336 \to 00{:}29{:}29.811$  that specifically compare a generic

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:29.811 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.342$  intervention to a culturally modified

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:32.342 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.747$  version of the same intervention.

 $00:29:34.750 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.850$  So a culturally adapted CBT

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}37.850 --> 00{:}29{:}40.330$  versus a generic CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:40.330 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.230$  We found about ten of

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:29:42.230 --> 00:29:44.130 those about a decade ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:44.130 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.186$  and we synthesized them in a meta analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:47.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.948$  and we found an effect size of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:49.950 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.010$  0 zilch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:51.010 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.600$  In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}52.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}54.336$  the culturally tailored interventions

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:29:54.336 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.940$  were no more effective than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00{:}29{:}57.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}59.161$  generic interventions in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:29:59.161 --> 00:30:00.778 head-to-head comparisons now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:00.780 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.644$  So keep this in mind because we're going

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:02.644 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.635$  to come back to this briefly shortly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:04.635 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.100$  So what do we know so far?

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.315$  Therapies are generally

00:30:09.315 --> 00:30:10.935 effective for ethnic minorities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:10.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.136$  and this is true in lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:13.136 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.234$  and real-world settings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:30:14.240 --> 00:30:14.524 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:14.524 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.796$  it turns out that in real world settings

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:16.796 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.819$  the the effects tend to diminish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:18.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.030$  but that's true for euro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:21.030 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.842$  As well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

00:30:21.842 --> 00:30:23.466 many evidence based treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.4804258

 $00:30:23.466 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.090$  are are out there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:25.090 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.540$  although they've been developed primarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:30:27.540 --> 00:30:30.352 for for Black and Latinx folks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}30{:}30{:}352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}32.886$  But the the data is growing when

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:32.886 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.128$  it comes to Asian Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:35.130 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.234$  indigenous populations,

 $00:30:36.234 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.546$  and ethnic minorities in other countries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:39.550 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.314$  In fact, we're working on a meta

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:41.314 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.661$  analysis now focused on indigenous

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:30:42.661 --> 00:30:44.269 populations not just in the US,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:30:44.270 --> 00:30:47.025 but also where they're mostly CBT's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:47.025 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.940$  but not exclusively.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.210$  We also find that ethnic minorities in your.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:30:50.210 --> 00:30:53.180 America's mostly benefit equally and

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:53.180 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.150$  overall cultural tailoring doesn't appear

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:56.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.396$  to reliably enhance treatment effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:30:59.396 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.992$  So does culture matter and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:03.992 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.536$  does cultural tailoring matter?

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:05.540 \longrightarrow 00:31:07.478$  I think the answer is yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}07.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09.657$  but like like many things in life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:09.660 \longrightarrow 00:31:11.088$  it's it's complicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}11.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}14.420$  So I'm going to quickly go through

 $00:31:14.509 \longrightarrow 00:31:16.727$  like 5 lessons that I've kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}16.727 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}18.472$  of learned in immersing myself

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:18.472 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.630$  in this literature and doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:20.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.492$  This this work over the past

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:23.492 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.180$  20 years or so first.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:31:26.180 --> 00:31:28.060 I would argue that successful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:28.060 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.872$  culturally responsive treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:31:29.872 --> 00:31:33.496 might be redundant with what many

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}33.496 \to 00{:}31{:}35.750$  clinicians do naturally anyway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}35.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}38.414$  So this is a figure taken from our

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:31:38.414 --> 00:31:41.432 our 2014 paper and it basically shows

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}41.432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}43.710$  the percentage of clinicians based

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}31{:}43.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}46.636$  on self report who say that they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:31:46.636 --> 00:31:48.865 fairly competent when working with

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:31:48.865 --> 00:31:51.505 ethnic minorities or that they tweak,

00:31:51.510 --> 00:31:53.442 adapt or modify in some way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:53.442 \longrightarrow 00:31:55.377$  to make their interventions more

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:55.377 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.465$  relevant for ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:57.470 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.717$  And it turns out that the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:31:59.717 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.095$  overwhelming majority of clinicians

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:01.095 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.850$  say that they're competent and

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:02.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.969$  or that they that they tweet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.770$  Or adapt or or modify in some way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:32:08.770 --> 00:32:10.117 So adaptation, tweaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:10.117 \dashrightarrow 00:32:12.362$  being sensitive at least based

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:12.362 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.669$  on self report from clinicians

