

A Qualitative Study Examining Discussions Of Multicultural Perspectives In
Clinical Supervision

by

Angela Lynn Zapata

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved November 2010 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Bianca Bernstein, Co-Chair
David W. Coon, Co-Chair
G. Miguel Arciniega
Patricia Arredondo

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2010

ABSTRACT

Multicultural counseling competencies (MCCs) are fundamental to the ethical practice of providing services to clients. One such competency is the aspect of self-awareness of one's own worldview. As such, it is incumbent that attention to counselor's self-awareness be a part of clinical training. While research has begun to examine multicultural supervision, much of the research holds assumptions about the types of multicultural discussions that take place, as well as what may actually occur within these sessions. Little is known about what is discussed and how. This exploratory, qualitative study examined what actually occurs within clinical supervision sessions with regard to having discussion of multicultural perspectives, as well as how supervisors and supervisees experience these discussions.

Five supervisory dyads from university counseling centers in the southwest were recruited to engage in a guided discussion of multicultural perspectives (DMP) in a supplemental supervision session. In these DMPs, dyads were asked to discuss issues related to personal identity, as well as to discuss the relevance of having such discussions in clinical supervision. Both the supervisors and supervisees then engaged in follow-up telephone interviews with the researcher to discuss their experience in having this discussion. All supervision sessions and follow-up interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Grounded theory was used to analyze the transcribed sessions and the follow-up interviews for emergent themes. Four domains emerged from the data: dynamics in the relationship, cultural lens, characteristics of the discussion, and

impact of the discussion. Further, several areas of congruence between supervisors' and interns' accounts of what occurred during the DMP, as well as congruence between supervisors' and interns' accounts of what occurred and what actually happened during the DMPs were discovered. These areas of congruence that emerged included power, similarities, differences, comfort level, enjoyment, intentionality for future work and increased awareness. The one distinct pattern of incongruence that emerged from the data was in the category of increased connection in supervisory relationship. A theoretical model of supervisors' and interns' experiences in discussions of multicultural perspectives is included.. Implications, limitations and suggestions for future research are explored.

DEDICATION

My family has always been a source of support for me. Not only have they provided continual love and understanding, but each member of my family has also added their unique perspectives to my life. My sister, who is also my best friend, has always been the person to whom I can go and who will tell it like it is. Her direct feedback, both positive and constructive, and at times gentle, at others stern, has helped me to reassess what it is I value in life and make the necessary adjustments. My mother, my everlasting cheerleader, has always helped to build up my confidence, always sharing her belief that I can do anything I put my mind to and that she believes in me. My dad has been the person who taught me to live and speak from my truth and to stand in my power, even if it seems like it is against all odds. And lastly, my niece, Lexus, whose gentle spirit reminds me to take time out to really enjoy life and express myself in exciting ways. I can't tell you how much you have all been an inspiration to me. I could not have completed this final leg of the journey without you. Thank you for being there and encouraging me to reach for the stars. *¡Te quiero mucho para siempre!*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely grateful to my participants for having the courage to take part in this study, knowing you were being asked to engage in a potentially difficult dialogue. I cannot express how much I appreciate being allowed to “witness” your process as you shared of yourselves with each other in an open and honest manner. I am honored to have the opportunity to share your experiences with the academic world and to utilize your experiences as a platform for encouraging such multicultural engagement among others in the field of mental health.

To my committee, you each contributed to this process in various ways, both professionally and personally. To Dr. Bernstein, I am very appreciative of the ways in which you challenged me to become an expert in this area of study, and sometimes with a kick in the right place! To Dr. Coon, you have been a steady mentor in the realm of research, and your modeling of connecting with participants in a personal way has been instrumental in my dissertation process. To Dr. Arciniega, my academic *padrino*, I cannot express to you how much your constant nurturing support has meant and how you helped me trust that I could reach my destiny. And to Dr. Arredondo, my academic *madrina*, you have been a consistent inspiration to me being a Latina who is a leader in the field of multicultural psychology, and you have helped me develop an even stronger passion for social justice work than I had thought was possible.

And finally to Linda Sompai, I cannot tell you how vital your help with transcribing was in my process of completing this dissertation. You are a very

special woman who never hesitates to lend a hand. I hope you know how wonderful you are!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
CHAPTER	PAGE
1 THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE	1
Conceptual Framework and Literature Review	2
Multicultural Competencies in Clinical Practice	4
Multicultural Supervision	7
Multicultural Supervision Theories.....	8
Empirical Research in Multicultural Supervision.....	12
Multicultural Supervision and Supervisory Working Alliance..	17
Purpose.....	22
2 METHODOLOGY.....	23
Research Paradigm	23
Methodological Approach.....	28
Qualitative Research Methodology.....	29
Grounded Theory Research.....	30
Researcher-as-Instrument	33
Participants and Recruitment.....	38
Demographics	40
Measures	42
Description of Training	42

CHAPTER	PAGE
Procedure	43
Multicultural Supervision Session	43
Interviews and Rapport.....	44
Data Collection and Transcription	46
Data Analysis	47
3 RESULTS	52
Domain 1: Dynamics in Relationships.....	53
Domain 2: Cultural Lens	65
Domain 3: Characteristics of Discussions	73
Domain 4: Impact of Discussions	83
Comparison Coding.....	90
Theoretical Model.....	129
4 DISCUSSION	131
General Discussion	133
Implications of Emergent Categories.....	139
Domain 1: Dynamics in Relationships.....	139
Domain 2: Cultural Lens	152
Domain 3: Characteristics of Discussions	157
Domain 4: Impact of Discussions	169
Limitations	176
Recommendations.....	178
Concluding Thoughts	179

REFERENCES	181
APPENDIX	
A INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER	188
B DEMOGRAPHIC FORM	190
C ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ASKED OF SUPERVISORS .	192
D ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ASKED OF INTERNS	194
E SUPPLEMENTAL SUPERVISION INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUPERVISORS.....	196
F DIMENSIONS OF PERSONAL IDENTITY	201
G QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Pseudonyms for Participants by Dyad	52
2.	Emergent Domains and Categories	53

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Theoretical Model of Discussions of Multicultural Perspectives in clinical supervision	205

Chapter 1

The Problem in Perspective

Many psychologists suggest multicultural competencies are directly related to ethical practice in providing services to clients (APA, 2003; Arredondo & Toporek, 2004; Fouad, 2006; Heppner, 2006; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). The APA Code of Ethics (1992) states, “Psychologists provide services, teach and conduct research only within the boundaries of their competence, based on their education, training, supervised experience, or appropriate professional experience.” (Principle 1.04). Arredondo and Toporek (2004) cite the ACA Code of Ethics as the backbone for inclusion of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies as ethical practice. Fouad (2006) further cites the ethical need for skills in recognizing differences among cultural groups and in learning to work with those who differ from us. She suggests that helping trainees become culturally competent increases their ability to be effective practitioners, teachers and researchers. Fouad suggests that curriculum be infused with a culture-centered perspective, with practicum being included in the curriculum. Heppner (2006) contends that increased cross-cultural competence encourages a deeper understanding of counseling as it occurs within a cultural context and increases overall effectiveness of counseling, as well as increases the profession’s ability to address the needs of diverse populations. Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) suggest a need for multicultural competence in a society in which services to underserved ethnic minority populations is increasing.

Though the need for multicultural competencies is great, there is little research examining the methods for increasing such competencies, especially within the context of clinical supervision. In fact, most of the research examining multicultural issues in clinical supervision has looked primarily at satisfaction and perceptions in supervision, as well as the ability to include multicultural issues in case conceptualization. Those studies that do examine multicultural competencies focus on self-report and do not control for social desirability. This exploratory, qualitative study proposes a necessary step back to examine what actually happens when supervisors and supervisees engage in discussions of multicultural perspectives, as well as their perceptions of such discussions.

Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

In order to understand the issues that are important in multicultural clinical supervision, a detailed review of the guidelines regarding multicultural competencies and theories of multicultural supervision is necessary. Often, multicultural supervision has been defined in previous studies as being a supervisory dyad that is comprised of a supervisor and supervisee who differ in relation to their race, ethnicity and/or culture, or it has been defined as that supervision that focuses on multicultural case conceptualization (Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997; Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski, Hess, & Knox, 2006; Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, & Patel et al., 2001). Multicultural supervision is defined in this study as supervisory relationships in which the supervisor and supervisee engage in discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs). While the term multicultural

may be used to reference merely race and ethnicity in many other studies, this term is being expanded in this study. These multicultural perspectives may be comprised of a number of personal identities, including but not limited to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, age, nationality, political affiliation, religion and spirituality, etc., as well as concepts such as stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, oppression, power and privilege.

The review of the guidelines regarding multicultural competencies will address awareness, knowledge and skills psychologists and counselors should possess to ethically work with clients of various identities, including race and ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, etc. (APA, 2003; Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996), curriculum for counselor education (Fouad & Arredondo, 2007), and principles to be implemented when working with clients (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004). Review of the theories of multicultural supervision includes developmental stages of cross-cultural awareness (Christensen, 1989), stages of multicultural supervision (Carney & Kahn, 1984), a discriminant model of multicultural supervision (Chen, 2005), an interactional approach to multicultural supervision (Chen, 2001), and the importance of multicultural discussions in supervision (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004). The working alliance in clinical supervision and its relation to multicultural supervision also will be explored. Finally, a review of empirical research regarding multicultural supervision will be included.

Multicultural Competencies in Clinical Practice

In response to the call for multicultural counseling competencies as guidelines for ethical practice, APA (2003) developed guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. The following pertain to counseling and supervision:

Guideline 1: Psychologists are encouraged to recognize that, as cultural beings, they may hold attitudes and beliefs that can detrimentally influence their perceptions of and interactions with individuals who are ethnically and racially different from themselves; Guideline 2: Psychologists are encouraged to recognize the importance of multicultural sensitivity/responsiveness to, knowledge of, and understanding about ethnically and racially different individuals; Guideline 3: As educators, psychologists are encouraged to employ constructs of multiculturalism and diversity in psychological education; and Guideline 5: Psychologists are encouraged to apply culturally appropriate skills in clinical and other applied psychological practices.

Further, the members of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, a division of the American Counseling Association, developed Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCCs) (1992). These include the following domains: 1) counselor awareness of own cultural values and biases, 2) counselor awareness of client's worldview, and 3) culturally appropriate intervention strategies. Multicultural competence is the extent to which counselors have appropriate levels of self-awareness, knowledge and skills within these three areas in working with people from diverse backgrounds (Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996).

The specific competencies regarding attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills are quite extensive, and are conceptualized in specific behaviors. In regard

to the attitudes and beliefs aspect of the first domain of the MCCs, counselor awareness of own cultural values and biases, Arredondo et al. (1996) suggest that culturally skilled counselors: 1) are aware of their own culture and sensitive to their own heritage; 2) understand that their cultural experiences and background influence their attitudes, biases and values regarding psychological processes; 3) can identify the bounds of their multicultural competence and expertise; and 4) can recognize their discomfort with differences that are present between themselves and their clients. In regard to the knowledge aspect of the MCCs, they hold that culturally skilled counselors: 1) have knowledge about their own cultural heritage and how it professionally and personally impacts biases about and definitions of normality/abnormality and counseling process; 2) are knowledgeable and understanding of how stereotyping, discrimination, oppression, racism and privilege affect them both personally and in their profession, which allows them to better understand their own oppressive attitudes, beliefs and feelings; and 3) have knowledge about the impact they have on others socially, including communication styles and how they may foster the relationship or have conflict with clients from different backgrounds. Arredondo et al. also propose the following skills for culturally skilled counselors, including: 1) the ability to seek out experiences for education, consultation, and training in order to further develop their understanding of and effectiveness in working with populations from different cultures; and 2) an understanding of themselves as cultural and racial persons and the pursuit of a nonracist identity.

Some scholars have suggested a multicultural focus in educational curriculum for increased multicultural competence in counseling and psychology trainees. Fouad and Arredondo (2007) suggested guidelines and best practices for a culture-centered educational program in psychology. In their book, they propose that programs ensure that trainees increase awareness of their own cultural biases and values, knowledge of other groups, and gain skills to work with people from diverse populations. To this end, they recommend practicum experiences that expose trainees to diverse populations, and that trainees have access to supervisors who possess competence in helping trainees to develop skills to work with clients from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds. Carter (2003) also suggested that encouraging counselor trainees to engage in self-assessment will increase understanding of themselves, their biases, beliefs, and values. Coleman (1998) posited the promotion of self-awareness and empathy is indicative of increased competence in a clinician. Thus it may be inferred that supervisors also engage in self-assessment and encourage this self-assessment in their supervisees.

Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, and Weintraub (2004) have proposed a set of principles they believe counseling psychologists should implement in counseling and social justice work. These principles derive from feminist and multicultural approaches to counseling. The principles include: 1) on-going self-examination in which counseling psychologists face their stereotypes and biases toward people in out-groups, to recognize how sociohistorical and sociopolitical forces impact one's own and client identities,

and to recognize the role of power in the therapeutic relationship; 2) the sharing of power with the clients with whom counseling psychologists work through shared decision-making and remaining cognizant of the power differentials when working with traditionally disenfranchised groups; 3) a commitment to giving voice to groups who have traditionally been oppressed, which may occur through narrative; 4) a raising of consciousness by helping clients to understand how their presenting issues may be tied to historical, social and political influences; 5) identification of clients' strengths, skills and abilities, and aid to help clients recognize they are competent and powerful, with the ability to create and enact solutions to their problems; and 6) the intentional provision of access to resources for self-determination among minority groups. While the authors do not explicitly address supervision, one might be curious about whether or not these guidelines may be appropriately applied to supervisors in regard to their supervisees and supervisees' clients.

Multicultural Supervision

The inclusion of multicultural issues in supervision seems important. Bernard and Goodyear (1998) suggest the goals of supervision are to examine client welfare and help increase the professional competence of the supervisee. As such, some scholars have proposed a need for culture to be discussed and integrated into supervision (Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Helms & Cook, 1999). It also appears that supervisees may believe culture should be infused into supervision. Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, and Ho (2001) discussed multicultural supervision from the perspective of four supervisees who were psychologists-in-

training. According to those who took part in the discussion, multicultural supervision takes into consideration and integrates various cultural interactions as they occur within the supervisor-supervisee-client triad. Supervisees also suggested that the dynamics of the supervisory relationship are greatly affected by cultural interactions; the quality of supervision is impacted by power dynamics associated with multicultural aspects including race, ethnicity, gender and other cultural factors.

Multicultural Supervision Theories

Given the focus on multicultural competencies among counselors and psychologists, some theories have been developed around supervision that center on multicultural issues. Christensen (1989) put forward developmental stages of cross-cultural awareness among trainees. These stages include: 1) unawareness – in which serious thought has not been given to cultural differences or their meaning and impact on individuals and groups; 2) beginning awareness – in which trainees experience uneasiness and cognitive dissonance around cultural differences; 3) conscious awareness – in which trainees experience conflicting preoccupation with cultural differences and their meanings; 4) consolidated awareness – in which trainees become committed to societal change and intergroup understanding; and 5) transcendent awareness – in which trainees go beyond social dictates for relating to culturally different groups.

Christensen's stages of cross-cultural awareness may inform multicultural supervision. Carney and Kahn (1984) developed stages of multicultural supervision. The first stage is highlighted by the supervisor's primary task, which

is to encourage the supervisee to explore ways they and their clients have been impacted by group membership. In Stage 2, the supervisor helps the supervisee to increase familiarity with ethnic-racial identity theories, helps to identify stages of identity development, discusses dynamics of interacting at different stages of identity development, and fosters awareness and confidence in using culturally-specific interventions. Stage 3 emphasizes the supervisor's acknowledgement of dilemmas supervisees face in wishing to work in a more culturally-responsive manner, yet also feeling trapped by their limited professional training. In this stage, the supervisor should be supportive of supervisee's frustration and provide opportunities to acquire new, culturally-responsive counseling skills. In Stage 4, the supervisee is in the process of developing a professional identity as a multicultural counselor. Here, the role of the supervisor is to help the supervisee develop a comprehensive understanding of the intersection of various contextual factors. In the final stage, supervisees advocate for rights of Persons of Color, and the role of supervisor is one of consultant. This stage model for multicultural supervision presumes that it is the role of the supervisor to broach the topic of multicultural issues in the supervision session.

Roles and goals for multicultural supervision have also been suggested. Chen (2005) proposed four roles of a supervisor in multicultural supervision: as teacher, as counselor, as supervisor and as advocate. As a teacher, the supervisor strives to raise supervisee's awareness about racial-cultural issues in supervision and counseling, as well as expand knowledge and skill base that affect the supervision relationship and process. As a counselor, the supervisor creates a receptive

atmosphere of trust and safety; they also help to identify and overcome obstacles that may interfere with acquisition of declarative knowledge. As a supervisor, the supervisor supports integration of cognitive learning with supervision practice; further, they safeguard the welfare of supervisees and clients alike. Finally, as an advocate, Chen suggests the supervisor identifies and remediates problems with an external source for supervisor trainees. According to Chen, the supervisor will be an advocate “when contextual conditions may hamper or sabotage racial-cultural training” (pp. 179). Supervisors should also promote and embrace multiculturalism within the system. Similar to Carney and Kahn’s (1984) developmental stages of multicultural supervision, Chen’s theory of the role of supervisors in multicultural supervision places the introduction of multicultural-oriented discussions in the hands of the supervisor. Note that in Carney and Kahn’s model, the focus in multicultural supervision is solely on race, ethnicity and culture.

Chen (2001) also suggested an interactional approach to multicultural counseling supervision. Chen proposed that all supervisory relationships are multicultural in nature, and suggested an inclusivist definition of multiculturalism which includes expanding the discussion to other variables such as sexual orientation, gender, physical ability, and socioeconomic status, similar to the definition of multicultural supervision in this dissertation. He argued that minority groups in each area may experience similar forms of oppression and discrimination from the majority culture. Chen’s interactional approach includes two concepts: intentionality and reflection. Intentionality refers to the counselors

and supervisor's purposeful behaviors and perceptions that may be reactions to the context in which they exist, but also as a result of one's culture. Chen posited that a counselor's cultural sensitivity is related to how the counselor purposefully applies a cultural perceptual schema when working with clients to understand the client's experience. Reflection refers to the internal process of attention and thought. Chen suggested reflection assists the counselor to make meaning of the complexities and ambiguities of the relationship between themselves and their clients across various factors. This means engaging in a series of thoughts and actions grounded in their professional experience. Thus the role of supervision is "to facilitate the reflection of counselor intentionality" (pp.812) in order to aid the supervisee in confronting attitudes and biases, increase the acquisition of knowledge, and improve skills for the integration, evaluation and application of such knowledge.

Chen's (2001) interactional approach for supervision strives to train reflective supervisees who are mindful of their own views and assumptions and who can incorporate intervention strategies into the counseling process. He went on to say that this approach can also motivate supervisees to be self-directed and self-monitored. According to this approach, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to utilize critical incidents to improve the supervisee's reflective skill by guiding the supervisee's exploration of interpersonal counseling relationships. The supervisor does this by initiation of discussion through encouraging the supervisee to describe the situation, aiding information gathering regarding to reactions and perceptions, confronting the supervisee in regard to alternative responses, and

planning what to do in the next session. The supervisor then facilitates the use of this information to evaluate the supervisee's cultural effectiveness.

Other scholars have also suggested the inclusion of multicultural discussions in supervision. In a case study, Estrada, Frame, and Williams (2004) argued for the importance of meaningful discussions regarding race and ethnicity in cross-cultural supervision. They cited personal observations of resistance by supervisors and supervisees in discussing issues of race, ethnicity and culture. They further stressed creating safety within the supervisory relationship in order to facilitate these multicultural discussions. And similar to Fouad and Arredondo's (2007) contention that faculty and students be evaluated annually for cultural competence, Estrada, Frame, and Williams suggested that supervisors and supervisees conduct self-assessments regarding cultural awareness, and that they embrace learning opportunities. They also viewed the role of the supervisor as one to raise the topic of differences in race and ethnicity, expectations and fears.

Empirical Research on Multicultural Supervision

Studies point to the need for increased multicultural competence among counselors and psychologists. Constantine (2002) discovered that clients' satisfaction with counseling was related to perceptions of counselors' general and multicultural competence. She further found that racial and ethnic minority clients' perceived counselor multicultural competence accounted for significant variance in satisfaction beyond that of perceived general counseling competence. Ancis and Szymanski (2001) conducted a qualitative analysis of White counseling trainees' responses to a questionnaire regarding White privilege. Three themes

were discovered in the data: 1) lack of awareness and denial of White privilege, 2) demonstrated awareness of White privilege and discrimination, and 3) higher order awareness and commitment to social action. The authors posit that trainees' reactions incorporated many interrelated components, exploration of the intersection of socio-identities, and attitudes toward those who are racially different than themselves. The authors imply that these findings point to a need for training that encouraged trainees to listen for clients' testimony regarding issues of race and ethnicity, as trainees may not have an understanding of how White privilege might impact psychological services to ethnic-racial minority clients. In a recent review of the literature, Hays and Chang (2003) explored the complexity and interdependence of White privilege, racism and oppression, particularly how they impact the field of counseling and supervision. They suggest that defining and explaining how these concepts function is vital in clinical supervision. When working with White supervisees, they presented the following as important: discussing the meaning of being White, examining the values and traditions associated with being White, exploring how the counselor's racial heritage might impact the relationship with the client, and how this racial identity might also impact the supervisory relationship.

In a study examining counselor trainees' perceptions of clients based on the client's sexual orientation, Barrett and McWhirter (2002) found that counselor perceptions of their clients were significantly predicted by the client's sexual orientation, the counselor's gender, and the counselor's homophobia. Counselors assigned more negative adjectives to gay male and lesbian clients than they did to

heterosexual clients, and counselors with higher levels of homophobia used less positive adjectives for gay male and lesbian clients and more positive adjectives for heterosexual clients than did those counselors with lower levels of homophobia. Further, the relationship between levels of homophobia and the assignment of negative adjectives was stronger for male counselors than for female counselors. There was also a negative relationship between the level of homophobia and the number of relationships the counselors had with gay males or lesbians in their private lives.

Given the need for increased multicultural competence in counselors, some studies have examined supervisee perceptions in multicultural supervision. Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski, Hess, and Knox (2006) conducted a qualitative study which examined culturally responsive and unresponsive cross-cultural supervision experiences among supervisees of color and of European American background. Cultural responsiveness was defined as responses from a supervisor which acknowledge, show interest in and appreciation for the ethnicity and culture of both client and supervisee, as well as identifying client's and/or supervisee's problems within a cultural context. Burkard et al. found that in culturally responsive supervision, supervisees felt encouraged to explore cultural issues. The supervisory relationship, the supervisee and the client outcomes were affected positively within the context of culturally responsive supervision. Conversely, cultural issues were not acknowledged, actively disregarded or outright dismissed by supervisors who were perceived to be culturally unresponsive. This seemed to negatively affect the supervisory

relationship, the supervisee, and the client outcomes. Further, supervisees of color seemed to experience more cultural unresponsiveness and reported more negative effects than did the European American supervisees. Important to note is that supervisees in this study were asked to focus on supervisory relationships in which they differed from the supervisor racially/ethnically. This study points to the importance of supervisors being open to discussions of multicultural issues in supervision, as well as suggests that the supervisory relationship may be more effective when discussions of multicultural perspectives take place.

Research has also begun to examine the role of multicultural supervision in counselor multicultural competence. Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) conducted a study to examine supervisees' abilities to utilize multicultural case conceptualization and self-reported multicultural competence as a function of racial identity and supervisors' instructions regarding multicultural issues. They found that self-reported multicultural competence was not related to supervisees' multicultural case conceptualization abilities, though supervisors' instruction to focus on multicultural issues in case conceptualization was significantly related to supervisees' ability to do so. Ladany, Inman, Constantine and Hofheinz also discovered that racial identity was positively related to self-reported multicultural competence. Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings and Ottavi (1994) conducted a study examining multicultural competencies in doctoral interns at university counseling centers. They found that interns' multicultural competence was positively related to having received supervision in a multicultural counseling situation, as well as being related to greater

multicultural workshop hours or greater number of multicultural courses. Of importance in this study is the finding that only supervision was significantly related to the awareness aspect of multicultural competence. Given this finding, discussions of a multicultural nature and increasing the awareness aspect of multicultural competence may be a necessary function of clinical supervision.

Some studies have addressed the importance of multicultural discussions in supervision. In an exploratory study, Constantine (1997) posited that all supervisory relationships were multicultural in nature in that there could be a variety of demographic differences between supervisors and supervisees. She found that approximately 70% of supervisors had not completed formal multicultural counseling training, and a reported 15% of supervision time was spent addressing or discussing multicultural issues. Constantine also discovered that supervisees reported supervisors were reluctant to discuss multicultural issues, and some supervisors reported multicultural issues were not important. Dressel, Consoli, Kim and Atkinson (2007) examined supervisors' thoughts regarding multicultural supervision and found elements of successful and unsuccessful multicultural supervision. Creating a safe environment for discussion of multicultural issues; developing self-awareness of cultural/ethnic identity, biases, and limitations; and communicating acceptance of and respect for supervisees' culture and perspective were among the most widely identified successful elements. Unsuccessful elements included a lack of awareness regarding one's own racial/ethnic/cultural biases and stereotyping; overlooking or failing to discuss cultural issues; becoming defensive around cultural issues; and

failing to establish a working alliance and safe environment. In an examination of cross-racial supervision in university counseling centers, Duan and Roehlke (2001) found that supervisees reported more sensitivity to cultural/racial issues than did their supervisors. Supervisors in this study reported making more efforts to address cultural issues than supervisees perceived. Together, the findings of the previous studies may point to a need for supervisors, as well as their supervisees, to increase their multicultural competence and to actively and intentionally engage in multicultural discussions in supervision.

Multicultural supervision and supervisory working alliance

Bordin (1983) described the supervisory working alliance as applying the working alliance, goals, tasks and bond to the supervisory relationship. Thus, the supervisor and supervisee must agree to the goals for supervision, as well as to the tasks that will help them to reach those goals. Goals are the agreed upon objectives for outcomes or change. Goals for supervision include: mastery of skills, increasing one's understanding of the client, increasing understanding of process issues, awareness of the self and its impact on process, overcoming obstacles (personal and intellectual) that may impede learning and mastery, deepening supervisee's understanding of theory and concepts, stimulating interest in research, and maintaining standards of service. Bordin also suggested tasks that may accompany these goals: 1) in the case of mastery of skills, the supervisor gives feedback regarding the supervisee's progress toward mastering those skills, and the mode of feedback ought to be agreed upon; 2) supervisor and supervisee share in the responsibility of the tasks, thus the supervisor shares power with the

supervisee; and 3) supervisor and supervisee select problems and issues for presentation while being able to connect process issues and previous issues presented. According to Bordin, the emotional bond between the supervisee and the supervisor helps support the work that needs to be done in supervision. The bond referred to here is the level of trust, respect, and care the supervisor and supervisee have for one another.

Recent studies have found a relationship between multicultural competence and working alliance in clinical supervision. Inman's (2006) study examined the relationships between supervisees' perceptions of supervisor multicultural competence and supervisory working alliance, as well as trainee multicultural competence and satisfaction with supervision. This study found that supervisee's perceptions of the supervisor's multicultural competence was directly and positively related to the working alliance between supervisor and supervisee, though it also had a direct, negative relationship to supervisees' ability to etiologically conceptualize. Further results indicated a positive mediating effect of supervisory working alliance between perceived supervisor multicultural competence and satisfaction among supervisees. Inman suggested supervisory relationships that implement cultural competence through mutually agreed upon goals and tasks related to multicultural issues may affect greater satisfaction in supervision. Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, and Patel et al. (2001) found that few discussions of culture actually occurred in supervision dyads, though when they did occur, supervisees reported greater working alliances and increased satisfaction with supervision.