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:14.669 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.894$  is is essentially the norm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:16.900 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.173$  Now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:17.173 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.357$  It doesn't mean that they're doing it well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:19.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.570$  My my suspicion is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:20.570 \longrightarrow 00:32:21.780$  there's a lot of variation,

 $00:32:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.018$  like some some are really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}32{:}24.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}27.332$  really good at it and they get great outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:27.332 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.348$  when they adapt and others are horrible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:30.350 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.408$  But but it it is the norm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:32.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.855$  So that's some one thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:33.855 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.710$  to sort of keep in mind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:32:35.710 --> 00:32:38.440 Another is this notion of equifinality

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:38.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.924$  and and it it it the argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:41.924 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.343$  here is that culturally diverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:44.343 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.217$  clients might take different paths

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:47.217 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.413$  within the same intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:49.413 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.480$  to arrive at the same place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:32:52.480 --> 00:32:54.710 So you can give different

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}32{:}54.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}56.494$  groups the same intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:32:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.912$  The processes what happens in treatment

 $00:32:58.912 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.520$  might look somewhat different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:00.520 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.145$  but they get to the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:03.145 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.895$  place essentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418 00:33:03.900 --> 00:33:04.130 So, NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.970$  so one of the problems here is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}33{:}05.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}08.080$  there's not a lot of research looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:08.080 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.296$  at ethnocultural differences and

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:09.349 \longrightarrow 00:33:10.674$  treatment processes and and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}33{:}10.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12.375$  what we did in this particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:12.375 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.000$  study by one of my former students.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418 00:33:15.000 --> 00:33:15.402 So, NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:15.402 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.814$  so there's this notion that resistance

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:17.814 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.219$  in the context of treatment is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:20.220 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.459$  is bad generally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:21.459 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.524$  And Patterson and Chamberlain and

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}33{:}23.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}26.038$  other scholars have kind of start to

 $00:33:26.038 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.055$  normalize that and argued that well

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:28.055 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.663$  resistance is actually kind of kind of OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:33:30.670 --> 00:33:32.478 it's it's sort of normal and they they

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:32.478 \longrightarrow 00:33:34.027$  have the struggling working through

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

00:33:34.027 --> 00:33:35.762 model that they develop basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00{:}33{:}35.762 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37.454$  saying well you expect resistance to

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:37.454 \longrightarrow 00:33:39.078$  be low at the beginning of treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.730989418

 $00:33:39.078 \longrightarrow 00:33:40.568$  and low at the end of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}33{:}40.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}42.426$  but you expect a decent amount of it

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:42.426 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.227$  in the beginning and that's that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:44.227 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.141$  maybe a good thing because this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:46.198 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.626$  suggests that they're struggling

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:33:47.626 --> 00:33:49.768 and working through as clients to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}33{:}49.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}51.870$  get to a better a better place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:51.870 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.650$  So, so the rapist should anticipate.

 $00:33:53.650 \longrightarrow 00:33:54.810$  This and work with this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:54.810 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.350$  but not just think of it as a bad thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:33:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.614$  And what they find in their work is

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}33{:}59.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}01.548$  that with predominantly white families

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:01.548 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.152$  in parent training is that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:34:04.152 --> 00:34:06.329 struggle in working through pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:06.329 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.424$  is predictive of better outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:08.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.992$  So we wanted to see what this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}34{:}10.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}14.186$  applied to black families who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:14.186 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.028$  getting multisystemic therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:16.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.747$  And these were mostly black and white

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:19.750 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.640$  kids in the juvenile justice system

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}34{:}21.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}23.730$  who also had comorbid substance use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.762$  Problems and what we found was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:27.762 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.030$  the struggle and working through

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:31.030 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.195$  pattern was true and held

 $00:34:34.195 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.575$  for your American families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:35.580 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.925$  Yes, they they showed this same pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:37.925 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.168$  that Chamberlain and Patterson argued for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:34:40.170 --> 00:34:41.462 but African American families

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:34:41.462 --> 00:34:42.754 showed a different pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:42.760 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.734$  They they struggled around the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:44.734 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.839$  amount at the beginning of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:46.840 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.680$  in the end of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.872$  but they struggled a lot less than Euro

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}34{:}49.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51.872$  Americans did in the middle of treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:51.872 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.740$  during that kind of working through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:53.740 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.870$  Process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}34{:}55.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}58.354$  So and I won't get into

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:58.354 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.596$  this complicated figure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:34:59.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.120$  So it it argues that.

 $00:35:02.120 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.920$  So that data suggested that our black

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:35:07.577$  families and our white families getting

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:07.577 \longrightarrow 00:35:10.331$  the same interventions had this sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:10.331 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.544$  of different resistance trajectory

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:12.544 \longrightarrow 00:35:15.054$  within the context of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:15.060 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.923$  but they got to the same place

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:35:17.923 --> 00:35:20.098 outcomes were similar for our

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:20.098 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.830$  black and white families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:21.830 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.860$  Another lesson is that cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:23.860 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.078$  responsive treatment effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}35{:}25.078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}26.930$  might vary by acculturation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555 00:35:26.930 --> 00:35:27.445 status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:27.445 \longrightarrow 00:35:32.080$  and here I'll focus on a trial that we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:32.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.860$  Did a decade ago where we randomly

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:35.860 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.825$  assigned phobic Asian Americans to either

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:38.825 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.120$  get a standard exposure based treatment,

 $00:35:42.120 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.600$  a culturally modified version

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:43.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.080$  of the same treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:47.380$  or a self help intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:47.380 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.509$  And these are mostly small animal phobics

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:50.509 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.656$  and and I won't get into the adaptations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:54.660 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.005$  but there are 7 broad adaptations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:35:57.005 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.660$  we made to this this intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:35:59.660 --> 00:36:01.736 Many of them had spider phobias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:01.740 \longrightarrow 00:36:03.280$  but not all of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.320$  And basically what what we found

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}36{:}05{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}07.669$  is that the culture we adapted

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}36{:}07.669 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.501$  intervention and the standard

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}36{:}09.501 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}11.850$  intervention were both fairly effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:11.850 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.075$  relative to the control condition

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:14.075 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.850$  at getting good outcomes at post

 $00:36:16.850 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.820$  treatment and then six months later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:19.820 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.846$  But more interestingly and also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:23.846 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.164$  adaptive intervention was somewhat more

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:27.164 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.368$  effective for two of the outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:30.370 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.690$  Then then the standard intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:33.690 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.200$  But then,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.985$  when we looked at a culturation stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:35.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.450$  we found some interesting patterns.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}36{:}37.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}39.935$  So the culture adapted into

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:39.935 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.923$  intervention seemed to work

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:36:41.923 --> 00:36:44.417 best for those who are most.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:44.420 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.558$  Identify with their Asian American heritage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00{:}36{:}47.560 \longrightarrow 00{:}36{:}51.400$  So the the low acculturation or the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:36:51.400 --> 00:36:54.530 high Asian identified folks seem to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:54.530 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.120$  have the best response to our culture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:36:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.890$  We adapted intervention and there are

 $00:36:58.890 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.510$  a couple of other trials done by other

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:37:01.510 \dashrightarrow 00:37:03.240$  scholars that find something similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:37:03.240 --> 00:37:04.736 So you don't find this all the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

00:37:04.740 --> 00:37:07.050 but you find it enough to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7974415555

 $00:37:07.050 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.590$  suggest that there might

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:08.669 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.794$  be a pattern. Another interesting finding

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:12.794 \longrightarrow 00:37:16.898$  is that cultural responsiveness can help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:16.900 \dashrightarrow 00:37:19.645$  In some cases, and it can harm in others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:19.650 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.642$  Recall that meta analysis that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}37{:}21.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23.941$  mentioned where we got an overall effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:37:23.941 --> 00:37:26.184 size of point O1, essentially zilch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:26.184 \dashrightarrow 00:37:29.803$  where the we looked at studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}37{:}29.803 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.162$  compared adapted interventions to

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:32.162 \dashrightarrow 00:37:35.666$  generic versions of the same treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:35.670 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.225$  So yes, the overall effect was .01,

 $00:37:38.230 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.894$  but if you look at the individual trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:40.894 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.868$  outcomes, you see a lot of variation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.402$  Some of the trials show pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:37:45.402 --> 00:37:46.668 robust positive effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:46.670 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.618$  other trials showed pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:48.618 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.079$  robust negative effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:37:50.080 --> 00:37:52.141 So the argument is that tailoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:52.141 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.307$  can be helpful in some cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:54.310 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.899$  but it can harm in other cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:55.900 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.160$  So, well, why is this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:37:57.160 \dashrightarrow 00:38:00.528$  Well, it turns out that some scholars have

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:00.528 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.260$  have speculated on why this might happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:03.260 \longrightarrow 00:38:05.020$  Monica Webb argued that, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:38:05.020 --> 00:38:08.540 sometimes some forms of cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:08.540 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.356$  adaptation might evoke negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}38{:}11.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}15.430$  emotional reactions in in.