It further appears that cultural factors within the supervisory dyad can impact the supervisory working alliance. Some researchers have noted that heightened conflict appears to occur in supervision when the influence of cultural factors was disregarded in the supervisory relationship (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Cook, 1994). Ladany, Britton-Powell, and Pannu (1997) explored the impact of racial identity and racial matching on supervisory working alliance and multicultural competence in supervisees. They assessed both supervisors and supervisees for racial identity development and interactions, and thus examined four phases: 1) regressive relationships in which the supervisee is at a more advanced level of racial identity development than the supervisor, 2) progressive relationships in which the supervisee is at a less advanced level of racial identity development than the supervisor, 3) parallel-low relationships in which both the supervisee and supervisor are at similarly low levels of racial identity development and share similar racial worldviews, and 4) parallel-high in which the supervisee and supervisor are at similarly high levels of racial identity development and share similar racial worldviews. Ladany, Britton-Powell, and Pannu found that the supervisory working alliance was strongest for dyads in the parallel-high condition, meaning they reported the strongest agreement on goals and tasks of supervision. The dyads in this condition were also discovered to have the strongest emotional bonds. Progressive dyads seemed to have the next strongest working alliance, with parallel-low having the next strongest working alliance. Regressive relationships predicted the weakest supervisory relationships. The authors suggested the parallel-low and regressive relationships might be

conflictual, but for different reasons. They posited the parallel-low relationships may be conflictual due in part to lack of general insight which might be reflective of an insufficiency of racial awareness. The authors further suggested regressive relationships may be conflictual in part due to supervisors disregarding racial issues, which may be related to disagreement of goals and tasks in supervision. They went on to say the supervisees will feel less comfortable and be less trusting in their supervisors in this type of relationship. The authors also found that supervisees perceived their supervisors were more influential in helping them to develop multicultural competence in the progressive and parallel-high conditions.

In this study, racial matching did not predict supervisory working alliance, though racial matching did relate to supervisees' perceptions of the influence of their supervisors in developing their multicultural competence (Ladany, Britton-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). In particular, for both supervisees of color and White supervisees, supervisors of color were perceived to have the most influence on the supervisee's multicultural competence. The authors suggested this may reflect that merely working with a Person of Color may signify a multicultural experience in and of itself.

As has been noted, previous research has focused on supervisee perceptions of multicultural competence, satisfaction with multicultural supervision and ability to address multicultural issues in case conceptualization. As mentioned above, the majority of these studies have defined multicultural supervision as those in which the supervisor and supervisee differ along race and ethnicity, or in which the supervisor and supervisee discuss racial and ethnic

differences between the supervisee and her/his clients. Previous research has also examined behaviors of supervisors in multicultural supervision, as well as the relationship of multicultural supervision to supervisory working alliance.

However, many of the previously mentioned studies regarding multicultural supervision hold certain assumptions. One such assumption is that multicultural supervision is that in which the supervisor and supervisee is different racially, ethnically and/or culturally. Most of these studies do not address differences on other levels of identity, such as gender, sexual orientation, age, religion/spirituality, ability, etc. Further, none of these studies examined what actually occurred in supervision; rather, they relied on self-report measures and asked about perceptions of supervision after the fact. Social desirability is a concern with any self-report measure, especially those in which multicultural competence is a factor. These studies did not control for social desirability. Further, except for one study that examined multicultural case conceptualization, the studies did not examine other forms of reports on multicultural competence, such as reports from others or the types of interventions used by supervisees or supervisors that might further assess multicultural competence. What is also missing from the literature is an examination of what happens when multicultural discussions occur in supervision and how this may relate to the supervisor's and supervisee's perceptions about having such discussions. This exploratory, qualitative study took a necessary step back to examine what actually happens in supervision sessions in which discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs) occur, as well as examined the perceptions (thoughts and feelings) of the

supervisors and supervisees when having these discussions. Identifying what actually happens in these supervision sessions could provide a foundation for understanding how supervision may facilitate the development of MCCs.

Purpose

Although it is clear there is an increased need for multicultural counseling competence in counseling and supervision, little research has attempted to study how multicultural competencies may be developed through supervision. In particular, a thorough examination of what occurs when supervisors and supervisees engage DMPs has yet to occur. Therefore, this exploratory, qualitative study explored the experiences of supervisors and supervisees while engaged in DMPs in clinical supervision. Experiences in this study refer to what was discussed, as well as thoughts, feelings and behaviors that occurred during the supervision session. This study explored how supervisory dyads experience a semi-guided DMP.

This study sought to answer the following questions:

- 1) What do supervisors and supervisees experience when having semi-guided discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision?
- 2) How do supervisor's and supervisee's perceptions of what occurred in their discussions of multicultural perspectives compare?
- 3) How do the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding their discussions of multicultural perspectives in supervision compare to what actually occurred?

Chapter 2

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of supervisors and pre-doctoral psychology interns when having discussions of multicultural perspectives. This chapter describes the research paradigm guiding this study, the methodological approach used, participant information, and techniques of data collection and analysis.

Research Paradigm

A paradigm is the worldview or interpretive framework within which a researcher works. Guba (2000) describes a research paradigm as a “basic set of beliefs that guides action” (p. 17). This paradigm consists of five philosophical assumptions: 1) ontology, which refers to the nature of reality, as well as its characteristics; 2) epistemology, which is the study of knowledge; 3) axiology, or the values held by a researcher; 4) rhetoric, or the choice of language used; and 5) methodology, or the ways to go about acquiring knowledge (Creswell, 2007; Guba, 2000; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). There currently exist five primary research paradigms: positivism, postpositivism, constructivism, critical theory, and participatory/cooperative. While qualitative researchers often can blur these paradigms, with a researcher integrating two or more of them, it is helpful to have a basic understanding of each of the paradigms. A brief description of these paradigms follows in order to illuminate the paradigms guiding this study.

Positivism holds that there is an objective world with one, fixed reality that is observable (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; McGrath & Johnson, 2003). This is the

prevailing paradigm utilized in quantitative research, where methodology, typically experimental and/or manipulative, focuses on verifying a priori hypotheses. Here a verified hypothesis is established as fact or truth. The goal in positivism is to find “an explanation that leads to prediction and control of phenomena” (Ponterotto, 2005, pp. 128). Rhetoric within positivism utilizes scientific, structured language, often in quantification of reality. Researchers utilizing a positivistic inquiry approach deny the influence of values on their research, insisting on objectivity throughout the study (Guba & Lincoln; McGrath & Johnson). Further, focus is placed on establishing rigor in the forms of internal validity, external validity, and reliability.

Postpositivism holds that while there is an objective reality, it cannot be fully captured due to the flaws inherent in the mechanisms of human intellect (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Postpositivism differs from positivism in that it focuses on falsification of theory, as opposed to verifying theory. Where postpositivism and positivism agree is in the pursuit of an explanation that leads to predicting and controlling phenomena. Further, postpositivism is similar to positivism in that they focus on cause-effect relationships and they posit researcher objectivity. Typically, researchers employing a postpositivist approach will use various methods in order to apprehend as much of reality as is possible (Miller, Hangst, & Wang, 2003). They will also utilize evaluative criteria similar to positivist researchers (i.e., validity and reliability). Further, these paradigms function from nomothetic (general or universal) and etic (one who is removed from and does not participate in the culture) perspectives (Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Ponterotto, 2002).

While postpositivism, as well as positivism, serve as a foundation for quantitative research, there are those who espouse a postpositivist paradigm who will engage in qualitative research. Those who do will typically use rigorous methods to collect and analyze data (Creswell, 2007).

Constructivism (or interpretivism) holds a relativist stance that assumes there are many and equally valid realities or meanings (ontology) that are apprehendable (Ponterotto, 2005; Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). This approach uses a hermeneutical approach, suggesting that meaning is concealed and necessitates deep reflection to bring that meaning to the surface (Ponterotto, 2005). That deep reflection takes place in the interaction between the researcher and the participant(s). In a constructivist paradigm, both the researcher and the participant create understandings of reality (epistemology). Creswell suggests these understandings are “socially and historically” negotiated through interactions with others (p. 21). Different from positivism and postpositivism, constructivism does not begin with a theory. Rather, a theory is inductively developed or generated. Researchers employing a constructivist perspective will address the process of interactions and specific contexts. In regard to axiology, constructivists realize their values, experiences and background are inherently a part of the research process as they shape researcher interpretations. The goal of constructivist research is to gain an understanding of the lived experiences of the participants, or idiographic and emic perspectives (Ponterotto, 2005). Evaluative criteria in constructivist research include trustworthiness, credibility and confirmability (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Morrow, 2005; Miller, Hengst, & Wang,

2003). The rhetoric of constructivists is often in the first person, and researchers detail their own experiences and biases (Ponterotto, 2005). In an attempt to understand the meanings constructed by participants, those who take a constructionist approach will immerse themselves in naturalistic research designs.

Similar to constructivism, critical theorists hold that reality is constructed in socio-historical context (Ponterotto, 2005; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). However, critical theorists believe that this reality is held within power relations, and the goal of their research is to incite transformation that leads to empowerment and emancipation of oppressed groups. This is done through an emphasis on a dialectic position in the interaction between the researcher and the participant. Knowledge is understood through structural and historical insights (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Similar to constructionists, criticalists acknowledge their biases; however, they go a step further in admitting hopes and expectations that their value biases impact the research process and research outcomes. Criticalists hope to empower their “participants to transform the status quo and emancipate themselves from ongoing oppression” (Ponterotto, 2005, p. 131). Similar to constructivists, critical theory rhetoric will usually be in the first person and will describe the researcher’s personal experiences, biases, expectations and hopes. Further, they will immerse themselves in naturalistic research designs and use of qualitative methods such as participant observation and face-to-face interviews.

The participatory/cooperative paradigm takes a middle-ground on reality, suggesting that reality is co-created by the participant, or the mind, and the cosmos (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Thus reality is both subjective and objective, so

researchers embracing this paradigm do not subscribe to any particular reality or system of philosophy (Creswell, 2007), although they do agree with constructionists and criticalists that research occurs in social, political, historical and other contexts. Those using this paradigm believe they may freely choose any method, technique or procedure that will best meet their research needs and purposes, and will often employ quantitative and qualitative (mixed) methods to answer the research question. Further, the primary focus within this paradigm is not on methodology, but rather on “the actions, situations, and consequences of inquiry” (Creswell, p. 22). Researchers here are concerned with “political participation in collaborative action inquiry” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p. 195). They tend to be very pragmatic and practical, with the primary goal of encouraging social action.

For the purpose of this study, a constructivist approach was taken with postpositivist elements infused into the methodology and participatory elements infused into the methodology and goals of this research. The use of a constructivist paradigm was appropriate as I desired to learn about the meaning and gain a deeper understanding of what supervisors and interns experience when they engage in discussions of multicultural perspectives while in clinical supervision. I recognized that the interactions between supervisors and interns have social and historical meaning, but wanted to learn more about how these meanings might be negotiated within clinical supervision, as well as how that may impact the participants. I wanted to learn about the participants’ lived experiences and to understand their perspectives of what occurred in these clinical supervision

sessions. Further, the relativist ontology, or multiple realities, and transactional epistemology, or the researcher-participant interactions, of constructionism fit well for understanding the social realities of the participants and how these realities may impact their clinical work through observation of clinical supervision sessions and semi-structured interviews. As per the constructivist view, my values and experiences were important to acknowledge and describe, but were not eliminated. The structure of the methodology (i.e., protocol for guided discussions of multicultural perspectives, semi-structured interviews) follows the postpositivist paradigm. I also employed the postpositivist element of trustworthiness through reflexivity to keep my values and biases appropriately in check and immersing myself in the literature to become aware of various perspectives about having discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision. Further, a participatory paradigm was used in that I hoped that through engagement in a guided discussion of multicultural perspectives, participants might gain insight that would lead to transformation regarding their focus on multicultural issues in clinical supervision. Questions posed during the follow-up interviews with participants included questions about how their participation in this study might impact their future work. Thus, a qualitative methodology was chosen for this study. Grounded theory was chosen for analysis of the data, as described below.

Methodological Approach

Previous research on multicultural supervision has utilized primarily quantitative methods. Qualitative methods have been used sparingly, and in

regard to studying the perspectives of supervisees regarding their experiences with multicultural supervision after the fact. Little is known about what supervisors and supervisees experience while engaged in multicultural discussions in a clinical supervision session. Therefore, qualitative methods can help to expand the knowledge of experiences in having such discussions in supervision, and perhaps shed light on important aspects that ought to be included in multicultural supervision training.

Qualitative Research Methodology

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggest that “qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world” (p. 3). They posit that researchers employing a qualitative approach study phenomena in their natural setting, attempt to interpret phenomena “in terms of meaning people bring to them” (p.3). Thus qualitative researchers utilize various pieces of empirical information that describe a variety of moments and meanings in people’s lives, such as interviews, case study, personal experience, observation, study of cultural texts, etc. Qualitative research takes an inductive route (or bottom-up approach) to shed light on how various ideas point to key constructs. This inductive approach lends itself well to developing an understanding of what supervision dyads experience while engaged in discussions of multicultural perspectives. This is the primary purpose in this grounded theory study.

Another tenet of qualitative research is to understand the concepts under investigation from the participants’ viewpoint, as opposed to the researcher’s viewpoint. This means focusing on the emic, or insider’s point of view, rather

than the etic, or outsider's point of view, as typically occurs in quantitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). To understand from the emic viewpoint, it is necessary to obtain thick, rich descriptions that cannot be unpacked utilizing quantitative research methods. Thus a qualitative methodology was used to gain a deeper understanding of what is experienced in clinical supervision sessions where discussions of multicultural perspectives take place.

As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggest, qualitative research may utilize a variety of investigative techniques. The primary goal of this study was to understand the experiences of supervisors and interns while having discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision. Therefore, grounded theory was chosen for this study because it focuses not only on content but also process.

Grounded Theory Research

Grounded theory is a bottom-up approach to developing constructs as they emerge from the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The constructs should fit the data from which they emerge and ought to make sense and be understood by not only the participants in the study, but others who practice in that area. Strauss and Corbin hold that a grounded theory that is generated from the data should be abstract enough that it can be applied to various contexts of that phenomenon. Thus a grounded theory approach uses "a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon" (p. 24) However, more recently Charmaz (2006) has advocated for a less systematized and more constructivist grounded theory. Charmaz argues that instead of grounded theory emerging from data separate from the researcher, rather, grounded theory is

constructed “though our past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices” (p. 10). She suggests an approach that assumes any theory that is developed is an interpretation of the phenomenon studied rather than a picture of it. She further states that the theories that researchers develop based on the implicit meanings and experiential views of participants are constructs of what is real.

This study employs the constructivist grounded theory approach advocated by Charmaz (2006) as I hold the view that there are multiple and equally valid realities that are socially constructed, and this research aims at an attempt to understand those various realities. Charmaz holds to flexible guidelines with a focus on developing theory that depends on the view of the researcher. Further, she focuses on understanding experience through embedded and hidden situations, networks, and relationships, as well as highlighting hierarchies in power, opportunities and communication. She advocates placing emphasis on beliefs, feelings, views, values, assumptions and ideologies of individuals as opposed to focusing on research methods. However, she goes on to provide guidelines around the gathering of rich data, coding of data, use of memos and theoretical sampling. While these guidelines seem to hold elements of postpositivism, her focus on beliefs, values, etc suggest a more constructivist approach.

A grounded theory approach seemed most appropriate for this study as it holds primarily with the constructivist paradigm, while infusing some elements of postpositivism. This seems to best reflect the paradigm I chose for this study and

discussed earlier. Modifications to theoretical sampling in grounded theory were made to fit the purpose of this study. According to Charmaz (2006), theoretical sampling means seeking data that are pertinent to developing the emergent theory. She shares that the purpose of theoretical sampling is to expand and polish the categories that constitute the theory. There was a small number of participants (n = 10) as opposed to a greater number which may have helped this study reach saturation. Saturation occurs “when gathering fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights nor reveals new properties of these core theoretical categories” (Charmaz, p. 113). The small number of participants was a function of difficulty in recruitment (see Participants and Recruitment for detailed explanation).

In order to stimulate and encourage a discussion of multicultural perspectives, supervision dyads were asked to engage in a supplemental supervision session in which they were given a guide for having a discussion of multicultural perspectives. Although it was assumed some discussion of multicultural issues was taking place in supervision as the internship sites chosen for this study professed a specialization in multicultural therapy, asking participants to engage in a guided discussion of multicultural perspectives may not reflect naturally occurring discussions. Qualitative research strives to observe what occurs in naturalistic settings. Therefore, this study employs some of the tenets of qualitative research in that the supervisory relationship was already developed. Further, the dyads were asked to have discussions that pertained to their supervisory relationship, as well as their clinical work. Thus, the guided discussion of multicultural perspectives was an additional topic to their already

developed discourse in clinical supervision, especially had they not already engaged in discussions about their supervisory relationship.

Following their experiences in the supplemental supervision session, participants engaged in semi-structured, telephone interviews. Interview questions were designed to “elicit participant’s interpretation of his or her experience” (Charmaz, p. 25). Open-ended, non-judgmental and broad questions were developed. Participants were asked to describe and reflect upon their experiences. However, as is consistent with a constructivist approach, I asked various questions in response to participant answers in an attempt to get deeper and richer reflections, as well as to ascertain participant meaning and interpretation.

Researcher-as-Instrument

When taking a constructionist approach, researcher values are acknowledged and described, but they are not thrown out. As mentioned earlier, Charmaz (2006) states that grounded theory is constructed “through our past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices” (p. 10). She further suggests that grounded theory depends on the integration of constant comparative methods and interaction, which stems from the researcher’s worldview and occurs between the researcher and the data. Thus, it is important to give an explanation of researcher interest in the topic, as well as any experiences with the topic, biases, hopes and expectations. Grounded theorists are encouraged to interact with data and emergent themes in a reflective manner (self-awareness), which promotes the development of abstract interpretations. As such, grounded theory methods help the researcher to grab

hold of fleeting thoughts and questions that give concrete form to ideas for analytical writing. Morrow (2005) puts forth that researcher reflexivity helps the researcher “understand how his or her own experiences and understandings of the world affect the research process” (p. 253). Memos and self-reflective journaling were employed as ways to engage in reflexivity in the current study. Further, Morrow suggests that researchers “always believe something about the phenomenon” they are investigating and thus advocates “grounding in the literature” to militate against biases through understanding various viewpoints about the phenomenon under question (p. 254). As such, a thorough review of the literature was conducted prior to designing and implementing the methodology and analysis for this study.

Morrow (2005) emphasizes the importance of “making one’s implicit assumptions and biases overt to self and others” in qualitative research (p. 254). My interest in multicultural/diversity issues began with my personal experience. I am a woman of multiple heritages (i.e., Latina and White), from a lower middle socioeconomic status background, whose family members espoused various religious and spiritual beliefs. I grew up in a diverse rural area in which there were comparable numbers of Latinos and Whites, with very little representation from other racial and ethnic groups. Further, while there was an active lesbian population in my area, there were no openly active gay groups. I began learning cultural sensitivity at a young age. Further, I witnessed many gender power dynamics which led to my identity as a feminist and social justice advocate, as well as to the decision to study psychology and diversity issues.

I have been studying multicultural and diversity issues throughout my graduate studies in counseling psychology, as well as for two years of my undergraduate studies in psychology with a minor in women's studies. I have attended 7 courses in my graduate study that are specifically focused on multicultural/diversity issues, including the required course in Multicultural Counseling. I have also attended workshops and seminars at regional and national conferences for additional education on multicultural and diversity issues. Much of the research in which I have engaged while in graduate school has focused on various multicultural/diversity and mental health issues, including issues such as race, ethnicity, LGBTQ, religion/spirituality, gender, and socioeconomic status. The majority of my clinical experience has been with diverse populations in university/community college counseling settings. I have also taught courses in multicultural and gender issues at Arizona State University (ASU) at the undergraduate level. Further, I volunteered and worked for the Intergroup Relations Center at ASU as a facilitator for intergroup dialogues, which reflects my values in social justice. An additional reflection of my values in multicultural/diversity and social justice issues is seen in the training I provide to administrators, faculty and staff around these issues in my current place of employment. Clearly, I am passionate about and eager to increase multicultural competencies in order to better serve the populations with whom I work.

I have taken a course in clinical supervision which focused on theory, research, ethics and multicultural issues relevant to supervision, and I engaged in a supervision practicum while attending my doctoral program in counseling

psychology. I received additional training in and provided supervision while on my pre-doctoral psychology internship. To date, I have supervised three Masters of Counseling students and three doctoral students in practicum at university counseling sites. For four of these practicum students, I was their primary supervisor; for two of these practicum students, I was their supervisor for group therapy. Further, I have been a supervisee for approximately six years. This recent experience of being both a supervisor and a supervisee has provided me the opportunity to understand better the complex power dynamics inherent in supervision.

All of these experiences lend to my bias around the importance of having discussions of multicultural perspectives in supervision session. I have found that in my experience, these types of discussion rarely happened unless I explicitly broached the topic with my supervisor. Further, I found that when these topics were discussed, my supervision experiences were enhanced in that I was able to challenge my own assumptions through the support of my supervisor, as well as being able to more thoroughly consider many of the possibilities of how clients' cultural backgrounds might impact their presenting problems. I have also found it useful to have discussions with my supervisors regarding the power dynamics inherent in the supervisory relationship, as well as to discuss the issue of power with my own supervisees. This has been especially helpful in supervisory relationships in which there have been fissures that can further impact the working alliance between me and my supervisor or my supervisee. Further, my own theoretical orientation to counseling and supervision is an integrative

orientation. I integrate feminist, multicultural, social justice, interpersonal and relational perspectives into my own orientation. This integrated theoretical orientation lends itself to the importance I hold in having discussions of multicultural perspectives, both with my clients as well as with my own supervisors and supervisees.

My professional interest in examining multicultural/diversity issues as it relates to supervision stems from a review of the sparse literature on multicultural supervision and a desire to expand this literature to include an examination of what actually occurs when discussions of multicultural perspectives takes place in clinical supervision. It is my hope that the findings of this study will help to increase understanding of how supervision can be instrumental in developing multicultural competencies and sensitivity. I also hoped that participants might gain insights as to the importance of infusing multicultural/diversity discussions in their supervision sessions as impacting provision of services to clients, as well as to the supervisory relationship.

For this study, I acknowledge the following assumptions regarding multicultural supervision: 1) Multicultural counseling and supervision competencies are those many in the mental health fields continually aspire to and seek through continuing education and self-reflection; 2) Supervisees may have more training in multicultural/diversity issues than their supervisors; 3) Power dynamics inherent in the supervisory relationship could make it difficult for supervisees to engage their supervisors in candid discussions of multicultural perspectives; thus it may be necessary for supervisors to introduce the topic in

order for an exchange to take place; 4) Anecdotally, I was trained that self-disclosure on the part of supervisors is inappropriate unless it is deemed necessary for the supervisee's growth, which could stymie discussions of multicultural perspectives if a supervisor is uncertain about this necessity; 5) Supervisors and supervisees may have similarities and dissimilarities in various personal and professional identities and which could impact not only the supervisory relationship, but also the work the supervisee does with the clients.

Participants and Recruitment

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Arizona State University (See Appendix A). Participants were recruited from APA-accredited pre-doctoral psychology internships at university counseling centers in the southwest to engage in discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs). APA-accredited pre-doctoral psychology internship sites were chosen as recruitment sites due to the requirement that they provide a multicultural/diversity training component. Further, the internship sites chosen for recruitment purposes were those that professed provision on the APPIC website of specialized training with multicultural/diverse populations. According to this criterion there were 32 internship sites chosen for recruitment purposes. In addition, supervisors for APA internship sites are required to have a doctoral degree and to be a licensed psychologist. Further, criteria for the supervisors in this study were that they have provided supervision for at least three years, denoting some experience with the supervisory role. Interns were trainees in a doctoral program in psychology who were engaged in their pre-doctoral psychology clinical training.

During the first wave of recruitment, a script was emailed to the training directors at the internship sites requesting they forward the invitation to participate to their interns. The decision to send the recruitment script via email to interns as opposed to supervisors, or to both interns and supervisors, was a result of wanting to honor the power differential in the supervisory relationship and give interns the power and authority to decide if they wanted to participate independent of their supervisor's desires. Interns were then asked to approach their supervisor regarding participation if they were interested. Interns would inquire as to the supervisor's willingness to participate. Interns were offered \$35 for their participation. Supervisors and interns were asked to consent to participation.

This method of recruitment proved to be difficult and there was no response from potential participants during the first round of invitations to participate. I sent out a second round of invitations and again received no response. I then began to contact training directors by phone to request assistance with participation. Again, this method did not elicit responses. Finally I began to contact (via email and phone) people I knew personally and knew to be currently on internship. It was at this point that people began to consider participation.

Although the recruitment script explicitly stated the supervision dyads were to engage in discussions of multicultural perspectives, interns returned to me with questions from their supervisors regarding what was being asked of them before they would consent to participation. Specifically, some interns shared their supervisors' concerns about possible evaluation of multicultural competencies or general caution about participation. While I did not send out the protocol for the

guided discussion, I did provide answers that more explicitly described what they would be asked to do in the multicultural supervision session, as well as making it understood that this was not an evaluation of their multicultural competencies. Once these concerns had been assuaged, eight (8) supervision dyads verbally consented to participation. However, three (3) dyads withdrew their verbal consent to participate for various reasons, including lack of time, being too busy, and lack of availability to participate. Each dyad was instructed to engage in a supplemental supervision session lasting 1 hour to have DMPs. They also provided demographic information and information related to their training.

Demographics

Five (5) supervisor-supervisee dyads from APA-accredited pre-doctoral psychology internships at university counseling centers in the southwest were recruited to engage in DPMs. Supervisors' ($n = 5$) ages ranged from 30-44 years of age ($M = 35.20$, $SD = 5.26$). Four of the supervisors were female, and one was male. Four of the supervisors identified as Euro-American/White, while one of the female supervisors identified as Asian/Asian-American. Four of the supervisors identified as heterosexual, while one female supervisor identified as bisexual. Three of the supervisors reported religious/spiritual identity as Atheist/Agnostic, while one supervisor reported identifying as a non-denominational Christian and Jew, and another supervisor identified as non-denominational spiritual. All supervisors reported they had received education and training in supervision, and the number of supervision courses or continuing education they had received ranged from 2-5 ($M = 3$, $SD = 1.22$). All but one of

the supervisors stated they had received education in multicultural/diversity issues and the number of courses or continuing education they had received ranged from 0-10 ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 3.90$). All five supervisors reported their theoretical orientation as integrative, with three of these supervisors stating their integrative orientation includes relational, interpersonal, humanistic, and psychodynamic approaches. Two other supervisors reported their theoretical orientations integrate primarily behavioral and cognitive behavioral with interpersonal approaches.

Supervisees were pre-doctoral psychology interns (Interns) who were working on doctoral degrees in either clinical or counseling psychology. Interns' ages ranged from 27-32 years of age ($M = 30.00$, $SD = 1.87$). All interns were female. Four interns identified as Euro-American/White, while one intern identified as Asian/Asian-American. All five interns reported identification as heterosexual. In regard to religious/spiritual orientation, two interns reported identifying as Christian, one intern identified as Methodist, one intern identified as Atheist/Agnostic, and one intern did not report her religious/spiritual orientation. Four interns reported they had coursework in supervision, but all interns reported they had experience in providing supervision and had received supervision training in their internship experience. Each of the four interns who reported they had coursework in supervision also reported they had 1 course in their graduate training. All interns reported they had received education in multicultural/diversity issues and reported the number of multicultural/diversity courses or continuing education they had received in the range of 5-7 ($M = 5$, $SD = 1$). All five of the interns reported their theoretical orientation as integrative.

They stated their orientations integrate humanistic, relational, psychodynamic and interpersonal approaches. One intern also stated she integrates multicultural, feminist, and systemic influence approaches into her theoretical orientation. It is important to note that one of the interns who participated was a current colleague of mine (at the time of data collection) and another intern was a previous colleague of mine, with whom I had worked as a trainee in a previous practicum experience. Further, two of the supervisors who participated had been my primary supervisor during previous practicum experiences, and another supervisor who participated was the facilitator of the internship group therapy seminar that occurred while I was collecting data for this study.

Measures

Description of Training

Both the supervisor and the supervisee were asked to complete demographic information, including the following: race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, ability/able-bodied, religion/spirituality, nationality, and age (See Appendix B). They were also asked the following: 1) number of multicultural classes/workshops attended, 2) topics of multicultural classes/workshops attended, 3) theoretical orientation, and 4) techniques of preference (See Appendix C for supervisors and Appendix D for interns). Interns were further asked the area of study in which their degree was being earned. In addition to basic demographic information, supervisors were asked to provide the following information: 1) number of years of supervision experience, 2) approximate number of supervisees in the past, 3) information about courses or

continuing education in clinical supervision, and 4) if their education in clinical supervision had a multicultural component.