 $00:38:15.430 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.390$  Ethnic minority clients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:16.390 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.350$  So for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:17.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.822$  she had a this smoking cessation

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:19.822 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.470$  intervention that was culturally

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:21.534 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.019$  adapted where they had sort of slavery

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:24.019 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.515$  imagery that they used to kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:26.515 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.567$  highlight some of the negative effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:28.570 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.498$  of smoking for African Americans and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:31.498 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.066$  and that their sense is that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:35.066 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.234$  they reflect on later that it may have

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:38.234 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.168$  rubbed some of their African American.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:38:41.170 --> 00:38:45.200 Clients the wrong way basically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:38:45.200 --> 00:38:45.640 Another argument,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:45.640 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.180$  I think this is maybe a more

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:47.180 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.800$  important argument,

 $00:38:47.800 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.014$  is that there might be less

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:50.014 \longrightarrow 00:38:51.852$  activation of change mechanisms if

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:51.852 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.952$  you focus too much on the cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:53.952 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.679$  content or cultural context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:38:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.038$  So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:38:56.038 --> 00:38:58.544 So tailoring in this way it might

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}38{:}58.544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}00.306$  distract from core intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:00.306 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.246$  strategies or create inefficiencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:02.246 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.960$  in in your your intervention in ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:05.960 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.540$  that might interfere with the active

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}39{:}08.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}11.227$  ingredients of of the the intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:39:11.230 --> 00:39:13.060 Wendy Clara did this interesting study

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:13.060 \longrightarrow 00:39:15.358$  that kind of looked at this, but we're.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:15.358 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.080$  Let me I need to flip past that and

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:18.080 \longrightarrow 00:39:21.024$  and go through a couple more slides

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:39:21.024 --> 00:39:24.108 so we have enough time for Q&A.

 $00:39:24.110 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.690$  So culture responsive interventions can help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:26.690 \dashrightarrow 00:39:30.420$  Sometimes they can harm and other times.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:30.420 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.434$  And in fact 5th my 5th lesson is

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:33.434 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.356$  that effective culture we talked of

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:36.356 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.465$  treatment might challenge conventional

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:38.465 \longrightarrow 00:39:41.315$  notions about what matters when.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:39:41.320 --> 00:39:44.725 We're addressing diversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:39:44.725 --> 00:39:48.884 So Brian Kim, counseling psychologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}39{:}48.884 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55.268$  did a series of really cool analog studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:39:55.268 --> 00:39:59.720 evaluating Epic match with Asian Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:39:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.962$  and they found that Asian

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:02.962 \longrightarrow 00:40:04.486$  American counselors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}40{:}04.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}09.058$  when paired with Asian American clients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:09.060 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.366$  smiled less than Euro American counselors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}40{:}12.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}14.526$  An Asian American counselors

 $00:40:14.526 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.682$  received lower session positivity

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:16.682 --> 00:40:19.000 and session arousal ratings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:19.000 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.072$  then Euro American counselor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92004714538461500:40:21.072 --> 00:40:22.108 So again, NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00{:}40{:}22.110 \to 00{:}40{:}25.950$ all Asian American clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:25.950 --> 00:40:28.918 But the Asian American counselors

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:28.918 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.424$  are smiling less,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:30.430 --> 00:40:34.130 and they're perceived less positively

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:34.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.678$  than Euro American counselors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:35.678 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.000$  So this leads to this very

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:38.077 \longrightarrow 00:40:40.049$  counterintuitive possibility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:40.050 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.400$  It's just suggests that sometimes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:42.400 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.669$  Ethnic minority therapists,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:43.669 --> 00:40:45.361 particularly those who might

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:45.361 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.140$  be more culturally attuned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:47.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.768$  might inadvertently engage in less therapy

 $00:40:49.768 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.200$  conducive behavior than white therapist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:52.200 --> 00:40:53.664 And this might have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

00:40:53.664 --> 00:40:55.794 you know, implications for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615 00:40:55.794 --> 00:40:57.188 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.920047145384615

 $00:40:57.188 \longrightarrow 00:41:01.650$  the this interesting ethnic match literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:03.940 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.404$  One of my increasingly favored studies is on

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:41:08.404 --> 00:41:15.238 done by Immel and his colleagues and the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:15.240 \longrightarrow 00:41:17.473$  The the premise here is that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:41:17.473 --> 00:41:19.437 really don't know what reliably

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:19.437 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.782$  makes some therapist more effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:21.782 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.040$  with ethnic minorities than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:24.040 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.160$  But what we do know is that some

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}41{:}27.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}29.327$  the rapists are reliably more

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:29.327 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.927$  effective with ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:31.930 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.960$  Than than others and Emma's

 $00:41:33.960 \longrightarrow 00:41:35.990$  work kind of highlights this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:35.990 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.590$  So and that there were kind of suggests this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:39.590 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.470$  this possibility for reverse engineering

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:42.470 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.774$  the cultural competence process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:44.780 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.377$  So, so his group basically reported data

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}41{:}47.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}50.138$  from a large clinical trial showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:50.138 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.238$  that although outcomes generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}41{:}52.238 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}55.198$  were equivalent for white and ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}41{:}55.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}57.383$  minority folks in drug treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:41:57.390 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.450$  some therapists had great outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:01.450 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.301$  The clients broadly?

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:42:03.301 --> 00:42:05.769 Umm. And and importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}42{:}05.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07.955$  some the rapists had superior outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:07.955 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.666$  with white clients whereas some had

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:10.666 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.936$  better outcomes with ethnic minorities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:12.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.110$  So some therapists appeared to be more

 $00:42:15.110 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.836$  skilled at treating minorities where

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:16.836 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.412$  others are more skilled than treating whites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:42:19.420 --> 00:42:20.948 But but more importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:20.948 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.721$  some therapists appeared to be great at

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:23.721 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.776$  treating everyone white and minority.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:25.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.881$  So basically the lower the value here

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:28.881 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.377$  the the better the the outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:32.380 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.804$  So so these are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:34.804 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.668$  Are star clinicians basically who

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:37.668 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.296$  are who are reliably getting good

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:42:40.296 --> 00:42:43.210 outcomes not just with white clients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:43.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.526$  but with ethnic minority clients too?

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}42{:}45.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}47.925$  So they're getting good outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:47.925 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.882$  generally and they're getting it those

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:50.882 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.786$  outcomes for white and minority clients.

 $00:42:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.887$  So these are the folks we want to emulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:55.887 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.777$  and we want to find out more about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737 00:42:57.780 --> 00:42:58.245 Um, NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:42:58.245 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.570$  however these clinicians are overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:00.570 \longrightarrow 00:43:02.989$  they're not getting great outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:02.989 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.399$  and you're seeing the disparity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}43{:}05.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}08.704$  So their outcomes for epic minorities are

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:08.704 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.940$  worse than they are for Euro Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:13.940 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.172$  So the so in and more studies have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:18.172 --> 00:43:20.537 done replicating kind of this finding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:20.540 \longrightarrow 00:43:22.940$  So therapist variability in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:22.940 --> 00:43:25.905 your ability to get good outcomes broadly

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:25.905 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.908$  and your ability to get good outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:28.910 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.582$  For ethnic minorities in

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:31.582 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.507$  relation to Euro Americans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:33.507 --> 00:43:37.456 but what we don't know is what it is

 $00:43:37.456 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.228$  that these star clinicians are doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}43{:}40.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}42.609$  compared to these clinicians who need

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:42.609 --> 00:43:45.409 kind of maybe maybe more help in terms of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:45.410 --> 00:43:47.580 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.750$  reducing disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:49.750 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.036$  So what Emmel argues is that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737 00:43:52.040 --> 00:43:52.527 well, NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:52.527 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.962$  maybe culturally competent therapists are

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00:43:54.962 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.418$  those who achieve equivalent outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:57.418 --> 00:43:59.608 with white and minority clients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

00:43:59.610 --> 00:44:02.858 but they're also meeting some sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.771793737

 $00{:}44{:}02.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05.269$  absolute standard of of effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00{:}44{:}08.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}11.284$  OK, let me just give some quick reference

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:11.284 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.449$  recommendations and I'll kind of wrap it up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:13.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.140$  So given all this context,

00:44:15.140 --> 00:44:16.270 given everything I've thrown at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:16.270 --> 00:44:18.568 what, what, what am I recommend?