Procedure

Multicultural Supervision Sessions

Each dyad was instructed to engage in a supplemental supervision session lasting one (1) hour to have a guided discussion of multicultural perspectives (DMP). Supervisors were presented with a guide for DPMs in supervision (See Appendix E). This guide was developed with the Multicultural Counseling Competencies component of self-awareness in mind. As a major portion of the MCCs is that the counselor should be able to identify her/his own cultural background, including attitudes, beliefs and values, a central part of the guide was to instruct participants to discuss their various salient personal identities. The guide instructed participants to use Arredondo and Glauner's (1992) Dimensions of Personal Identity to help facilitate this discussion. Further, the guide included instructions for discussing these identities within the supervisory and therapeutic relationship.

Supervisors were instructed to familiarize themselves with this guide prior to engaging in the supplemental supervision session with their intern. They were further provided with instructions on how to use the digital recorder for audio-recording the supplemental supervision session, as well as to record this session using the preferred method of recording in their counseling center. This additional recording was a precautionary measure in case the digital recording had been damaged in route via the U.S. Postal Service to the researcher. The guide also

included the following questions/topics, as suggested in multicultural supervision literature, to be discussed with the intern in a one-hour supervision session, as well as a copy of Arredondo and Glauner's Dimensions of Personal Identities model (1992) (See Appendix F):

- Important personal identities for both you and your supervisee which may impact supervisory and/or client/counselor relationship
- What makes these identities salient/important to you and your supervisee
- How these identities may impact the supervisory relationship
- What other kinds of multicultural topics would be important to have in clinical supervision and why?

It should be noted that both the supervisors and the interns read and signed the informed consent provided with the instructions for participation prior to engaging in the discussion of multicultural perspectives. Following the supplemental supervision session, both the supervisors and interns were provided with instructions to contact this researcher to schedule the follow-up interviews, as well as instructions for completion of the demographics forms and description of training. They were also provided with a self-addressed stamped envelope in which to return the completed forms to this researcher. The supervisor and intern were instructed to not discuss this supplemental supervision session until after they had engaged in the follow-up interviews with this researcher.

Interviews and Rapport

Following the supervision sessions, supervisors and interns completed and returned a demographics form and answered additional questions regarding their

training and supervision experiences. As per the constructivist paradigm utilized in this study, they then independently engaged in semi-structured telephone interviews with this researcher. Telephone interviews were necessary as participants were located in various areas across the southwest. Following the supplemental supervision session, the supervisor and intern would each contact me via email to schedule the follow-up interview. Interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes. Interviews were recorded via digital recorders. The actual interviews ranged from 20-35 minutes, and the average interview was 24 minutes in length. Interviews were ended when the participants reported they had no additional information to add to what they had shared about their experience in the supplemental supervision session. Rapport had already begun to be established with interns through the recruitment process. However, with all participants, interviews began with questions meant to develop further rapport and to establish a general feeling of comfort in the process (i.e., How has your day been?). Interviews proceeded with a reiteration of the purpose of the study and statements of appreciation for their consent for participation. They also were assured that no identifying information would be included in the reporting of findings in this study and that all recordings would be erased one year following the end of this study. A similar process occurred in establishing rapport with the supervisors, though this necessitated slightly more time allotted to establish rapport with those supervisors with whom I had no previous relationship. The range of time given previously for the semi-structured interviews did not include the time utilized for rapport-building. Further, questions were posed as to the clarity of the instructions

for the guided supervision session and any equipment difficulties that may have occurred. All participants then were asked to respond to questions regarding the topics discussed in the supplemental supervision session, their reactions to this session, their perceptions regarding their supervisor's/intern's reactions, what was meaningful or relevant in this discussion, and how this discussion may impact their future clinical work (See Appendix G). Given the challenges of telephone interviews where one cannot respond to non-verbal cues, I attempted to maintain rapport and to ascertain clarity in meaning by use of reflection and interpretive statements such as 'What I hear you saying is (*fill-in-the-blank*)' and 'It seems you are saying you felt comfortable.' I also asked open-ended questions such as 'What do you mean by that?' and 'Tell me more about (*fill-in-the-blank*).

Data Collection and Transcription

The supplemental supervision sessions and the follow-up interviews were recorded via digital recorder. Recordings were then stored on thumb drive in a locked filing cabinet in an office for which only myself and an administrative associate have a key. I, with the help of an administrative associate at Marquette University who provides confidential transcription services in the counseling center in which I currently work, transcribed the supervision sessions and interviews. This administrative associate was not a staff member at any of the institutions from which I collected this data and has no knowledge of the participants. She was not provided with any identifying information except for what was in the recorded sessions and interviews themselves. I then verified the

transcripts while listening to the sessions and interviews to make certain they were transcribed accurately.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began as data were collected as is recommended by Charmaz (2006). Charmaz suggests that simultaneous data collection and analysis allow the researcher to go deeper into the research question and to develop categories, thus allowing the researcher to become aware of gaps in the data from the earliest stages of research. Prior to data being transcribed, memos were kept detailing initial thoughts and noting emergent themes regarding the data. Memos were recorded following the telephone interviews and after listening to recorded supervision sessions. All recorded supervision sessions and telephone interviews were transcribed. The transcriptions were coded using grounded theory.

Initially, independent coding was conducted for supervision sessions, interviews with supervisors, and interviews with interns. During the initial coding, fragments of data were analyzed to determine their importance. These initial codes were comparative, provisional and grounded in the data. Thus, the coding changed over time as data underwent subsequent reviews. Initial coding was conducted by attempting to understand the supervision sessions from the participants' words and phrases, thus trying to preserve the participants' experiences.

Initial coding entailed line-by-line analysis (Glaser, 1978); thereby creating codes for each line of data. Line-by-line coding allows the researcher to remain open regarding the data and to be able to identify the nuances in it, thus

helping the researcher to identify implicit as well as explicit concepts. Through the initial coding, the following strategies might be used (Charmaz, 2006): 1) identifying tacit assumptions, 2) determining implicit actions and meanings; 3) crystallizing the significance of points, 4) comparing data with data, 5) looking for gaps in the data, and 6) breaking data into their component parts or properties. Coding data in this way helped identify the fit and relevance of the codes, as well as may help to protect the results from the researcher's motives, fears and unresolved personal issues that might have been placed onto the participants and the data. Special attention was paid to in vivo codes. In vivo codes are those for which the language of choice for participants is used as the actual code names or categories.

As coding continued, the researcher used a constant comparative method in order to establish analytic distinctions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This means that comparisons were made at each level of analysis. Data were compared with other data to look for similarities and differences. Thus, data from the same clinical supervision session were compared and then data from different clinical supervision sessions were compared.

Once line-by-line and in vivo coding was complete, more focused coding occurred. During this stage of coding, the most significant or frequent codes were used to sort through larger portions of data. Therefore, decisions were made regarding the initial codes that made the most sense analytically to use to categorize the rest of the data. It is through this stage of analysis that new events, perspectives, and interactions might come to light. Charmaz (2006) suggests it is

through focused coding that the researcher's preconceived notions about a topic are checked.

Once focused coding was completed, the codes from the data from the follow-up interviews with supervisors and interns were placed in a matrix and compared to each other, as well as with the codes from the clinical supervision sessions to determine how they fit together, thus comparing and contrasting the data from the supervision sessions with the data from the follow-up interviews. This led to more focused codes that encapsulated the experiences of supervisors and interns in having discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision.

The final stage of coding to answer the first research question (What do supervisors and supervisees experience when having semi-guided discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision?) entailed theoretical coding. In essence, theoretical coding helps to identify possible relationships between the categories that were determined through the focus coding (Glaser, 1978). Theoretical coding gave form to the focused codes. Theoretical codes not only help to identify the connections between the focused codes, but also lead the researcher in a theoretical direction.

Once coding for the first research question was complete, a more in-depth comparison within dyads occurred to help answer the second (How do supervisor's and supervisee's perceptions of what occurred in their discussions of multicultural perspectives compare?) and third research questions (How do the

perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding their discussions of multicultural perspectives in supervision compare to what actually occurred?).

In order to examine congruence between supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of what occurred in session, I organized the data by codes within dyads. I did this by first identifying the data from the interviews that best fit for each category for the intern, and then the supervisor. This allowed me to determine if the data from both interviews were congruent or not. To answer the question of how the accounts between supervisors and interns compare, congruence in this study referred to patterns of similarity in accounts and degree of emphasis between supervisors and interns during interviews regarding their perceptions of content, thoughts, feelings and behaviors that occurred in the DMPs. Each dyad was then treated like a case and compared to the other cases to determine overall congruence. In order to be considered overall congruent, 4 out of 5 cases had to have congruence for a particular category (code).

Once congruence was determined to answer the question of how supervisors' and interns' accounts and perceptions compared, then congruence was determined to answer the question of how supervisors' and interns' accounts during the interviews compared to what happened in the DMPs. Congruence for this question was similar to how it was determined for the previous research question. To answer this question, congruence in this study referred to patterns of similarity in accounts and degree of emphasis between supervisors and interns during interviews regarding their perceptions of content, thoughts, feelings and behaviors that occurred in the DMPs, as well as to what actually occurred in the

DMPs. Once congruence or lack thereof was determined within each dyad, each dyad was then treated as one case that included the supplemental supervision session, the supervisor's account in the follow-up interview, and the supervisee's account in the follow-up interview. Each case was then compared to the other cases to determine overall congruence. In order to be considered overall congruent, 4 out of 5 cases had to have congruence for a particular category (code).

While I was going through the process of comparison coding for congruence, I also engaged in checking for instances in which the codes did not hold up. Specifically, I looked to instances that did not fit the coding. This was done to ensure that my biases did not impact the results. When looking for instances in the data that did not seem to fit with the coding, I was unable to locate any.

Chapter 3

Results

The data reflected participants' experiences while engaged in discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs) in a guided clinical supervision session. Examination of the data led to the emergence of 4 categories: dynamics in relationships, cultural lens, characteristics of discussion, and impact of discussion. To help organize the results, pseudonyms for identification of participants are highlighted in Table 1. For research question 1 (What do supervisors and supervisees experience when having semi-guided discussion of multicultural perspectives [DMPs] in clinical supervision?), emergent domains and categories are highlighted in Table 2. Rich descriptions are used to illustrate domains and categories.

Table 1

Pseudonyms for participants by dyad

Dyad	Supervisor	Intern
Dyad #1	Joan	Colleen
Dyad #2	Bill	Kathy
Dyad #3	Denise	Karen
Dyad #4	Sonali	Kayla
Dyad #5	Jamie	Amalia

Table 2

Emergent Domains and Categories

Domains	Categories
Dynamics in Relationship	Power Privilege and Marginalization Theoretical Orientation Similarities Differences
Cultural Lens	Assumptions, Stereotypes, Prejudice Bias and Values Identities Working with Clients
Characteristics of Discussion	Personal Quality Self-disclosure Openness Depth of Discussion Comfort Level Enjoyable
Impact of Discussion	Intentionality for Future Work Increased Awareness Increased Connection in Supervisory Relationship

Domain 1: Dynamics in Relationships

Participants shared their perspectives on the dynamics within the supervisory relationship, as well as the dynamics within the therapeutic relationship. These dynamics included issues of power, privilege and marginalization, theoretical orientation, similarities and differences.

Power.

The issue of power dynamics within the supervisory and therapeutic relationships emerged in the interactions between supervisors and interns during

the DMPs. For some, just broaching the topic of power in supervision could be challenging. During the follow-up interview, an intern named Kathy shared her thoughts about broaching the topic of power in supervision, "...it's challenging to talk about power and influence, and the ways in which that supervisory relationship plays into some of those issues...it can be a tough one to open that door, and once you walk through that, it is much easier."

When discussing issues of power in the supervisory relationship, participants often focused on the power differential inherent in the supervisory relationship and the intersectionality of that power with other identities. For example, in response to a question from her supervisor, Bill, about how differences in gender impact how she hears him during their supervision sessions, Kathy stated,

I certainly think that gender pieces of that [how supervisor is heard] are compounded by power, power that is there because of an intern vs. licensed clinician. The fact that you are a man and I am a woman, how that is part of it too. So for me it is really hard to keep those two apart in our relationship because I think they are both there.

Bill's later response to Kathy's comments regarding their discussion of power in session indicated his understanding of how power impacts the interactions in the supervisory relationship:

As a supervisor, I think I probably set a stage in my work because if I have this power and also my own identities of being a white male, and not just the supervisory power of authority, but other power I have here [in

counseling center], it is probably more likely that someone [intern] would follow my lead in that regard [what to do with clients and in supervision].

Some supervisors shared sensitivity to power in supervisory relationships and awareness of the impact of power on the relationship. Jamie, another supervisor, shared with her supervisee during the DMP that:

I try to be very sensitive about that power differential...really wanting to be open with somebody and not in any way disempower them...because of the difference...and I think that affects how I am in supervision. I think that is part of why I consistently acknowledge the power differential.

During the follow-up interview, Bill (supervisor) also addressed sensitivity to the power he has:

It is a very gratifying thing to be reminded of that [power], not because I want to have that power, but because I can't forget that I have it, because forgetting you have it...if you don't understand your own [power], then you are doomed to make all sorts of decisions based on the fact that you don't know that you're doing that, and certainly all the harm that comes from that.

Interns seemed to experience some difficulty with changes in power dynamics. In the follow-up interview, Karen shared her internal reaction regarding power dynamics in the supervisory relationship and having engaged in the DMP with her supervisor:

But in supervision, I think I am really aware that there is a hierarchy. So it wasn't weird when she was asking me questions, but it was weird when I

was asking her more questions (about identities being shared). I was like, 'ooh, I don't feel real comfortable asking her these things,' to say more...it was that reverse power thing.

During her follow-up interview, Kathy (intern) also shared her reaction to a change in power dynamics when discussing with her supervisor the relationship she had with her practicum supervisee who she supervised while on internship, "...having always been the person at the bottom, that was a real challenge to be much more assertive and to have the final say and to have more power in that relationship." Kathy seems to be referring to the challenges in transitioning from a role with less power (as a supervisee) to a role with more power (as a supervisor providing supervision to someone with less power). However, she also acknowledged the impact of a change in power dynamics with her own supervisor that occurred in the DMP, "I felt empowered...to have more of a voice, to state how I was feeling, and not necessarily just follow his lead or to continue in that more traditional hierarchy that supervision has."

Participants further discussed the issue of power in connection to therapeutic relationships. During the DMP, Joan (supervisor) suggested to her intern, Colleen, "It is going back to that power differential; once they [clients] walk into our office, more often than not, they are going to say you have a degree which means you know what you're doing somehow and I'm going to defer to you." During a discussion of the power inherent in the therapeutic relationship while in the DMP, Amalia (intern) expressed an internal conflict with clients' expectation of power in the therapeutic relationship:

The elimination of that hierarchy, or not the elimination but minimizing, it is not well accepted by the client. And they insist on keeping you in the expert role of wanting you to tell them what to do. I think this year was probably the first time where I really had a huge internal struggle [with this].

Privilege and marginalization.

Participants introduced issues of privilege and marginalization when discussing power in relationships. Privilege was often discussed as a concept that encompassed the ability to not have to consider one's personal and social identities, as well as other advantages of being a member of the dominant group. Marginalization was often referred to in discussing targeted or subordinate group identity. In discussing the importance of acknowledging power dynamics in relationships during the DMP, supervisor Joan posited:

...across all of these is that ability to identify where privilege is held and where marginalization is held and how that impacts supervisory relationships, as well as clinical relationships... it can really bring up a chasm where the student or client might not bring up those differences.

Here Joan seems to reference how chasms may occur within the therapeutic relationship if attention is not paid to privilege and marginalization. During the follow-up interview, an intern named Amalia shared implicit knowledge of privilege when she remarked on her relationship status, "I don't think I had realized how much my identity was tied to being in a relationship, in a long-term relationship, and the kind of safety that provides." Important to note is that

relationship status was discussed in her DMP with her supervisor. This realization also points to a new awareness as a result of the DMP (See Increased Awareness category).

Bill, another supervisor, introduced the idea of privilege in not having to think about one's identities by sharing a documentary he had recently seen:

He [the presenter of the documentary] said what the privilege for Whites is that we don't have to really know [someone else's experience] because it doesn't really matter for my daily experience on most levels...for Blacks they better know what White Americans think and feel, otherwise it is going to be difficult for them to engage in some of the structures that are currently set up.

Bill then linked this concept of privilege to institutional power structures, "...stepping into an authority and a higher role and how necessary it is for you to understand kind of a dominant white male authority perspective which we clearly have here [counseling center]."

Kathy, an intern that works with Bill, alluded to potential marginalization when she wondered what it means to have values that may not match with the existing power structures, "...what to do when that conflicts with your values or beliefs and your identities as a person, and how do you make the decisions about that...do you just fit into white structures because that is what you have to do?"

Theoretical orientation.

Participants recognized that theoretical orientation might play a role in the process of having discussions of multicultural perspectives in supervision. Many

participants mentioned the ease or difficulty in having such discussions in relation to theoretical orientation. An intern named Amalia suggested during the follow-up interview that “with another supervisor who was less relational, who was...more solution-focused or goal-oriented, less process-oriented, that it would be more awkward and difficult to share because I don’t think that precedent would have been set to do that as easily.”

Some participants shared they had been having similar discussions of multicultural perspectives in their supervision prior to this study. During the follow-up interview, one supervisor named Joan stated, “Both of us come from a pretty strong humanistic, interpersonal framework as a theoretical orientation, so it’s a piece of the conversation we’ve been having...in...supervision.” An intern named Karen shared similar views during the follow-up interview regarding the role of theoretical orientation in having already engaged in these types of discussions in a previous supervisory relationship:

...like self-exploration and he really encouraged me to, well we talked about a lot of this stuff because I felt, and still do, that this is a growth edge for me...So we talked a lot about my background and to find where my interesting and unique stuff [identities] is...He came from a psychodynamic background...

Similarities.

While discussing personal identities during the DMPs, all of the participants discussed similarities between themselves within the supervision dyad, both personally and professionally. Most participants recognized

similarities amongst themselves in the supervisory relationship. A supervisor named Joan noted, "...we're privileged across most of those [identities], I mean for culture, we're both young, we're both American, we're both White." An intern named Karen expressed excitement over learning about similarities between herself and her supervisor during the follow-up interview when sharing what she liked about the DMP, "It was really neat to hear how we came from such different backgrounds, but we had similar underlying values."

Some participants recognized that these similarities might impact their supervision. An example comes from a supervisor named Jamie who stated, "I think that our clinical approaches...and our training is [sic] probably somewhat similar because we have similar degrees and have been more clinical focused. So that could impact our supervision."

Many participants discussed how they find similarities in identity between themselves and clients. For some participants, the similarities between themselves and their clients helped facilitate understanding and connection. During the DMP, one intern named Karen shared the importance of similarity in age to her clients when she stated, "Maybe it is important because I feel like I can relate to them pretty well because it wasn't too long ago that I was dealing with some of those things." Her supervisor, Denise, agreed, "You are old enough for them to see you as sort of older and wiser, but still young enough where they probably feel you can relate and you are not an old fogey."

When discussing similarities to clients in the DMPs, participant noted that they might actually look for similarities to facilitate a sense of connection in the

therapeutic relationship. An intern named Kayla shared, “I feel like sometimes the difference pieces are so apparent, like in skin color or if their name is from a certain religious group or culture...but then there are moments where I look for similarity to be able to feel the connection.” Her supervisor, Sonali, agreed with Kayla on wanting to feel connected to her clients, “I sometimes can fall into the familiarity of...the positive feelings of connection, like ‘oh, we are alike and I really like this girl because she has the same ideas as I do’ and ‘you go!’”

Participants also recognized that people make potentially erroneous assumptions about similarities. During the DMP, a supervisor named Bill considered the impact of meaning around identities that may superficially appear similar:

...anytime you talk about age, it begs the question of what you are really talking about. Is it a chronological thing, it is developmental age, is it life experience or my own view of being 35? How that differs, like when you are 35 and I am 35, do we see that as even remotely similar?

Another supervisor named Sonali shared with her supervisee her experience with clients who assume some similarity with her:

I think that that happens a lot of times with clients as well like when they assume...that you have some similarity with them and then you start to hear a lot of ‘well, you know how it is’ or ‘you know’ and that kind of implicit or explicit message that ‘you get me because I think you are the same as me.’

Sonali's comment suggests that assumptions of similarity can impact how clients and therapists communicate with one another. Sonali's supervisee, Kayla goes further to imply focus on similarities might impact the relationship, "There could be a difference there and I may not recognize it because I am latching on to those similarities." Kayla's implicit knowledge suggests that focusing on similarities, whether actual or perceived, can impact what happens in therapy and might guide a therapist to not look at differences that could impact the therapeutic relationship. Kayla also acknowledges she may automatically be looking for similarity, "...sometimes when I am with someone [client] similar to myself...I tend to, which I think is a natural human thing, I tend to be like 'oh, we are so much alike'...even though we are trained not to think that, it just comes out."

Differences.

Participants talked about the role of differences in personal identities in their supervisory and therapeutic relationships. Some participants focused on the impact of differences within the supervisory relationship. During the DMP, an intern, Kayla posited, "Sometimes I feel like it may be important to talk about that...differences [exist] between us and what does that mean for how we understand the relationship and that kind of thing." During a discussion about differences between supervisors and supervisees in the DMP, an intern named Colleen also stated:

...when there's too much of a difference, depending on how that supervisory relationship works, that can be a growth experience or that can be something that is mismatched. I definitely think there's room in

supervisory relationships for different identities to not meld well together and have a very strong impact on the supervisory relationship.

Some supervisors expressed concern about how differences within the supervisory relationship might have a negative impact. In discussing difference in regard to relationship status between her and her supervisee during the DMP, a supervisor named Jamie shared:

I think that is something that has certainly affected our supervision in this past year because having gone through a difficult time and...[my partner] asking me for a separation, and then going through the process of divorce; it still gets me teary...I think that has had a huge impact on our supervision because of what I am going through in my own personal identity.

Jamie later implicitly shared her concern that discussing differences in background might impact how she is viewed by the supervisee:

I think being from the South, particularly when talking to supervisees [about differences in race and ethnicity] who are black, I get a little anxious. Not because I have negative views of it but because in my background, my cultural background, my familial background there was [sic] a lot of racial prejudices. Some of my family members are still, not my immediate family members, but some of my extended family members are very racist... I am aware of the fact that I have this fear that somebody can look at me and tell that I have this racist background in my family.

Participants also discussed how differences might impact how they are viewed by clients. When discussing with her supervisor during the DMP differences in age between herself and her clients, the intern named Colleen stated, “I might be viewed as young or inexperienced or not having enough life experience.” Colleen seems to have an implicit concern that she may not be viewed as a competent therapist.

Participants went further to discuss the impact of difference on the therapeutic relationship. During the DMP, the intern named Colleen suggested that it is important to consider:

...what it might be like for them knowing that I’m getting a degree, and they might be a 1st generation student, and so that might impact the therapeutic relationship... to really be aware or to be able to put myself in their shoes to see what their experience is, or be able to understand more what their experiences have been like.

Participants further acknowledged the importance of discussing differences with their clients. While discussing differences in identity between herself and her clients in the DMP, the intern named Kayla stated, “When I work with clients who are different, sometimes we will talk about those differences, and I feel like that is important to do that if it comes up.” When discussing difference in identities with her supervisee in the DMP, a supervisor named Joan highlighted how having these discussions “open[s] up a deep and meaningful conversation that really helps to move the therapy that wouldn’t have happened if I hadn’t taken ownership for bringing it up.” Joan’s supervisee, Colleen, shared her belief

that discussing differences with clients may impact the working alliance, “I think if we did more explicitly explore some of that [difference], it could increase the connection with the client and help them be more open in exploring themselves with you.”

Participants also discussed their personal awareness of difference from their clients. A supervisor named Sonali shared that “the places where there is more of a strong difference is where I view and am more aware of who I am,” suggesting that noticing differences between herself and her clients highlights her own identities and viewpoints. Her supervisee, Kayla, agreed with Sonali’s statement, “And so I think that fits for me too, that it seems like I am most aware of it when it is the strongest difference between us.”

Domain 2: Cultural Lens

Participants shared their beliefs that the cultural lens one has impacts not only how one views the world, but impacts how they are viewed by others, as well as how they work with clients. The cultural lens included assumptions, stereotypes, and prejudice; biases and values; identities; and working with clients.

Assumptions/Stereotypes/Prejudice.

Participants shared their experiences of when others held assumptions, stereotypes, or prejudicial beliefs about them. Many participants described personal stories of people making erroneous assumptions about them. Denise, one of the supervisors, shared surprise upon discovering others made assumptions about her, “[it was] the rudest awakening to me...to think that I was considered

part of this group that was...stuck up and elitist was so weird for me because it wasn't at all what, it didn't fit at all with my idea of myself.”

Participants also talked about assumptions they had made within the supervisory relationship. While discussing assumptions in the DMP with her supervisor, the intern named Karen shared her response to learning about her supervisor:

...it is interesting to...hear how different [we are] because I wouldn't have assumed that we were that different...you have been so open and...I wouldn't think you were somebody from a really privileged background, in the way that I stereotype people from privileged backgrounds.

The supervisor named Sonali talked about making erroneous assumptions about similarity and understanding another person's point of view, “...sometimes those are wrong assumptions and sometimes we fall into that, too, like ‘oh yeah, I get what they are saying’ because we are assuming that it's the same thing that we've experienced or how we understand it.” She went on to discuss how these erroneous assumptions could lead to misunderstandings between people.

Some participants talked about the process of discussing their assumptions, prejudice and biases in the DMP. During the follow-up interview, one supervisor named Jamie stated:

Our work together had been such that I could admit my ignorance, my biases, my prejudices, my assumptions, things like that in a way that she wouldn't perceive as harsh or judgmental about those things. I felt very safe in being able to share those genuine experiences and to have that

acknowledged as that is just where I am as a person and as a therapist and these are things I'm trying to work on and work through.

Participants also explored how assumptions arise in therapeutic relationships. The supervisor named Denise shared with her supervisee her experience working with clients who have eating disorders:

They would...make assumptions, like clients might say 'oh, I couldn't wait to find out if you would be heavy or thin because I don't think you could help me with my issues if you were overweight' ... 'well, I don't think you could really understand unless you have been overweight.'

The intern named Kayla shared her experience of making assumptions about her clients with her supervisor during the DMP, "I think I do the same with her [client], like assuming that, I mean there are all different kinds of feminist views and assuming that we were on the same page and really identified with that."

Most participants discussed the importance of challenging assumptions within the therapeutic relationship. One intern named Colleen thought aloud during the DMP with her supervisor:

It's just a good model for having an open dialogue with clients and not making assumptions based on...their culture and things like that, but having an open conversation with them as an individual and learning the most pertinent dimensions of their identity, but also yours.

Colleen's statement highlights the thoughts of many of the participants, that learning more about clients will dispel erroneous assumptions, stereotypes and prejudices, while also providing an opportunity to understand the client's

perspective. Further, there appeared to be an implicit idea that these discussions will also increase awareness around one's own cultural lens.

Bias/values.

Participants talked a great deal about the biases and values they bring into their work. Some participants talked about bias and values that are present in supervision. One supervisor named Bill shared with his supervisee during the DMP, "I have seen more and more people who come in expecting, as trainees... me to already agree with them in their rejection of the modern view [postmodern view of therapy]."

Many participants talked about the role of bias and values when working with clients. When discussing the roles of their family background on their clinical work during the DMP, the supervisor named Denise shared her strongly held bias/value of egalitarianism and feminism and how this bias/value reared its head when working with clients:

But that was very strongly indoctrinated into me and I would have a hard time, I would sympathize if I was having a hard time working with clients who were very traditional [in gender roles] and especially if there was some expectation...the woman was supposed to do the what the man says or is supposed to do all the housework and I had a really hard time, that was one of the areas in which I felt myself most wanting to impose my own judgments about things and my having my reactions get in the way.

Participants also highlighted the act of becoming aware of one's biases and values. The supervisor named Sonali shared how she checks her bias, "I can

feel that maybe my bias is coming out in that area where I think, ‘okay that is because this is how I identify, and so I am having this reaction because there is a difference here in that identity.’” Her supervisee named Kayla also talked about engaging in work around awareness when she stated, “I feel like I have worked a lot on biases and I try really hard. Do you know what I mean? But they still come up automatically sometimes and it is so hard to combat that.”

Some participants also focused on the bias inherent in the field of psychology. The supervisor named Bill shared his thoughts on this while discussing the topic of values and biases in clinical work, “It is our roots and...we are building it on roots that are racist, sexist. Our science of our psychology is...no different than any other empirical science in the sense of...the biases...” In another DMP, the intern named Karen also spoke of the bias inherent in the field of counseling when she shared her belief that it is “really important to kind of think about where our values are, to consider...culture and background first before you pathologize because something can look pathological and really may not be at all.”

Identities.

Participants talked about their personal identities in relation to their cultural lens. For some, it is the context in which they find themselves that impacts the salience of a particular identity. Sonali, a supervisor, shared curiosity with her supervisee around “what pieces of my identity are more visible or...that I talk about or share more in different contexts.” Some participants also explored how their identity comes out in supervision. When discussing this with her

supervisee during their DMP, Sonali said, “I would step in and say, ‘well, you know, this is my experience having grown up as an Indian woman,’ like this is...another possibility of what he [the client] could be experiencing and...I might reveal more of that aspect of my identity.” While sharing her own personal identities with her supervisee, another supervisor Jamie talked about the role of identity development as it pertains to the supervisory role:

I think that I am very proud of being a female. I am very reactive to the idea that...of the male privilege in our society. And I think that that does impact me a great deal in my supervision. I think I am very sensitive because of that dynamic and feeling in the past that I had in some way been disempowered or there have been attempts to disempower me just based on my gender.

During the follow-up interview and discussing what she learned from taking part in the DMP with her supervisor, the intern named Colleen shared her enjoyment of the process in being able “to think more about my own identity and how that could impact my work with my supervisor and my work with clients, too.”

Working with clients.

Participants talked about the role of cultural lens on how they work for or with clients. One area discussed a great deal was that of how one’s cultural lens impacts case conceptualization. A supervisor named Denise shared with her supervisee that in a previous work setting, she:

...would be counseling people...who live next door to their whole families. Their families lived on the same property and were involved in their daily

lives. And I think, in my mind, I probably pathologized that a little bit because [to me] it was better to be independent.

When discussing how one's cultural lens impacts case conceptualization with her supervisor during the DMP, Kathy noted:

Certainly if we think of gender, viewing what gender roles are, what expectations are, in working with some specific clients and thinking about where they are and where they are headed, [there are] issues that maybe stand out to me as far as motherhood or other women's roles that maybe haven't been standing out for you. And vice versa when working with males and having a different perspective on how that client might be feeling and getting sort of the opposite influence there.

Here Kathy points out the difference in how gender impacts how she and her male supervisor conceptualize cases differently.

One of the supervisors named Denise talked about how her cultural lens impacts not only her conceptualization of the case, but also what she focuses on in conducting evaluations with her supervisee during the DMP:

And even when I was working in private practice and part of my job was to do family evaluations, I remember, I am thinking back on things that I wrote on my evaluations that, I don't think it was anything harmful or wrong, but I think I have a different perspective on it now.

Here Denise seems to be alluding to how one's cultural lens changes over time.

All participants discussed the role of cultural lens and provision of therapy. Many participants talked about checking in with clients regarding the

client's cultural lens. An example is when the intern named Kayla shared working with a Muslim man who did not "want to be in a relationship unless he can be married out of it." She explained to her supervisor her reaction to this statement, "...and so there was a moment where I was like 'okay' and then...I wasn't quite sure if that was related to his culture or if that was his viewpoint. And he said it was kind of a little bit of both maybe." When her supervisor asked about how she deals with a client for whom the use of medication may conflict with cultural values, another intern named Colleen shared how she might address recommending medication to a client who has expressed not wanting to take medication:

I like to explore where their feelings about the medication come from, whether it's from their culture or their family, maybe their parents and what they have told them. I like to see how strong that is and what their reasoning is, and if their reasoning is rational, I'm never going to force someone if they do have a strong cultural belief against it.

Many participants discussed how their cultural lens impacts their reactions to clients and their issues. Colleen shared the recognition with her supervisor that "...we definitely respond to that in different ways depending on what our experience and point of reference has been." When discussing perceptions and beliefs about age with his supervisee during the DMP, Bill shared the following: Men in my family don't live particularly long, so at 35 [years old], I am not middle age by history of men in my family. How does that influence how my orientation to work and my orientation to other people? It is like one of those

things that...I start to think about things like quality of life, or how I support people in daily choices that they might make...I've sort of moved away from the idea like things are supposed to be a certain way but much more of like, 'Okay, so you've gotten him through today. That is good enough,' and 'someone else will get him through the next day.' I know that is influenced by my personal experience in these kinds of things.

Domain 3: Characteristics of discussions

Participants experienced many different characteristics or qualities of their discussions of multicultural perspectives. These characteristics include: personal quality, self-disclosure, openness, depth of discussion, and comfort level.

Personal quality.

Participants described their experience in having these discussions of multicultural perspectives as intensely personal. One intern named Kathy described her experience of the DMP during the follow-up interview:

We definitely paid attention to interpersonal process as a big piece of our supervision, so that wasn't necessarily new. And yet it took a frame that was much more personal, a piece of exploring our own identities, and how that fit in...It was more of an inner exploration of our own personal identities as opposed to having it be a little more distant, like in examining my own relationship with clients. It felt a little more intimate.

Some participants talked about the emotionality of the session, as illustrated when the intern named Amalia commented during the follow-up interview, "My supervisor, who is in a very different place in her life, shared

some of her experience [with relationship status]. That was pretty memorable because it was emotional to talk about that together.”

All participants shared personal stories about themselves and/or their experiences. One supervisor named Joan shared her experience in being bisexual with her supervisee during the DMP:

The one I struggle with is being bisexual until I out myself, [which] allows me to live with heterosexual privilege because most people assume that I am straight and can pass as being straight. So that’s been an individual struggle for me around identity and being out, and when I can choose to out myself or when I can pass.

Amalia, an intern, shared her emotional reactions with her supervisor during the follow-up interview:

I felt guilty because I had brought up that topic in realizing that was a part of me and I had also been aware that was a painful area for her. So I wasn’t sure it was okay to go there because I knew it was a hard topic. When I said it, I wasn’t thinking about what that might be like for her to start talking about that topic. I knew from other conversations that this was a sensitive topic. So that was one experience where guilt was involved, so also appreciation that that is a piece of identity that anybody holds with them. That was the part that also made it feel like a rich experience, being able to share that emotional part.

The intern named Kathy was also able to share her emotional reactions to institutional edicts regarding professional attire with her supervisor during the

DMP when she stated, “It was just a gut reaction of ‘this is ridiculous’ and feeling controlled or feeling like a luxury or a privilege was taken away.” This reaction was in response to the counseling center having stated that staff could no longer wear jeans to work.

Self-disclosure.

The characteristic of self-disclosure took on two forms: 1) participants disclosing information about themselves that they had previously not shared, and 2) discussions about the use of self-disclosure. As mentioned in the previous sub-category of Personal Quality, participants divulged personal information about themselves during the discussion of multicultural perspectives. For instance, a supervisor named Joan shared, “I’ve struggled the most with, to some degree, colleagues that are very conservative and to me had very limiting belief systems about power and privilege.” An intern named Karen shared with her supervisor the act of disclosing her 1st generation college student status to clients during group therapy:

I told them they are actually pretty way ahead of the game in comparison to myself because I [have] just started thinking about how that has influenced me and how that is a piece of my own diversity and before this I don’t know if I would have considered that as much.

Participants also discussed the when’s and how’s of self-disclosure in their work. Joan, a supervisor, posited the importance of self-disclosure to her supervisee in stating, “I think that we’re taught to not self-disclose too much, but when I think we don’t identify or acknowledge pieces of those identities, we do a

disservice [to clients] because it cuts off a dialogue.” Denise, a supervisor, shared her perspective regarding her supervisee’s self-disclosure to clients while in the DMP:

It was really neat to hear you and [your co-facilitator] talk about your group and all the things you shared about your own experiences[as 1st generation college students] and it just seemed like that was so powerful for the students to get to hear you speak and because it was you verbalizing your own and validating their experiences.

Some participants discussed their uncertainty around self-disclosure.

During the DMP, one of the interns named Kayla expressed her ambivalence around self-disclosure in stating, “There is always this kind of like weirdness about like how much do I share about myself.” Her supervisor, Sonali, responded:

I think it’s a difficult balance because I find that I struggle with that too in supervision. In addition, I try to be mindful that this time is for you to be able to share your experiences and to work through whatever you need to be working through or working towards your goals. And I have kind of, you know, in the past I have gotten feedback from supervisees that I don’t share enough of myself.

Openness.

All participants spoke to the openness with which they engaged in the discussion of multicultural perspectives. They also talked about appreciation of having an open dialogue around these issues. One intern named Amalia shared during the follow-up interview her perception that her supervisor was open to the

process, “I felt like she was very open and willing and encouraging in talking about our differences and similarities.” When discussing how gender dynamics had played a role in their supervisory relationship during the follow-up interview, another intern named Kathy also highlighted her supervisor’s openness in the DMP, “It felt like a very open and candid conversation, to me, that the relationship dynamic wasn’t apparent to him also.”

Some participants talked about their appreciation of the open nature of this discussion. The intern named Amalia thanked her supervisor at the end of the DMP by stating:

I think that you have been really open and I have appreciated your openness about sharing that with me and I think the biggest impact that it has had is that it has made me feel more comfortable and closer with you because you have been so open about being vulnerable with me and acknowledging where you felt your limitations are.

Depth of discussion.

All participants commented on the depth and focus that the discussion took when examining how this session differed from previous supervision sessions. For example, one of the interns, Karen stated, “We [typically] talk about each client and anyone in risk, we don’t do a lot of video watching; so this type of supervision that we did was really different...it was really different because we don’t go into deep conversations like that.” Another intern named Colleen shared the power of having a deeper conversation during the follow-up interview:

I really enjoyed having that focus, a diversity focus on supervision. It felt really powerful in that we focused on the issues that we touched on in previous supervision, but hadn't really went [sic] into that depth into how that impacts supervision and therapy. So it was a powerful experience that allowed us to focus in ways that we necessarily hadn't done. It really opened up that area to explore it more.

Some participants wondered why they may not engage in deeper discussions more regularly, as noted by an intern named Kayla during the follow-up interview:

I feel like it was on a different level, like on a deeper level. I don't know if deeper is the right word. It was deeper on a different level, in terms of, I felt it was deeper because in part, we processed a lot about our own relationship. And then also, that we had this specific focus on the diversity of my clients. It felt different in that way, because we don't often have a whole session that focused on that. I mean, I may have a client that is having a problem being in between two cultures or something, so we'll talk about that for part of the session. But it never takes up the whole session. So I felt it was really in depth, and so that's why I felt like it was a deeper supervision also...I don't feel like we talk on this level a lot. It is all like, we just don't have the time, it is not our role or whatever.

Here, Kayla also highlights that depth in the discussion was related to talking about the supervisory relationship. Another intern named Kathy also shared during the follow-up interview, "I think it brought that [awareness] into the

picture a lot more than it had been before. That it [supervision] was looking at our relationship at a deeper level, whereas before it [supervision] was looking at my relationship with clients. Yeah, it had an influence.” Here Kathy is expressing an implicit thought that focusing merely on client issues is not as deep of a conversation as focusing on the supervisory relationship.

Other participants recognized the need to engage in deeper discussions more often. Joan shared her thoughts on this, “When you take the time to talk about diversity issues and identities, and what’s important to people, there’s a depth to the conversations that sometimes can get missed if you don’t take ownership for having those conversations.”

Comfort level.

Participants discussed their level of comfort in having these discussions of multicultural perspectives. Many things seemed to impact one’s sense of feeling comfortable while having these discussions. A supervisor named Joan talked about familiarity between herself and her supervisee prior to the DMP:

We knew so much about each other’s identities that... as a supervisor, I didn’t feel I was disclosing anything personal about my identities that she wasn’t already aware of, nor in having the conversation did I feel I was asking her to disclose anything I was not aware of that might make her feel uncomfortable.

Joan’s comment alludes to the idea that they had already had these types of discussions which makes having them now a more comfortable exercise.

An intern named Kayla shared her comfort level being impacted by setting a precedent in supervision around discussing these issues during the follow-up interview:

I have had supervisors before who, just as a blanket thing, talked about how people were different and how she was different from me in these ways or whatever, and we just talked about that near the beginning of our supervisory relationship...I felt more comfortable from the get go because she brought that up at the beginning of discussing how we were different.

Karen, an intern, mentioned during the follow-up interview that it was the sharing of self that contributed to the sense of comfort, “When it felt easier was when we were talking, well when we lost sight that we were talking about a specific topic and ended up sharing stories about things and different experiences.” Another intern named Amalia, during the follow-up interview, talked about honesty and alluded to trust within the relationship and how it contributed to her comfort level:

Another thing that made it easy for me, is that she is so willing to be honest about her reactions in the room, that I feel comfortable being honest about my reactions in the room, too. So there’s very little shame or embarrassment associated with whatever feelings come up, or impressions or stereotypes or whatever that come up for us.

A supervisor named Jamie also talked about the trust and safety within the relationship that helped this discussion to feel comfortable:

It would have been very difficult if neither of us had felt safe with each other. Our work together had been such that I could admit my ignorance, my biases, my prejudices, my assumptions, things like that in a way that she wouldn't perceive as harsh or judgmental about those things. I felt very safe in being able to share those genuine experiences and to have that acknowledged as that is just where I am as a person and as a therapist and these are things I'm trying to work on and work through. I hope that she had a similar experience, that she felt that way. I think if either one of us had felt that the other would not have been respectful of, and understanding of where we are as people and as therapists, that would have been a very difficult and challenging discussion in our supervision.

Colleen, an intern, suggested it was similarity between her and her supervisor, as well as comfort within their own identities, that made the discussion easier to engage in, "I think it was easier for us because we do share similar perspectives on multicultural issues. I think we're both comfortable talking about differences, too, and comfortable with our own identities to where that made it more comfortable." Another intern named Kathy posited it was the structure and purpose of the discussion that contributed to comfort level, "Having the structure and having that as our purpose made it easier, at least it made it easier for me. I knew that was what was on the table. So bringing that up was much safer for me." This seemed to be a common idea among many participants.

Discomfort was a topic that was emerged as well. For some participants, the discomfort was openly discussed in the DMP. Kayla told her supervisor,

Sonali, “I feel even uncomfortable with it right now because I’m like ‘Oh my gosh, are we like bringing up the difference and making it salient in the room?’”

Kayla may be expressing an implicit fear of discussing difference with her supervisor, which would contribute to her level of discomfort. While sharing her perceptions of the DMP during the follow-up interview, another intern named Karen offered that that her perception of her supervisor being uncomfortable contributed to her own discomfort during the DMP:

But I was uncomfortable seeing her be vulnerable, for me that was difficult...to see somebody that’s been in the field that is really competent [in other areas of therapy], that has been in the field for a really long time, get as uncomfortable as I perceived her to feel, I think there is really a need to be talking about this. I think a lot of people feel stressed out when they think about diversity, especially when they come from the majority background. I think there is an additional pressure or feeling like incompetence.

The implicit statement that Karen makes is that her questioning of her supervisor’s competence contributes to discomfort when having these types of discussions. Karen goes on to say:

Since I know my supervisor pretty well and I’ve been working with her for a while, I can tell non-verbally when she is feeling a little uncomfortable. And even before hand, when we started talking about doing this project, she had a lot of questions and she said ‘I’m not sure if

this is going to touch on my competence,' like if my competence is being evaluated, I don't feel comfortable doing the project.'

Domain 4: Impact of discussion

Although asked in the follow-up interview about the impact of engaging in the DMPs, most participants spontaneously provided information about its impact before being asked and many discussed the impact during the DMP. This category includes: intentionality for future work, increased awareness, and increase in connection in supervisory relationship.

Intentionality for future work.

All participants discussed how engaging in this discussion of multicultural perspectives impacted how they plan to incorporate these types of discussions in their future work. They shared plans to utilize these types of discussions as a supervisor. For example, the supervisor Sonali stated in the DMP, "I should try this next year, earlier in the year...and kind of open something up. A discussion about this specifically in some sense, so that it kind of sets precedence for that [multicultural discussions]." Another supervisor, Bill shared during the follow-up interview:

And the more active I can be to make sure those conversations are present, that the focus is there, that I'm attending to cultural competence, in both myself and my supervisees, the more enjoyable the experience will be for everybody, the clients working with people will have a better experience. So I think that happens on some level, but being more aware that I need to

do that intentionally will be better in the long run. And this is a good reminder of that.

Many participants believed infusing these types of discussions into supervision can facilitate development of multicultural counseling competencies. One of the interns, Amalia also shared plans to use this model, “I think that could be helpful with a supervisee, too, in helping to develop a multicultural competency, and having that be an important thing to highlight.” Some participants considered what it would mean to include these types of discussions in their supervision. While discussing the potential for having such discussions with her own supervisees during the DMP with her supervisor, the intern named Karen posited, “So it’s made me more aware of wanting to incorporate that more in my own supervision with students, and that is probably going to require that I share some of my background.” Many participants were specific about how they would incorporate discussions of multicultural issues in their supervisory relationships. Another intern named Colleen stated:

It made me reflect on the supervision that I’ve done and how I could use this, and how I would like to use it. Like I mentioned earlier, I think it could be beneficial in the beginning when you are building the relationship, to have that open discussion and to learn about each other, what makes that important in our individual identity, and then to follow-up with that mid-semester...I think I’d bring the model in earlier in the supervisory relationship, to talk about that and how it impacts our experience with each other and what we may need to be aware of or

maybe attend to more in our work together...I would like to use it for the supervisory relationship, but also as a model for the supervisee to use with their clients too.

Many participants talked about how they plan to engage clients in more discussion around multicultural perspectives as a result of engaging in this study. When discussing what she learned from engaging in the DMP, the supervisor named Denise declared:

During this discussion we also realized we have more differences that we were not aware of because on the surface, we look similarly, but we come from different backgrounds. And some of the things she shared with me were the exact opposite from me...It will definitely impact the work with clients in that I think it will keep reminding me how important this is to talk about.

Another supervisor, Joan shared with her supervisee during the DMP how having these types of discussions could be useful, "This [Dimensions of Personal Identity model] might be a useful tool to sit and talk through with a client in a relationship where it would be really important to talk about those similarities and differences within the relationship." The intern named Kathy also discussed using these types of discussions with clients during the follow-up interview, "I think with clients as a focus, figuring out when and where that [difference in identities] is really affecting the relationship and so having it be a more active process is something I'd like to have happen as I move forward."

Amalia, an intern, plans to not only utilize the Dimensions of Personal Identity model with her own supervisees, but also to continue to engage in self-reflection around her own identities. During the follow-up interview, Amalia shared, “I also like that resource of having that list of aspects of somebody that can intertwine in how someone views themselves and I like the idea of being able to look at those things and study them and to think about how I’m impacted by that.” Some participants talked about the impact of this discussion on their own process of self-reflection. Another intern named Kathy talked about the importance of continuing to engage in self-reflection:

It shows me that this can be a really important and powerful thing. So definitely as a supervisor, and as a therapist, absolutely, I think the same principles apply, taking the time to do that work really is a reminder at times to check in examine the culture I’m coming from and how that can help me and hinder me as a therapist. And the more we do that the better. It seems Kathy may recognize the impact that lack of awareness can have on her therapeutic relationship.

Karen, another intern, shared a lasting effect of having engaged in this study:

It was really impactful in many ways. I’m going to take out of this the importance of continuing to practice as a multicultural psychologist in my life...because I’ve seen throughout the year that I’ve developed in this area which I wanted to. I thought it was going to be technically knowing stuff, having the knowledge base. But it’s not really that. It’s the fact that

when I look at clients and my own life, it's a lens that I have that's always there that wasn't there before.

Here Karen seems to be indicating not only indicating a lasting effect of having engaged in this discussion, but also alludes to an increase in awareness, which is the next category.

Increased awareness.

All participants mentioned that engaging in this study helped to increase their awareness in various areas. For some participants, they experienced an increase in awareness regarding the dynamics within the supervisory relationship. In his exploration with his supervisee about her relationship with her own supervisee and how Bill structured their supervision of supervision sessions, Bill stated:

Because what I was doing, I think as I look back, I think I was skipping you and just acting like how I would interact with him [intern's supervisee], and thinking back, I don't think he [intern's supervisee] would have played it or done anything like that with me...he would have done something different with me because the interpersonal factors would have been different, plus I have all these other authority roles and I am very quick to jump all over that, while yours [approach to supervision] was a more reflective process in there, partly about gender, partly about that experience, partly about everything else. I think in many ways I probably just skipped your role [as a supervisor] when you would get in

that [conflict] with him. And by making the gender part more explicit, I probably wouldn't have done that.

Here Bill is addressing how he would instruct the intern to supervise her own supervisee rather than encourage her to develop her own process in addressing conflict within the supervisory relationship.

Another supervisor, Joan, suggested she gains an increased understanding of relationship dynamics by having these types of discussions, "The more we have these conversations, the more we know our own identities and how that is coming to play in our relationship." One of the interns, Amalia also discussed increased awareness around the dynamics impacting the supervisory relationship as a result of participating in this study:

One of the most memorable and I guess relevant pieces was something that I had not really realized in terms of how other people view me. My supervisor had shared with me that because I came from a different socioeconomic status, that there was some intimidating factor there... It was real eye-opening for me to realize what kind of impact my background, if I choose to share that with people, might do to our relationship due to their impression of me.

Another intern named Kathy also shared her increased awareness of relationship dynamics, "It really helped me to tap into some of the ways in which my personal identities certainly affected my experience supervising."

Many participants also discussed increased awareness around how their identities might impact their clients. Amalia, an intern, shared during the follow-

up interview, “It helped deepen my understanding, not only of where I’m coming from as a supervisee, but also how many things can impact me when I’m with a client.” Another intern, Kayla also shared how this discussion increased awareness around diversity issues:

I was thinking about the client I have who had not even crossed my mind until a second ago, who is gay and I am straight. And so I was thinking that is some variety in my caseload, and I have a client who is visually-impaired and I haven’t even thought, those weren’t my go-to things [to consider].

Amalia, an intern, further explained, “For me anyway, the way all experiences focusing on identity and diversity [do], it brings about an additional awareness of myself and of sensitivity to others.”

Increase in connection in supervisory relationship.

Some of the participants shared experiencing an increase in connection within the supervisory relationship as a result of having engaged in a discussion of multicultural perspectives. For example, Kayla shared with her supervisor:

...after having this conversation...I feel more deeply connected than I did even before we started this or yesterday or whatever. I’ve always known that you have been open to talking about that. But it makes it more like explicit like when we talk about it.

Amalia, another intern, shared a similar reaction during the follow-up session:

I have found that I get a lot out of sharing myself with my supervisor and out of sharing her responses. And I think what I get out of that is typically

support and reassurance in the sense of understanding. So for me, it made me feel closer to my supervisor.

Colleen, another intern, posited during the follow-up session, “I feel that it did connect us...but it was also neat to have a stimulating conversation like that with her, outside of discussing clients and gaining guidance about working with clients.”

Comparison Coding

Areas of Congruence.

For this study, congruence referred to the similarity in supervisors’ and interns’ accounts of what occurred in the DMPs, and in the degree to which these accounts reflected the data that shows what happened in the DMP. While there was some similarity in supervisors’ and interns’ accounts of what happened in the DMPs, their accounts did not always match in the degree to which they discussed various topics or the degree to which they ascribed importance to topics during the follow-up interviews. Overall, there was some congruence among the domains and categories between what supervisors and interns reported occurred during the discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs), as well as between supervisors’ and interns’ accounts of what happened and what the data showed occurred during the DMPs. Areas of congruence between supervisors’ and interns’ accounts during the interviews included the following domains and categories that were mentioned previously: A) Domain 1: Dynamics of the Relationship - Power, Similarities, and Differences; B) Domain 3: Characteristics of the Discussion – Comfort Level, and Enjoyable; and C) Domain 4: Impact of Discussion –

Intentionality for Future Work, and Increased Awareness. Areas of congruence between supervisors' and interns' accounts during the interviews and what actually occurred in the DMPs included the following domains and categories: :

A) Domain 1: Dynamics of the Relationship - Power, Similarities, and Differences; B) Domain 3: Characteristics of the Discussion – Comfort Level, and Enjoyable; and C) Domain 4: Impact of Discussion – Intentionality for Future Work, and Increased Awareness. Note that areas of congruence that emerged between supervisors' and interns' accounts during the interviews are the same areas as congruence that emerged between supervisors' and interns' accounts during the interviews and what actually occurred in the DMPs. Given that the areas of congruence are the same for both areas of comparison, exemplars were chosen to highlight each category.

In Domain 1: Dynamics in the Relationship, the categories in which the most consistent congruence was found was in discussions of power, similarities, and differences. For example, in regard to the category of Power, an intern named Kathy reflected, during the follow-up interview, on the discussion she had with her supervisor during the DMP:

A big focus was looking at male-female gender roles and how that impacts us, having a male supervisor and female supervisee, and ways that each of us ascribe to each of those. So how that affected, well just having a chance to ferret those things out a little bit and pulling that wall out to acknowledge that is what was happening in our relationship. And then to figure out what we wanted to do with that. So, it really feels intimidating

at that time to bring up that topic, and having that open forum to process it in ways that we were too intimidated to do that before, or that we weren't aware of before. So during the supervision [DMP], I think...I felt empowered in a lot of ways. Empowered to have more of a voice, to state how I was feeling, and not necessarily just follow his lead or to continue in that more traditional hierarchy that supervision has.

Kathy seems to be speaking about the influence of power to silence her. However, she stated she felt empowered during this session. Her supervisor, Bill, also shared during the follow-up interview his recollection of their discussion and his sense of his supervisee feeling more empowered:

It was also professionally great to see [my supervisee] flex that muscle and to speak in a more collegial way; it showed some nice growth on her part. I was really proud to have that conversation with her, especially in terms of being the end of her internship year. Having that conversation, she said some things that were challenging, maybe to my point of view, challenging to the dominant point of view, which I welcome. And it also gave me a chance to show something to [my supervisee] that I often say, but I don't often get a chance to show, which is I really am okay with being disagreed with and challenged, but it doesn't mean that I'm going to agree back. But that I'm totally okay with, I've got a thick skin, and I welcome disagreement. But it also gave me a chance to show that I won't, well I'll attempt not to and then we'll see, that if I disagree I won't play my power as a trump card. I believe in that conversation, I hope it was

then because it was such an interesting thing that we do talk about and I hope that we did talk about it in that hour, is that at the end of the day, I have most of the power over that decision, unless [my supervisee] just wants to quit the internship. But basically at the end of the day, it is my call. And so what is interesting when we get into this is to get in touch with that level of power, and to disagree with someone knowing that at any moment you can just pull that card out and say, 'Well, I don't care what you think, it's my call and you just got to do it regardless of what you think about it.' And to not forget you have that card but not to abuse that power. It is a very gratifying thing to be reminded of that, not because I want to have that power, but because I can't forget that I have it, because forgetting you have it, it is like anything else, if you don't understand your own privilege, then you are doomed to make all sorts of decisions based on the fact that you don't know that you're doing that, and certainly all the harm that comes from that. So the privilege of my race, gender, and everything else, the more I can call that into a room and have a discussion about that, the more gratifying it is for me. It makes me feel like we're doing the good work.

Here Bill not only acknowledges Kathy's sense of empowerment, but he also shares his increased awareness around the power he holds as a supervisor. The data from the DMP reflects what both Kathy and Bill recollected about the power dynamics within the session:

Kathy: Well it is interesting because we talk about personal identity and professional identity and I certainly see where those two things get mixed up too and having a more experienced clinician and ways in which that interaction is there. It is certainly part of that personal identity of being a trainee and the ways in which I approach your suggestions and the way that conversation happens. Certainly if we think of gender, viewing what gender roles are, what expectations are, in working with some specific clients and thinking about where they are and where they are headed, issues that maybe stand out to me as far as motherhood or other women's roles that maybe haven't been standing out for you. And vice versa when working with males and having a different perspective on how that client might be feeling and getting sort of the opposite influence there.

Bill: How about in terms of how you hear me?

Kathy: Well I certainly think that gender pieces of that are compounded by power, power that is there because of an intern vs. licensed clinician. The fact that you are a man and I am a woman, how that is part of it too. So for me it is really hard to keep those two apart in our relationship because I think they are both there and I think it is easier to place it on the hierarchy because of this.

Bill: What is because of this?

Kathy: That being more directive, that sort of asserting your views on what should happen, that is due to the hierarchy and the full licensed vs. not licensed.

Bill: So the idea is that I am more likely to be assertive? And you are more likely to listen? Or do it for both reasons potentially. One is the professional authority the other is the structural authority of a gender difference and how our society kind of has a default in that direction that you have to actively raise as an awareness or challenge or look at as opposed to sort of the default where you have sort of a default sexism built into our conversations that I am more likely to be listened to. Not just in our relationship but in general. I am more likely to be loud, I am less likely to be run over, just if you go traditional gender communication roles. Obviously has nothing to do with being the sex but at least our gender roles.