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00{:}44{:}18.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}20.178$  In the past I was kind of reluctant

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:20.178 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.810$  to give concrete recommendations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:21.810 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.568$  especially when it came to cultural

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:23.568 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.478$  competence as you since the research is

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:25.478 --> 00:44:27.430 is still kind of shaky at this point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:27.430 --> 00:44:30.038 but I think I feel more confident now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:44:32.290$  especially given some of the new

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:32.290 --> 00:44:34.250 stuff that's that's come through

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00{:}44{:}34.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}36.614$  the pipeline over the past decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:36.620 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.622$  So what I recommend a cognitive behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:38.622 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.210$  therapy is another evidence based

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:40.210 --> 00:44:41.915 treatments as first line treatments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:41.920 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.648$  continuous assessment and feedback.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:43.648 \longrightarrow 00:44:47.255$  What we do know is that when clinicians

00:44:47.255 --> 00:44:50.538 are monitored and when they get feedback

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:50.538 --> 00:44:52.837 session by session from clients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.700$  that feedback seems to improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

00:44:54.700 --> 00:44:57.326 performance and you find this in for

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:57.326 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.624$  clients more broadly and for ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.81670325

 $00:44:59.624 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.630$  minority clients more specifically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:04.330 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.067$  There, there. It turns out that their

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}07.067 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}09.014$  engagement strategies that seem to

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}09.014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}11.492$  work well for your Americans and ethnic

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:11.492 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.747$  minorities appointment prompts work well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}13.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}15.670$  Role induction, orienting clients

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}15.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}18.550$  at in those first initial sessions

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}18.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}20.890$  to the the culture of treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:20.890 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.039$  actively addressing treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:45:22.039 --> 00:45:23.954 barriers early on in treatment.

00:45:23.960 --> 00:45:26.312 These things seem to work fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}45{:}26.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}28.700$  well regardless of ethnic background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:28.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.180$  And then what about tailoring?

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:30.180 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.508$  What are some ways?

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:45:32.510 --> 00:45:34.950 To to think about tailoring,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.936$  you can use evidence based treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:36.936 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.110$  that include tailored elements,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:39.110 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.674$  adopting a tailoring model with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:44.674 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.784$  method that individualizes to address

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:46.784 \longrightarrow 00:45:50.918$  code for factor, so acceptance and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:50.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:53.404$  A commitment treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:53.404 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.060$  multisystemic therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:45:55.060 --> 00:45:58.428 which I did for a number of years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:45:58.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.610$  The Incredible years program for

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:00.610 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.354$  kids with behavioral problems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.782$  and this is just a sampling of

 $00:46:04.782 \longrightarrow 00:46:07.290$  interventions that have this sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:07.290 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.162$  individualized approach that intrinsically

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}46{:}09.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}11.720$  kind of addresses cultural factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:46:11.720 --> 00:46:13.757 This is one of the many tailoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:13.757 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.289$  models that are out there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:15.290 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.534$  but be mindful of the possibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:46:17.534 --> 00:46:19.624 that doing too much tailoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}46{:}19.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}22.204$  or tweaking or modifying can

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:22.204 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.268$  interfere with active ingredients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:24.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.800$  So so you do the tailoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:28.800 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.290$  and cultural infusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:33.290 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.776$  In moderation and and with that

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}46{:}36.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}39.870$  possibility that that concern in mind

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:39.870 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.565$  and then and then finally a approaching

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:42.565 \longrightarrow 00:46:44.270$  tailoring as hypothesis testing,

 $00:46:44.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:46.900$  not as an assumption there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:46:46.900 --> 00:46:49.535 There's a lot of variability

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:49.535 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.643$  across our diverse clients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:46:51.650 --> 00:46:54.205 So we probably shouldn't go in assuming

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:54.205 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.721$  that we need to tweak Taylor adapt

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:46:56.721 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.378$  or modify in some way just because

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}46{:}59.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}01.626$ someone's African American just

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:47:01.626 --> 00:47:04.024 because someones Central American.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:47:04.024 --> 00:47:07.209 Heritage and just approaches hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:47:07.209 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.439$  testing and assess routinely as

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}47{:}10.439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}12.899$  you're doing your intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:47:12.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.300$  Umm. Well, let me stop there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

00:47:18.300 --> 00:47:18.667 OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00{:}47{:}18.667 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.401$  stop share.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:47:19.401 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.970$  And I think we have maybe about

NOTE Confidence: 0.729031572041666

 $00:47:22.048 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.000$  10 minutes for questions.