Kathy: Yeah. Absolutely. You said sort of you have the position but also it is an ethical and a legal thing that is your say in a lot of ways that furthers that power balance.

Bill: Do you think there is a way that you, I don't know if we ever did this year, but do you think there is a way for you, in your multiple identities that we are talking about, this with gender and trainee and anything else?

We haven't talked about age yet but...

Kathy: SES had been...

Bill: True. And where we were raised and other experiences we had personally and professionally. Do you think there is a way to bring that up without calling into question my license, my ultimate authority to make the decision on...How would we do that?

Kathy: How to talk about that?

Bill: Yeah, what can you imagine that you would do? I can think of how I might do it, but I can say that second.

Kathy: I guess I don't completely know where you are going with that.

Bill: Well, if we were going to talk about the multiple influences on a decision, and know that at the end of the day it was my call. How would we have a useful conversation about that knowing that the trump card is always within my hand? Or I guess not always, you could quit or you could just refuse but, you know, in terms of the professional practice of it I always carry the licensed trump card.

Not only did Kathy and Bill's discussion reflect the issue of Power, but they also engaged in a discussion of how communication styles differ based on their differences in gender.

In regard to the category of Similarities, Karen (intern) shared her discussion with her supervisor around similarities in experiences around socioeconomic status during the follow-up interview:

It was really neat to hear how we came from such different backgrounds, but we had similar underlying values. I enjoyed hearing how she grew up so differently than I did and had these really different experiences. And yet I never would have guessed that because we get along so well and we share so many things that many people would think we had come from similar backgrounds. And I knew she was surprised to hear my background. She was definitely surprised by some of the things that she

heard. And in some ways we did have some similar experiences in that we talked about social class being important to us, and I've shared that with you many times, bouncing around with it. I was probably in the middle class most of the time, but bouncing around with where we were in it. And that made a big difference in going to a school, I went to a school that was really high SES and I could pass for that, but I wasn't one of those students. I didn't have all the things that they had, but they thought I did. And she talked about it from the opposite perspective that she went to a lower SES school at one point and was in a neighborhood or something like that where she was more privileged than the kids around her and she was trying to pass, too. So that was really interesting.

During the follow-up interview, Karen's supervisor, Denise, also shared the experience of discussing their similarities in regard to socioeconomic status while growing up:

One thing we bonded on was that we both had periods of time when our families didn't have much money. Like I shared that when my mom went to graduate school and we qualified for free lunch, but I was too embarrassed to take the free lunch, so my mom went ahead and gave me the money for the free lunch because I didn't want people to know I was getting free lunch. We bonded over the fact that we could pass for people who had more money, because we always had nice clothes but we really didn't have very much. We both bonded on that there were times, depending on what kinds of clients I might be working with, or what

circles I might be in, I might feel self-conscious because of my privilege...we were talking about sometimes I felt self-conscious because of what I had and other times when I felt self-conscious because of what I didn't have.

The data from the DMP reflects what both Karen and Denise shared during the interviews about discussing their similarities around social class:

Denise: I was thinking about social class also. When I was, I grew up in a pretty poor area but we... my dad taught at the college and of course was called a professor, and they don't make a ton of money but compared to my classmates I guess we did. So I grew up in this small little town where all my friends were professors' children, but then we had our elementary school where it was all tobacco farmers except for us. And I found out, I overheard, I think it was one of my girlfriends at my school, her sister, she was not in the [X university] community, and she told me that her sister was our substitute teacher who referred to us as the big shot [X university] dudes. And that was just the rudest awakening to me because to think that I was considered part of this group that was kind of stuck up and elitist was so weird for me because it wasn't at all what, it didn't fit at all with my idea of myself. It kind of stuck with me. And, of course, I have also been in other settings where I felt self-conscious because I didn't have it. I wasn't in the upper middle class with all the expensive stuff. So it has been very relative. I have never felt like, I mean there are times when I felt self-conscious both ways. Self-conscious because I feel there are people

out there who are really poor and then self-conscious because I am not as wealthy as other people who are out there. So for me it has been a very relative one.

Karen: Well, yeah it has been a relative one just in my own personal life. Just because I feel like it has been so erratic over time and my dad... Well I am a first generation college student, as we talked about. My dad didn't have, when it came time for college, his father told him 'we only have money to send one kid to school and your brother is the better bet so he is the one that is going to get the college education.' So, my dad always wanted to go to college, and so he decided that in order to provide for our family he would not be able to do the typical normal thing he could do with his high school diploma. It wasn't going to be enough money. And so he ended up taking tons of risks and starting new companies and so some of them would, it would either, it was always like feast or famine at our house. Either they did really, really well or they didn't. They kind of like, flopped. There were so many over time I just remember always being a part of putting the things together, collating products and all of that stuff when I was little.

Denise: He didn't go with Power Rangers when he had the chance?

Karen: No, he didn't but that really, just like, things like that frustrate me. When I think about, my mom told me years later that there was a certain company that he had that he could have sold for a lot of money. He ended up, I don't know what his reasoning was, I'm sure it was a good reason,

but he ended up holding onto the company instead of selling it. And eventually, over time, the company just kind of like, fizzled and he ended up selling it in the end but it wasn't worth nearly as much as it was at some points in time. And so it was like, when I think about that I understand that but it was really frustrating to me. I don't know why you wouldn't just sell and be able to have that to provide for your family. I don't think it was a greed factor but it kind of feels like 'how could you not do that' and I don't know it is just like it has been a really salient thing. I just remember, my parents never told me what their financial situation was, they were pretty secretive about it actually. I think in a protective way, like they didn't want to involve us but we could always tell, like over time, we knew. Based upon where we were living, how many presents were under the Christmas tree that year. I never realized how much it impacted me until now. Now that I am married, and [my husband] and I are kind of like thinking about our future and any time he talks about risk, I get like a little nervous because he is much more of a risk taker than I am. He is talking about wanting to like create his own companies and do these different things and I said I would support him, but one of us had to have a stable job. So if he was going to do that, I was going to make sure I stayed in a place like a counseling center and I wasn't going to go into private practice and that sort of thing. And his comment was about how we have very different views and I must be afraid of being without or something like that. And I think he is right

because I know what it is like to come from a one income household, and it is either a lot of success or a whole lot of nothing. And I was actually in a situation similar to what you were, because we ended up moving to the high SES city and school, but we were not like the other kids. But I could always pass for the other kids. So I remember there were certain points of time I didn't want them to know how I didn't have a car. It wasn't because I didn't have my license, it was because my parents couldn't afford to give me a car. And all the other kids, their parents could so when they turned 16, that's what they got for their birthdays. And all the cars in the parking lot were these ridiculously expensive cars and I just never had one. I got my first car when I was in college and I just remember being really aware of that type of thing and in some ways, I was like those kids, but in many other ways I was really, really different.

Denise: It is interesting because you just reminded me of when I, my parents divorced when I was getting ready, in between 6th and 7th grade and we moved with our mother who went back to graduate school. So she was working on a graduate school stipend and supporting 3 children.

Karen: I can't imagine.

Denise: Of course, she got child support. But you know, she was only making at that time, it was like 3,000 dollars that she got for the year or something. Maybe it was a semester, but anyway it was very little money and we qualified for free lunch. At the time free lunch was only like 50 cents a day, but we qualified for free lunch and my sister and brother were

younger and weren't so image-conscious. They were fine with getting free lunch, but I was too embarrassed. I didn't want anybody to know that I was getting free lunch. So I didn't get free lunch because the teacher would have to hand you the money or something. There was no way in 7th or 8th grade you were going to get free lunch. My mom was really cool about it. She understood. But I feel guilty sometimes I think back on that, you know. I remember my mom always made sure we had nice things. And I remember a girl in my class in 7th grade saying to me "You have so many clothes. You must be really rich." And of course we were not really rich. But again, when you said the thing about trying to pass, or that you could pass for...

Karen: Yeah, I always did.

Denise: I think about that.

In these excerpts, Denise and Karen have highlighted that although their identity with a particular social class was different, their experiences within those social classes were similar. Both talk about movement between social classes, as well as how they were viewed by others based on their social class. They also shared the experience of having being able "to pass" for someone of another social class. These excerpts illustrate the congruence in Denise and Karen's accounts of Similarities, as well as congruence between their accounts with what occurred in session. As a reminder, congruence occurred when the supervisors' and interns' accounts in the interviews were similar in content and emphasis, as well as when these accounts were similar in content and emphasis to what actually occurred in

the DMPs. Congruence was also determined if accounts seemed to reflect the process that occurred in the DMPs.

In regard to the category of Differences, Jamie (supervisor) and Amalia (intern) discussed their differences in socioeconomic status. During the follow-up interview, Amalia remembered:

One of the most memorable and I guess relevant pieces was something that I had not really realized in terms of how other people view me. My supervisor had shared with me that because I came from a different socioeconomic status, that there was some intimidating factor there, that she wasn't sure when talking with me sometimes that her experiences were similar to mine, just in being in graduate school and things like that, that was really surprising to me, that we would not have talked about if we had not been in this exercise. It was real eye-opening for me to realize what kind of impact my background, if I choose to share that with people, might do to our relationship due to their impression of me. I'd say that was one of the biggest.

Amalia talks not only about the content of their discussion, but her emotionality associated with this discussion. Further, she recollects how assumptions were made about her related to her socioeconomic background. Jamie, Amalia's supervisor, shared during the follow-up interview:

...we did talk about the fact that I did have some, I'm not even sure if reactions is the right work, well I guess reactions is the right word, about her parents being very well educated and based on the things she shared

with me, it became very clear that her family was very well educated. And I do think there was a part of me that was having to deal with some slight intimidation about that because my family is not well educated. I am by far the most well educated in my family, and not that I think there is anything wrong with that, it is just that there is a very different way of communicating. I also realized that, throughout our work together, that I had been making assumptions about how much support she must have been receiving from her family because at times I assumed they were incredibly supportive and understanding of what she was going through getting her Ph.D., whereas my family didn't have any understanding of that. And I realized over the course of us working together that it was a really inaccurate assumption on my part, and in many ways she was getting support and in others she wasn't. So that was really interesting for us to talk about. And for her to learn about me that I didn't really know what kind of support she was getting and not getting from her family, especially in relation to her dissertation.

Jamie and Amalia's accounts appear to be congruent with what occurred during the DMP:

Jamie: What other multicultural issues would be good for us to kind of talk about and explore. You know, you had mentioned educational background. I think over the year, hearing you talk about your family, it sounds like you come from a very well educated family, which I think is lovely and wonderful. I think that there were times where that is almost a

slight intimidation for me. I do not come from a-my parents are incredibly intelligent people but they are not well educated. They just haven't had the opportunities and so I think that hearing that sometimes there were just some moments of 'okay, that is just a very different background' and wondering what kind of difference that creates for us in terms of approaching academia and training and things like .

Amalia: Oh. Yeah. I never again...that is one of those privileges that I've not been aware of. I know I have talked with other people who acknowledge that as a difference between me and them, but I've never been aware of really just how different that might be for somebody. That it might be intimidating. I think I have seen it, in retrospect, I have seen it as it happens-like people feeling...or expressing a sense of unfamiliarity about...I don't know. I don't know. There is some sort of status associated [with it], it has been hard for me to differentiate if people sometimes react to my parents jobs versus if they were well educated, but maybe not in such a high status job. That has been hard to differentiate. But I know I have seen that throughout, just growing up because not everyone's parents are doctors and that was how I was known at school. 'Oh, you are doctor so and so's daughter.' It is still a huge part of how people identify me.

Jamie: I guess I never thought about that impacting you. Well, I think it is a lot of times because I've thought and I have wondered, 'what are the differences then in terms of what are the pressures you might feel or might not feel that I did or did not feel' just because of that background. And

what kind of understanding your family may have that, honestly, my family wasn't that they weren't trying to be supportive, there was really a lack of knowledge, there was ignorance about what it requires to have a PhD. What it means to have that post graduate degree and there is just a lack of understanding of what it entails, what kind of sacrifice it requires.

Amalia: I still feel like there is that lack of understanding. I think our experience is very similar when it comes to that. A lot of my family has post graduate education, but it is not the same as a PhD. I know because I went through [during my] master's program and that being really not a problem for me to complete.

Jamie: Really. Interesting.

Amalia: And then this PhD program, being drastically different from my experience as a master's student. And I feel like drastically different from my friend's experiences in medical school or law school. It feels very, very different. I don't see anybody else going through this same kind of thing that a PhD student does. I assume a PhD student in other fields struggle in the same way, but not like professional degree like MDs or...

Jamie: That is so interesting.

Amalia: Yeah. So I think there is a similarity there.

Jamie: That even in your own family there is like not quite the same understanding of the sacrifice it requires in terms of the time and the intensity of it.

Amalia: And they also grew up in a different era. They went to school in a different country. There weren't that many choices in terms of them finding a gateway to a different level of living. There were like 3 major choices. You become a lawyer or a doctor or a teacher. In my family, those are the major careers that were sort of acceptable. There are some variations, accountants or nurses, stuff like that. So for them, that influence, for them it made it hard to understand that there were all these different choices I had to choose from and the fact that I chose this one. I don't think I knew what I was getting into either when I started the PhD program.

Jamie: Yeah. It is kind of hard to know. They don't tell you everything up front.

Amalia: Nobody would do it.

Jamie: They wouldn't.

Amalia: I can't tell you how many times I've been told 'You could have been a doctor by now,' 'You would have been done with med school by now,' 'You could be practicing by now'" and I have had to fight that for awhile.

Jamie: Yeah. I bet. I think that the other thing is that people don't understand the kind of drain that it takes to do therapy. I think that is often something that....

Amalia: Yeah, this field in particular.

Jamie: Yeah that is so true. I think that it is nice to have had this discussion though because I think that there were, and the more I learned about your family the more I think I did think ‘Oh, that is such a different background, that educational component.’ My parents did stress education but it was from a different perspective. It wasn’t that that was necessarily modeled. It was very much that I had to pay for the road and so I think that I really wondered if there was a big difference in how that impacted us and how that continued to impact us.

Amalia: Yeah. There probably are some differences for sure. I think there are some similarities too.

Jamie: Yeah. That is what I am realizing. That maybe there were more similarities than perhaps I had realized. I don’t know that I felt like it necessarily strongly impacted how I interacted with you in supervision per se. I think it was always something that I thought about in the back of my mind. Well, I did think it probably impacted me in terms of when I would ask you about your dissertation. I think I may have probably assumed that there was, that you may have had a bit more of a support, family support and understanding than maybe you actually did. And so I think there may have been an assumption on my part that ‘Oh well, her family understands and knows.’ But then I started to realize that was not accurate because you started to say these stories about ‘Mom, I can’t go to this function, I have got to work on my dissertation.’ They just weren’t getting it. They were not understanding, like ‘No, seriously. I cannot go.’ and I started realizing

‘Oh, my gosh, that is the exact same thing that would happen with me and my family.’ That is so similar. So, I think it started to become more clear recently anyway, as you’ve talked more about it.

In this exchange about differences, Jamie’s assumptions seemed to have been challenged with what Amalia shared about her family’s socioeconomic and educational background, as well as her experiences. Further, it is clear that due to her erroneous assumptions, Jamie neglected to consider the possibility that her supervisee may benefit from additional support around completing her dissertation.

In Domain 3: Characteristic of the Discussion, there were two categories in which congruence emerged. Those categories included comfort level, and enjoyable. During the follow-up interviews, both Sonali (supervisor) and Kayla (intern) discussed their level of comfort in engaging in the DMP. Sonali shared:

Personally, with this specific supervisee, I found it to be very easy because we had gotten to know each other and I find [my supervisee] to be a very warm person that I feel very safe with. So in some ways it felt very good, but I think I am still learning as a supervisor how to feel comfortable sharing of myself, and I think that part felt awkward at times. And I was able to discuss that with [my supervisee], that I did feel awkward sharing this or that. And we’re usually pretty good about sharing our own reactions with each other.

Sonali shared here that while she felt comfortable engaging in this discussion, there were times she felt awkward, or uncomfortable. This sense of feeling both comfortable and awkward seems to be reflected in Kayla's recollection:

Well, given the focus here on diversity, I think she was open and willing to have that discussion, but I guess, I'm not really sure. Sometimes I can't read her very well. And I'm not sure, it sometimes seemed she was a little uncomfortable. I felt uncomfortable too, especially when we were talking about our differences in our supervisory relationship and how that may have impacted our work together. I felt like I wanted to go deeper, and we didn't go deeper. I'm not sure if that was me or if that was her, but I sensed her being very uncomfortable some of the time, although I also sensed her being very open and willing to discuss things, especially about client issues... When I first started talking about my clients, she was very willing to hear me out and offer her own thoughts on client development and my own work with the clients. So that is where I felt like she was very open. And I guess she was also willing and open to process part of our own differences. And maybe I was making more of the differences than they are, or they were. But I felt a little bit of holding back or discomfort on the part where we were talking about our relationship and our specific cultural differences.

Sonali and Kayla's interview comments seem to be reflected in the process that occurred during the DMP when they were discussing their racial and ethnic difference:

Kayla: But you know I was thinking when you were talking that I don't know that you and I have really talked about our differences from each other. I don't know...

Sonali: I was thinking that too.

Kayla: I don't know if that is something that just, I don't know, some people are different in that, some people bring it up no matter what and talk about it. And I tend to be one of the people who brings it up and if it appears, which may be wrong or right, I don't know, nothing new developing but brings it up as it appears like, important to what is going on. Or if it appears like it might be important to the relationship that we have. And so, I guess I am kind of not sure, not with these, but not sure about us not discussing it. If that is just because it hasn't come up or if we both kind of tend to not bring that up unless it's...but maybe it is important and we haven't...I don't know. Maybe there are some differences. Like I think, I have seen a lot of the time 'Oh, [my supervisor] is a psychologist and she is licensed and she is someone who I am going follow getting licensed, and we share similar views about clients and the way we work with clients' and so there I am again focusing on those similarities and not even being aware of points of difference. Even the obvious differences like that we're from, you know, different races and ethnicities.

Sonali: Yeah. No, I wondered about that too because I think I, I think I am similar to you in that way, that I don't always introduce myself or

introduce the parts of me or the identities if it doesn't seem relevant to the moment. But I can really see the benefit of throwing it out there on the table because I also think that sometimes that, I mean it is a difficult thing to talk about sometimes and it is hard, I think, I can imagine that for some clients it would be hard and as for some supervisees who would be kind of, that they would feel unsure about whether to bring it up or...Especially if there is a view that might, they feel like might offend me or aren't sure how it is going to be received. That it might help for me to take that role to say 'I see this, and if it comes up and you would like to talk about it, then we can talk about it'. You know, make it, normalize the fact that this is something important and good for us to talk about. But I go back and forth with that.

Kayla: Yeah, me too. I think it intersects too with that part of me that doesn't want to make it about me which I think I am able to moderate that or whatever you call it. I guess I don't feel like it necessarily would be about me. I guess I get uncomfortable sometimes too with... Like I feel even uncomfortable with it right now because I'm like 'Oh my gosh, like, are we like bringing up the difference and making it salient in the room,' and sometimes I am having the same feelings when I am with clients and not knowing kind of what to do with that, like not even being sure of kind of where to go. I haven't, honestly for myself, I haven't even thought about how our differences may impact our relationship. I feel like I come in here, and I am so focused on like 'alright, this client has this and this

client has this' and I need some help figuring out what to do with this, and almost like there is not room to discuss that. I am not saying that you don't make room for it or I don't make room for it. I think it is just part of the dynamic with all of the issues that go on here anyway. So I don't know. I guess I am feeling in this stuck place with not knowing even how...

Sonali: What are you going to do about it?

Kayla: Yeah. Not even knowing how to discuss that or even for the purposes of this study, you know what I mean? How...

Sonali: That it looks like.

Kayla: Yeah and do that.

Sonali: Yeah. I'm not sure either. I wish I had a good answer for you.

Kayla: And maybe there's not an answer. Maybe you are just supposed to dialogue about how the difference may impact us. Or I feel like there may be places where it does where I am not even aware of, that I haven't even really thought about where it could impact, even for the views that we have about clients or the way that we work. Even their background and it feels so little and so big at the same time.

Sonali: Yeah. No. Yeah. I agree. I thought that when I first read through this and I was talking about describing what we were supposed to be doing. And I was like 'we've never done that'. We've never talked about our identities and where things come from. And I think I have heard that more from you because it comes in pieces as you talk about your reactions to clients and things like that. And I guess I was wondering 'why haven't

we really talked about that' and I don't know that I have. I think I have talked about it in different contexts.

Kayla: Yeah. I feel like I know more about, I'm not saying I know everything about you, but I know more about your culture, kind of in the way you will talk about bringing your son to family get-togethers, and where you grew up and your mother-in-law or whatever. I feel like I know more about it in that context. But I guess in terms of how it impacts the supervision relationship. Like the relationship that we have in here, which is different. I mean, in some ways, I still see [Sonali] here, like I see [Sonali] in the lunchroom or whatever but it is different because it is more clinically focused. And so I am not sure where the differences impact the clinical part of it.

Sonali: Yeah. I'm not sure. Like in our specific relationship, I'm not sure. Because I think in other supervisory relationships, I have had opportunities to kind of talk about that, or places where it felt like 'okay, this is triggering something.' Like our difference here is really triggering a need to discuss this. And I haven't felt that as much in our relationship. I've kind of felt like, I recognize similarities. I recognize differences, but they don't seem to, they don't seem to be in a way that I, I guess I don't experience them in a way that feels like 'okay, we need to figure this out' or 'we need to understand this more in order to move forward' or...

Kayla: Yeah. I can see that. Yeah. I guess I was thinking too when you were saying that I've had all white female therapists, and I had one white

male therapist. And so I was thinking like you are the first, I didn't mean therapist I meant supervisor.

Sonali: Supervisor. Yeah.

Kayla: You're not my therapist. Supervisor. I'm sorry. So I have had all white supervisors until you. And I hadn't, I don't know. I think that I am falling into this thing of viewing the similarities so much more strongly. Like that view that's completely incorrect, 'oh I don't see color' kind of thing. Do you know what I mean? Maybe I feel like I've over latched on to like the similarities. And part of that may be because maybe I've shared more about my stuff, or whatever, my reactions to clients from my perspective than you are able to do as a supervisor. And so, I almost feel like, in the back of my mind, there is this inkling like 'Well if [my supervisor] was white, it wouldn't be any different'. Do you know what I mean? And I feel like that is inaccurate. Like I feel like there are differences there that I am not...

Sonali: Or maybe it wouldn't be.

Kayla: Or maybe not. I don't know.

Sonali: I don't know. I think that is interesting that, again, I think it's interesting what pieces of my identity are more visible or more - that I talk about or share more in different contexts. I was wondering actually with your Indian male client now, if we were flipped and if I was a supervisee and you were the supervisor, and he was my client, I think I would probably talk a lot more. I mean, partially because it would be my space to

talk more about about my reactions to him and things. But I think that there would be a different dynamic there which then we might talk about.

Kayla: That's true.

Sonali: Like, I would probably feel a sense like, I would probably assume, maybe wrongfully so, that you didn't have a lot, as much knowledge about the Indian culture as I did. Or maybe in a different way than I did, which may be totally wrong. You may have grown up in [X country] and I wouldn't know, you know. But I think that I probably would have shared more of that identity. That piece of me and my experience given that experience. And I think there is less of that kind of material for me to bring up as a supervisor.

This excerpt seems to illustrate not only a sense of discomfort or awkwardness around discussing their differences, but also highlights a sense of comfort Sonali and Kayla also have with each other, as evidenced by Kayla's ability to share her discomfort openly with Sonali. Further, Sonali seems comfortable sharing that she does not have answers.

In the category of Enjoyable, there was congruence among all of the supervisors' and interns' accounts. During the follow-up interview, one of the supervisors named Jamie shared what made this discussion with her supervisee enjoyable:

I really enjoyed it. I thought it was wonderful. We got into some things that we had never really talked about before and that was really interesting and fun. I do have to say a part of the reason I thought it was a fun

experience was because [my supervisee] and I felt very safe with one another and I think a part of that was that we had been talking about these things all along the way. So it felt like a very comfortable and safe thing to talk about. I don't know if that makes a difference, but I think that was what made it wonderful was to get to know her better at the end.

Jamie's supervisee, Amalia, also shared the enjoyment she got from taking part in the DMP:

Overall, I really enjoyed the experience. I think it could have been different with a different supervisor or a different person, but I have found that I get a lot out of sharing myself with my supervisor and out of sharing her responses. And I think what I get out of that is typically support and reassurance in the sense of understanding. So for me, it made me feel closer to my supervisor.

It seems that for both Jamie and Amalia, enjoyment in the process was related to sharing of themselves and learning about each other. Finding data that illustrate the enjoyment of both participants in the DMP was more difficult as transcripts did not note when participants laughed together or engaged in other behaviors that typically indicate enjoyment. However, one behavior that seemed to indicate enjoyment of having this discussion was that of supervisor and intern sharing of themselves and sharing what they learned about each other, as reflected in the following excerpt:

Amalia: That our careers being so much a part of our identities and related to our personal and emotional experiences, I end up feeling very angry for

my brother not understanding why I didn't live next to other college students. He thought, 'Well, I don't see what the problem is.' and I was just like well I wouldn't expect you to see what the problem is. You just get defensive some times. I think there is that lack of understanding no matter where you are but there is something unique about this field and about this process and obviously we have some similar experiences.

Jamie: Yeah that is so true. I think that it is nice to have had this discussion though because I think that there were, and the more I learned about your family the more I think I did think, 'Oh, that is such a different background, that educational component.' My parents did stress education but it was from a different perspective. It wasn't that that was necessarily modeled. It was very much that I had to pay for the road and so I think that I really wondered if there was a big difference in how that impacted us and how that continued to impact us.

Amalia: Yeah. There probably are some differences for sure. I think there are some similarities too.

Jamie: Yeah. That is what I am realizing. That maybe there were more similarities than perhaps I had realized. I don't know that I felt like it necessarily strongly impacted how I interacted with you in supervision per se. I think it was always something that I thought about in the back of my mind. Well, I did think it probably impacted me in terms of when I would ask you about your dissertation. I think I may have probably assumed that

there was, that you may have had a bit more of a support, family support and understanding than maybe you actually did.

Another area of congruence was in Domain 4: Impact of Discussion, in which there was congruence in two categories, Intentionality for Future Work and Increased Awareness. Joan (supervisor) and Colleen (intern) not only talk about how this discussion impacted their intentionality for future work in their follow-up interviews, but also discussed this in their DMP. During the follow-up interview, Joan shared:

Both of us (supervisor and intern) were curious if you brought the Arredondo model into client relationships or supervisory relationships earlier in the process, what would that be like...I think I'd bring the model in earlier in the supervisory relationship, to talk about that and how it impacts our experience with each other and what we may need to be aware of or maybe attend to more in our work together... This might be a useful tool to sit and talk through with a client in a relationship where it would be really important to talk about those similarities and differences within the relationship.

Joan seems to intend to use DMPs both in supervision in the future, as well as with clients. Her supervisee, Colleen, also shared how engaging in this discussion would impact her work in the future:

It made me reflect on the supervision that I've done and how I could use this, and how I would like to use it. Like I mentioned earlier, I think it could be beneficial in the beginning when you are building the

relationship, to have that open discussion and to learn about each other, what makes that important in our individual identity, and then to follow-up with that mid-semester, but also constantly checking back into that when necessary...I think it plants seeds for if we have that open conversation, it can translate into my supervisee feeling more comfortable exploring that with clients. So I would like to use it for the supervisory relationship, but also as a model for the supervisee to use with their clients, too.

An exchange during the DMP reflects Joan and Colleen's intent to utilize DMPs in the future:

Joan: So I think that [political affiliation] is one that we would add to this list that can change how well a supervisory relationship works based on similarities and differences.

Colleen: Right.

Joan: Like when there is so much similarity that works well, or sometimes when there's too much of a difference, depending on how that supervisory relationship works, that can be a growth experience or that can be something that is mismatched. I definitely think there's room in supervisory relationships for different identities to not meld well together and have a very strong impact on the supervisory relationship. And I think for you and I, so much has been comfortably similar or dissimilar, but it has worked well.

Colleen: Right. I definitely agree.

Joan: I think that's changeable based on the relationship, any reactions for you in moving into your identity as being a supervisor? Well, I mean you've supervised here, but continuing in that role?

Colleen: This [reminds me] of things to make sure that I'm being continually aware of when I do supervise. And to explore with my supervisee if there are some stark differences. One thing that I didn't overtly explore with someone I did supervise was the difference in age. Actually, with everyone I've supervised I've always been younger, and I feel that could really...I felt once the relationship was built, it was fine, but always ahead of time. Same thing when I see clients that are older than me, there is that wonder if that is going to impact the other person's assumptions, or what my assumptions might be. That's an example of when I have thought about these things and wished that I had explored them further. But I think it is a good thing to have on the back burner and bring to the front burner when they are relevant, or even to explore if it is relevant or not.

Joan: I think that's the thing – just being explicit about them. Once you've named it and talked about it, the more you practice having these conversations, the more comfortable it is to bring that up in the moment when it really fits in the relationship, whether that is in a supervisory relationship or with clients.

Colleen: Definitely.

Later in the DMP, Colleen shares her thoughts on how engaging in DMPs in the future can be helpful:

I think it would be neat to have this discussion with a supervisor early on because you might learn things about them that you might not have known, or just to feel out – because with some supervisors, it’s more overt and you might have that discussion as you are getting to know them, but depending, there’s such a wide variety that these things might not come up in terms of the styles or differences that might be there that could impact supervision.

Here, Colleen not only discussed the utility of having these discussions with a supervisor, but also alludes to her enjoyment of the process, of learning more about her supervisor.

The final area of congruence between supervisors’ and interns’ accounts, and congruence between their accounts and what occurred in the DMPs, was that of Increased Awareness. One of the supervisors named Denise spoke of her increased awareness during the follow-up interview:

I think it is interesting that in recent years I have become more aware of some of my biases, like another one that has been there is, again, I was raised in a very egalitarian home, by dad is a big feminist, and I was raised a sort of color-blind feminism, like it is not cool to acknowledge differences between men and women. Women can do anything men can do and you’re sexist if you somehow talk about differences. Same thing with different races, you weren’t supposed to acknowledge differences.

Maybe that was a more old-school way of looking at things, I don't really know, but I feel in some ways that that was a disservice. Now in some ways, if you are a feminist, you maybe do have to acknowledge women have different needs and that there are certain things that are more important. So when I've had clients who have more traditional sex roles, gender roles, or the husband has the wife do all of the cooking and cleaning and doesn't want her working, I would have really strong reactions to that because of the values that were instilled in me from a very young age... So that is a real bias I have when I come across people who have more traditional gender roles. It was neat to have all of the identities on one page (during the DMP). I've had similar discussions with other interns, but to have them all together was neat to go through them and helped me be more aware.

Denise seems to be indicating that while her awareness about her own identities has grown over the years, awareness about her identities increased as a result of considering them together as opposed to independent from one another. Denise's intern, Karen, also spoke about her increased awareness during the follow-up interview:

...A lot of values came up. And we also talked about how certain aspects influenced our work with clients more, but then other ones were more important to us, but that was more related to our personal lives...It was really interesting. I found myself, I wasn't uncomfortable, [but] I think I was aware that we just hadn't really discussed this stuff before. It was a

little bit different. I was thinking to myself, 'Oh, why haven't we discussed any of this before.' Some of the stories that came up during our conversation, my supervisor had told me those stories before, but now we were talking about it in a different context. I was just really aware that we hadn't talked about that type of thing before...because it had never occurred to me before when she was saying those examples that it had anything to do with multiculturalism at all. It was never in that context. And all of a sudden we were talking about that and I became aware how we don't talk about multiculturalism in our supervision.

It seems that Karen's awareness around her supervisor's identities increased her understanding of multiculturalism, as well as gaining an increased awareness that she has not explicitly discussed multiculturalism with her supervisor in the past. Thus, she now recognizes that these identities are not separate from one's cultural lens and how one views the world and themselves in the world. Denise and Karen's discussion around Denise's identity as a feminist helps to illustrate their increased awareness:

Denise: Another part of my identity which I don't know if it is on here, a big part of it I feel like, is I grew up with parents, especially my father and my stepmother, who were very much, very focused on feminism and egalitarianism and sort of more the old school type of feminism, where you are supposed to treat males and females exactly the same, and you are not really even supposed to acknowledge...I call it the old school

feminism, I don't know if that is what it really is but...you know, sort of like you weren't really even allowed to acknowledge differences.

Karen: Right, there were no differences. We are all equal.

Denise: Kind of like we are color blind, gender blind or whatever. But that was very strongly indoctrinated into me and I would have a hard time, I would sympathize if I was having a hard time working with clients who were very traditional and especially if there was some expectation of the woman was supposed to do the what the man says or is supposed to do all the housework and I had a really hard time, that was one of the areas in which I felt myself most wanting to impose my own judgments about things and my having my reactions get in the way.

Karen: I have a hard time with that too. I can respect it...

Denise: I haven't encountered it as much here as I did in rural West Virginia or rural North Carolina.

Karen: It is funny that you say that because I, again, this is from my perspective and the way that I grew up, and coming from the north to the south. Texas is so traditional. I find that a lot of people hold those traditional values. So I guess I have encountered it more here, and I do find myself having to check in, and we've talked about this a lot too, like 'is it okay to have certain expectations of your family and what things are going to look like?', and I find myself being more open to that because I am so aware that I have really strong biases there, that I am like 'okay, I need to step back and really check out what this person's values are and do

they want to change this or are they okay with this' and hold off from my own. But I grew up in the opposite sense of what you are talking about. I grew up in a really traditional household where dad went to work, mom stayed home to take care of the kids, and my parents, I just remember being so aware, so early on, that it was really contradictory. Because there is my brother who is 2 years older, he is the oldest and then there is myself and my sister. We were told that girls can do anything boys can do, except you can't go out late at night, you can't walk by yourself to the store, you can't do this, you can't do that, and so my brother would have a very different rule set than my sister and I would have. And yet my brother was the one that was the troublemaker, that pushed the boundaries, and my sister and I always followed the rules. We were really upset when the expectations of what we would do would be the same. It was expected that we would get our education, because in that way you are really equal and you can do anything a guy can do. You could play sports...you could do all these things, but we kind of felt like we were being punished because we were girls. We weren't allowed to do these other things that my brother was allowed to do. I just remember being so furious about that. And I never challenged it because we just didn't challenge things.

Denise: Right. Interesting.

Karen: It is just such a button for me, because as soon as I got my own place and I lived alone, I just did - I would challenge those things a lot. Probably a little bit against safety, you know, the fact that I probably

pushed the safety concerns, because I would just do whatever I wanted to do. So I'm really aware of that.

Denise: It is interesting that you've never talked about that before, that you don't really worry too much about bad things happening or safety.

Karen: Yes, but I am aware of it now. I listen to my gut and how I feel but when I think back to my early 20's when I was in college, I would walk home at 2 o'clock in the morning just because I wanted to, and I wasn't going to worry about those types of things. Now I would never do that. I am... I have found more of a balance I think. That there were some things my parents were saying...

Denise: The optimal level of anxiety.

Karen: Yes. They were important but at the same time it was a real issue for me about why we are created equal, but yet we are not.

Denise: Right. Along with that feminism from my family too, was this sort of, and I realize just now, becoming more culturally sensitive, working in this setting I realize that some of these similar biases are probably, may have been acting out in the past with my clients from more rural areas, because my family was very into being independent, like the idea that I would stay to go to college where my dad taught, that was preposterous. Of course, I am going to go away to college. A lot of people have the opposite, where their parents tell them they have to go to college close to home and my family was like 'no, why would you move to be closer to family? You would move to go to your job.' That was just how, my family

is very close, we get together, but no one would blame anyone for moving across the country because that is what you do. You go to where your job is, you don't go to where you are close to your family.

Area of incongruence.

There was only one area of incongruence in which a distinct pattern emerged between supervisors' and interns' accounts during the interviews and with what occurred in the DMPs. The area of incongruence in which there was a distinct pattern was that of Domain 4: Impact of Discussion. The category that stood out with this distinct pattern was Increased Connection in Supervisory Relationship. All of the interns mentioned during the follow-up interviews that they felt "closer" to their supervisor as a result of engaging in the DMPs. However, none of the supervisors shared this increase in connection within the supervisory relationship, though one supervisor did mention she believed that engagement in DMPs could have the impact of increasing connection within the supervisory relationship. Further, this increased sense of connection was not discussed in the DMPs. One intern named Colleen shared, "It felt good to have that (DMP) happen. I feel that it was kind of a way of getting outside of the box. I feel that it did connect us." Another intern named Kayla shared her sense of connection with her supervisor:

I think what I especially enjoyed about it, because it was focused on multicultural differences and differences of all kinds, that I haven't had a ton of diverse clients this year, and so I haven't always been able to bring those up in supervision. So this felt very focused and that's what we were

supposed to be focusing on. So I could bring up different issues in a different way that I hadn't thought about in terms of the client load and how I work with them. What could have been more helpful – and even though it didn't go as well as I, or the way that I would have wanted it to in terms of talking about our own supervision relationship, I really did feel that the discussion we had, I felt closer to my supervisor in those moments when we were talking about our differences, even though it didn't go like I had hoped it would go. I felt that was an important thing, too, getting that out in the open and exploring it the amount that we did...

It seems that for Kayla, talking about the differences within the supervisory relationship helped her feel closer to her supervisor.

Theoretical Model of Discussions of Multicultural Perspectives in Clinical Supervision

Given the results that emerged from the data, participants' experiences can be described and understood in a model that consists of four spheres/domains of experiences (See Figure 1 for theoretical model). This model illustrates the relationship between domains in the engagement of discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision. The first sphere/domain of experience is that of Characteristics of Discussion, which includes personal quality, self-disclosure, openness, depth of discussion, comfort level, and enjoyable. The second sphere/domain is that of Dynamics in Relationship, which includes the categories of power, privilege and marginalization, theoretical orientation, similarities and differences. The third sphere/domain is that of Cultural Lens, which includes

assumptions, stereotypes, and prejudice; bias and values; identities; and working with clients. The final sphere/domain is that of Impact of Discussion, which includes intentionality for future work, increased awareness, and increased connection in supervisory relationship.

Chapter 4

Discussion

The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand the experiences of supervisors and pre-doctoral psychology interns when having discussions of multicultural perspectives. This study sought to answer the following questions: 1) What do supervisors and supervisees experience when having semi-guided discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision?, 2) How do supervisor's and supervisee's perceptions of what occurred in their discussions of multicultural perspectives compare?, and 3) How do the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding their discussions of multicultural perspectives in supervision compare to what actually occurred? Data from the discussions of multicultural perspectives (DMPs) and from follow-up interviews with the supervisors and interns within the dyad that took part in the DMPs were analyzed using a grounded theory approach. The theoretical model developed in this study suggests that characteristics in the discussions of multicultural perspectives, as well as participants discussing their cultural lens and the supervisory relationship had an impact on participants in regard to their intentions for future work, in their awareness, and in the connection in the supervisory relationship.

Four domains emerged from the data: 1) dynamics in the relationship, 2) cultural lens, 3) characteristics of discussion, and 4) impact of discussion. In Domain 1: Dynamics in the Relationship, participants shared their perspectives about the dynamics within the supervisory and therapeutic relationships. Within

this domain, five categories emerged, including power, privilege and marginalization, theoretical orientation, similarities, and differences. In Domain 2: Cultural Lens, participants discussed how their cultural lens not only influences how they view their world and how others view them, but also how their cultural lens impacts their supervisory and clinical work. Four categories emerged within this domain, including assumptions/stereotypes/prejudice, biases/values, identities, and working with clients. In Domain 3: Characteristics of Discussion, participants shared their perceptions of the many different characteristics or qualities of their DMPs. Five categories emerged from the data, including personal quality, self-disclosure, openness, depth of discussion, and comfort level. In Domain 4: Impact of Discussion, participants shared how engagement in DMPs impacted them personally and professionally. Three categories emerged from the data, including intentionality for future work (both in supervision and clinically), increased awareness, and increased connection in the supervisory relationship.

An in-depth comparison between supervisors' and interns' perceptions of what occurred in the DMPs revealed congruence among some of the categories. Where congruence was found, supervisors and interns perceptions seemed to mirror each other quite well. It was also discovered that the categories of congruence between supervisors' and interns' perceptions with what actually happened in the sessions matched the categories of congruence found in the comparison between supervisors' and interns' accounts. Congruence was found in the following categories: A) Domain 1: Dynamics of the Relationship - Power, Similarities, and Differences; B) Domain 3: Characteristics of the Discussion –

Comfort Level, and Enjoyable; and C) Domain 4: Impact of Discussion – Intentionality for Future Work, and Increased Awareness. What follows is an examination of what was found and implications for these findings.

General discussion

Given the impact of these discussions on the participants in this study, the supervisory relationship may be an important tool for increasing cultural competence. Further, in this study, it was found that when intentionally engaged in a discussion of multicultural perspectives, focusing on personal and social identities seemed to open the door to discussing other multicultural issues in a safe and open manner. These topics included discussions of power dynamics, privilege and marginalization, assumptions and biases, and how these aspects of multiculturalism are present not only within the supervisory relationship, but also with the work they do with clients. Thus, the guide seemed to provide safety for discussing these issues. The participants noted their increased awareness around these issues and considered the importance of this increased awareness as related to their multicultural counseling competence. This seemed to provide evidence for the contention Myers, Echemendia and Trimble made when they stressed the importance of processing and exploring the implications of cultural and diversity design among the client, supervisee and supervisor (1991). It seems that a vital part of engagement in these discussions was the intentionality, or structure and purpose, of the exercise. It may be that the structure and purpose of these discussions allowed for a candid exploration of these issues. More about the role of structure and purpose will be explored later. In addition to purposeful

engagement in these discussions, participants decided to utilize DMPs in their future work, both in supervision and in therapy. This experience seemed to have influenced them both personally and professionally. In comparison to previous supervision sessions, participants noted the DMPs were more in-depth, focused and personal in regard to multicultural issues.

What does this mean if there is no intentionality around having discussions of multicultural perspectives? First, there is evidence that culture does not often arise as a topic in supervision because many supervisors may not know as much as their supervisees know about cultural competence (Bernard, 1994). Thus, many supervisors may not realize the importance of broaching the topic of culture or diversity within the context of supervision, and especially within the context of the supervisory relationship. It is possible that if supervisors do not intentionally engage their supervisees in activities that help to develop these competencies, supervisees will receive the implicit message that this is not an important part of supervision and that development of multicultural competencies in relation to supervision should be done elsewhere. Thus, it may continue a pattern in which these issues are not addressed if and when trainees become supervisors. A less desirable result of not purposefully engaging in DMPs could be that trainees will not believe intentional focus on multicultural issues, especially pertaining to self-awareness, is an important function of multicultural competence. Carter (2001) suggested this very thing. He stated that a lack of focus on self-awareness and knowledge can result in supervisors, and thus their supervisees, having an academic view of culture that is separate or at least distanced from their personal

being. And worse, supervisors may miss an opportunity to not only help guide and advance their trainees in developing cultural competence, but they themselves may not further develop their own cultural competence.

Further, the results indicate there is a need for additional training programs that focus on the development of the self-awareness component of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCCs). As a reminder, this component includes four areas: 1) counselors are aware of their own culture and sensitive to their own heritage; 2) counselors understand that their cultural experiences and background influence their attitudes, biases and values regarding psychological processes; 3) counselors can identify the bounds of their multicultural competence and expertise; and 4) counselors can recognize their discomfort with differences that are present between themselves and their clients (Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996). Falender and Shafranske (2004) stated, “Although self-awareness is a component of cultural competence, incorporation of an integrated awareness, understanding, and competence with one’s own cultural or multidiverse background has been slow to come in training environments” (pp. 122). That the participants in this study had not engaged in such in-depth discussions prior to engaging in the DMPs indicates the need for supervisor training in this area. In particular, supervisors may benefit from additional education and training in providing multicultural supervision. Further, both supervisors and trainees may benefit from training for engagement in difficult dialogues. Most supervisors in this study reported they had supervision training that incorporated a multicultural component. However, it is not known if

this multicultural component was infused throughout the supervision training curriculum, or was a single event in their training. It is not known, either, if the multicultural component in their training included the aspect of self-awareness. What is more telling is that when reporting on the nature of their multicultural training, they did not address further education in multicultural supervision. Further, little is known about the continuing education of supervisors. What support or encouragement do these supervisors receive from the counseling centers they work in to continue developing their multicultural competence? Future studies might examine the culture and attitudes of counseling centers around the development of MCCs.

Also, while training programs have provided educational opportunities for multicultural exploration, it is possible they may not be doing enough. Though all APA accredited doctoral programs in psychology must include at least one course in multicultural issues, few doctoral programs offer a greater number of classes on this topic (Yutzenka, 1995). Further, it is also unknown how much these programs infuse multicultural issues into other standard courses. Research regarding the utility of existing multicultural training is necessary. And while these courses may provide the basic research on multicultural issues, how do they encourage self-exploration and reflection, if they even do? The operationalization of the MCCs (Arredondo, et al., 1996) into distinct behaviors that demonstrate competency might help provide some guidance and an additional foundation for infusing this aspect of the MCCs into training. The current study highlights the utility of engaging in discussions that require self-reflection. This self-reflection

and thus, increased self-awareness, may impact counselors' cultural sensitivity. According to Wade and Bernstein (1991), clients' perceptions of the counseling process and the counselors themselves had more to do with culture sensitivity training of the counselors than with the counselor's race. Culture sensitivity training in Wade and Bernstein's study contained a component on self-awareness and the minority client. In that study, counselors who underwent the culture sensitivity training also were trained to recognize and cope with their own defensiveness as counselors. Their study further found that culture sensitivity had the impact of decreasing attrition rates of clients during the first three counseling sessions. Constantine (2002) also discovered that clients' satisfaction with counseling was related to perceptions of counselors' general and multicultural competence. These findings seem to support the need for further developing MCCs in order to positively influence the therapeutic relationship and potentially, therapeutic outcomes. Future studies might examine the nature of multicultural exploration in training programs to determine their capacity for encouraging the development of MCCs. Other studies may look at impact of DMPs throughout the course of training, beginning when students start their doctoral studies in psychology. Further, it may be fascinating to see how this compares to trainees in other mental health fields, such as counseling and social work. Additionally, it could provide a great deal of information about the development of multicultural competencies over time.

While the participants in this study appeared to have a natural flow of exploration in these discussions, it does not appear that they have had training in

different ways to engage in these discussions. Supervision could be vital to developing the skills necessary to engage in DMPs, just as supervision seems to be vital to developing counseling skills. Participants noted the modeling that occurred during the DMPs that could be helpful in the learning process. Further, practicing these skills could make it easier to utilize in the future, whether in supervision experiences or in therapy. More research is needed to determine the role of supervision in developing the self-awareness piece of MCCs.

Theoretical orientations such as humanistic, relational, and interpersonal appeared to influence the ease with which participants engaged in these discussions. Falender and Shafranske (2004) suggested that supervision is impacted by personal factors and that supervisors need to develop an awareness of their beliefs, values and attitudes that can influence their behaviors in the supervisory relationship. It is possible that relational styles could be more facilitative of engaging in DMPs as participants seemed to believe they allow for more sharing of personal factors. If this is the case, how might those who espouse theoretical orientation that are not relational engage their supervisees in developing the self-reflective skills necessary for increasing awareness of one's own worldview? It may be that more training is necessary in how to incorporate DMPs into supervision sessions in which less relational approaches are utilized. Future studies might examine the role of theoretical orientation in engagement in DMPs.

The DMPs that participants engaged in were quite rich with content that is indicative of having awareness, knowledge and skills associated with

multicultural competence. However, this could be an artifact of choosing university counseling centers that have a multicultural specialty. It might be assumed that these counseling centers, due to their focus on multicultural populations, are more committed in their dedication to increasing cultural competence. If they are committed to the development of MCCs, it stands to reason they may engage more regularly in discussions around multicultural issues. It is unknown what might be found in DMPs that take place at university counseling centers that do not have a similar specialty area. It is interesting to consider how these DMPs might look similar or different in university counseling centers in which there is no multicultural specialty. Future studies might examine this, as well as what DMPs might look like in settings other than university counseling centers.

Implications of the emergent categories

Domain 1: Dynamics in Relationship.

In this study, participants talked about dynamics within the supervisory relationship, as well as dynamics within the therapeutic relationships during both the DMPs and the follow-up interviews. Relationship dynamics explored included power, privilege and marginalization, theoretical orientation, similarities and differences. Power, privilege and marginalization seemed to be somewhat related. However, power was discussed in a variety of ways, including the hierarchical nature of the supervisory relationship which related to the primary focus on the intern's growth and client issues during supervision, who ultimately makes the decisions for clinical direction both with clients as well as with interns'

supervisees, empowerment, and sensitivity to one's power so that it will not be abused, taking on a role of power that one has not had in the past, and power in the therapeutic relationship.

It may be that having a space set specifically for a discussion of multicultural issues and how they related to the supervisory relationship allowed for discussion of the power dynamics in the supervisory relationship. Participants seemed very aware of the hierarchical nature of the client-intern-supervisor relationship. Some of the interns talked about how supervision sessions prior to this focused almost exclusively on the clients and the intern's growth. This makes sense in many ways as supervision typically focuses on intern training and client welfare. Falender and Shafraske (2004) suggested that one of the goals of supervision is to assist the supervisee in gaining understanding around the therapeutic process. It is assumed that the supervisor is fully trained, has expertise, and is helping the interns in their own professional growth. Therefore, while supervisors may indeed learn a great deal from their supervisees, the nature of the relationship is that it is assumed the supervisee is learning from the supervisor.

Among many of the interns, the awareness of the power their supervisors held in the relationship seemed to affect them in many ways. As Kathy, one of the interns, mentioned, the inherent hierarchy set up by her supervisor being a licensed psychologist and her being a psychologist-in-training meant she often felt she had to defer to her supervisor's edicts about how to work with clients and in providing supervision to a practicum student. Bill, her supervisor, recognized that he had not allowed for Kathy to develop her own style in addressing clinical and

supervisory issues, but rather had relayed the message, “This is not negotiable.” Interestingly, it was not only the discussion of power, but also of their gender differences that facilitated an increased awareness of the power in the relationship and its effects on their work together, as well as the work Kathy did with clients and her own supervisee.

Interns and supervisors talked about how the DMP allowed for power to be shared in the relationship in a different way than it had been throughout the supervisory relationship prior to the DMP. It seems the supervisory relationships among the participants in this study took a top-down approach in that many of the supervisors did not share similar amounts of themselves in comparison to their interns prior to the DMPs. However, in the DMP, supervisors shared equally of themselves and their personal and social identities. This seemed to have had the impact of minimizing the power dynamic that was inherent in the supervisory relationship as many of the participants described the interactions in the DMPs as being more “collegial” and having gotten enjoyment from that. Whether this was a function of the DMP, the fact that it was near the end of the internship year for the interns, or a combination of both that contributed to the more collegial nature of the DMP is unknown. Further, it could be that the participants who decided to participate in this study may have been more comfortable with self-disclosure. Many of the participants endorsed a theoretical orientation that seems to support use of self-disclosure in supervision sessions.

Many of the interns talked about feeling empowered during the DMP. Kathy had shared that she felt she “had a voice” in the DMP, suggesting that prior to this

session, she may have felt disempowered. Or perhaps if not disempowered, she may have previously felt somewhere lower on the continuum of disempowerment – empowerment. Although many of the interns talked about feeling empowered, and some of the supervisors also mentioned the idea of empowerment, Kathy's situation may have been unique. Participants were asked to record the sessions not only with the digital recorder provided to them by the researcher, but also with their preferred method of recording used in their counseling centers to ensure that a copy of the recording was available in the case that the digital recording was damaged in-transit. As most recording that occurs in university counseling centers happens in the intern's office and not in the supervisor's office, it may be safe to say that for some of the dyads, this supervision session may have taken place in the intern's office. A question that must be asked is: Where did these dyads typically engage in supervision session? And how might that have compared with where the DMP took place? Kathy's supervisor, Bill, mentioned during the follow-up interview that the DMP took place in his supervisee's office, which was very different than where their supervision sessions typically took place, which had usually been in his office. He shared, "It was interesting as an artifact of needing to record it (the DMP). It required us to be in her space. I sat in the chair in which typically clients sit, and she sat in the chair she typically sits in, I think, as the therapist or supervisor (to her own supervisee). So that was an interesting experience both behaviorally and emotionally for me. I was aware as we were doing it that it wasn't my space, and I think that gave some interesting intensity to the discussion of hierarchy and power because we were in her environment or her

space and a typically more dominant or physical arrangement for her than for me, although of course, as the supervisor and in my role at the university, I'm usually in a much more powerful position hierarchically than she is." While the issue of space came up in only one of the interviews and was not included in the results of this study, it is an interesting concept to consider in regard to the potential artificiality of the DMPs and dynamics that could have further influenced discussion around power in the relationships. If sessions took place in the interns' offices, and this was a different space in which supervision usually took place, this could have influenced the power dynamics in the DMPs and thus the discussion that ensued. This leads to the question of how the space in which the supervision session is determined and how the space belonging to one person or the other further adds to the power dynamics in the relationship. Bill was the only participant to note the physical location of the DMP and his awareness of how this may have impacted the DMP itself, so little is known about the extent to which this might have occurred with other dyads, and if this could be a limitation of this study.

Many of the supervisors and interns recognized their power within the supervisory relationships. Further, both supervisors and interns recognized the power inherent in their therapeutic relationships. This seems to reflect what Ancis and Marshall (2010) found in their interviews with four doctoral students in counseling who discussed their perceptions of culturally competent supervision. In their study, the participants noted the issue of power dynamics arose in regard to different aspects within the supervisor-supervisee-client relationships. For

supervisors and interns in the present study, the idea of not being aware of their power and potentially abusing it was repugnant. For some this meant explicitly acknowledging the power differential, and for others it means consistently attending mentally to the power in the relationship and attempting to minimize and share the power. For some interns, the issue of power became more pronounced as power seemed to be minimized during the DMPs. While some interns seemed to be appreciative of this change in the power dynamics, others seemed to experience discomfort. This discomfort may have been a result of sharing power within the supervisory relationship, which may have been very different from how the interns had related previously to the supervisors. Interns' discomfort also may have related to having taken on a role with more power that they were not prepared for or had not been aware could happen during the DMPs. As mentioned earlier, this could be related to developmental models of supervision. Some of the interns further talked about taking on a mantle of power in regard to becoming a supervisor. As a result of the DMPs, it seems interns may have felt they needed to take on new behaviors or responsibilities that come with a role of power that before this, they had not engaged in or considered. As interns were nearing entry into the professional world, it seems important that they be guided into this new role. Goodyear (1998) suggested that the one of the goals of supervision is to help increase the professional competence of the supervisee. Perhaps it might be necessary to help trainees to negotiate the taking on of more power in their roles as psychologists and as future supervisors. Clearly the role of

power within relationships is complex and can be influenced by a number of variables.

Power dynamics between the supervisors and interns seemed to have impacted the supervisory relationships. The awareness around power dynamics in the relationship in this study seems to mirror the results that Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, and Ho (2001) found when interviewing supervisees about their multicultural supervision experiences. In their study, supervisees suggested the quality of supervision is impacted by power dynamics associated with multicultural aspects including race, ethnicity, gender and other cultural factors. That both supervisors and interns in the current study not only acknowledged the power dynamics in the relationship, but seemed appreciative of this acknowledgment, and that interns felt closer to their supervisors by the end of the DMPs suggests that the power dynamics may in fact impact the quality of the supervision experience.

Participants talked about privilege and marginalization as related to power. For some, merely the act of recognizing one's privilege that comes with power and the ability to marginalize those without power is an important part of the supervisory relationship. While it seemed important to supervisors and interns alike, it seems that these specific types of discussions had not taken place prior to the DMPs. It could be that it was not until they had taken part in the DMPs that they became aware on a more personal level of the importance of acknowledging power in the relationship. Further, it could have been that until taking part in the DMPs, acknowledgment of power was thought of in a more academic or

theoretical fashion. It appears from this finding that the supervisors in this study have knowledge about power dynamics and their influence, and may be aware they could exist, but may not actually be attending to the power dynamics on a more consistent basis, nor be practicing skills around for addressing the issue of power within the relationship. This seems to reflect Constantine's (1997) discovery that supervisors may be reticent in broaching issues of diversity in context of the supervisory relationship. It begs the question of how aware really have the supervisors been around their privilege as a person with power? Participants talked about their privilege in not having to consider their dominant identities and the power that came with those identities. Tatum (2010) suggests that members of the dominant group do not need to attend to their experience in the same way that members of the subordinate group do. She states that it is members of the dominant groups that determine the parameters within which the members of the subordinate groups must function. Interns seemed to have been very aware of the power dynamics. And this fits with Tatum's (2010) contention that members of the subordinate or targeted groups must be highly attuned to members of the dominant group in order to survive. It seems possible that some of the interns might have felt marginalized as a result of having less power in the supervisory relationship. This was definitely true of Kathy, who had shared that in the DMP she felt she had a voice. Where was her voice before this? Future studies might examine the role of marginalization in supervisory relationships.

This sense of marginalization was also discussed during DMPs. It sometimes took the form of a more academic dialogue, though could also have some personal

edges to it. For example, when Kathy and her supervisor, Bill, discussed marginalization, it was in the context of discussing how people with differing views than those held by people in power may not feel valued or may feel as though they cannot share their opposing viewpoints. For this particular dyad, it seemed a prelude to discussing Kathy's wish that her internship experience had exposed her to some less traditional methods of therapy:

I guess I would like to see more generally in the field, alternative ways of approaching therapy and clinical issues and it is something that I don't think has ever been brought up in my training. There are other methods and ways in which people are providing therapeutic services and it is not talked about. That is not appropriate, often is the message I have gotten.

Did Kathy and other interns feel marginalized in their internships? None of the interns explicitly shared this if they did. However, it is definitely possible. The findings of the current study speak to Hays and Chang's (2003) conclusion that defining and explaining how privilege, racism and oppression function is a vital part of clinical supervision. It should be noted that Hays and Chang focused specifically on race in their study. Clearly from the data in the current study, discussing power and privilege was an important part of the DMPs, both within the context of the supervisory relationship as well as in the context of therapeutic relationships.

Participants also discussed the role of theoretical orientation within the supervisory relationship. Many shared they had talked briefly about multicultural perspectives in prior sessions and attributed this to having a relational,

humanistic, interpersonal and/or psychodynamic theoretical orientation. They suggested that these orientations lend themselves to more self-disclosure and equitable sharing of themselves with each other. Conversely, for those for whom the content and focus in the DMPs were completely new, often the supervisors held primarily a behavioral or cognitive behavioral theoretical orientation. Putney, Worthington and McCullough (1992) found that theoretical orientation can influence the supervisory relationship. They discovered that supervisors who espoused humanistic, psychodynamic, and existential orientations were perceived by supervisees as being more relational and focusing on case conceptualization. They further found that supervisors who espoused a cognitive-behavioral orientation were perceived more as a consultant and seemed to focus more on skills and strategies.

Their results seem to mirror the perceptions of the participants in the current study that theoretical orientation may influence the topics that are discussed in DMPs. For those supervisors in the current study who ascribed to a cognitive behavioral theoretical orientation, the act of self-disclosure in supervision seemed to be a new experience, especially around diversity issues. For humanistic, relational, interpersonal and psychodynamic theoretical orientations, attention to the relationship is an integral part of the approach to addressing client problems. As mentioned by the participants, for those who held more relational orientation, it seems there had already been discussions about the supervisory relationship. It seems that for those for whom this type of discussion was completely new, discomfort accompanied focusing on the supervisory

relationship. It could be that this discomfort came out of engagement within the dyad in a new way.

Supervisors and interns also talked about their similarities to each other, as well as similarities to their clients. Many participants were excited to learn about similarities between themselves and for interns, this seemed to impact their sense of connection with their supervisor. Some participants talked about how they look for similarities, both within the supervisory relationship and therapeutic relationships, almost to the exclusion of noticing differences among themselves. There was some agreement within dyads that similarities may help increase the working alliance with clients as clients may believe that the therapist can understand their predicament. Kayla shared with her supervisor, Sonali that she experiences more positive emotions toward a client who she sees as similar to herself. It is interesting to wonder if this bias leads one to experience negative emotions toward those who are dissimilar to her. What might this mean for the therapeutic alliance? What might this mean in regard to the work that therapists do with their clients? It is possible this could impact therapists' motivation to help, or even impact the choice of interventions utilized with clients. Might a therapist engage less in the therapeutic process if it is thought there are little similarities? And what might this mean for clients? It is possible that a similarity bias could impact clients negatively by not helping to reduce their distress or even in exacerbating it. Participants recognized that their assumptions of similarities within the supervisory relationship and the therapeutic relationships can impact communication. They noted that if there is an assumption about similarity, it

could be an erroneous assumption. This could lead to not seeking clarification about what a supervisee or client means when they say something out of the assumption that one knows what is meant due to the perception of similarity. Miscommunications could occur on a routine basis, thus further stunting or dismantling the progress that could be made in therapy. That participants recognized their own cultural lens could impact the work they do suggests the need for increasing awareness of one's cultural lens, which could be an important part of supervision. This seems to provide further evidence of the need for having meaningful discussions of culture in supervision as has been suggested by Estrada, Frame, and Williams (2004) and Chen (2001). In fact, this finding further highlights the importance of the interactional approach suggested by Chen, which posits that the role of supervision is to aid the supervisee in confronting attitudes and biases through reflecting on counselor's intentionality. It appears that in this study, DMPs provided a venue for such reflection and confrontation to occur.

The topic of differences brought up many issues for participants. Participants recognized that unacknowledged differences could potentially lead to a fissure in the supervisory and therapeutic relationships. As mentioned previously with the bias toward similarity, it can cause miscommunication, but it can also cause conflict. For some, this conflict may be in the form of offending someone or in the form of hurting someone emotionally and mentally. And while participants seemed to understand the positive role that conflict can play within relationships, they also seemed to want to avoid them. For interns, this avoidance could have to do with the idea that they are being evaluated by the supervisor and

fear that conflict could impact their evaluations. For the participants, they may wish to avoid the discomfort that conflict can bring. This could be especially problematic if supervisors wish to avoid conflict, so will not directly address cultural issues within the supervisory relationship. Moskowitz and Rupert (1983) discovered that supervisors' identification of problems and initiation of discussions around these problems were key elements of effective supervision. Supervisors need to be willing and able to identify when discussions of multicultural perspectives might facilitate discussion around potential problems within the supervisory relationship.

Participants also talked about the role of differences in the eyes of clients. They realized that differences could pose a challenge in whether or not a client views the therapist as competent. If a client does not view the therapist as competent, it can negatively impact the therapeutic relationship and outcomes. Further, for clients who view the therapist as too different to be able to develop a positive working alliance, clients may terminate therapy prematurely. Participants shared anecdotes of how having open discussions with their clients about the differences in the therapeutic relationship has helped increase the working alliance.

Both personally and professionally, participants also noted that it is when there are clear differences between themselves and others that they become more aware of their own identities. This seems to have been referenced in relation to visible identities or those identities which are known. Might this mean that participants are more likely to focus on clients' visible identities such as race,

gender, class, and able-bodiedness as opposed to more invisible identities such as sexual orientation or religious affiliation? This could result in completely missing an identity that is very important to the client and which could be impacting the client's therapeutic concerns. This could mean that the participants in this study are more likely to attend to their own visible identities, but perhaps only when confronted with someone who has a visible identity that is different than their own. This would suggest that having discussions of multicultural perspectives might help supervisors and interns attend more intentionally to these identities on a more consistent basis. Consistent attention to these identities may help decrease instances in which counselors might not be viewed as culturally sensitive or competent by clients. As mentioned by Wade and Bernstein (1991), perceptions about cultural sensitivity can impact attrition rates in therapy.

Domain 2: Cultural Lens.

During the DMPs, participants discussed the assumptions, stereotypes and prejudices they hold. Some participants were surprised to learn about others' assumptions about them that stemmed from stereotypes held by those who had made the assumptions. Assumptions had been made among peers during childhood through adulthood, by their clients, and within the supervisory relationships. This surprise often came out of incongruence between how they viewed themselves and how they were viewed by others. Clearly, perception plays a role in assumptions in regard to the "us vs. them" perspective. However, assumptions seemed to have been made based on group membership and stereotypes. For some, having had assumptions made about them felt hurtful. For

example, one intern named Amalia was surprised to hear her supervisor express her assumptions about Amalia's need for support based on the stereotype and prejudice held about people of a higher social class. Again, judgments or assumptions that come from stereotypes and prejudice can impact the choices people in this study made around how they would interact with one another. Supervisors and interns were also interested and surprised to learn about differences between themselves and recognized they had made assumptions of similarity based on physical appearance. For example, one supervisor named Denise had assumed her supervisee, Karen, had a similar family and social class background, an assumption that she based on her recognition that they were both White, blond, and had a doctoral education. This assumption turned out to be erroneous. How might this assumption have impacted their supervisory relationship throughout its course? It is possible that participants may have made faulty assumptions of similarity out of a similarity bias in which they look for areas of similarity for connection.

Supervisors and interns also shared the importance of challenging their assumptions. They seemed to recognize that while it seems everyone is guilty of making assumptions, they can be harmful if erroneous. They seemed to believe that in order to really understand their clients' perspectives, they need to learn about their clients and dispel the erroneous assumptions they may hold. Participants further seemed to value the challenging of their assumptions, viewing this as increasing awareness of their cultural lens, thus continuing to develop their cultural competence. This finding seems to corroborate what Ancis and Marshall

(2010) found with their participants in the role of supervision for confronting one's assumptions and biases. In their study of trainee perceptions of culturally competent supervision, trainees shared that their supervision experiences helped them to consider their assumptions and how it could lead to possibly misdiagnosing or overdiagnosing clients.

Biases and values were often discussed alongside assumptions, stereotypes and prejudice. Participants were able to recognize the roles of bias and values in their supervisory and therapeutic relationships. They often discussed how biases are a part of their cultural lens and upbringing. They further recognized when their biases and values were challenged by clients and supervisees who hold different biases and values. This was especially pertinent for Denise, a supervisor who shared with her supervisee the difficulty she has as a person with a feminist bias who sometimes works with women who accept what Denise deems is a subservient role.

Participants explored the importance of becoming aware of their biases and values and how that may impact the work they do. This awareness included the biases and values inherent in the field of psychology. Participants seemed to believe that they must work on increasing their awareness and to understand the roots of their biases and values. They may believe this is the way to understand and potentially challenge those biases and values which may be the foundation for oppression and marginalization, as is suggested when Bill, a supervisor, shares his thoughts about the "racist" and "sexist" roots of psychology. Thus, intentionally attending to multicultural issues in supervision may lead to increased awareness

of one's worldview and how it can influence one's work, which is an important aspect of multicultural counseling competencies. It seems the DMPs were helpful in providing a stage in which attending to one's biases and values could occur within the supervisory relationship.

Supervisors and interns shared their visible and invisible identities with one another. For some, this is how they began to express the salience of certain identities over others and how this impacted their cultural lens, or how they view the world and their work. For some, this included a discussion of identity development and how this development may be in response to their external environment and being a member of the subordinate or targeted group. It seemed that for some participants, discussion of their identities took a personal quality in that they shared not just which groups with which they identified, but also the impact on them personally and professionally. It was often the case that the discussion of their identities elicited the topics of power, privilege and marginalization, assumptions, biases and values. Given that many of the participants had shared some of their personal identities with each other in the past, but had not done so in such a focused manner, it seems the DMPs were different in that they allowed a space to really explore the impact of these issues on the supervisory relationship and the therapeutic relationships. Falender and Shafranske (2004) have suggested that metacommunication, or the processing of the relationship, is integral in supervision. They put forth that metacommunication within the supervisory relationship can aid growth within the supervisory alliance similar to how this can occur in a therapeutic setting. They posit that engagement

in metacommunication in supervision can provide “essential modeling and implicit training” (pp. 107).

As has been noted while discussing the previous categories that emerged from the DMPs and interviews, the therapeutic work they engaged in was part of the focus while sharing their personal identities. Participants routinely would explore how these issues influenced the work they do with clients, both in terms of the therapeutic alliance as well as in therapeutic outcomes. It is with this topic especially that the issue of case conceptualization arose. Supervisors and interns realized that their cultural lens impacted how they conceptualized client cases. One intern, Kathy, noted to her supervisor how they had each completely conceptualized a case with one of her female clients. She had realized that her male supervisor, Bill, had not considered issues pertinent to women when discussing what might be contributing to this client’s problems or the ramifications to various areas in the client’s life if she were to make certain changes. It seems that Bill was considering the case from a male perspective. Another supervisor named Denise also recognized her cultural lens impacts how she conducts evaluations and her inclination to pathologize a client if engaging in behaviors contrary to Denise’s values and beliefs and shared examples of such occasions with her supervisee. It is clear that these participants value considering how their cultural worldviews might impact the work they do with clients. It seems that these participants strive to not only increase their awareness of the impact of their own cultural views, but they also strive to keep those cultural views from impacting the client and therapeutic relationship in a negative way.

Domain 3: Characteristics of Discussion.

Participants talked about various characteristics or qualities of the DMPs. These included a personal quality, openness, self-disclosure, depth of the discussion, levels of comfort, and enjoyment they received from having these DMPs. Personal quality, self-disclosure, openness, and depth of discussion all seemed to be related to each other. Often in the follow-up interviews, participants mentioned many of these together as being what made the DMPs so enjoyable for them. This seems to support Dressel, Consoli, Kim and Atkinson's (2007) assertion that successful multicultural supervision includes creating a safe environment for discussion of multicultural issues; developing self-awareness of cultural/ethnic identity, biases, and limitations; and communicating acceptance of and respect for supervisees' culture and perspective.

The topic of self-disclosure came up both in the DMPs and in the follow-up interviews, and it was discussed in two ways. First, it emerged from the actual self-disclosure in which participants engaged during the DMPs. Self-disclosure referred to the sharing of their own personal information with each other. Second, the participants actually discussed the use and process of self-disclosure, particular within the context of working with clients. While the first aspect of self-disclosure relates much more closely to the topic of personal quality of the discussions, the second speaks much more to a skill that can be utilized in supervision or in therapy with intentionality. Many participants seemed to struggle with the question of when, why and how much they should self-disclose, both in the context of supervision as well as that of therapy. It is not a surprise

that this struggle with self-disclosure exists. Often in training, clinicians are encouraged not to self-disclose unless it seems clinically relevant or therapeutic. Part of this comes out of an idea that therapeutic time is to be devoted to the client and that the therapeutic time should not be about the therapist, a message that I heard throughout my clinical training during my doctoral program. Yet there is research that suggests boundary crossings in therapy actually help to increase the working alliance between the counselors and clients. In a ground-breaking study, Gutheil and Gabbard (1993) examined instances in which boundary crossings occurred. They found that boundary crossings can “at times be salutary, at times neutral, and at time harmful” (pp. 188). They further suggested that nature of the boundary crossing, its clinical value, and its impact can be assessed only by carefully attending to the clinical context. Pope and Keith-Spiegel (2008) suggest that nonsexual boundary crossings enhance therapy, can help the treatment plan, and can strengthen the working alliance between the therapist and the client. In the case of the DMPs, self-disclosure fit with the purpose of the study. Pope and Keith-Spiegel also suggest one consider if self-disclosure fits within one’s theoretical orientation and the type of therapy that is being provided. As discussed earlier, for those supervisors that had a more interpersonal and relational approach, self-disclosure in supervision sessions prior to the DMP had occurred around multicultural/diversity issues. However, for those whose theoretical orientation leaned toward the behavioral and cognitive behavioral camp, self-disclosure seemed to happen less often.

Participants talked about the openness with which their supervisor or intern engaged in the DMP. This openness seemed a piece of the sharing of personal identities without censoring or holding back in self-disclosure, as well as sharing openly one's reactions to what was being discussed. Supervisors and interns in the present study seemed to display their openness first by agreeing to take part in the study, and then by being open to talking about their own identities, biases and values, and assumptions, stereotypes and prejudices in a personal and intimate way and relating these to their professional lives.

Both supervisors and interns shared deeply personal information about their backgrounds and identities, with each person in the dyad learning a great deal about the other person that they had no awareness of prior to taking part in the DMP. Personal stories included family histories and values that were imparted to children, difficulties within relationships, struggles with sexual orientation, race and class, etc. Rather than talking about these topics in an academic and highly rational manner, they were usually discussed with emotionality that participants stated felt more intimate.

Openness in the DMPs seemed to include not only openness to sharing of one's identities (self-disclosure), but also openness to sharing one's limitations. Supervisors and interns shared in a mutual way that may have contributed to the creation of a safe environment as these can be difficult topics to discuss. For many people, these topics can bring up feelings of guilt, shame, anger, sadness, shock, etc. Further, many people can be afraid of offending others, or of judgment imposed on them for their biases/values and assumptions/stereotypes/prejudices.

For supervisors, this may be especially difficult as the tradition for sharing of oneself in supervision usually is one-directional, with the supervisee doing the majority of the sharing as a training method. While interns may be encouraged to explore their biases/values and assumptions, stereotypes and prejudices through seminars devoted to diversity and multicultural competence and/or in supervision, and hence are encouraged to be vulnerable in these explorations, supervisors need not engage in sharing of vulnerability within the supervisory relationship in a similar way. Supervisors could potentially fear that displays of vulnerability or of lacking knowledge might result in them being seen as incompetent, which many may believe could lead to ruptures in the supervisory relationship. However, in this study, it seems that openness may have done the exact opposite – it led to an enhanced working alliance in the supervisory relationship. It may be that this enhanced working alliance was a result of experiencing a change from the previous patterns of engagement in supervision. Another explanation for this enhanced working alliance may be that the interns, by approaching their supervisors to engage in this study, were choosing how to best utilize supervision. Supervisors and supervisees may have different ideas of what is the proper or best use of time in supervision (Bernard, 1979). If interns had desired more interaction around multicultural issues and had not previously gotten this interaction, engagement in the DMPs may have felt relevant to the interns. This relevance may have impacted the interns' perceptions about the supervisory working alliance.

While interns may be encouraged to be vulnerable and become more aware of their biases/values and assumptions/stereotypes/prejudices during their training in the internship year, they may also fear judgment on the part of their supervisors. After all, interns are being evaluated by their supervisors, and interns could feel pressure to present themselves as culturally competent. However, as evidenced in the data, supervisors instead seemed to believe their interns were quite culturally competent. This was illustrated in Sonali's comment to her supervisee, Kayla, "You have a strength in that area (cultural sensitivity)."

Many participants highlighted the depth of discussion that took place during the DMPs and associated depth with focusing on the multicultural dynamics within the supervisory relationship. Many of the participants stated they had not had these in-depth conversations within their supervisory relationship prior to engaging in the DMPs. Many of the interns, in particular, stated that their previous supervision sessions had focused more on client issues and the therapeutic relationship. They also suggested that when these conversations arose, the length of time devoted to discussing these diversity issues was minimal. The question that arises is why had these types of discussion not occurred in such a focused manner prior to engagement in this study? It could have been that supervisors and interns chose other topics that were deemed more relevant during previous supervision sessions, such as making decision to focus on clients who might have been in crisis. Also, it may be that supervisors' and interns' intentionality around broaching these topics may be the impetus for having such

discussions. More will be discussed on this issue in the section exploring the findings on the impact of structure and purpose of the DMPs on comfort level.

All participants addressed their comfort levels both in the DMPs and in the follow-up interviews. Supervisors and interns describe their sense of comfort as being impacted by a number of variables: familiarity with each other, having set a precedent earlier in the supervisory relationship around discussing their differences, trust and safety within the relationship, having similarities to one another, comfort with one's own identities, and the structure and purpose of the DMPs. It seems that for many of the participants, having a strong working alliance was related to their sense of comfort in discussing their multicultural perspectives. This seems to support Bordin's (1983) theory regarding the link between the working alliance and emotional bond between the supervisee and supervisor. It seems that the dyads in this study held a level of trust, respect, and care between the supervisor and supervisee for one another. Thus a sense of comfort may be a necessary aspect of a strong working alliance. Again, the DMPs took place during the very end of the internship year and the end of the supervisory relationship. Thus, it is probably safe to say that the supervisors and interns had worked together for at least a semester before engaging in the DMPs, if not longer, which could have contributed to the familiarity with each other. It stands to reason that they were familiar with each other's styles within supervision, may have talked about multicultural issues in the past, albeit in a different manner or with a different focus than in the DMPs, and had some knowledge of each other before engaging in the DMPs.

Given that this study was conducted with participants from university counseling centers that had a specialty in multicultural counseling, it is probable that discussions around intern identities may have occurred in various settings within the counseling centers, including supervision. Further, as all interns had attended a number of multicultural/diversity classes, it is likely that interns had done quite a bit of work in developing their self-awareness around cultural issues. This may be similar for the supervisors as they worked in centers for which multiculturalism and diversity are strong values, and supervisors also had reported attending a number of courses or continuing education in multicultural issues. Thus, for the vast majority of participants, discussing multicultural and diversity issues may not have been a new experience, which may have contributed further to a sense of comfort with their own identities.

These participants reflected during the interviews that it was the structure and purpose of the DMPs that allowed for a much more in-depth discussion of the supervisory relationship. This finding seems to provide support for Chen's (2001) model of interactional supervision and the role of intentionality for incorporating multicultural issues into the supervision experience. Some of the participants talked about the importance of the structure and purpose of the DMP that made it easier and more comfortable to have. In particular, some of the interns shared they had wanted to have such discussions before this, but discussions of the supervisory relationship had never been discussed in such depth. This suggests that intentionally setting out to have discussions of multicultural perspectives may help foster exploration of the supervisory relationship dynamics, as well as

therapeutic relationship dynamics, which may in turn enhance the working alliance in the supervisory and therapeutic relationships. Future studies may examine the causal direction for the enhancement of working alliance in supervisory relationships.

But what is it about the structure and purpose that aid this discussion? And what does this suggest about the difficulty that interns may have in broaching these topics with their supervisors? As the recruitment process set out to first recruit interns, who then approached their supervisors to request participation in the study, it might be that these interns desired more in-depth discussions with their supervisors around multicultural issues that were not as intensely focused on client issues before engaging in the DMPs. While some of the motivation for participation perhaps stemmed from wanting to help a colleague with her dissertation, there may have been other motivations. One, participants may see the development of multicultural competence as valuable, and may have considered this an additional opportunity to increase their competence. Two, perhaps the idea of sharing personal identities and placing more focus on this within the supervisory relationship was something many of the interns desired as a way to get to know their supervisors better on a personal level. Three, it is possible that interns used this as an opportunity to focus more deeply on the supervisory relationship out of not being able to ask for this opportunity otherwise. This could make sense if, as Kathy pointed out during the follow-up interview, "...in the course of the year in internship, you get lost in the nuts and bolts of particular clients and cases." Given that interns are required to have 2 hours of clinical

supervision per week, much of that time may be taken up with discussing client issues and supervision of supervision issues, with little time being given to discussing in more depth multicultural issues and/or processing the supervisory relationship. Four, it is possible participants felt unsafe or intimidated to broach some of the topics with each other without such structure and purpose, such as power and identity differences. An intern named Kathy shared the following during the follow-up interview, "...it really feels intimidating at that time to bring up that topic, and having that open forum to process it in ways that we were too intimidated to do that before, or that we weren't aware of before."

Discomfort was also discussed by the participants. For some there was discomfort with discussing differences that were, perhaps, not previously discussed, or that took on a new form during the DMPs. For example, an intern named Kayla shared with her supervisor during the DMP that she was uncomfortable as they were beginning to discuss their racial differences which is not something they had done previously. During the follow-up interview, Kayla had shared that she had wanted to broach this topic before, but had not felt comfortable doing so. It is possible that due to the structure of the DMP and its purpose as explicitly for discussing one's personal identities and how it may impact the supervisory relationship, Kayla felt the topic of her racial difference from her supervisor could be brought up with her supervisor. As Kayla was a White intern and her supervisor was of a particular ethnic and racial descent, Kayla may have been intimidated to bring up racial difference due to the power differential in the supervisory relationship, as well as potentially having been

judged as racist for being a White person (a member of a dominant group) or as having made assumptions that may have come out of working with a Person of Color. Kayla may have also been worried she might have come across as offensive if she had brought up the topic of their racial difference with no seeming cause. Thus, Kayla may have felt it was within the purpose of the DMP to broach the topic of their racial differences. It is curious to wonder how the comfort level may have been different or similar had her supervisor raised the topic first. The excerpt provided from the DMP regarding the supervisor's and intern's discomfort around this issue illustrated how neither participant directly addressed how this racial difference may have impacted the supervisory relationship. Nor did either participant talk in depth about their racial difference with each other. Rather, the topic was couched within a discussion of racial difference between the intern and her clients. Perhaps when discussing race, it felt safer to discuss it within the context of a more distant relationship than the one in which this conversation took place. Perhaps discomfort existed out of fear of conflict that could arise when discussing differences within the relationship with a person of power. Discomfort may have also come out of a concern for the potential for negative evaluations. Further, with this particular dyad, little to none of the supervisor's and intern's personal identities had been shared within the context of the supervisory relationship, which differed from that of three of the other dyads for whom discussions of identities and worldviews had been something that had occurred previous to the DMP.

What is interesting with this dyad is that Kayla seemed to have assumed her supervisor's discomfort stemmed from talking about their differences, which is a possibility. However, in the follow-up interview, her supervisor, Sonali, shared her discomfort came not from talking about their differences, but rather from feeling ambivalent around how much of herself she should share in the session. It could also be that Kayla was projecting the reasons for her own discomfort onto her supervisor. The issue of amount of appropriate disclosure may have been a factor in the discomfort experienced during this DMP.

Another source of discomfort was when participants noticed the other person in their dyad becoming uncomfortable, especially when it was the intern doing the noticing. There was something about noticing that the supervisor was uncomfortable that made Karen consider that perhaps her supervisor was not as competent in this area. Karen seemed to have some beliefs that her supervisor should be more competent than her in all areas as her supervisor has been a psychologist for many years. Could it be that interns have expectations about their supervisors' level of competence and expertise that could be challenged by engaging in these types of discussions? This would seem to support the idea that supervisee perceptions of supervisor multicultural competence could impact the supervisory relationship and supervisee satisfaction with the supervisory relationship (Inman, 2006).

This discomfort could also speak to the developmental process of a trainee becoming a professional. Similar to what may occur when children begin to mature into adulthood and begin to develop new relationships with their parents,

potentially becoming aware of their parents' limitations, so too might this be an area in which interns begin to learn more about their supervisors' limitations. This is something that typically happens during later stages of trainee development according to the integrated developmental model of supervision (Stoltenberg, McNeil, & Delworth, 1998). According to this model, a trainee experiences anxiety when faced with new situations in their training. Learning about a supervisor's limitations could cause some discomfort, or cognitive dissonance. Future studies might be to gather data from supervisors and interns at beginning of internship year who engage in DMPs and compare their experiences to those who engage in the DMPs at the end of the internship year. It would be interesting to see how familiarity and comfort levels might impact what occurs in these sessions.

In addition to the DMPs being personal, including a great deal of self-disclosure, openness, depth, and varying degrees of comfort, all participants shared the enjoyment they received by taking part in the DMPs. Participants seemed to get enjoyment not only from the content of the DMPs, but due to also to the characteristics of the discussions. All interns shared they not only enjoyed the DMPs, but that they actually felt "closer" to their supervisors. It may be that supervisor's openness to sharing their limitations was a model for being able to do this without it having implications of incompetence. It is possible that interns interpreted this sharing of self, on the part of the supervisor, as an illustration of the supervisor's cultural competence instead. Interns may have viewed their supervisors' sharing of limitations as highlighting a self-awareness that is a

necessary part of becoming culturally competent. As has been noted previously, self-awareness of worldview as has been put forth as one of the three areas in which counselors should have appropriate levels when working with people from diverse backgrounds according to the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996). Also, it could be that the characteristics of the discussion in addition to the content around the dynamics within the relationship and their own cultural lenses lent to an increase in connection within the supervisory relationship. Thus one impact of the DMPs was to strengthen working alliance between the supervisor and intern, especially from the point of view of the intern.

Domain 4: Impact of Discussion.

In both the DMPs and in the follow-up interviews, supervisors and supervisees discussed the impact of engagement in the DMPs. All participants shared how this experience impacted their intentions to address multicultural perspectives in the future, both in supervisory and therapeutic relationships. Although the semi-structured interviews included a question specifically addressing how this DMP impacted their work, most participants had already addressed this question before it was posed to them during the interview. Each participant shared they plan to engage in DMPs in the future. They wondered what it would be like to engage in a similar discussion earlier in the supervisory relationship. While they shared thoughts about how to utilize DMPs in future supervision, it is possible that this allusion to intentionality could have reflected social desirability. On the other hand, social desirability in this study may have

been mitigated by having chosen counseling center sites with a multicultural specialization, as participants may already have had a vocabulary consistent with having such discussions. Further, as the guide for the DMPs did not explicitly mention the topics for that emerged from the data, social desirability may not have been a large factor in the results. Future studies might examine the role of social desirability in regard to having such discussions.

Clearly, the experience of engaging in DMPs had a positive impact on the participants. Not only did they enjoy the discussion, but they received other benefits such as increasing their awareness, flexing their “multicultural muscles” in a deeper manner, and potentially feeling validated in their experiences. Supervisors were able to view growth in their supervisees in a new way. They suddenly had the opportunity to have a more collegial exchange with their supervisee at the end of the internship year, which may have elicited positive feelings and emotions. Interns also had the opportunity to have a more collegial exchange, which seemed to have impacted their sense of connection with their supervisors. Further, they had an opportunity to experience what it feels like to be a supervisee having such a discussion with a person in power. All of the interns shared how this experience has influenced their decision to engage in these discussions with their own supervisees. All participants seemed to believe such discussions can help to develop multicultural competencies. Participants further shared plans to more intentionally have discussions with their clients regarding multicultural perspectives. Some participants plan to use the Dimensions of Personal Identity model to help facilitate these discussions with both supervisees

and clients. Clearly, the model helped to facilitate the discussions. It may be that the model added to the structure of the session.

All participants also stressed that engagement in the DMPs increased their awareness around cultural issues. They experienced an increase in awareness not only around their own cultural lens, but of others' cultural lenses as well. And they experienced an increase in awareness around the dynamics of the supervisory relationship, which they may have been mildly or moderately aware of or not at all prior to the DMPs. It seems engagement in this exercise allowed them to focus more intently on the supervisory relationship dynamics, thus highlighting how those dynamics may impact the work the supervisor and intern do together. Participants also shared increased awareness of how their own personal identities can impact the therapeutic alliance and clients.

One final outcome of the DMPs was that of increased connection in the supervisory relationship. What is fascinating is that only interns mentioned feeling closer to their supervisors as a result of taking part in the DMPs. This was not mentioned by the supervisors, nor was it mentioned in the DMP itself. What might be reasons for this finding? In the current study, it seems that as self-disclosure by the supervisor occurred, interns felt closer to their supervisor, reflecting what has been discovered in previous studies. Evidence suggests that greater self-disclosure by supervisors is associated with stronger working alliance in the supervisory relationship (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999). Falender and Shafranske (2004) stated that "relational qualities are seen by supervisees as important to the supervisory relationship and, in our view, are particularly salient

when addressing factors that are by definition personal to the supervisee” (pp. 97).

In the current study, interns clearly viewed the content of the DMPs as personal and perceived an increase in supervisory working alliance. Another possibility as to the increase in closeness to their supervisors is that the power dynamics changed during the DMPs. Given the power dynamic which existed prior to the DMPs, it is possible that with much of the focus of supervision being on the intern, supervisees felt less of an equal exchange of sharing. While support and encouragement can be helpful in developing a supervisory alliance, as well as mutual goals for supervision (Bordin, 1994), self-disclosure on the part of supervisors may help interns to believe they know more about the supervisor, help to increase empathy toward the supervisor, increase positive feelings toward the supervisor, and normalize doubts and vulnerabilities. These things could increase the sense of connection interns have with their supervisors. Another possibility is that supervisors may have already felt a strong sense of connection with their supervisees and did not experience a dramatic change in their feelings toward the interns. This is possible as the interns most likely would have been displaying vulnerability and self-disclosing throughout the internship experience. An alternate reason for the incongruence in connection could be found in the power dynamics. It is possible that given the power dynamics, supervisors may not have felt it was appropriate to disclose an increased sense of connection or closeness with their supervisees. This may be related to the professional desire to maintain a relationship that fits within the bounds of a professional relationship. Suggesting

that they feel closer to their supervisees might feel as though it is blurring the boundaries too much.

In the comparisons between supervisors' and interns' accounts and perceptions of what occurred in the DMPs, as well as in the comparison of these accounts to what actually took part in the DMP, it was discovered that there was congruence among some of the categories. For both research questions, areas of congruence included: A) Domain 1: Dynamics of the Relationship - Power, Similarities, and Differences; B) Domain 3: Characteristics of the Discussion – Comfort Level, and Enjoyable; and C) Domain 4: Impact of Discussion – Intentionality for Future Work, and Increased Awareness. What might be reasons for the congruence among the categories of power, similarities and differences? First, this was the first time for most participants to focus on the supervisory relationship itself, especially in the context of examining multicultural perspectives. Given that participants engaged in this discussion in a more equitable manner, with both the supervisor and intern sharing of themselves, the power dynamic seems to have shifted. This shift may have made it more salient to both persons in the dyad, thus more memorable. Second, this was the first time to focus on their similarities and differences, which seemed to have impacted the supervisory working alliance. Focusing on these in the follow-up interviews may be associated with the positive feelings they experienced in discussing these particular issues within the dyad. The positive feelings may have contributed to having focused on these in the follow-up interviews. Further, it seemed both supervisors and interns learned something new about each other and experienced

an increase in awareness around these similarities and differences. They may have ascribed more importance to these discussions, thus focused more on them during the interview.

It is interesting to consider the congruence in comfort level. In the category of comfort level, there was only one dyad in which there was incongruence, with an intern perceiving her supervisor as uncomfortable discussing race, yet the supervisor had stated she felt comfortable. The remainder of the accounts was congruent with each other, as well as with what had seemed to occur in session. It may be that while engaged in this session, supervisors and interns were highly attuned to their level of comfort and discomfort, which may have been heightened given the topic and that they had not engaged in this way with each other prior to the DMPs. Comfort level is often not just an emotion, but many people experience physical sensations. It could be that the comfort levels experienced helped increase not only the enjoyment participants experienced, but that the discomfort they may have experienced could have impacted the importance they ascribe to the topics which elicited the discomfort. Further, discomfort often can be noticed through non-verbal actions. As this study did not examine the data for non-verbal behaviors, future studies might look at how non-verbal behavior impacts one's perceptions of discomfort while engaged in DMPs.

The congruence on intentionality for future work and for increased awareness may be related to some elaboration supervisors and interns did around what they experienced during the DMPs, as well as having discussed this in session. Both knew they were going to engage in a follow-up interview to discuss

their experiences, which might have further encouraged them to elaborate more on the experience and what they got from it. The congruence might also point to the learning that occurred and that contributed to the sense that they had worked on multicultural competence and want to continue to do so. For both the supervisors and the interns, at the time of the follow-up interviews, the internship year was over. Both were preparing to begin new supervisory relationships and therapeutic relationship. For interns especially, they shared wanting to create opportunities to continue to learn about their own cultural lens.

Important to note is that all participants in this study were from university counseling centers that have a specialty in multicultural counseling. Further, all APA accredited internships are required to provide multicultural training, usually in the form of a seminar. Yet for most participants, this was the first opportunity in their supervisory relationship where they were able to have such focused and deep discussions of multicultural perspectives. Even more fascinating is that these discussions occurred at the end of the internship year. What does this say about the multicultural training of psychologists? And what does this say about the multicultural training of potential future supervisors? First, it says that although the development of multicultural competencies is important, it may take a back seat to the priorities of addressing specific client issues, such as risk, depression, anxiety, psychosis, etc. Second, it suggests that multicultural training may be left to seminars and coursework. Perhaps few supervisors see how vital and viable it is to utilize supervision to further develop multicultural competency. This may be even more pronounced in centers for which multicultural counseling is not a

specialty. While most participants stated they had discussed multicultural issues in supervision sessions in the past, they also shared these prior discussions focused more on the client issues and on the therapeutic relationship than specifically on the supervisory relationship.

Limitations

There were various limitations in this study. First, five of the participants were people that I know very well. Two of the supervisors had been my supervisors in prior practicum experiences, while another supervisor was, at the time, my current internship Group Seminar facilitator. Further, one of the interns who took part in the study was a colleague of mine at the time, while another intern had been a previous colleague. These five participants knew me quite intimately and may have been motivated to take part in the study not only for the sake of engaging in a research study, but also to help a colleague in completing her dissertation. Further, as I had previous professional relationships with these five participants, they would have had knowledge of my passion for multicultural issues. This could have elicited social desirability. And as three of these supervisors had been engaged in a supervisory role with me prior to taking part in the study, it is possible they felt some need to perform in the DMPs. However, as mentioned previously, the methods in this study may have reduced the possibility of social desirability impacting the results. Another limitation of the study was the small number of participants. This was an exploratory study, thus while grounded theory attempts to develop a theory that is generalizable, it may be difficult to do so in this case. This study was not a traditional qualitative study in that

participants were asked to engage in an activity that was supplemental to what they typically do. Clearly, as is evidence by the reports by the participants, they had not before engaged in such a deep discussion of multicultural perspectives. Thus this study does have the feel of an intervention study.

Further, the university counseling centers that were contacted for recruitment purposes had a multicultural specialty, which might mean that the themes that emerged are indicative of the amount of education and training the participants had prior to taking part in this study. It is entirely possible that these same themes might not emerge with participants with considerably less multicultural education and training.

Another limitation that derives from the small sample size is that saturation was not fully met in regard to themes that emerged from the data. Saturation occurs when no additional codes emerge from the data. Although most codes had emerged prior to completing the coding, a couple of codes emerged during the end of the coding process. It is possible that more codes could have emerged with more participants. An additional limitation is that this was an exploratory, qualitative study, utilizing a primarily constructivist paradigm. Therefore, my own biases may have been reflected in the results. Through analyzing and looking for instances that did not fit the results, I attempted to not allow my own biases to influence what emerged from the data. Further, as I provided thick, rich descriptions of the categories and codes, and as I engaged in a constant reflective process, it is less likely that my bias would have polluted the findings. Further, having engaged in an extensive review of the literature, I was

aware of multiple perspectives of multicultural supervision. While this was a qualitative study and is not generalizable to the entire population of interns and supervisors in university counseling centers, the conceptual theory developed from what emerged from the data may be applied to future research. This theory suggests that having the opportunity to discuss dynamics within the supervisory relationship as well as one's cultural lens, all within the safety of comfort, openness, disclosure of personal information, and an enjoyable quality lead to increased awareness of cultural issues, a stronger supervisory relationship, and intentionality to engage more consistently in DMPs. Future studies might test this theory.

Recommendations

Various recommendations have been posed throughout this discussion. However, I would like to highlight those that are most salient. First, the guide in this study seemed to help create a sense of safety that allowed participants to share openly of themselves. Thus, it could be helpful if training programs considered utilizing such a guide in training supervisors how to engage their supervisees in such discussion. The guide presented in this study could be modified for use in other training settings, such as in the classroom and in research. Training programs could explicitly state that such exploration of one's multicultural perspectives is an expected part of the training in mental health. Such a statement makes it clear that addressing the self-awareness aspect of Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCCs) is important and will be addressed in the training program.

Further, it would be vital that supervisors be willing to engage in these discussions with their supervisees. Thus, supervisors can model thorough exploration and growth in this area. It would be important to stress that MCCs are aspirational and that one strives to develop them over time. Therefore, as supervisors continue to engage in these discussions, they can demonstrate that we are continually learning more about ourselves and growing in our understanding of cultural issues.

Another recommendation would be to engage in these discussions earlier in supervisory relationships. Doing so may not only provide an message about the importance of multicultural awareness, but it could also provide a sense of safety much earlier in the supervisory relationship to engage in such discussions and exploration. Once topics have been raised, it seems it may be easier to broach these topics later in the relationship, and potentially as often as is deemed necessary.

Concluding thoughts

It is clear from the results of this study that having a guide to facilitate discussions of multicultural perspectives can be very helpful in creating the necessary safety for discussions to be able to reach a level of depth that can elicit increased awareness around one's worldview. Further, such guided discussions around multicultural perspectives could potentially impact the provision of therapeutic services, as well as how these worldviews may impact the supervisory relationship. It is exciting to consider the ramifications of utilizing clinical

supervision to help in the development of one's self-awareness, and thus, potentially facilitate the development of MCCs.

This study not only addressed the self-awareness aspect of MCCs, but also found that through use of the guide for discussions of multicultural perspectives, a deeper connection to their supervisors was felt among the interns. Although these difficult dialogues bring up some discomfort, these participants also experienced enjoyment. At the very basic level, supervision is about a relationship between people. How often do we connect on a personal level with our supervisors? It could be that the personal quality of these discussions can help further develop the working alliance in supervisory relationships; thus increasing the potential for positive outcomes in supervision. Further, focusing on supervisory relationship and the diversity inherent in that relationship can provide a model for how the trainee can engage their clients in these discussions. Not only can this open the relationship to more in-depth discussions, but these discussions can also help minimize the power dynamics which may distance supervisors from their supervisees, and supervisees from their clients.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (1992). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58, 377-402.
- Ancis, J.R., & Szymanski, D.M. (2001). Awareness of White privilege among White counseling trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 29, 548-569.
- Ancis, J.R., & Marshall, D.S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 88, 277-292.
- Arredondo, P., & Glauner, T. (1992). *Dimensions of personal identity*. Boston, MA: Empowerment Workshops, Inc.
- Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S.P., Jones, J., Locke, D.C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 24, 42-78.
- Arredondo, P., & Toporek, R. (2004). Multicultural Counseling Competencies = Ethical practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 26, 44-55.
- Barrett, K. A., & McWhirter, B. T. (2001). Counselor trainees' perceptions of clients based on client sexual orientation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41, 219-232.
- Bernard, J.M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19, 60-68.
- Bernard, J.M. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 34, 159-171.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11, 35-42.

- Brown, M. T., & Landrum-Brown, J. (1995). Counselor supervision: Cross-cultural perspectives. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. Suzuki, & C. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (pp. 263-286). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burkard, A.W., Johnson, A.J., Madson, M.B., Pruitt, N.T., Contreras-Tadych, D.A., Kozlowski, J.M., Hess, S.A., & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 288-301.
- Carney, C.G., & Kahn, K.B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 111-119.
- Carter, R.T. (2001). Back to the future in cultural competence training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*, 787-789.
- Carter, R. T. (2003). Becoming racially and culturally competent: The racial-cultural counseling laboratory. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31*, 20-30.
- Charmaz, K (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chen, E.C. (2005). Racial-cultural training for supervisors: Goals, foci and strategies. In Carter, R.T. (Ed.), *Handbook of Racial-Cultural Psychology and Counseling (Vol. 2, Training and Practice)* (pp. 168-188). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chen, E. C. (2001). Multicultural counseling supervision: An interactional approach. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.). *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling (2nd Ed.)* (pp. 801-824). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Christiansen, C.P. (1989). Cross-cultural awareness development: A conceptual model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 28*, 270-287.
- Coleman, H. L. K. (1998). General and multicultural counseling competency: Apples and oranges? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26*, 147-156.
- Constantine, M.G. (2005). White racial identity dyadic interactions in supervision: Implications for supervisees' multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 490-496.

- Constantine, M.G. (2002). Predictors of satisfaction with counseling: Racial and ethnic minority clients' attitudes toward counseling and ratings of their counselors' general and multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 255-263.
- Constantine, M.G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision. In Pope-Davis, D.B., & Coleman, H.L.K. (Eds.). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 310-324). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 132-141.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dressel, J.L., Consoli, A.J., Kim, B.S.K., & Atkinson, D.R. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful behaviors: A Delphi Poll. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35*, 51-64.
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive "snapshot" of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 131-146.
- Estrada, D.E., Frame, M.W., & Williams, C.B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32 (Extra)*, 307-319.
- Falender, C.A., & Shafranske, E.P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fouad, N.A. (2006). Multicultural Guidelines: Implementation in an urban counseling psychology program. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 37*, 6-13.
- Fouad, N.A., & Arredondo, P. (2007). *Becoming culturally oriented: Practical advice for psychologists*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., et al. (2001). Exploring ethnic gender and social orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 102-113.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goodman, L.A., Liang, B., Helms, J.E., Latta, R.E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S.R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural perspectives in action. *The Counseling Psychologist, 32*, 793-837.
- Goodyear, R. K., & Bernard, J. M. (1998). Clinical supervision: Lessons from the literature. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 6-22.
- Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp. 17-30). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gutheil, T. G., & Gabbard, G. O. (1993). The concept of boundaries in clinical practice: Theoretical and risk-management dimensions. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 150*, 188-196.
- Hays, D. G. & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 134-145.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). Using race and culture in therapy and supervision. In Helms, J.E., & Cook, D. A. (Eds.), *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process* (pp. 277-298). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Heppner, P.P. (2006). The benefits and challenges of becoming cross-culturally competent psychologists: Presidential address. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 147-172.

- Hird, J.S., Cavalieri, C.E., Dulko, J.P., Felice, A.A.D., Ho, T.A. (2001). Visions and realities: Supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 114-130.
- Inman, A.G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 32*, 73-85.
- Ladany, N., Britton-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*, 284-305.
- Ladany, N., Inman, A.G., Constantine, M.G., & Hofheinz, E.W. (1997). Supervisee multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competence as functions of supervisee racial identity and supervisor focus. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 284-293.
- Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 143-160.
- LaFromboise, T.D., Coleman, H.L.K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22*, 380-388.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, G. E. (2002). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McGrath, J. E., & Johnson, B. A. (2003). Methodology makes meaning: How both qualitative and quantitative paradigms shape evidence and its interpretation. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 31-48). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Miller, P. J., Hengst, J. A., & Wang, S. (2003). Ethnographic methods: Applications from cultural psychology. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (pp. 219-242). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 250-260.
- Moskowitz, S.A., & Rupert, P.A. (1983). Conflict resolution within the supervisory relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14*, 632-641.
- Myers, H.F., Echemendia, R.J., & Trimble, J.E. (1991). The need for training ethnic minority psychologists. In H.F. Myers, P. Wohlford, L. P. Guzman, & R. J. Echemendia (Eds.), *Ethnic Minority Perspectives on Clinical Training and Services in Psychology* (pp. 3-11). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2002). Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 30*, 394-406.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 126-136.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Rieger, B. P., & Austin, R. (2002). A construct validity study of the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS). *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30*, 153-180.
- Pope, K. S., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2008). A practical approach to boundaries in psychotherapy: Making decisions, bypassing blunders, and mending fences. *Journal of Clinical Psychology: In session, 64*, 638-652.
- Pope-Davis, D.B., Reynolds, A.L., Dings, J.G., & Ottavi, T.M. (1994). Multicultural competencies of doctoral interns at university counseling centers: An exploratory investigation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 25*, 466-470.
- Putney, M.W., Worthington, E.L., Jr., & McCullough, M.E. (1992). Effects of supervisor and supervisee theoretical orientation and supervisor-supervisee matching on interns' perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 258-265.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Sue, D.W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R.J. (1992). Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 477-486.
- Tatum, B. D. (2010). The complexity of identity: "Who am I?" In Adams, M., Blumenfeld, W. J., Castaneda, R., Hackman, H. W., Peters, M. L., & Zuniga, X. (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice*, Second edition (pp. 5-8). New York: Rutledge.
- Toporek, R.L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D.B. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 66-83.
- Wade, P., & Bernstein, B. (1991). Culture sensitivity training and counselor's race: Effects on Black female clients perceptions and attrition. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 9-15.
- Yutrzenka, B.A. (1995). Making a case for training in ethnic and cultural diversity in increasing treatment efficacy. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 63*, 197-206.

APPENDIX A

ASU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

To: Bianca Bernstein
EDB

From: Mark Roosa, Chair
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 07/25/2008

Committee Action: Expedited Approval

Approval Date: 07/25/2008

Review Type: Expedited F7

IRB Protocol #: 0807003106

Study Title: Supervisors' and supervisees' experiences in having discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision sessions

Expiration Date: 07/24/2009

The above-referenced protocol was approved following expedited review by the Institutional Review Board.

It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without approval by the Institutional Review Board.

Adverse Reactions: If any untoward incidents or severe reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Soc Beh IRB immediately. If necessary a member of the IRB will be assigned to look into the matter. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending IRB review.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, or the investigators, please communicate your requested changes to the Soc Beh IRB. The new procedure is not to be initiated until the IRB approval has been given.

Please retain a copy of this letter with your approved protocol.

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHICS FORM

What is your age: _____

Please indicate your race/ethnicity:

____ Euro-American/White

____ African-American/Black

____ Hispanic/Latino/a

____ Native American or Alaska Native

____ Asian or Asian-American

____ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

____ Bi-racial: (Please specify) _____

____ Multi-racial: (Please specify) _____

____ Other: (Please specify) _____

How many languages do you speak? _____

Please specify which languages you speak _____

What is your native language? _____

What is your language of preference? _____

What is your gender?

____ Man ____ Woman

____ Other – Please specify: _____

Please indicate your sexual orientation:

____ Heterosexual ____ Gay ____ Lesbian ____ Bisexual

Do you have any disabilities? ____ No ____ Yes

If yes, please indicate which type of disabilities you have (check all that apply):

____ developmental disability ____ learning disability

____ physical disability

____ other: (please specify) _____

Please indicate your religious/spiritual preference:

____ Christian ____ Jewish ____ Buddhist ____ Hindu

____ Mormon ____ Catholic ____ Methodist ____ Islamic

____ Baptist ____ Protestant ____ Jehovah's Witness

____ Seventh Day Adventist ____ Presbyterian

____ Atheist/Agnostic

____ Earth-based spirituality/Wiccan/Pagan: Please specify _____

____ Other: Please specify _____

Please indicate your family yearly income:

____ \$1 - 19,999 ____ \$40,000 - 59,999 ____ \$80,000 - 99,999

____ \$20,000 - 39,999 ____ \$60,000 - 79,999 ____ \$100,000 or more

Are you a U.S. citizen or permanent resident? ____ No ____ Yes

If you answered no, in which country were you born? _____

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ASKED OF SUPERVISORS

Questions regarding training in supervision and multicultural counseling

Please indicate which degree you have earned:

Ph.D. Psy.D. Ed.D.

Other: please specify _____

In which of area of psychology did you earn your degree:

clinical psychology counseling psychology

Are you a licensed psychologist? Yes No

How many years have you been licensed? _____

In which state(s) are you licensed? _____

How many years have you been providing clinical supervision? _____

Approximately how many clinical supervisees have you had in the following categories:

post-doctoral level doctoral level practicum

pre-doctoral psychology intern Master's level practicum

How many years have you been providing clinical supervision?

Have you had a course or attended a continuing education workshop in clinical supervision?

Yes No

If so, did it have a component on multicultural counseling and supervision? Yes No

How many courses or continuing education workshops in clinical supervision have you attended? _____

What is the total number of multicultural classes/continuing education workshops that you have attended?

Please indicate the topics of discussion in the multicultural classes and/or continuing education workshops you have attended:

What is your theoretical orientation?

What interventions/techniques do you prefer to use with clients?

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ASKED OF INTERNS

Questions regarding training

Please indicate which degree you are working toward:

Ph.D. Psy.D. Ed.D.

Other: please specify _____

In which of area of psychology will you earn your degree:

clinical psychology counseling psychology

Are you planning to become a licensed psychologist?

Yes No

Have you ever provided clinical supervision to doctoral level or Master's level students in a practicum? Yes No

If yes, approximately how many clinical supervisees have you had in the following categories:

doctoral level practicum Master's level practicum

Have you had a course in clinical supervision? Yes No

If so, did it have a component on multicultural counseling and supervision? Yes No

What is the total number of multicultural classes/continuing education workshops that you have attended? _____

Please indicate the topics of discussion in the multicultural classes and/or continuing education workshops you have attended:

What is your theoretical orientation?

What interventions/techniques do you prefer to use with clients?

APPENDIX E

SUPPLEMENTAL SUPERVISION INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUPERVISORS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study which examines the experiences of clinical supervisors and their supervisees while engaging in discussion of multicultural perspectives in supervision sessions. Your participation will help to increase understanding of what occurs in such sessions, as well as to understand the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that supervisors and supervisees experience while having such discussions in the supervision session. Your participation will take approximately 1.5 hours in total: one hour for engaging in the supplemental supervision session and a half-hour to complete the demographics form and to engage in a tape-recorded, semi-structured telephone interview to answer follow-up questions regarding your experience in this session. The supplemental supervision session will be audio-taped. Audio-tapes will be destroyed at the completion of the study. All identifying information will be separated from the data immediately to ensure confidentiality.

You will find the following items in the packet which has been sent to you:

1. Consent forms for both supervisor and supervisee
2. Digital recorder
3. Copy of Arredondo and Glauner's model: Dimensions of Personal Identity
4. Supervisor Packet containing instructions for supplemental supervision session and demographics form
5. Supervisee Packet containing demographics form and instructions for scheduling follow-up telephone interview
6. Instructions and materials for returning Consent Forms, digital recorder and demographics form to the researcher

Below are the instructions for engaging in a supplemental supervision session in which a discussion of multicultural perspectives will occur.

As the supervisor, you are being asked to facilitate a discussion of the following multicultural perspectives with your supervisee in a one-hour supplemental supervision session:

- Important personal identities for both you and your supervisee which may impact supervisory and/or client/counselor relationship
- What makes these identities salient/important to you and your supervisee
- How these identities may impact the supervisory relationship
- What other kinds of multicultural topics would be important to have in clinical supervision and why?

In this study, “multicultural identities” is a broad concept including three dimensions from Arredondo and Glauner’s model of Dimensions of Personal Identity (DPI). These dimensions include those which are basically constant (Dimension A), such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, culture, physical and mental well-being, language, and social class; those which are more flexible (Dimension B), such as educational background, geographic location, hobbies/recreational, health care practices/beliefs, religion/spirituality, military experience, relationship status, and work experience; and the final dimension (Dimension C) which includes historical moments or eras that occur within one’s lifetime. You will find a copy of the DPI model attached to these instructions.

Please familiarize yourself with the topics for discussion and the DPI model prior to engaging in the supplemental supervision session.

Before beginning the supplemental supervision session, please make sure that the digital recorder is actually recording. The digital recorder should be set to “Meeting” rather than on dictation. When you have completed the supplemental supervision session, make sure to stop the digital recorder. Please also record this session using the preferred method of recording at your university counseling center. Thus, there will be two audio-recordings of this supplemental supervision session.

Upon completion of the supplemental supervision session, please hand the Supervisee Packet containing a demographics form and instructions for scheduling the follow-up telephone interview to your supervisee. You should now fill out the demographics form for supervisors. Use the self-addressed, stamped materials provided to return the digital recorder and your demographics.

Please do not speak further with your supervisee regarding this experience until after you have both engaged in the semi-structured telephone interview and have answered the follow-up questions regarding your experience.

At this time, please contact me to schedule the semi-structured telephone interview to discuss your experience in this supervision session. If sending an email, please enter the following in the subject line: “Supervision Study – Scheduling Interview”. This telephone interview should last approximately 30 minutes.

Please keep the audio-recording using your preferred method until the researcher has contacted you to confirm receipt of the packet of materials. The second copy of the audio-recording of the supplemental supervision session (in which you used the preferred method of recording at your university counseling center) should be kept by you in a secure place and until you have received confirmation from me that I have received the digital recording in the mail. At that time, you must destroy the audio-recording that you have secured.

Thank you again for your participation.

APPENDIX F
DIMENSIONS OF PERSONAL IDENTITY (ARREDONDO &
GLAUNER, 1992)

“A” Dimensions:

- age
- culture
- ethnicity
- gender
- language
- physical/mental well-being
- race
- sexual orientation
- social class

“B” Dimensions:

- educational background
- geographical location
- hobbies/recreational
- health care practices/beliefs
- religion/spirituality
- military experience
- relational status
- work experience

“C” Dimensions:

- historical moments/eras

APPENDIX G

QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. What topics were discussed in the supervision session?
2. What was it like for you to have this discussion with your supervisor/supervisee? Please discuss your perceptions which may include thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.
3. What do you think having this discussion was like for your supervisor/supervisee? Please discuss your perceptions which may include thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.
4. What made this discussion difficult or easy?
5. What was the most meaningful or relevant part of this discussion? What are the top 2-3 things you learned through this discussion?
6. What do you think was the most meaningful or relevant part of this discussion for your supervisee? What are the top 2-3 things you believe your supervisee learned through this discussion?
7. How did this supervision session compare to other supervisions sessions you have experienced?
8. How might this experience impact your future work with clients and/or supervisees? What might you do differently as a result of this discussion?

FIGURE 1
CONTEXTUAL MODEL OF DISCUSSIONS OF MULTICULTURAL
PERSPECTIVES IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION



