



Minnesota State University, Mankato
**Cornerstone: A Collection of
Scholarly and Creative Works for
Minnesota State University,
Mankato**

Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects

2014

Experiences and Perspectives of Clinical Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision: The Impact of Supervisor Race and Ethnicity

Masahiko Sato

Minnesota State University - Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>

 Part of the [Counseling Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sato, Masahiko, "Experiences and Perspectives of Clinical Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision: The Impact of Supervisor Race and Ethnicity" (2014). *Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects*. Paper 313.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Experiences and Perspectives of Clinical Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision:
The Impact of Supervisor Race and Ethnicity

By

Masahiko Sato

Dr. Aaron Jeffrey, Dissertation Advisor

A Dissertation in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
Counselor Education and Supervision

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, MN

May 2014

Experiences and Perspectives of Clinical Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision:
The Impact of Supervisor Race and Ethnicity

Masahiko Sato

This dissertation has been examined and approved by the following members of the student's committee.

Aaron Jeffrey, Ph.D.

Jacqueline Lewis, Ph.D.

John Seymour, Ph.D.

Jennifer Pepperell, Ph.D.

Karin Lindstrom Bremer, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

Completing my dissertation was an interesting journey. This would have been impossible without guidance and support from the people in my life. Therefore, I would like to express my gratitude. My first appreciation goes to my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Aaron Jeffrey. He accompanied me on the long winding road in the journey. He spent enormous amount of time to meet with me and read and edit my work. I believe he has worked as hard as I did with this project.

I would like to express my gratitude to my committee members as well. Dr. Jacqueline Lewis enriched diverse perspectives and gave me courage to do my work. I know that she looked out for me in the degree program. Dr. Jennifer Pepperell was gracious enough to share her wisdom and expertise to the complex work of qualitative research. Dr. Karin Lindstrom Bremer sparked inspiration for research and provided me with meticulous editing and feedback. Dr. John Seymour shared a great wealth of knowledge in clinical work and supervision. He became a mentor for me at times. Of course, I have to mention his great sense of humor and unique metaphors he added to my journey.

My family deserves appreciation. I thank my parents for their support and understanding. They survived the hardship after the World War II and gave me motivation and opportunities for higher education. I am also grateful that my sisters provided me with kindness and encouragement. My sisters' families always welcomed me when I went back home.

I also want to thank my friends in the U.S. for their understanding, encouragement, and inspiration during my stay in this foreign country. They took me in as a second family. I am fortunate to have these friends in my life.

Lastly, I would like to thank the participants in this study for their honesty, courage, kindness, patience, and wisdom they shared through their stories of their experiences as minorities in the U.S. I experienced their mentorship vicariously through this project. It was inspirational.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | vii |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Cross-Cultural Supervision..... | 2 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 5 |
| Purpose of the Study..... | 6 |
| Research Questions..... | 7 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 7 |
| Summary of Introduction..... | 11 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 12 |
| Introduction..... | 12 |
| Supervision in the Counseling Field..... | 12 |
| Multicultural Education/Training in Counseling Programs..... | 14 |
| Multicultural Supervision..... | 16 |
| Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision..... | 17 |
| CHAPTER THREE: METHOD..... | 25 |
| Introduction..... | 25 |
| The Qualitative Paradigm..... | 25 |
| Phenomenology..... | 27 |
| Rationale for Selecting Phenomenological Method..... | 29 |
| Theoretical and Philosophical Framework..... | 30 |
| Participants and Sampling..... | 34 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Procedures | 37 |
| Data Analysis | 39 |
| Researcher-As-Instrument | 41 |
| Building Trustworthiness..... | 43 |
| Summary | 44 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: PARTICIPANT ONE | 46 |
| Textual Analysis | 46 |
| Structural Analysis..... | 59 |
| Textual-Structural Description..... | 65 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: PARTICIPANT TWO | 76 |
| Textual Analysis | 76 |
| Structural Analysis..... | 92 |
| Textual-Structural Description..... | 97 |
| CHAPTER SIX: PARTICIPANT THREE..... | 110 |
| Textual Analysis | 110 |
| Structural Analysis..... | 125 |
| Textual-Structural Description..... | 132 |
| CHAPTER SEVEN: PARTICIPANT FOUR..... | 142 |
| Textual Analysis | 142 |
| Structural Analysis..... | 153 |
| Textual-Structural Description..... | 160 |
| CHAPTER EIGHT: PARTICIPANT FIVE | 170 |
| Textual Analysis | 170 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Structural Analysis..... | 179 |
| Textual-Structural Description..... | 185 |
| CHAPTER NINE: COMPOSITE DESCRIPTION | 194 |
| Introduction..... | 194 |
| Distinct Experiences as a RE Minority | 194 |
| Managing Diversity Issues with Cultural Focus | 196 |
| Embracing the Difference and Its Challenges | 200 |
| Support and Mentorship Are Critical to Success | 203 |
| Summary | 205 |
| CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSION..... | 207 |
| Discussion | 207 |
| Significance..... | 210 |
| Research Limitations | 219 |
| Implications and Recommendations..... | 222 |
| Summary | 227 |
| REFERENCES | 229 |
| APPENDICES | 254 |
| Appendix A..... | 254 |
| Appendix B | 255 |
| Appendix C | 257 |
| Appendix D..... | 258 |

Experiences and Perspectives of Clinical Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision:
The Impact of Supervisor Race and Ethnicity

Masahiko Sato

Counselor Education and Supervision

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, MN

May 2014

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study explored experiences of racial and ethnic minority supervisors in cross-cultural supervision in the counseling related fields in the U.S. or Canada. Five supervisors from different countries of origin participated. Both their general experiences in supervision and the ways in which the racial and ethnic minority supervisors managed cultural discussions and the supervisors' own needs were examined in supervision. The phenomenological study sought to describe the essence of the racial and ethnic minority supervisors in cross-cultural supervision and identified several themes grounded in their experiences: (a) distinct experiences as racial and ethnic minority supervisors; (b) managing diversity issues with cultural focus (challenging supervisees with diversity issues; using self-disclosure); (c) embracing the difference and its challenges (managing diversity issues universally; using a difference as a motivator and strength); (d) support and mentorship are critical to success. While there are some limitations, this study contributes to the growing body of literature about multicultural supervision and the approaches to improve the counselor education and training and the

quality of clinical work. Finally, recommendations for supervision practice, counselor educators and trainers, and future research are discussed.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The world continues to become more globalized and its demographics continue to change. The United States is no exception. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the racial demographics of the U.S. were: White/Caucasian 72 % (5.7 % increase from the Census 2000), African American 12.6 % (12.3 % increase), Native American 0.9 % (18.4 % increase), Asian 4.8 % (43 % increase), Pacific Islander 0.2 (35.4 % increase), and Hispanic/Latino 16.3 % (43 % increase). The U.S. society has continued to become more diverse racially, ethnically, and culturally. This trend will become even more pronounced in the future.

The counseling related fields, including counseling, marriage and family therapy (MFT), and clinical psychology, continue to struggle with promoting diversity in their membership. According to the 2013 American Counseling Association (ACA) membership report, only 18 % of its members identified as racial minorities. The American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) reported that nine percent of members identify as racial minorities (AAMFT, 2012). Ten percent of the American Psychological Association (APA) members (not including student affiliates, associates, and fellows) in 2009 were identified as racial minorities (APA, 2010). Although the demographics of the U.S. continue to change, the counseling field struggles to keep up with the trend. One manifestation of this is the lack of research that has focused on the experiences and needs of Racial and Ethnic (RE) minority supervisors.

Cross-Cultural Supervision

As the demographics of the U.S. and counseling organizations continue to change, it is assumed that there may be an increase in frequency of supervision taking place between supervisors and supervisees who are of different racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds. While the numbers of RE minority members in these organizations are still relatively small, those numbers are slowly increasing (AAMFT, 2011; ACA, 2013; APA, 2010). With that increase, the field has begun to see more minority supervisors engaging in cross-cultural supervision. One factor that is little understood in the literature is how minority supervisors experience engaging in cross-cultural supervision, and more specifically, what role supervisor multicultural competency plays in those interactions.

Supervisor Multicultural Competency in Cross-Cultural Supervision

Effective cross-cultural supervision is influenced by the supervisor's level of multicultural competency (MC). High supervisor MC will likely lead to more cultural discussions, more self-disclosure by supervisees (Beaumont, 2010; Fukuyama, 1994; Mori, 2010; Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009; Zapata, 2010), better case conceptualization and clinical interventions (Inman, 2006), better working alliance (Dressel, Consol, Kim, & Atkinson, 2007), improved supervisee MC (Beaumont, 2010), and higher supervisee satisfaction with supervision (Inman, 2006). Traditionally, MC has been defined as an awareness of one's own values, biases, and assumptions, as well as knowledge of characteristics of culturally diverse clients, and skills for appropriate intervention strategies and techniques (Sue & Sue, 1990; 2008). In addition, high MC requires the ability to manage multiple realities or experiences from different multicultural statuses, to

create a safe place to address diversity related issues, and to initiate and model cultural discussions (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011; Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004; Fukuyama, 1994; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, Pope-Davis, 2004). Cultural discussions and processing multicultural experiences are crucial components in supervision (Estrada et al., 2004; Toporek et al., 2004). Cultural discussions are defined as discussions or conversations of multicultural variables to process and develop awareness of how these variables impact supervisory and/or therapeutic dynamics and processes.

Research suggests that cultural discussions in supervision do not occur as often as they are recommended (Burkard et al., 2006; Gatmon et al., 2001). Strong, especially negative, emotions evoked in discussions can make the supervision process complex and challenging for both supervisees and supervisors (Christiansen et al., 2011). This may be one of the reasons for inadequate discussions in supervision. It is a supervisors' responsibility to effectively manage negative feelings in supervision, but there is little research about the experiences of supervisors in these important interactions (Christiansen et al., 2011). Therefore, as supervisors have a key role in broaching and facilitating cultural discussions, more research needs to focus on an RE minority supervisor experiences.

Challenges of Minority Supervisors

In cross-cultural supervision, cultural discussions can be challenging, especially to minority supervisors as a result of their minority statuses (Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). Minority supervisors may face supervisees' stereotypes of their minority clients or even themselves (Constantine & Sue, 2007).

Minority supervisors can encounter defensiveness from their supervisees that mainstream supervisors may not experience when these supervisors broach cultural issues in supervision (Estrada et al., 2004). These supervisors are also exposed to microaggressions and oppression from colleagues, institutions, and environments in addition to supervisees. Microaggressions are conceptualized as “brief and commonplace verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities (whether intentional or unintentional) that somehow communicate negative or denigrating messages to minorities” (Constantine & Sue, 2007, p. 143). Cultural discussion within supervision may be influenced by its context. Advocacy and social justice has gained more importance in the counseling field (Chang, Crethar, & Ratts, 2010; Chang, Hays, & Milliken, 2009) and the work requires supervisors to take risks, but it in turn exposes them to further emotional reactivity and oppression from supervisees and institutions (McGeorge, Carlson, Erickson, & Guttormson, 2006). Racial and ethnic minority supervisors have to figure out strategies to manage this complexity of cross-cultural supervision, often without adequate training and/or support.

Research Suggestions in Cross-Cultural Supervision

There are several suggestions for improving cross-cultural supervision from existing research. Much of the current research focuses on supervisees’ experiences in supervision. Supervisors’ experiences in cross-cultural supervision are rarely addressed. The use of qualitative research is suggested to examine successful and unsuccessful behaviors in multicultural supervision (Toporek et al., 2004). A qualitative approach is recommended to address affective aspects and power dynamics of multicultural supervision in order to create safety and initiate and facilitate cultural discussions

(Beaumont, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011). This may require exploring different perceptions and reactions between a minority person and a RE majority person in a supervision dyad (Beaumont, 2010; Brown, 2009). Future research still needs to investigate how supervisors establish and maintain a supervisory alliance while discussing multicultural issues and how supervision impacts minority supervisors' professional development (Dressel, 2007; Zapata, 2010). Other research suggestions include examining how cultural discussions in a supervisory dyad affect client outcomes in a therapeutic relationship (Beaumont, 2010; Brown, 2009; Teasdale, 2007). Research has yet to examine other multicultural variables such as spirituality and sexual orientation in supervision (Brown, 2009; Toporek et al., 2004).

Statement of the Problem

Existing literature does not adequately address supervisors' experiences, especially minority supervisors' experiences, in cross-cultural supervision. Only a few studies in the counseling field have examined how supervisors, especially minority supervisors, navigate the complex process of cross-cultural supervision without alienating RE majority supervisees and without further marginalizing minority supervisees (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011). The anecdotal literature suggests that supervision may be more challenging for minority supervisors. Therefore, there still is a need for research to investigate the experiences of what minority supervisors experience in cross-cultural supervision. It is unknown how these supervisors' MC and experiences play a role in helping supervisees develop MC, considering the lack of education and training specifically designed for these supervisors' needs. The educational and training needs for these minority supervisors are also rarely studied. This study focused on the

gap in research for empirical data on minority supervisors' experiences, cultural discussions, and their perceived needs in cross-cultural supervision to effectively practice in the current counseling field.

Purpose of the Study

This study intended to explore what it is like to be an RE minority supervisor in the counseling field. It was designed to examine subjective experiences, especially affective experiences, of RE minority supervisors in cross-cultural supervision in the current Western atmosphere of the counseling field in the U.S. or Canada. The study also investigated RE minority supervisors' perceptions and meanings of cultural discussions in cross-cultural supervision, particularly when they worked to promote supervisee MC development by broaching and facilitating these discussions. RE minority supervisors may have their own unique ways of conducting cross-cultural supervision because of a less powerful status and little formal training to manage emotional reactions from supervisees and institutional oppressions (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2011; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997).

This study intentionally focused on race and ethnicity in multicultural supervision. This researcher hopes that the findings from this study will contribute to understanding the roles of other multicultural variables in a process of cross-cultural supervision in future research. This is based on the assumption that the underlying power dynamics of the other variables may be similar to ones of RE variable. When conducting qualitative research, stories of these minority supervisors' experiences and wisdom provide valuable insight to further improve multicultural education and training in an increasingly diverse society. This research will inform the counseling field of what the

needs of RE minority supervisors are for their cross-cultural supervision practice. This information will ultimately help the counseling field to more effectively and ethically serve minority supervisors, supervisees, and the clients they serve.

Research Questions

The researcher generated three research questions based on the gap in the literature on cross-cultural supervision identified in the literature review and based on his personal experiences and interests.

Research question 1: How do RE minority supervisors experience multicultural supervision in the current counseling field?

Research question 2: How do RE minority supervisors perceive, understand, and manage cultural discussions, especially the affective components, in cross-cultural supervision?

Research question 3: What are the needs perceived by RE minority supervisors for their practice of cross-cultural supervision in the current atmosphere of the counseling field?

Definition of Terms

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism recognizes visible and invisible differences among people, including their identity surrounding a difference. It embraces the worth and dignity of uniqueness of individuals within their geographic, physical, historical, cultural, economic, political, and psychosocialspiritual contexts (APA, 2005). Multiculturalism implies that counseling, counseling supervision, and counseling research all are influenced greatly by multicultural variables such as race, ethnicity, culture, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion/spirituality, nationality, and disabilities (Fukuyama, 1990). These constructs and interactive dynamics among these variables

need to be integrated into counselor education, training, and research to address cross-cultural dynamics in order to appropriately serve diverse clients and students (Ponterotto et al., 2010). This requires a person to possess multicultural awareness and knowledge about self, others, and the relational dynamics among them, and how this awareness and knowledge is applied effectively to other groups (APA, 2005).

Race/Ethnicity/Culture

The concepts of race, ethnicity, and culture overlap and these terms may be used interchangeably in the existing research (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). Race tends to focus on the visible physical traits such as a body structure and a phenotype (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1998). Race is also a social construct since there are social consequences of being perceived to be a part of an identifiable racial group, regardless of the accuracy of perception (Heppner et al., 2008). The visibility of race may accentuate the experiences of an RE minority supervisor. Race has been a provocative topic historically, so discussions of race, ethnicity, and culture can be difficult to facilitate effectively (Hardy & Laszloffy, 1995; 1998).

Ethnicity involves sharing cultural characteristics and physical features (Heppner et al., 2008). Culture comprises any socially definable group with its own set of beliefs, norms, and behaviors (Heppner et al., 2008). RE identity is a more theoretical concept to help us understand how RE minorities experience their RE status in a given political context and make sense of their experiences socially (Ponterotto et al, 2010). This study emphasizes the RE variable. Due to the invisibility, other variables such as socioeconomic status (SES), sexual orientation, and spirituality may not have the same impact on supervision as the RE variable. In addition, the RE variable in supervision is

less researched than the gender variable. The single RE variable is influenced by factors such as RE identity level, acculturation level, and impact of their history and context (Fukuyama, 1990; Ponterotto et al., 2010). By focusing on a single multicultural variable, this research is designed to tease out and understand the complex dynamics of cross-cultural supervision in depth and its findings may provide relevant information to understand supervisory dynamics with other variables. However, each multicultural variable may have its own unique complexity and dynamics in cross-cultural supervision. The complexity within a variable requires additional research focusing on other multicultural variables. The primary reason the RE variable is selected for this study is that the variable is critical to training RE minority professionals, and eventually serving minority clients who the counseling field has been struggling to assist.

Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Supervision

The term, “multicultural” tends to imply involvement of more than two cultures while “cross-cultural” tends to imply involvement across two cultures directly (Bernard, 1994). “Multicultural” can be defined as a process in which diverse cultural topics are legitimate for consideration and discussion (Atkinson, 2004). However, the word, “culture” here may include gender, sexual orientation, SES, and spirituality. In this study, multicultural supervision is understood to address and process multicultural issues in counseling and supervision, even when a triad consisting of a supervisor, a supervisee, and a client has the same multicultural background (Atkinson, 2004). This study defines cross-cultural supervision as supervision that involves a dyad of a supervisee and a supervisor who have different RE backgrounds, so that it is a direct encounter between two cultures (Atkinson, 2004; Bernard, 1994). Therefore, cross-cultural supervision is

one form of multicultural supervision as a result of cross-cultural dynamics, even when there may be a lack or avoidance of cultural discussion in supervision.

Minority

Minority is defined as an ethnic and/or non-dominant racial individual or group of people. It implies that minorities have less power and fewer privileges because of their multicultural characteristics (sociopolitical statuses) in the U.S. culture. Diversity in the U.S. is increasing, but its predominant culture still has a bias toward White Eurocentric practices and beliefs. This holds true in the counseling field as well. A minority group is singled out from others in society, exposed to differential and unequal treatment, and regarded as targets of discrimination and oppression (Atkinson et al., 1998). A privilege provides a power difference that exists in favor of one group over other groups (Atkinson, 2004). A majority group, or a privileged group, is considered as a norm in given sociopolitical contexts, which assign a privilege or power to the specific group. Minorities are left with limited access to fewer resources by subtle and overt discrimination. The privilege is most commonly found with White, male, heterosexual, and middle-to-upper socioeconomic statuses in the U.S (Atkinson, 2004). Therefore, a minority group is marginalized due to the lack of privileges to access resources and power to normalize their experiences. Without privileges, voices of minorities are powerless and silenced, often unintentionally (Atkinson et al., 1998). These experiences are often scarcely heard by the mainstream culture. Discussions about their experiences would privilege minorities and their experiences and give them power to contribute to society more significantly.

Summary of Introduction

In this chapter, the demographic trends of the general population and the counseling related fields in the U.S. are discussed to highlight the ongoing struggle for these fields to keep up with the demographic changes of the general population. Cultural discussions in supervision may facilitate supervisee MC and clinical development (Estrada et al., 2004; Toporek et al., 2004). Supervision is one of the most important elements in training for supervisees to address and process cross-cultural issues resulting from direct clinical client and community contact (Dickson, Argus-Calvo, & Tafoya, 2010). RE minority supervisors encounter cross-cultural supervision daily due to the current demographics in the counseling related fields. Exploration of their experiences with cultural discussions, resulting emotional reactions, and power dynamics in cross-cultural supervision may provide invaluable information to these fields. However, this researcher identifies the problem of the lack of research on how RE minority supervisors' experiences in cross-cultural supervision, how they facilitate and process cultural discussions and emotional reactivity from them, and what these supervisors' needs are. The findings of this study are intended help supervisors, especially RE minority supervisors, to supervise their supervisees more effectively. The definitions of terms of this research project are provided to give the reader context for the study. The next chapter reviews literature related to cross-cultural supervision in detail.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This section reviews several critical topics of cross-cultural supervision in the counseling field. The section starts with a review of the role of supervision in counseling. Supervision in the process of multicultural education and training programs is then discussed. Research pertaining to multicultural supervision and supervisors in cross-cultural relationships will then be addressed to give a broader context for this study. Literature pertaining to the specific research questions of this study will be reviewed; specifically, managing cultural discussions and emotional responses, and experiences of supervisors in cross-cultural supervision. This section will conclude with a statement on the scarcity of research on supervisors' experiences in the field. This study attempts to highlight and bridge the gap in research related to experiences and needs of minority supervisors within cross-cultural supervision in the counseling field.

Supervision in the Counseling Field

Supervision has been an integral part of counselor training for a long time, but it is relatively new to consider that supervision requires a distinct set of educational and training experiences (Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey, Haynes, Moulton, & Muratori, 2010; Todd & Storm, 2002). In the past, it was an accepted practice that a clinician could supervise if the clinician had enough clinical experiences. The clinical skills were viewed as transferable, but not sufficient for supervisory practice (Corey et al., 2010). AAMFT was the first to develop training requirements for the AAMFT approved supervisor designation in 1983. ACA set standards for counseling supervisors in 1989. The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) crafted guidelines for clinical

social work supervision in 1994. APA has not consistently delineated qualifications for supervisors (Corey et al., 2010).

Supervision serves different purposes (Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). One of the key purposes is quality control. A supervisor is to ensure the quality of care to clients and protect their welfare as an administrator. A supervisor as a mentor and/or a teacher is also to promote the personal growth and professional development of supervisees, so they will become a more seasoned clinician. Ideally, these supervisees will gain the ability to self-supervise their performance and to know when they need to seek consultation or supervision (Todd & Storm, 2002). The final and most challenging role is a gatekeeper to the profession. It involves monitoring and evaluating the competence of supervisees and deciding who is qualified to be licensed independently.

There are several different models of supervision (Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). Among these models, there are two major categories: clinical (psychotherapy-theory-based) models and trans-theoretical models. Clinical models include the cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) model, the solution focused model, and Bowen's (trans-generational) model (Corey et al., 2010; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). Traditionally, clinical models have been a common part of supervision, since supervisors were trained and practiced in the model, and then often trained their supervisees in the same model. However, clinical models also rely on the concept of the parallel process or isomorphism that is trans-theoretical or goes beyond a specific theory (Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010). Examples of trans-theoretical modes are the developmental model, the discrimination model, and the systems approach (Borders

& Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010). These models can be integrated into the clinical model. For instance, supervision can be based on a CBT model while considering the clinical and professional development of a supervisee from the developmental model.

A more recent model in the field is the common factors approach which is based on the meta-analysis of past therapy outcome research. Research has found that there are common key factors to successful therapy beyond specific models of therapy. This has now been applied to a supervision model (Lampropoulos, 2002; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). The original common factors identified for beneficial therapeutic outcomes were extra therapeutic factors, working alliance, instillation of hope, and treatment technique (Hubble, Duncan, & Miller, 1999). One of the significant common factors that can be applied to supervision is the supervisory working alliance. In cross-cultural supervision, the supervisory relationship can be more fragile due to the vulnerability that comes from differences of cultural backgrounds and power that is assigned socially (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Beaumont, 2010). Supervisory roles can also be understood differently, based on a distinct perspective of a cultural being. This needs to be addressed in multicultural education and training. Unfortunately, little is understood about the perspectives of minority supervisors in their experiences of the supervisory alliance.

Multicultural Education/Training in Counseling Programs

Diversity or multicultural education has been discussed since the 1960s. Debates and mixed research findings continue in how to increase MC in the counseling field (Beaumont, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011). Traditionally, graduate counseling programs in the 1980s and 1990s had only one course that focused on diversity in multicultural education and training. One diversity course has been postulated not to be

enough to achieve well developed MC in students (Ladany et al., 1997). There is now a more recent recommendation to infuse diversity and multiculturalism throughout the education and training program and clinical practice of students (McGeorge et al., 2006; Stadler, Suh, Cobia, Middleton, & Carney, 2006).

Ponterotto, Alexander, and Grieger (1995) created a checklist for infusing diversity into a counseling training program. The checklist includes a 30% critical mass for faculty, students and program support staff, curriculum issues (course work, pedagogy, and student assessment), counseling practice and supervision, research considerations, student and faculty competency evaluations, and the physical environment. This can be used as a pragmatic guide in multicultural program development since the 30% critical mass matches the RE demographics of the 2010 U.S. Census. Some of the counseling programs more intentionally infused multiculturalism throughout the program from recruitment of diverse students and faculty to community outreach (McGeorge et al., 2006; Stadler et al., 2006). Today, textbooks are also incorporating a chapter on diversity or infusing diversity throughout chapters. There also has been more research on multiculturalism in the counseling field (Ponterotto, 2010).

Effective multicultural education and training needs to emphasize experiential, participatory, and hands-on activities and discussions and reflections of these activities. The suggested experiential activities are discussion, lecture, reading, and cross-cultural contacts such as working with diverse peers and clients, presentations by diverse guest speakers, service learning, site visits, and simulations and role plays (Dickson et al., 2010). Despite the efforts to infuse multiculturalism, little exposure of counseling

trainees to diverse populations is a major obstacle to achieving a high level of MC (Dickson et al., 2010).

Supervision in practicum, internship, and post-graduate clinical work is crucial to MC development since it is a place to apply multicultural knowledge, awareness and skills into practice and discuss and reflect on how they are integrated into clinical work effectively and ethically (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Estrada et al., 2004; Toporek et al., 2004). This may be the first time for new counselors to have and process direct clinical contact with diverse populations. Supervision would be an optimal place to process these experiences in depth. Therefore, supervision is crucial in order for supervisees to develop MC, in which supervisors play a key role. In particular, minority supervisors may be in a unique position to encourage supervisees to process direct cross-cultural contacts (Dickson et al., 2010). However, this may also put minority supervisors in a position in which they experience much of the multicultural development of supervisees. This dynamic may present a variety of personal and professional experiences that supervisors may or may not be comfortable with. Minority supervisors in cross-cultural supervision offer invaluable opportunities to address multicultural experiences and issues, while cross-cultural supervision also poses challenges and complexities on both supervisees and supervisors such as language difference, misunderstanding, and power difference in the supervision process.

Multicultural Supervision

There is little research conducted to address supervisors' perspectives and experiences in multicultural supervision. Most of the current literature on cross-cultural supervision has focused on supervisees' development as a counselor. Studies have

explored the supervisee variables such as supervisees' perspectives on satisfaction, working alliances, MC, and experiences in supervision. Multicultural supervision seems to have a positive and favorable outcome in general (Burkard et al., 2006). Multicultural supervision and working with cross-cultural clients tends to increase supervisees' MC (Vereen, Hill, & McNeal, 2008). Nevertheless, there is still a question about how accurate these findings are. There is always a threat of social desirability by both supervisees and supervisors in their MC in multicultural supervision (Boysen, 2010). Supervisors have reported higher MC in themselves when compared to the MC their supervisees perceived in them (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). The color blind attitude is still common in supervision (Brown, 2009), so self-reported supervision outcomes may be biased. The color blind attitude is the belief of seeing a human, not color, because race does not matter to them, so race should not be an issue (Brown, 2009). Helms (2008) identified four types of color blindness: (a) invisibility of race; (b) color-evasion; (c) power-evasion; (d) race as taboo. In addition, multicultural supervision, even for supervisors, can be difficult today (Christiansen et al., 2011; Watt, Curtis, Drummond, Kellogg, Lozano, Nicoli, & Rosas, 2009). There is a clear lack of research that addresses what and how minority supervisors experience cross-cultural supervision, including dynamics such as color blind attitudes.

Supervisors in Cross-Cultural Supervision

The existing literature in multicultural supervision has tended to focus on the experiences of supervisees and strategies to help supervisees develop MC. Research highlights the supervisors' responsibility to facilitate cultural discussions. Inevitably, supervisors have to manage emotional reactions that stem from cross-cultural encounters

in supervision. This challenge may be accentuated for RE minority supervisors due to their minority statuses and their resultant power dynamics with supervisees from different RE backgrounds. They also need to manage contextual oppression in and outside of supervision. The contextual oppression involves institutional and societal oppression including microaggressions. These experiences may result in certain emotional experiences of RE minority supervisors. However, experiences of RE minority supervisors are rarely investigated. More in-depth discussions on these topics will follow next.

Supervisors' Responsibility to Facilitate Cultural Discussions

Effective multicultural supervision requires cultural discussions and their appropriate facilitation by a supervisor. Cultural discussions can be challenging to both supervisors and supervisees. As a result, cultural discussions in supervision do not occur as often as researchers recommend (Burkard et al., 2006; Gatmon et al., 2001). Research has shown that working with minority supervisors has a great influence on the development of supervisees' MC in counseling training, while cross-cultural contacts tended to evoke strong emotional reactions in supervision (Ladany et al., 1997). Supervisors need to help supervisees work through cognitive dissonance from cultural discussions in order to promote MC development of those supervisees. Supervisors also need to help supervisees work through negative emotions in multicultural supervision, which is related to reducing biases (Boysen, 2010). It is also critical for supervisors to promote cultural sensitivity that requires emotional reactions to create a culturally meaningful experience (Hardy & Laszloffy; 1995; 1998). Consequently, multicultural training is not complete without addressing the process of multicultural supervision with

its accompanying emotional reactions (Christiansen et al., 2011). Therefore, cross-cultural supervision can be emotionally taxing to both a supervisee for MC development and a supervisor for promotion of supervisee MC. Considering inherent supervisors' power from their advanced training and experiences, it is their responsibility to facilitate and manage cultural discussions with possible emotional reactions (Christiansen et al., 2011; Taylor, Hernández, Rankin, & Siegel, 2006).

Supervisors' Responsibility to Manage Emotional Reactions

Part of facilitating meaningful cultural discussions in supervision includes responding to and managing emotional responses that take place in those conversations. Multicultural supervision can be stressful for minority supervisors as a result of negative feelings and reactions from supervisees (Boysen, 2010). Supervisors may encounter negative reactions including discomfort and defensiveness from supervisees with underdeveloped MC. Since multicultural supervision can be fraught with anxiety and discomfort (Constantine & Sue, 2007), supervisors need to have the ability, or high MC, to tolerate discomfort and help both parties in supervision to work through the negative feelings effectively (Christiansen et al., 2011). Supervisor MC fosters an open supervisory working relationship, maintains the facilitative relationship, and promotes supervisee MC (Beaumont, 2010; Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Inman, 2006). Because of the supervisors' role and power, they are accountable for managing and processing emotional reactions of supervisees and themselves. However, some supervisors may lack training and support to manage the emotional reactivity that contributes to the lack of cultural discussions in supervision (Constantine, 1997). There is unfortunately a paucity of literature that addresses the affective aspect and power

dynamics of cross-cultural supervision (Christiansen et al., 2011). This gap in research may be one of the reasons why cultural discussions do not take place in supervision as often as necessary.

Challenges RE Minority Supervisors Experience in Cross-Cultural Supervision

In cross-cultural supervision, minority supervisors have additional challenges, compared to RE majority supervisors, as a result of their less privileged status. RE minority supervisors have encountered resistance, such as color blindness and stereotyping, from supervisees in multicultural supervision (Estrada et al., 2004). They may also find themselves being the focus or target of supervisees' cultural misconceptions or antagonisms and as a result expend energy to avoid negative feelings associated with these microaggressions (Priest, 1994).

Supervisees, especially RE majority supervisees, can employ different types of defense mechanisms that supervisors need to manage in multicultural supervision (Utsey & Gernat, 2002; Watt et al., 2009). Reverse oppression has been an issue brought up by majority supervisees when supervisors encouraged social justice and advocacy to supervisees in counselor education (Heppner, 1994; McGeorge et al., 2006). Some majority supervisees have claimed that supervisors' challenges to their values and beliefs discriminated against them. Because of their sociopolitical status, minority supervisors may find it harder than majority supervisors to manage defense mechanisms utilized by majority supervisees such as color blindness and reverse oppression. Supervisors', particularly minority supervisors', competency and authority may be questioned in multicultural supervision when these supervisors experience prejudice in which supervisees assume that supervisors lack expertise (Chung, 2009; Priest, 1994).

For minority supervisors, their supervisory relationships tend to be dyads in which supervisor RE identity is higher, or more developed than supervisees' (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Ladany, 1997). As such, both White supervisees and minority supervisees may have a difficult time trusting and agreeing with minority supervisors (Chung, 2009; Priest, 1994). Low MC of supervisees and institutional oppression may interfere with positive effects of high RE identity and MC of RE minority supervisors on supervisee MC development. With the fact that there is a lack of training and support for this particular issue, RE minority supervisors have to find their own way to manage the previously discussed challenges related to their expertise and authority (Watt et al., 2009). Researchers in the counseling field have rarely explored experiences on how minority supervisors perceive and manage the complexities in cross-cultural supervision.

Contextual Challenges for RE Minority Supervisors

RE minority supervisors may also face contextual challenges that create a double bind within the supervision process. The minority status of these supervisors may promote their MC development through their daily cross-cultural contacts in and out of the counseling field; nonetheless, it can also be a source of stress and difficulties for them to have higher MC in the field (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004). The cross-cultural contacts that minority supervisors are exposed to tend to involve microaggressions and oppression from colleagues, institutions, and environments as well as from supervisees. Microaggressions and oppression stem from minority supervisors' less powerful status (Priest, 1994), and processing these experiences may promote high MC in minority supervisors. In turn, high MC pushes supervisors to be more aware of multicultural issues and take actions to make a difference. This awareness and high MC urge them to

promote social advocacy and social justice with supervisees in supervision. Advocacy and social justice requires supervisors to take risks, but it further exposes them to direct and vicarious oppression and emotional reactivity from supervisees and institutions (McGeorge et al., 2006). These series of experiences may facilitate higher RE identity and MC in minority supervisors. However, these minority professionals tend to be left on their own to figure out how to manage these challenges and the process of their identity development is rarely examined.

Scarcity of Research on Experiences and Needs of RE Minority Supervisors

Although research on multiculturalism in the counseling field has increased in the past three decades, researchers have done little exploration on minority supervisors, their experiences of these challenges, and the needs and support necessary to cope with the challenges. Daily, minority counselor educators and supervisors have to face distinct challenges due to their minority status in the counseling field. Specifically, many minority professionals have had experiences with microaggressions and institutional oppression that have been rarely researched in academic literature (Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). However, the existing anecdotal literature shows that common negative feelings RE minority professionals have reported are hurt, fear, frustration, anger, confusion, vulnerability, insecurity, loneliness, and helplessness in the counseling field in which they practice (Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). When their professional credibility is repeatedly challenged both directly and indirectly, minority professionals may develop the above feelings and second-guess themselves, leading to the sense of low self-efficacy and incompetence as a professional (Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). Some minority counseling

professionals have reported feeling unprepared to work effectively cross-culturally, because of a lack of training, mentoring, and support that specifically focused on their particular needs as minority professionals in order for them to manage microaggressions and institutional oppression they encounter in the Eurocentric counseling field (Chao et al., 2011; Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). At the same time, there were some RE minority professionals who had learned how to masterfully handle cross-cultural issues in spite of some of the negative outcomes. These experiences and needs may be similar to minority supervisors' experiences and needs. Consequently, cross-cultural supervision may be a more complex and challenging process for minority supervisors to navigate because of its sociopolitical nature, especially within the Western bias of the counseling field (Fukuyama, 1990). RE minority supervisors' experiences are also important to study in order to identify how they navigate supervision and the field. The counseling field urgently needs empirical data on the needs of RE minority supervisors and a way to train and prepare them to resolve these challenges effectively in cross-cultural supervision, considering the scarcity of research.

Summary

Supervision is an essential component of multicultural education in counseling. It is necessary for trainees to have direct cross-cultural contact to develop MC. Supervision is an ideal setting to process cross-cultural experiences. It is supervisors who need to promote and facilitate cultural discussions in order to make multicultural supervision effective in counselor training. Strong, especially negative emotions evoked in cross-cultural discussions can make the supervision process complex and challenging for both supervisees and supervisors. It is a supervisors' responsibility to have adequate

MC to effectively manage negative feelings in supervision (Christiansen et al., 2011). In cross-cultural supervision, cultural discussions can be more challenging to minority supervisors as a result of their minority status. Minority supervisors are exposed to microaggressions and oppression from supervisees, colleagues, institutions, and environments. Historically, these minority professionals tend to be left on their own to figure out how to manage these challenges that may ironically advance their RE identity. Because of the scarcity of research, the purpose of this study is to produce empirical data on experiences of RE minority supervisors, especially in regard to facilitating cultural discussions and on their needs to effectively manage and resolve the common challenges in cross-cultural supervision.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

Introduction

The review of the literature indicated that there was little research done on the experiences of RE minority supervisors in the counseling field. In order to address the gap in the literature, this dissertation study employed a phenomenological approach to explore and examine the experiences of RE minority supervisors in the counseling field. This chapter first introduces the rationale for choosing a qualitative approach, specifically the transcendental phenomenological approach (Moustakas, 1994) utilized for this study. A description of the philosophical underpinnings of the phenomenological approach is provided initially and is followed by the reasons for selecting a phenomenological method. I will also discuss the theoretical and philosophical frameworks with which this study is developed and conducted in order to give readers the context of the study. In qualitative research, the researcher is the crucial instrument. Therefore, my philosophical orientation, background, biases, and assumptions were examined to help a reader deconstruct the preconceptions of this researcher and contextualize findings. I then describe the steps I have taken in this study including the recruitment of participants, the interview process, data collection, data analysis, establishing trustworthiness, presentation of the findings, and ethical considerations.

The Qualitative Paradigm

A qualitative method allows researchers to discover and gain access to rarely examined materials (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Researchers can have an opportunity to encounter participants as a whole human rather than just a number and to understand them and their complexity through their rich and thick descriptions of their experiences.

Qualitative research assists researchers to look into the inner experiences of people and to understand how a culture shapes the meaning of people's experiences (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This is consistent with my postmodern philosophy, which I will discuss later, and helps me to learn the wisdom from the participants, especially the marginalized, through their first-person accounts of their experiences.

The qualitative research approach was a suitable approach for this study because the purpose of the study is to explore and describe the rarely examined experiences of RE minority supervisors in cross-cultural supervision. This method provided me with a tool to give a voice to these supervisors. The qualitative approach fit the intention of this study to research the common themes and meanings of RE minority supervisors' experiences, in order to understand the complex dynamics of different levels of systems such as their minority status, their relationship with supervisees with their cultural status, and their supervisory context. The approach focuses on a holistic or systemic experience rather than its parts, or numbers.

The quantitative, or nomothetic, method tends to perpetuate the marginalization of minority issues and populations by needing representative samples, using measurements, aggregating results, and utilizing inferential statistics (Smith, 2009). The numerical data analyses in the quantitative method tend to reduce the human experiences to average numbers and eliminate outliers, or different experiences from the norm. This process perpetuates the Western bias in the counseling field since the demographic in the field is predominantly White.

As my focus was on the experiences of minority supervisors, employing a qualitative method to get at thick, rich descriptions of their lived experiences seemed the

most appropriate. I placed importance on the meaning making of participants and valued different perspectives, especially from marginalized populations. A qualitative researcher with a social constructivist and postmodern lens holds participants' experiences as valid as the dominant or majority ones. Through the social constructivist lens, the participants' views of a situation, or subjective meanings, are negotiated and formed through interactions with others socially and historically (Creswell, 2007).

Good qualitative researchers are courageous enough to draw on their own experiences rather than to see them as problems when analyzing data and to refuse more conventional ideas of objectivity and neutrality (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Corbin and Strauss (2008) have highlighted characteristics of researchers who tend to do well with qualitative research: a humanistic bent, curiosity, creativity, imagination, a sense of logic, the ability to recognize diversity as well as regularity, a willingness to take risks, the ability to live with ambiguity, the ability to work through problems in the field, an acceptance of the self as a research instrument, and trust in self and the ability to see value in the work that is produced. I agree with these ideas and also strive to achieve these qualities in my work in general and also in this study. In the next section, the attention shifts specifically to the method of phenomenology within the qualitative orientation.

Phenomenology

This phenomenological study was designed to examine common experiences of several RE minority supervisors and to describe the meanings of their "lived supervisory experiences" in details. Phenomenology, specifically transcendental phenomenology, is influenced by Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) and is both a philosophy and a research

methodology (Richards & Morse, 2013). Transcendental phenomenology encourages a researcher to achieve transcendental ego, or presuppositionlessness, after bracketing. This leads to the essential structure that is left in pure consciousness. On the other hand, existential phenomenology rejects the transcendental ego. Transcendental phenomenology deemphasizes interpretation, compared to hermeneutical phenomenology. Transcendental phenomenology assumes that objective reality of a phenomenon is accessed through the window of the subjective and lived experience of an individual (Mertens, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). This orientation is similar to cybernetics of cybernetics that emphasizes subjective interconnectedness between a researcher and a researched (Becvar & Becvar, 2013; Finlay, 2009). Therefore, an objective reality does not exist separately from an individual who experiences it. The evidence of a phenomenon can only be accessed through first-person accounts of the lived experience of the phenomenon (Richards & Morse, 2013) as in the postmodern perspective. A phenomenon is, therefore, understood through the perception and meaning of the experience a person lives within their contextual systems. The purpose of phenomenological research is to identify universally essential themes in individual experiences of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Phenomenological reduction is a process that allows a researcher to arrive at the pure essence of a description of participants' experiences of a phenomenon. It requires prereflection, reflection, and reduction to understand and explain the essence of a phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). This will be described further in the data analysis section.

From the transcendental phenomenological perspective, epoche, or bracketing, encourages a phenomenologist to discover reality as a person lives and experiences it

(Moustakas, 1994). While epoche encourages a phenomenologist to suspend all presumptions, a researcher asks questions to individuals who live a phenomenon and lets them speak, describe it, and define it for themselves as they have experienced it in their own unique ways (Moustakas, 1994). Epoche is a process of cultivating the awareness of presuppositions and setting them aside to see a phenomenon in its pure form. This process resembles an effort to distinguish different realities of an observer and an observed from the systems theory and the postmodern lens.

Rationale for Selecting Phenomenological Method

Experiences of RE minority supervisors are scarcely researched in the field, so I needed an exploratory design of a qualitative approach (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). A phenomenological method allowed me to gather rich descriptions from minority supervisors and to extract an essence of personal accounts of their lived supervisory experiences (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). It gave significance to the participants' perceptions and meanings of experiences. It also helped me examine participants' perceptions and meanings of experiences of supervision (Mertens, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). It was less reductionistic and less likely to further marginalize the participants than quantitative approaches.

I hoped that the characteristics of phenomenology would allow unheard voices of RE minority supervisors to be heard and empowered. Its philosophical orientation fit my worldview of both social construction of meaning and subjective reality from postmodernism. Social constructivism allowed research results to be contextualized, in order to make sense of the accounts. Phenomenology resonated with my attitude of curiosity, or a "not knowing" stance from the postmodern approach, as I was curious

about RE minority supervisors' experiences in this study. It also harmonized with a non-judgmental stance from the philosophy of Buddhism, to which I ascribe. This helped me mindfully acknowledge the voices of these supervisors.

Theoretical and Philosophical Framework

This study was developed and conducted from four perspectives that fit how I view and comprehend the world: systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race theory. These theories were foundational in this study and permeated the stages of planning, collecting data, interpreting the findings, and writing the results. Their tenets supported the philosophical underpinnings of the phenomenological approach for this study. The following sections are the definitions of each perspective.

Systems Theory

According to systems theory, individuals cannot be understood separately from the whole, such as a relational system within a societal/cultural system. The properties arise from the interactions and relationships among the parts within a system or multiple systems (Bateson, 1972; Nichols & Schwartz, 2010). The feedback loops of these interactions in a system or among systems are called cybernetics (Bateson, 1972). Systemic thinkers highlight the importance of paying attention to interactions rather than individuals, subjective meanings of relationships rather than their descriptions, and a given context with which an individual interacts and in which positions him/herself, as well as functioning and experience of a particular individual in the environment (Von Bertalanffy, 1972). Within diversity issues, systems theory validates both majority and minority experiences in any multicultural variable, conceptualizing that the minority experiences exist in relation to (or in the context of) the majority culture (Becvar &

Becvar, 2013; Von Bertalanffy, 1972). Cybernetics of cybernetics, or second order cybernetics, takes into consideration that the observer is an active component of what is observed in the feedback loop between them in contrast to the positivistic perspective that the observer exists neutrally, separate from the observed (Bateson, 1972). Systems thinkers focus on process rather than content and embrace complexities. Utilizing systems theory, I explored the complexity of interactions and dynamics in cross-cultural supervision and contextualized experiences of RE minority supervisors.

Social Constructivism

Social constructivism is a worldview that is often combined with interpretivism (Creswell, 2007). It is a philosophy that assumes experiences are a function of how people think about and understand them instead of viewing them as objective realities (Gladding, 2010). Social constructivism suggests that reality is not an objective entity, but a reflection of an observer's experience and understanding of the reality (Anderson, 1997; Becvar & Becvar, 2013). Individuals make subjective meanings of their experiences negotiated through interactions with others socially and historically. The meanings are complex, stemming from their variability and multiplicity. "Reality" or "truth" is constructed by these meanings, so that cultural and historical context will provide understanding and meaning to the participants' experiences in a given environment (Creswell, 2007).

Social constructionists assume the social nature of knowledge and a multiplicity of interpretations of reality that are socially constructed (Anderson, 1997). In radical constructivism, a person who tries to know objective reality (the truth) actively constructs a (subjective) reality (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). A researcher conducts a study and makes

an interpretation of findings that are shaped by his or her own personal, cultural, and historical experiences. Therefore, researchers need to position themselves in the research by acknowledging and being mindful of their biases and preconceptions from their own experiences, which are the foundation of interpreting the research findings (Creswell, 2007). I focused on the subjective experiences of RE minority supervisors in the counseling field. I acknowledged that I myself was an RE minority supervisor and thus strived to bracket my own experiences and presuppositions in order to understand the experiences of the participants as they experience them.

Postmodernism

The basic concept of postmodernism is that there is not a single absolute truth, while modernism highlights that there is the truth and research is conducted to attain it (Nichols & Schwartz, 2010). Postmodernists suggest that knowledge must be understood from multiple perspectives and various meanings or interpretations based on multicultural variables in a specific social location or context (Anderson, 1997). Postmodernists also highlight the relational nature of knowledge generated through discourse (Anderson, 1997). Knowledge of minority perspectives only takes on meaning within the context of a dominant culture that has hierarchies, power, and privileges over the less privileged one. In terms of the meaning, there is a concern with both the knowledge and the context in which it is embedded (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). People *construct* behaviors rather than discover them, based on how they *language* or describe them (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). In contrast, through the lens of modernism, people search for the objective and universal truth.

In postmodernism, reality is understood and constructed through lens of the belief systems that an observer has and functions with in a particular situation (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). The observer has to be understood to be part of what is observed and describes what is observed and its observing systems (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). Accepted knowledge and practices (or dominant discourses) are developed by people in power with their own agendas (or perspectives). Conventional knowledge and its assumptions needs to be *deconstructed* by letting alternative voices speak in the midst of the dominant discourses that silence the marginalized voices as untrue and invalid (Nichols & Schwartz, 2010). Facts are then named and replaced as perspectives rather than truth, which is a challenge to the power and privilege attributed to the owner of knowledge of the facts. The awareness of perspectives is based on how much one pays attentions to story, discourse, or use of language critically (Becvar & Becvar, 2013). It is a key to examine how people tell their stories in details to understand how they experience their realities. This philosophical approach encourages me to take a curious, or *not knowing* stance to hear and understand others' human experiences and stories.

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) empathizes the issue of racism within the context of the U.S. society (Creswell, 2007; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). With the orientation of CRT, a researcher examines how the concept of race is socially constructed and how privileges are assigned according to the existing hierarchy of power (Creswell, 2007; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). A race is a product of social interactions among people and contexts. CRT presumes that RE minorities have competence to speak about racism and they are in a unique position to be able to communicate what a White counterpart would

not see due to their own privileges and the power structure invisible to them (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). This invisibility leads to color blindness, microaggression, and institutional racism against RE minorities, often unintentionally without awareness. One of my goals is to present first-person narratives of racial minorities from their own perspectives. Through these stories from a CRT perspective, I intended to deconstruct the privileges and make racial issues apparent to examine and challenge in cross-cultural supervision. CRT assisted me to redirect the dominant discourses by validating voices of RE minorities as a reality (Creswell, 2007). The realities of these voices increased the awareness of the issue of marginalization in the process of supervision. I applied CRT to this study and examined racial issues through the entire research process. I deconstructed the traditional research method, theories, and institutional and societal structures through the lens of CRT in order to investigate the invisible privilege and power hierarchy and to highlight and empower the marginalized or disempowered voices in the process of supervision, specifically in cross-cultural supervision by RE minority supervisors.

Participants and Sampling

In this section, I will describe the procedure for how I recruited the participants and the demographics of the secured sample. I obtained a purposive sample in which participants who had experienced the phenomenon of being an RE minority supervisor in the U.S. or Canada were selected. To investigate this phenomenon, five participants were recruited by using criteria focused on the RE minority status and the training requirements for supervision in the counseling field. Participants were RE minority supervisors who had an independent clinical licensure in the U.S. or Canada, had supervision education, more than three years of supervisory practice, and more than

seven years of clinical practice in the U.S. or Canada. The last criterion was that these supervisors had lived in the U.S. or Canada for at least eight years, so that they had cross-cultural experiences to refer to as a supervisor of an RE minority.

By focusing the counseling related fields, I generated a list of key informants and/or participants who were associated with ACA and AAMFT (Appendix A). I obtained the list of presentations from the 2013 ACA conference and the 2011 AAMFT conference. I looked for presentations related to multicultural issues. The list of presenters of these sessions served as my list of key informants and/or participants for snowball sampling to secure this purposive sample. I contacted the key informants via e-mail to assess their interest in participating. I also asked them for referrals for potential research participants. The snowball sampling did not produce any further participants. All the participants were the original key informants from the list. Since they indicated that they were willing to participate, the participants were provided with a consent form (see Appendix B) and an initial demographic questionnaire (see Appendix C) to see if they meet the criteria for the purposive sample of this study. All of the people recruited and who were interested in participating, met the criteria. These steps continued until five participants were recruited and their interviews were completed. There was no correct number of participants for this qualitative study. This sample size was normative for phenomenological research (Creswell, 2007).

I utilized a questionnaire to assess the participants' demographic data such as race, ethnicity/culture, nationality, gender, other minority statuses, educational and training level, the length of clinical practice and supervision practice, and the setting and the geographic area of practice. Names of these participants were concealed to protect

confidentiality by the following steps. I was the only person to interview these participants and have access to the recordings. The recordings were stored in a secure place. I used their initials to conceal the actual names in the process of transcribing. Identifiable information also was changed to more general information. IRB approval was obtained to ensure ethical compliance of this study, and the appropriate informed consent was signed and collected. The informed consent (see Appendix B) included who conducted the study, the purpose of study, risk and benefits of the study, the guideline of confidentiality, the volunteer nature of the study participation, and cost and compensation of the study. I encouraged participants to review a written report (final draft of dissertation) for any violation of confidentiality or unethical use of their information.

The sample I secured was a total of five participants whose demographic information was diverse. All five participants were originally from countries other than the United States, and four of them currently live in the U.S. Their length of stay in the U.S. was between 11 to 34 years. One participant identified as Middle Eastern, one as Caribbean, one as Mexican, and one as Asian. The fifth person was born and has lived in Canada for his whole life, over 50 years. He, unlike the other participants who live in the U.S. and are all first generation immigrants, is a second and third generation Asian in Canada. His father was a first generation Asian and his mother was a second generation Asian from the same country. Racially, two participants identified as White, one as mixed race, and the last two as Asian. Although two of the participants identified their race as White on the demographic form, their own assessment of themselves as being minority supervisors made them fit for this study. Their physical presentation, languages, and

cultures were evident in personal interactions and would therefore play a role in cross cultural supervision.

Three participants were female and two were male. Their ages varied from 36 to 68 years old. They all identified as heterosexual for their sexual orientations and indicated the middle class as a socio-economic status. Their faiths differed among non-practicing Christian, Catholic, Buddhist, and Muslim. The participants have practiced counseling clinically between seven and 27 years. The length of their supervisory practice ranged from 4.5 to 20 years. One person was licensed as a psychologist while the other four were licensed as marriage and family therapists. However, all of the participants had training in MFT. Four participants had a Ph.D. and the other had an Ed.S.

Procedures

This section delineates the procedures I took in the process of interviewing the participants and how I maintained the data. Once informed consent was obtained, the interview time was scheduled via e-mail. Data were collected and audio-recorded through semi-structured and interactive in-depth interviews via Skype™. Skype™ was downloaded from www.skype.com for videoconferencing and XM SkypeRecorder was downloaded from www.skyperec.com for recording the interview as a MP3 file. Sykpe was a free program, but XM SkypeRecorder was purchased due to the length of recording. Each participant had Skype, a microphone, and a webcam in their computers. The Skype interview took place in a private room of their choice for confidentiality while the researcher conducted interview in his office at home. Interviews took from 45 minutes to 75 minutes per person.

The participants were asked to talk as openly as possible about the different ways their minority status in race and ethnicity had influenced their experiences (thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, and/or meanings) as a supervisor in cross-cultural supervision. I utilized three research questions that are open-ended (See Appendix D) to guide the interview, in order to elicit a detailed account of their experiences (Moustakas, 1994; Richards & Morse, 2013). These are the three research questions listed previously. In semi-structured interviews, participants were encouraged to lead the interview and talk in detail about their particular experiences and were asked general follow-up open-ended questions on important individual topics that arose during the interview. There was no specific time restriction to the length of interview. The length was determined by the need of each specific interviewee. This phenomenological study required rich data through which participants should be given an opportunity to tell their stories, to speak freely and reflectively, and to develop their ideas and express their concerns at some length (Smith et al., 2009).

The Skype, or videoconference, interviews initially were audio-recorded on the researcher's computer and then were transferred to a USB drive. I transcribed the recordings and verified the accuracy of transcription by checking them twice against the recording. Verbatim transcripts of the interviews served as the raw data for the study. In this process, the participants' confidentiality was maintained by eliminating identifiable information and storing information securely on a USB drive in a locked office. In cases where the researcher utilizes quotes from their interviews, I encouraged participants to review their quotes and provide their informed verbal consent for publication in order to

maintain their confidentiality in the paper and to avoid further marginalization of their experiences. The MP3 files of the recording were erased at completion of the study.

Data Analysis

The following section describes what steps I took in the data analysis process. I first bracketed out my preconceptions as described below in the epoche section. With my own biases and assumptions suspended, I listened to the audio-recordings and read and re-read transcripts to familiarize myself with the stories of the participants. Moustakas (1994) identified two methods of data analysis in phenomenology: modifications of the Van Kaam method and the Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method. I chose the Van Kaam method modified by Moustakas (1994), which involves seven steps. I took the first step of horizontalization, which required me to underscore significant statements that provided fresh descriptions of what the participants experienced in the phenomenon and how they experienced it (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Through the lens of systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race theory, I looked for significant and meaningful words and statements in the transcripts. The literature review and my personal experiences as a RE minority also guided this process. Every statement relevant to the three research questions was highlighted, and each expression was valued equally. The second step was to determine the textual themes by reduction and elimination (Moustakas, 1994). If a statement reflected the importance of an experience, helped to understand the phenomenon, and could be abstracted and labeled, it was kept. Other expressions were discarded. Redundant and vague expressions were condensed into more descriptive statements. These expressions that remained were *invariant constituents*. I developed clusters and themes of meanings from these constituents into

core themes of the experience in the third step (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). The fourth step was validation to check if these themes were expressed explicitly in the transcripts or were reflected implicitly in the transcripts. If not, they were deleted. Individual textual descriptions of the experience of each participant with examples of verbatim quotes from the transcripts were constructed in the fifth step. These significant statements and themes are used to write textual descriptions—what the participants experienced. The sixth step allowed the researcher to construct structural themes by using imaginative variation—descriptions of how the context and its dynamics influenced participants’ experiences of a phenomenon from the textual description (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Based on the textual and structural descriptions, for each participant I constructed the textual –structural descriptions of the meanings and essences of the experiences, integrating the invariant constituents and themes in the seventh step. From the individual textual-structural descriptions, I compiled the *invariant structure* of the phenomenon, or a composite description that represents the *essence* of the experience of the supervisors with verbatim quotes of participants representing the group as a whole in the final step. This description highlights common experiences of participants and was constructed by descriptive paragraphs that help a reader to understand how and what it was like for a person to live the phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). The interpretive lens of postmodernism and critical race theory was heavily utilized to understand the meanings of their experiences in the power dynamics of their given context. The committee chair and another committee member reviewed the themes and the descriptions to ensure that they were grounded in the transcripts and had captured the participants’ experiences. Each participant also was asked to review and give feedback

on the textual, structural, and textual-structural descriptions, which resulted in a few minor corrections in the descriptions. The final reports and accounts were presented to the participants to cross validate the accuracy of them.

Researcher-As-Instrument

Epoche (Bracketing)

Moustakas is one of the key developers of transcendental phenomenology, which focuses more on descriptions of experiences of people than interpretation (Creswell, 2007). Moustakas (1994) articulated intersubjectivity that views experiences of a phenomenon as “an integrated and inseparable relationship of subject and object and of parts and whole (p. 21).” At the same time, Moustakas (1994) endorsed the concept of Husserl, *epoche* (or bracketing). This practice is to help an investigator to freshly perceive participants’ experiences as if for the first time without preconceptions (Moustakas, 1994). A researcher examines and reflects on his or her own experiences as much as possible, in order to perceive a phenomenon as it is experienced by participants. From the social constructivism and postmodernism perspectives, the researcher’s experiences, biases, and sociopolitical statuses will influence the data analysis, or the researcher’s meaning making of the data collected from the participants in a given sociopolitical context (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, it was crucial for me as the primary research instrument to examine, maintain an awareness of, and be transparent to the participants and the readers of this study regarding these biases, assumptions, and the dynamic of power differences. I contextualized myself in this study in the following section, so that readers of the report are able to understand the results in their specific context.

Self-Reflection

In this section, I present the bracketing of my biases before I implemented any steps of the data analysis described previously.

I was born and raised in a suburb of Tokyo in Japan. My family started off in the lower class and moved later to middle class socioeconomically and practiced fairly traditional family roles in Japan. I am a first generation college student in my immediate family. I came to the U.S. to attend college and have lived in relatively rural (smaller) culture, and nationality for me to be out of the context of Japanese culture and Japanese people. I was exposed to the U.S. culture all the time, so that I was reminded that I was an outsider.

My professional training is in Counselor Education, Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT), and Alcohol and Drug Counseling. My professional identity leans toward MFT. The systemic thinking from MFT fits my worldview and facilitated me to be even more aware of the influence of the context I was in as well as that of my clients. I became more interested in diversity issues, partially to make sense of my experiences as a Japanese student, clinician, supervisor, and educator in predominantly White Christian towns in Minnesota and Iowa. Most of my clients, co-workers, and supervisors were also White Christians, compared to my upbringing in Buddhism and Shintoism.

I had four diversity courses in my master's and doctoral education and have also had other training through conferences such as the AAMFT annual conference, especially their race, ethnicity, and culture track in 2005. I had two doctoral-level supervision classes and also training via AAMFT annual conferences such as a supervision track and a supervision refresher track. I just completed supervision mentoring (supervision of

supervision) and became an AAMFT approved supervisor and have been providing supervision for three years. My predominant experiences in my training and clinical work were that diversity/multiculturalism was mentioned as an important issue, but not necessarily discussed or supported in a meaningful or effective way to promote it and produce a positive change, especially to the minority population. Nonetheless, I also was aware of diversity within diversity. I always tried not to impose my biases or experiences onto others, with the awareness that I still might at times.

Some of my biases are: (a) I was affected by and aware of culture daily; (b) my view of my minority status was predominantly negative, even when I knew that it was just different and helped me be aware of culture; (c) diversity issues were important, even clinically in the counseling field; (d) there was still a need to improve infusion of diversity issues in counselor education in order to serve clients more effectively; (e) direct contacts with diverse populations were the most effective way to promote MC; (f) cultural discussions were inherently emotionally laden and could make people emotionally reactive and lose their open-mindedness/curiosity; (g) Minorities were exposed to microaggressions and institutional oppression, often without education and support tailored for their needs to work cross-culturally mostly with the more privileged from their less privileged status; and (h) It was important to consider a context and power dynamics in order to comprehend experiences of people. With the awareness of these presuppositions, I continued to attempt to bracket them out in the research process.

Building Trustworthiness

I took several steps to establish the trustworthiness of this research. I have tried to bracket out my biases and initially be transparent about my beliefs and assumptions.

With awareness of my biases, I was better able to help participants feel comfortable and let participants share freely. In data analysis, I continued to attempt to bracket out, or suspend, any presuppositions and judgments in order to understand freshly what was actually presented in the interview data. I kept reflexive notes that recorded details of the thoughts, feelings, and reflections of any interpretations (Creswell, 2007). The dissertation committee chair, another member, and participants audited the data analysis to improve trustworthiness. I also invited the participants to check the accuracy and credibility of the findings for testimonial validity when textual, structural, textual-structural descriptions. Triangulation with existing literature was utilized to improve the research validity and add corroborating support (Creswell, 2007). In the report, I wrote rich and thick descriptions that allowed readers to contextualize the findings. Supervision was utilized to check the research process, so that the finding would increase its trustworthiness of research (Creswell, 2007).

Summary

This chapter described the qualitative approach, specifically the phenomenological research method utilized for this study to explore the experiences of RE minority supervisors in the counseling field. A phenomenological approach was selected for this study to examine underrepresented experiences of RE minority supervisors in the U.S. The qualitative approach, specifically the phenomenological research method, was delineated. I explored my philosophical stance to the study, my background, biases, and assumptions to help a reader contextualize the purpose, process, and findings of this study. It is important to bracket out my presuppositions in the research process to see experiences of participants as they live. I then laid out the

research process I took in this study for the purpose of transparency for ethical and scholarly integrity of this study and its future replication. I finally described my approach to analyze and write the essence of experiences of RE minority supervisors. The data analysis and its results will be discussed in the next chapter.

In each of the next five chapters, I present textual, structural, and textual-structural descriptions for each participant as the steps of the data analysis. Throughout the process, I continued to utilize systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race theory as lenses to look for significant and meaningful labels and themes in the transcripts. I also used the literature review and my personal experiences as a RE minority to guide the process.

In the fifth step of the analysis, I wrote individual textual descriptions of what each participant experienced, based on the significant statements and themes from the first four steps of data analysis. These textual descriptions are primarily comprised of quotes. The sixth step involved constructing individual structural descriptions of how the context and its dynamics influenced each participant's experiences of a phenomenon grounded on the textual descriptions from the previous step. This sixth step involved a more interpretative process through the theoretical frameworks in which there were no direct quotes used in structural descriptions. Based on integrating both the textual and structural descriptions, I wrote individual textual-structural descriptions of the meanings and essences of the experiences, integrating the invariant constituents and themes for each participant in the seventh step.

CHAPTER FOUR: PARTICIPANT ONE

Textual Analysis

P-1 is originally from the Middle East and came to the United States as an adult to pursue higher degrees. She obtained her degrees including Ph.D. in the U.S., and she has lived here for three decades. She has practiced clinically and provided supervision for over 10 years. Her foreign status was obvious to Americans because of her name, her accent, and her appearance such as clothes. Her experiences in the U.S. were impacted by the historical tension between the Middle East and the U.S.

Impact of Diplomatic Tension and Sociopolitical Context Involving the U.S.

When P-1 came to the U.S., she was caught with the political tension between the Middle East and the U.S. and was always made aware of it. The history of and the relationship between her country of origin and the U.S. colored her experiences as a student and professional in the field. Therefore, she had different experiences with the issues such as having an accent or being an international person.

Europe is cool. Being French and having an accent is sexy. Being Middle Eastern and having an accent is not... What's the history behind this country and your country of origin that makes a huge difference in how people perceive you and connect with you.

Because of the diplomatic crisis and tension between these two countries, she faced negative sentiment towards her nationality, culture, and religious faith from Americans when she came to the U.S.

It is a very complicated history between the U.S. and my country. I got smacked right in the middle of it. I have always been. I arrived in the U.S. right after the diplomatic crisis. People hated, hated, hated us...

Therefore, her experiences in the U.S. have been somewhat more negative or challenging than positive. In addition to the diplomatic history, she also witnessed a stereotype of the bad image of people from the Middle East portrayed by the U.S. media.

For example in ‘Aladdin,’ they have all these Middle Eastern bad guys with very thick Arabic accent, and so that’s Disney’s way of making this ingrained in kids’ perception of this. As kids grow, adults, when they think about this kind of accent... they automatically think about bad guys.

The historical context and political climate created this different experience for her. She felt that “it is the reality and what’s happening” to her, so she had no choice but to deal with it. She needed to worry about the lack of credibility as a foreigner in addition to the negative image of a person from her country of origin. She thought that “It would have been different if I had to, like other supervisors, advertise and say, ‘Come and become my supervisee.’ People then said ‘who wants to be working with this woman?’” She was constantly very sensitive to people’s reactions due to the atmosphere.

A Hard Process of “Proving Myself”

P-1 was keenly conscious of the negative sentiment and stereotypes, so she tried to overcome them by her sense of humor that made obvious to others that she knew their attitude and view toward her. As a result, she was put in a place to utilize self-deprecation as a compensating strategy for her to diffuse potentially negative attitudes toward the stereotype of Middle Eastern people.

I noticed that I made fun of myself before anyone else made fun of me. I made fun of my clothes. I made fun of my accent. You know, I did that because I did not want people to actually do it... I was trying to put people at ease by saying I knew how you perceived me.

She did not elaborate on the feelings she had behind these experiences where she had to joke about herself to make others feel comfortable.

She also needed to prove herself in her training program. People in her program thought that she was not able to do clinical work because of her culture, so she was discouraged from being a clinician. This came out as protecting her. Instead, it became another challenge for her to disprove.

I said, 'Why can't I become a therapist?' They said, 'It's not you. No one will come to see you because people think that you don't understand them. And you have an accent. People do not want to talk about their problems to people that have an accent. And also your name cannot be pronounced. The way you look is weird, so people do not want to come and talk to you. It's not anything about you.' I mean they are telling me, 'We love you. And everything about you is wrong. So, we are just trying to be helpful to you.'

There was a huge discrepancy between the intention of the program and her experience of it. In her perspective, they were very discouraging and unsupportive to her when they in the guise seemed to try to protect her. They ended up discrediting everything about her knowledge, capacity, and her whole existence as a person from her country of origin.

She also had complicated challenges and related feelings as a student, a clinician, and an RE minority supervisor throughout her professional development. There were some similar experiences and processes among experiences of these different roles. She always felt that as an RE minority, she needed to "prove" her competency and "gain credibility" that she could work with people in the U.S. and that she professionally and culturally knew what she talked about. She worked hard to learn American English and U.S. culture and "compensate" her credibility by having a good understanding of theories in her field. Because students had no choice but to initially take her class and get supervision, it gave her an opportunity to gain credibility. Eventually, "people actually realized" that she had the knowledge and competency to help them.

They come to trust me and they come to say, ‘Okay, I want her as a supervisor even when I graduate.’ So, it has been a process. It hasn’t been like, ‘Okay, you provide supervision. Let me seek supervision from you.’ It has been the same exact process of my being a therapist and people say, ‘Oh, she doesn’t know anything. It’s too bad that she is my therapist.’ Then, they say, ‘She actually knows what she is talking about.’ So, that has been the same process. It hasn’t been easy. Um, I haven’t been relaxed. You know, it’s a process of always proving yourself...

She worked hard to show that she was as competent as people from the U.S. and she has not been able to drop her guard even today.

Seeing the Difference as Everyone’s Challenge

Her challenging journey of proving herself continued. At the same time, P-1 also highlighted that everyone, including people from the U.S., had to gain trust and credibility in the therapeutic and supervisory process. Interestingly, she felt that in the field the challenges of minorities were emphasized while the majority also had to go through the same process of proving their own credibility. She then went back and forth between RE minority specific challenges and everyone’s challenges such as age and gender. She experienced that it was not taught or emphasized that everyone needed to prove herself in her training.

They just told minorities that, at least in my experience, you are going to have a hard time. They did not tell other people in the program they are going to have a hard time. But, what happened was that I learned in the process of providing therapy, later in supervision, that it doesn’t matter who you are. You have to prove yourself. You have to gain credibility.

Both majority and minority people have to prove themselves. We think, because we are minority, it’s only us that have to work hard. I think everyone has to work hard.

P-1 then pointed out that it has become “her calling” to tell minority students that everyone had “a set of their own challenges.” They are just different, based on any

differences in variables such as theoretical knowledge, age, gender, sexual orientation, culture, and language. Everyone has to “work against it.”

I always thought I was a foreigner and with presentations people were going to say ‘I do not want to listen to this person.’ Then, over time I realized that White people got more nervous than I was. And so I wondered, ‘Why do I think that it’s because I have an accent while they have many other issues...’

She challenged her own thoughts about feeling nervous about being less when she saw the challenges and struggles of Americans. When she explained her thought process, P-1 empathized with the assumption or stereotype the majority culture had about her in the U.S. by comparing herself as majority in her country of origin.

If my neighbor nationals try to provide therapy to people in my country, they will be as prejudiced. Or provide supervision, they will be as cautious as here... People would be thinking, ‘What do you know about this culture?’ So, I was able to understand that this is hard because I am different and am from another culture...

She believed that the statuses of majority and minority were determined by a context a person was in, so anyone could be minority and therefore have a set of challenges from a minority status, juxtaposed to a majority one.

Negatives Feelings from the Challenging Experiences

As P-1 described earlier, she experienced a lot of challenges. She used to feel annoyed at the beginning of her career when she was stereotyped and judged by the majority and had to work harder to prove she knew as much as others did. She believed, “They have to get proven wrong. It used to bother me and I got annoyed and said to myself, ‘Heck with you people.’” Another challenge for her was microaggressions. She, as an RE minority woman, had to deal with these challenges and accompanying feelings day after day: “It’s a daily reminder. They won’t let you forget that you are different... I

am functioning on many different levels, and each one of these levels creates a layer of, “okay, don’t you forget that you are a minority.”

She had to go through the stages of her cultural identity developmental process in the context of the U.S. by herself through trials and errors since she unfortunately did not have support of peers or encouragement from mentors. She experienced it as “a very slow painful dreading process” for her to prove herself. She initially took her struggle personally and internalized it:

At that time I was going through it, I thought that I was crazy. I’m no good. It’s my issue. It’s not a program’s issue. It’s no one else’s issue except mine. Now I understand that it’s not my issue. So, I tell the students that ‘it’s not you. It’s the context that creates the situation for you.’

She was able to continue to believe in herself and her ability in spite of the adverse context and the lack of support and encouragement. She named her upbringing and family as a source of her success retrospectively. She had an attitude of “I am going to do it if you tell me ‘I cannot do something.’” She said, “Let me show you. So, it became a challenge. You know. Not everybody can do that. Not everyone can say you crossed so badly and you told me that I can’t do any of it, ‘let me show you.’”

Her resources enabled her to see her difficulty as a challenge, which made her feel motivated to overcome it. Today, she has established her career. However, her challenges continue even to this day. She illustrated her feeling of being dismissed or not respected as an administrator:

The office manager comes to my office and says, ‘Don’t you think you need to be included because you are the one who has to approve courses...’ You cannot teach a course if I don’t sign off on it, but, still they don’t include me.

Even with the amount of power and authority she has as a chairperson in her department, she continues to feel invisible to her fellow faculty. She also had the same experience at a national conference in 2012. A White woman attended her presentation. The lady was unaware of how prejudiced she came out to her when she thought she was paying a compliment to her. She commented that the woman said:

‘I thought you weren’t going to be good, but you were good.’ And I’m thinking this is really racist. I mean, a back handed compliment. She was so clueless telling me that. ‘I thought you weren’t going to be good...’ I have been hearing that for the past 20 years. People came to me and said, ‘You were actually funny. You actually...’ Actually, the word, ‘actually’ means that I wasn’t expecting...

P-1 thought the comment offensive since it implied that her presentation was unexpectedly and surprisingly good for how she looked and who she was. P-1 seemed to have some negative feelings from it. However, she has come a long way to be able to embrace the challenge in her cultural identity and professional development, so she is able to deal with these challenges gracefully today. She reflected, “I laugh with the woman and I said, ‘You weren’t disappointed and stayed. Okay, thank you. See you later.’ And I walked away from it because developmentally I was in a different place.” She stayed calm and collected without getting worked up. She seemed to see it not worth the hassle of being upset and the battle of trying to teach the women the different perspective.

Embracing the Difference as a Bonus

P-1 mentioned about working hard as an RE minority several times. She tried to see this additional pressure of an RE minority as motivation to grow and a natural part of professional development. She also even went further by calling it “a bonus” because it made her better at what she did in the process of “overcompensating to become as good

as the majority people” or becoming perceived as good. She shared, “I’m still nervous if I can’t deliver what I need to deliver. So, I have embraced the pressure and the stress of being different as opposed to making me bitter and mad about what is happening around me.”

She continued to try to figure out how to “embrace” all additional challenges as an RE minority and “make sense of” her experiences and herself in them, so she could help others including her supervisees. She saw another “bonus” as minority because of her different experiences and perspectives, especially in the context of increasing diversity in the U.S. Her view was, “I have a different lens because I see it from my own experiences of being dismissed and not valued, and undervalued at best... I think by being from a different culture, I can advocate for people.”

She even went further to call the “bonus” as an RE minority a “gift” to use and share with clients and future professionals in the field.

We are actually a gift to our professional community because of our own struggles, because of the understandings of minorities’ struggles, so we become a cultural broker between students in the field and their clients that come and see us.

Here she called a “different experience,” a “different perception,” or a “different kind of conversation” as a “gift.” The difference experienced by minorities can improve the therapeutic and training process, if not just by providing another option. Just like the process of counseling in which we do not always see the result, she emphasized that minority professionals needed to have faith in the fact that our difference makes a difference.

We have to, as a minority, believe that we are making a difference just by our existence. Just our knowledge, just the fact that we have different experiences... It's a gift to the field. Opening up different kinds of conversations.

No Mentors

Unfortunately, P-1 had little support and no mentors in her professional development, which made her experiences much harder for her.

I didn't have any mentors. I did not have anyone telling me you are good at anything. All I heard when I was in a graduate school that 'you are not going to be successful.' No one told me 'you are going to be okay.'

It seemed very painful to her to bear these experiences of misunderstanding, the lack of support, not to mention the discouragement from the people she thought would be helpful. She also saw other minorities not having good mentors and support. She thought that one fellow minority professional of hers might have been misguided. She even perceived this misguidance as racism while her fellow professional took it as a benevolent act to help him.

He is an amazing therapist, so he could have been a mentor for many African American supervisees. But they told him, 'No, no, no. The field does not need you as a teacher nor as a supervisor. Go become a therapist.' So, he did. He believed them and 20 years later when I told him that what they did to you was criminal, he said, 'no, they wanted the best for me.' So, that's the difference between my personality and his. I see it as racism. He sees it as they loved me and they wanted to protect me.

She mentioned that they did not have a lot of minority supervisors or mentors in the field in the past and even today, so there was a "great need for minority supervisors for majority people and minority people because we have different perspectives." She tried to mentor and help minorities go through this developmental process more effectively because she did not have this in her own experiences.

I don't want that to happen to other minorities, so I make sure that I meet with students that are minorities. I talk about my experiences in different class and say, 'This is how I got to survive in this field.'

"Surviving" the field could be very trying and difficult. When she was faced with challenges as a minority, she found "the connections with other minorities are helpful." She thought, "We need to become a support system to help each other not to feel crazy, alone, and judged."

Connections with other minorities who could understand these experiences seemed to be an antidote to losing sanity and defense to stay healthy to survive as minority. She thought that they needed to support each other intentionally since there were not enough minority supervisors, so it could be hard for them to be visible and be connected for support. She said, "I think there should be more of us. I think we need to work hard to stay connected in the community and help other minorities continue with the path that we have taken. Hang in there no matter what." Through reading, research, and writing, she "always had been connected, somehow to minorities." She thought that it had "helped to keep her in a good place" because she knew that she was "not alone" in this. She said that "continuing to be connected to people who are doing the same kind of work is the best way to continue this work."

Supervision Process

P-1 cautioned not to assume, because there is diversity within diversity. This complexity made her supervision experiences "emotionally all over the place" for her in addition to the challenge of dealing with her multiples roles she played in supervision.

I have had White supervisees who are very culturally sensitive. I've had, you know, minority supervisees who are not. So, I have to be open to that. We have students who are minorities and they are so bad when it comes to culture.

It was very crucial to remain open to anything because the status of majority vs. minority did not guarantee what to expect from supervisees. She also saw supervision as an emotional process in which supervisees could be challenged and might feel judged in its process. She said she would handle cultural issues “the same way as she handled other topics,” so she saw them integral to clinical issues. She tried to help supervisees empathize with clients and see what it was like to be in their positions.

What I can be challenging you, if you are a woman, I can be challenging you about providing good therapy to men. If you are a man, I may be challenging you and saying you are clueless about what’s happening to women. So, someone comes with culture, I then need to challenge you and say, ‘You do not have an understanding of what’s happening to this person.’

She tried to prepare supervisees for the difficult cultural discussions in supervision. She tried to make the supervision process transparent by explaining what her supervisees could experience in supervision and letting supervisees know that she was open to feedback from them. She seemed to balance between a direct approach and a collaborative one.

I usually say, ‘What I am about to say may be emotional for all of us at different levels.’ I may say, ‘This is going to be difficult, so tell me how this is affecting you.’ I would say, ‘What I’m about to challenge you about may be something you didn’t think you would be challenged on.’

It was obvious that she was aware that it would be challenging to supervisees.

Nonetheless, the process sounded difficult for both parties. Here, she expected that it was part of the training process that students would not like what she said to them and challenged them with. She even went beyond that. She had to take a risk of not being liked by students in order to develop cultural competency in students.

I always say, 'If you ever liked me and thought that I am a good teacher, this class isn't going to change your mind. This is going to be a difficult class and you are not going to like me.'

In this difficult process, she at times felt "annoyed" and "frustrated" as she thought, "Why can't White people know more about the challenges that minorities have?" She then "realized that they just haven't been exposed" to different cultures or different experiences, so she was able to "have a lot of empathy for them."

She also saw the cultural identity development as a very personal process which she thought was tied to self-of-therapist issues, so she also proceeded with supervision with a lot of sensitivity.

I over time have become very conscious of that what I say matters, that I have to be careful, that I have to make sense, that I have to do something to balance my own perception and other person's perception and know that many of these people haven't been exposed.

She could identify with the struggle the majority had. Simultaneously, this was an additional layer of a challenge to her as an RE minority since there were very few minority supervisors who could support her. She did not get the reassurance or validation to this paradoxical experience between the pain from not being liked and empathy for her supervisees' lack of cultural exposures. She went even further and highlighted the need for minorities to challenge themselves as supervisors or educators.

The fact is that we are in the field we need to be challenging ourselves and staying true to ourselves, so we can provide better education, or at least different kind of education. It may not be better, but at least different kind of education for supervisees.

While she offered “different kind of education,” she underwent the hard and exhausting process of providing multicultural education and supervision. She vacillated between her sense of duty and feeling of wanting to quit because the stress was too much.

It’s a balance between ‘Ah, this is hard,’ and ‘I need to be doing this...’ Every year I teach a multicultural class, I say ‘I won’t do this again because it’s so hard. This is emotionally exhausting.’ And then a year after, I say, ‘No, I can’t stop teaching this course. I *have* to be here. I have to...’ because it changes... Some people say, ‘Well, thank you. You gave me so much to think about.’ Other students say, ‘I hate you forever.’

Because of this painful challenge, she took a further step and emphasized that they “really have to think about this as their calling.”

She thought that this cross-cultural exposure was very important and critical in the field as diversity continues to increase, so minorities need to maintain efforts to educate. However, the most important and hardest part of the process is to manage the negative or painful reactions from others. Here she talked about how she dealt with them.

We have to *not* personalize it. I think that’s the most important part of our job. As a minority, do not personalize people’s reactions to us. Because the minute we make it personal and say that’s not fair to me, we get stuck where we ‘poor me,’ and ‘why people treat me this way,’ ‘I’m sick and tired of being treated the way I do,’ so it takes us away from the good work we do.’

This might sound easy, but it seemed to be very difficult to do, even for her. At the end, she realized that she helped students and supervisees better than American colleagues because she had her unique experiences as an RE minority. This difference became a “gift” and ended up validating her work and helped her continue with her work.

I think my clients, students, colleagues, and supervisors over time have so much to do with that. They saw I can make a difference and they said ‘Thank you.’ They said ‘Wow, I thought what do you know about American culture, and then I realized that you helped me more than American therapists.’ I got a lot of feedback from my colleague, students, supervisors, and clients. That helped me

build my personality... I was in the position of power and people who had less power than me said, 'You are in the position of power and I have to listen to you, but you actually make sense.'

She took their comments that she actually helped as a compliment or appreciation of her work rather than as superficial respect for her authority. As a part of the progression in her cultural identity development, "social justice work had become very important" to her. She "looked at other people's writing on social justice" for validation and encouragement. She thought, "Reading books, reading philosophy books, thinking about the nature of capitalism, thinking about race/ethnicity, writing about race/ethnicity, and interviewing people for research articles about their experiences kept me going..." She took the diversity issue to another level of social justice in the field, which in turn encouraged her to continue with her "calling."

Structural Analysis

Surviving the Field as an RE Minority in the U.S.

P-1 came to the U.S. when there was a diplomatic crisis between her country of origin and the U.S. She was well aware of the international political tension surrounding her country of origin and what she symbolized to people in the U.S. There was negative sentiment against her nationality and her religion. This has greatly influenced her experiences as an RE minority in the U.S. She perceived that her culture was not as valued as the Western culture was. She felt that her nationality and her religion were perceived as adversarial. Therefore, she had experiences as such. This made her question everything about her being: her appearance, speech, culture, and worth as a person. She felt judged, questioned, and less valued. As a result, she had to work harder to be perceived and treated the same way as the majority people were.

In addition, she encountered a different kind of obstacle in her training program. The program tried to dissuade her and other minorities from becoming therapists, supervisors, and educators. The interesting dynamics of this was that the program acted as if they were doing a favor to her and her fellow students and trying to “protect” them, but she perceived it as doubting and discrediting their ability and competency. This led to her personal and professional journey of proving herself to and gaining credibility from others

Negative Emotions

The complexity of surviving the field made her feel “emotionally all over the place.” P-1 unfortunately experienced a lot of negative emotions from the challenges of surviving. At the beginning, she took stereotyping and judging by others personally. This led to feelings of annoyance and anger. This was even harder since she faced these microaggressions every day. The daily encounters chipped her self-worth away and confronted her cultural identity. Furthermore, she did not have a buffer of support and mentors, so it was very easy for her to eventually internalize these experiences. This set her up to feel “crazy” because of the discrepancy between what she knew she truly was capable of and what the context, such as the political climate, imposed on her, in addition to the lack of understanding of her diversity issues in the field. This led her to undergo “a very slow painful dreading process” of surviving the field.

For her to survive the field without support in the U.S., she resorted to her own secure attachment and familial support. This helped her to fight back against the daily microaggressions towards her. She rebelled against the microaggressions and saw them as a “challenge” she needed to surmount. This resulted in her on-going quest of working

harder and proving that she was as good as others. Unfortunately, there was no end to this journey. As a chair of a department and even with the amount of authority and power, she still continued to experience these challenges. Eventually, the journey shifted its direction from fight to acceptance. Her more mature and advanced cultural identity let small microaggressions go since it was not worth fighting every single battle while she persevered with the journey of proving herself.

“Proving Herself” and “Gaining Credibility” as an RE Minority

P-1 utilized different strategies to prove herself and gain credibility. One strategy was for her to use a sense of humor by “making fun of” herself. This was used as a defense mechanism to diffuse the negative stereotype toward her culture. However, it also might put herself and her culture down in the process of making others feel comfortable with her. Her ability was questioned continuously due to her nationality and culture. It was helpful to her that she had students who had to take her class, which provided her an opportunity to prove that “she knew what she was talking about.” It was a long hard process of proving herself.

In the meantime, she also strived to see this challenge of proving self as a universal process in which everyone had to prove him/herself. She conceptualized this in a few different ways. Firstly, this was not just a minority issue, which meant everyone could be a minority by focusing on the most disempowered variable among different multicultural variables a person possessed. Diversity issues and clinical issues came together and were integrated. There was no difference between these issues, so everyone had to prove. She had all different multicultural variables such as age, gender, and sexual orientations in mind. She also thought that minorities were as good as the majority were,

so it is not a just minority issue to prove themselves. It is everyone's process. If we looked at it as just a minority issue, it would reinforce the deficient stereotype of minorities. Another point she emphasized was that she tried to help minority students overcome the feeling of self-pity from needing to prove themselves and work harder, since everyone had to work hard. This might help them stay focused on the task and continue with the work they did instead of being stuck wondering why they could not get a break. She was also aware of the reality of the dichotomy between minority versus majority. The difference was based on the context of geography, time, and political climate. She readily knew that she was the majority in her own county against other foreigners from other countries. She seemed to try to take responsibility for this fact.

Transcending the Challenges

By calling the additional challenges of being an RE minority as a "bonus," P-1 turned them into motivation to grow personally and saw them as part of the process of professional development. This helped her become better at her clinical work, supervision, and academic work since she "overcompensated" for her perceived deficiency and discredit by others. This also helped her overcome her hard feelings from the daily encounter with microaggressions. This process also tied to her cultural identity development. She constantly tried to figure out who she was and to make sense of her experiences in relation to the context. She then strived to embrace the challenges in spite of the negative feelings. With the rapidly diversifying trend in the U.S., she also saw the difference that was a source of the hardship as a "gift," since the difference presented to minorities a different experience, a different perspective, and a different kind of conversation. As a result, the difference would help them advocate for people, especially

minorities. At the same time, she continued to underscore the growing pain of the developmental process and highlighted the importance of believing that the difference from our existence in the field itself was making a difference.

Lack of Support and Mentors

Her experiences were impacted by her lack of support and mentors. P-1 was not encouraged to continue and guided to be successful. She had to figure out the process on her own through trials and errors. Furthermore, her heightened awareness of the challenges gave her a different perspective. She saw some of the seemingly benevolent acts to minorities as racism to put them back in a certain category or position. She perceived it as discouraging and deceptively misleading to them. Thus, this led to the perpetuating lack of minority clinicians, educators, and supervisors in the professional field. Since she was aware of the lack of minority supervisors and mentors in the field both in the past and currently, she did not want minority students and supervisees to go through the same experiences as hers and tried to mentor them. In the process, she used and shared her own experiences to help them. She was also well aware of the need of support for herself and found that she needed to be connected with other minorities in the field in order to survive. This prevented her from feeling “crazy, alone, and judged.” She maintained connections and support through reading, research, writing, and conferences.

Managing Cultural Discussions as an RE Minority Supervisor

Here P-1 more focused on the supervision process. She was aware of diversity within diversity, so she was open to the fact that some minority supervisees were culturally unaware and insensitive. Conversely, some White students were extremely culturally competent. This might be tied to her assertion that it was a challenge for

everyone to prove him/herself and she did not discriminate cultural issues from other clinical or diversity issues. The apparent status of majority or minority might not be a good indicator of racial or cultural identity development and competency. It might be more related to what kind of power or status difference supervisees experienced and how they overcame it. She had to help supervisees develop cultural competency by empathizing with them while challenging them simultaneously and tactfully. She was cognizant of this emotional process of supervision that could critique personal experiences and values of supervisees. This was closely tied to the work of self-of-therapist. She strived to balance her perception and supervisees' perceptions sensitively. She knew that supervisees would feel judged or that their world views might be questioned. She managed it both collaboratively and directly by preparing supervisees for difficult discussions. She explained the supervision process, possible experiences from it, and her openness to feedback from supervisees. She tried to make the process as transparent as possible.

As a consequence of the fact that she was aware of supervisees' struggles, she had to manage her own challenges of their reactions from their struggles in supervision. The supervision process can be difficult since she was to promote supervisees' clinical and professional development. She had to challenge them about multicultural competency. She then had to take a chance not to be liked by them because of her push to facilitate their multicultural competency. She had to have courage, wisdom, and health to live with not being liked, or even being hated by supervisees in the process of helping them. Naturally, she felt "frustrated," not to mention "annoyed." She wondered why White supervisees could not get it or could be even more open to understanding it. She then

was to empathize with them that they just did not have exposures to different experiences, so she just needed to help them work through the process with her knowledge and their direct experiences with her. It was consequently a lot of pressure on her. She was forced in a position where she had to manage two conflicting notions between “I won’t do this again because it’s so hard and exhausting” and “I can’t stop teaching. I have to be here.” She suggested considering it as her “calling.” It was obvious that she had a sense of duty. It was cruelly hard to take the comment such as “I hate you forever” when she was doing her job and tried to help them.

She shared her wisdom of not personalizing these reactions. Internalizing them would make supervisors reactive and prevent them from being effective and helpful to supervisees. She also advised minorities to challenge themselves and stay true to themselves, even when it felt too hard, so they could continue to provide a different kind of education. She implied that the different education might be a better education, or their “gift.” She was eventually validated by American clients and supervisees that she helped them more than American professionals did, so her difference became a “gift” in addition to a challenge. She continues to advance her interest and efforts to social justice issues in the field today.

Textual-Structural Description

P-1 is originally from the Middle East and came to the United States as an adult to pursue higher degrees. She obtained her bachelor’s, master’s, and Ph.D. degrees in the U.S., and she has lived here for three decades. Her foreign status was obvious to Americans because of her name, her accent, and her appearance such as clothes. Her experiences in the U.S. were impacted by the historical tension between the Middle East

and the U.S. When she discussed her supervisory experiences, she also shared her own training, her clinical work, and teaching experience. Her degrees were related to working with families. She had a private practice and had an interest in working with different cultures, immigrants, and their families. She taught graduate level classes including multicultural counseling. These different experiences were interwoven and influenced her professional and cultural identity development. She continues to currently face some of the same experiences she had in the past as a new comer.

P-1's experiences as an RE minority in the U.S. have been influenced by the diplomatic tension between her country of origin and the U.S. She became aware of negative sentiments against her nationality and her religion, and what she represented to people in the U.S. She felt that her culture was not as valued as Western culture. In addition, her culture was perceived as adversarial. She describes an example of the media's perception of her ethnicity when she first moved to the U.S. by citing a popular Disney movie:

In Aladdin, they have all these Middle Eastern bad guys with very thick Arabic accent, and so that's Disney's way of making this ingrained in kids' perception of this. As kids grow and think about this kind of accent, they automatically think about bad guys. These people are no good, or up to no good. And it got complicated with diplomatic crises. It got complicated with political turmoil in my country. It is a very complicated history between the U.S. and my country. I got smacked right in the middle of it. When I arrived in this country was right after the diplomatic crisis. People hated, hated, and hated us.

As a person from the Middle East, P-1 faced negative stereotypes in the U.S. She was viewed as the enemy. The way she was perceived in the U.S. made her question everything about her identity: her appearance, speech, culture, and worth as a human being. She spoke about feeling judged, devalued, and attacked. P-1 was keenly

conscious of the negative sentiments and stereotypes toward her and other Middle Easterners in the U.S., so she tried to overcome them with her sense of humor. She used humor to diffuse tensions of others. Self-deprecation was a compensating strategy for her to counter potentially negative attitudes toward Middle Eastern people. She joked about herself to make Americans feel more comfortable around her:

I noticed that I made fun of myself before anyone else made fun of me. I make fun of my scarf. I make fun of my accent. You know, I do that because I don't want people to actually do it. So, over time, I realized that and made it conscious. And said this is what I am doing. I am trying to put people at ease by saying I know how you perceive me.

She tried to protect her relationships with others in the U.S. to survive challenges of her professional field. Therefore, she did not challenge this microaggression toward her. Moreover, she encountered a different kind of obstacle in her academic training program as a student. The faculty in her training program unconsciously tried to dissuade her and other minorities from becoming therapists, supervisors, and educators. The staff acted like they were trying to "protect" her and other students. On the contrary, she experienced it as doubting and discrediting her ability and competency. When she reflected on those experiences, the message she received was:

'You just get a degree in the program and then go back to your country and tell people you are a therapist. Nobody will notice.' Right. I said, 'Why can't I become a therapist?' They said, 'It's not you. No one will come to see you because people think that you don't understand them. And you have an accent. People do not want to talk about their problems to people that have an accent. And also your name cannot be pronounced. The way you look is weird, so people do not want to come and talk to you. It's not anything about you. We love you. And everything about you is wrong. So, we are just trying to be helpful to you.'

P-1 was discouraged. She also encountered other stereotypes surrounding the Middle East. She initially took this stereotyping personally. As a result, she felt hurt, angry, and

alone with the challenges of surviving the field. There was another situation where she and her student presented at a conference, which illustrated the stereotype. They had different perceptions of a compliment they received from a member of their audience. She saw through the stereotype when it was presented positively at the surface level:

My student I was presenting with was so happy that he was getting these compliments, 'I thought you weren't going to be good, but you were good.' And I'm thinking this is really racist. I mean, a back handed compliment. She was so clueless telling me that 'I thought you weren't going to be good.' I have been hearing that for the past 20 years. People come to me and say 'You were *actually* funny.' The word, 'actually' means that she wasn't expecting [that I would be good]. It's the expectation they have [that I would not be good]. They have to get proven wrong. It used to bother me and I got annoyed and said, 'Heck with you people.' You know. You put me in a category.

There was a big discrepancy between the positive intent of others and the negative perception she had about these experiences. This seemingly positive compliment made her feel judged and less capable. These microaggressions toward her identity made her feel annoyed and frustrated. Due to the negative feelings and the lack of validation, she had to endure "a very slow painful dreading process" of surviving the field. In the process, she initially internalized her negative experiences, so she felt that she was to blame for them. She was forced to deal with this mystifying dual reality, whether she liked it or not. These encounters led to what is identified as internalized oppression. She elaborated the process of working through it as:

Because at that time I was going through [the process], I thought that I was crazy. I'm no good. It's my issue. It's not a program's issue. It's no one else's issue except mine. Now I understand that it's not my issue. So, I tell the students that 'It's not you. It's the context that creates the situation for you.'

She initially took the negative messages personally, which was painful. However, she later was able to externalize the problem and place its responsibility back on the

particular political context. She was resilient and fended off the microaggression. These experiences made her empathic to others in similar situations, especially minorities. She shared her experiences with students to help them with their struggles. She could also consider this as a “challenge” she needed to surmount. This resulted in her on-going quest to work harder and prove that she was as good as people from the U.S.

Even with these challenging experiences as an RE minority, P-1 used a broader perspective in her work. She was aware of the diversity even within a cultural group. The racial and ethnic status of the majority or the minority group was not always the best gauge cultural competency.

I have had White supervisees who are very culturally sensitive. I’ve had, you know, minority supervisees who are not. So, I have to be open to that. We have students who are minorities and they are so bad when it comes to culture.

Her experiences disproved the assumptions that minority students were culturally sensitive and White students were not. Cultural sensitivity is a challenge for everyone, and everyone needs to prove that he/she is competent; not just the minorities. According to P-1, cultural issues are interwoven into clinical issues. Therefore, they should be treated just like clinical issues. This would help minority supervisees to deal with the tendency of feeling sorry for themselves when they face their challenges. Therefore, she strived to help all supervisees develop cultural competency by empathizing with them and simultaneously challenging them tactfully. She explained the difficult process of supervision:

I usually say, ‘What I am about to say may be emotional for all of us at different levels. This is going to be difficult, so tell me how this is affecting you. What I’m about to challenge you about may be something you didn’t think you would be challenged on.’

I over time have become conscious that what I say matters, that I have to be careful, that I have to make sense, that I have to do something to balance my own perception and others' perceptions, and that many of people haven't been exposed.

She was direct, but collaborative at the same time. She also tried to make the process as transparent as possible by explaining it explicitly. She was careful because she was aware that some supervisees struggled with their perceptions being challenged. This could also be their first exposure to a different culture or perception. Consequently, she had to manage and deal with their reactions. The supervision process could be difficult for both her supervisees and herself, but she needed to face it to promote their clinical and professional development, even at the cost of not being liked by her students.

I always say, 'If you ever liked me and thought that I am a good teacher, this class isn't going to change your mind [about multicultural issues]. This is going to be a difficult class and you are not going to like me.'

It was a difficult task for her to manage students who did not like her challenging their perceptions. Consequently, she had to deal with her own negative feelings toward these students. She felt frustrated that White supervisees could not understand or could not be more open to understanding about what she was trying to teach. However, she was able to empathize with their limited exposure to different experiences and understand their difficulty with a different perception. She used her knowledge and wisdom to help them work through their direct experiences with her. Consequently, this imposed a lot of pressure on her. She narrated the experience of vacillating between wanting to quit teaching the subject and feeling the need to continue:

It's a balance between 'Ah, this is hard,' and 'I need to be doing this.' Every year I teach a multicultural class, I say, 'I won't do this again because it's so hard. This is emotionally exhausting.' I then say, 'No, I can't stop teaching this course.'

I have to be here. Some students say, 'Well, thank you. You gave me so much to think about.' Others say, 'I hate you forever.'

This was a very challenging process she experienced when she dealt with cultural issues. What motivated her to continue was her sense of duty to this work and occasional appreciation from students. However, she did not have a lot of support in the process, especially at the beginning. This accentuated the negative aspects of her experiences in the field.

The field has lacked minority supervisors. In addition to the discouragement and the painful reactions P-1 received from others, her experiences were impacted by the lack of mentors and support. She had to figure out how to survive the field on her own through the prolonged process of trial and error.

I didn't have any mentors. I did not have anyone telling me I was good at anything. All I heard when I was in a graduate school was that I was not going to be successful. No one told me I was going to be okay.

P-1 received little guidance, validation, and encouragement for her work. It was challenging for her to tolerate the lack of understanding and support from the people she thought would be helpful. She felt isolated and alone. At the same time, other minorities also did not have good mentors and support. She, therefore, did not want minority students and supervisees to go through the same experiences as she did. She tried to mentor them whenever she could, since she was aware of the general lack of minority supervisors and mentors in the field.

I don't want that to happen to other minorities, so I make sure that I meet with students that are minorities. I talk about my experiences in different classes and say, 'This is how I got to survive in this field.'

She shared her story of survival as an RE minority with students, especially with minority students, as part of the mentoring process. She was also well aware of her own need for support in order to continue to survive and mentor others, so she strived to be connected with other minorities in the field.

We [minorities] need to become a support system to help each other not to feel crazy, alone, and judged.

I think there should be more of us [minorities]. We need to work hard to stay connected in the community and help other minorities continue with the path that we have taken. Hang in there no matter what.

Staying connected with other minorities was difficult. She intentionally maintained these connections through reading, research, writing, and conferences. She thought, “Reading books, reading philosophy books, thinking about the nature of capitalism, thinking about race/ethnicity, writing about race/ethnicity, and interviewing people for research articles about their experiences kept me going.” In addition to these resources, she relied on her own internal resiliency and support from her family. This helped her continue to see her survival as a challenge she needed to overcome.

P-1’s challenges contributed to her development in a number of ways. For example, it was a long, hard process of proving herself because her competency was questioned continuously due to her nationality and culture. In order to transcend this challenge, she strived to see this challenge as a universal experience, which eventually led to her “calling”. She described the process:

I always thought I was a foreigner and people were going to say, ‘I do not want to listen to this person’ when I presented. Over time I realized that White people got more nervous than I was. I wondered, ‘Why do I think that it’s because I have an accent while they have many other issues?’ I had to get over the first five minutes. I know that what I am talking about and I am very competent about the topic. Somehow, it has become my calling. It has become part of my training that I tell

minority students that you are no different in terms of your struggles and white people's [struggles].

P-1 realized that everyone had challenges and had to prove him/herself. This was not just a minority issue. It evolved into her "calling" to educate her students, especially minority students, about the challenge and the process of proving. She thought everyone could be a minority by focusing on a different cultural variable such as age, gender, sexual orientation and socioeconomic status. She viewed that diversity issues and clinical issues were intertwined and integrated. There was no significant difference between these two issues. Therefore, everyone had to deal with them. She also believed that minorities were as good as the majority were. If people looked at the challenge as just a minority issue, it would reinforce the deficient stereotype of minorities.

There was also an issue of taking the struggles personally. It became P-1's "calling" to help minority students overcome self-pity stemming from their need to work harder and to prove themselves, by teaching that everyone had to work hard. This helped them stay focused on the task and continue with the work they were doing instead of continuously wondering why they could not get a break. She was aware of polarization between minority and majority. The difference was based on the context of geography, time, and political climate. She knew that she was the majority in her home country. She took responsibility for this fact by considering multiple perspectives. At the same time, there were the additional challenges of being an RE minority which she called them a "bonus," and even a "calling" at the end:

I was able to understand that this was hard because I was different and was from another culture, but then I thought it added a bonus to me because I had to become better at what I did and I wanted to prove that I knew what I was talking about. Overcompensating helps all of us.

[Minorities] really have to think about this as their calling. They have to think about this as something important. They have to *not* personalize it. I think that's the most important part of our job. As a minority, do not personalize people's reactions to us. Because the minute we make it personal and say that's not fair to me, we get stuck where we 'poor me,' and 'why people treat me this way,' 'I'm sick and tired of being treated the way I do,' so it takes us away from the good work we do.

By referring to these additional challenges as a "bonus," she turned them into motivation to grow personally, and saw them as part of the process of professional and cultural development. This encouraged her become better at her clinical work, supervision, and academic work since she strived to disprove her perceived deficiency and discredit from others. This also motivated her to overcome her daily encounter with microaggressions. It prevented her from internalizing such treatment. This process was also tied to her cultural identity development. She constantly tried to make sense of her experiences and to figure out who she was in this specific context. With the rapidly diversifying trend in the U.S., she saw her uniqueness as a "gift" because it presented to minorities a different experience, a different perspective, and a different kind of story. As she reflected, she emphasized that:

We *are* actually a gift to our professional community because of our own struggles, because of the understandings of minorities' struggles, so we become a cultural broker between students in the field and their clients that come and see us.

[Even with all the struggles] We have to, as a minority, believe that we are making a difference just by our existence, our knowledge, and the fact that we have different experiences. It's a gift to the field. It opens up different kinds of conversations.

As a result, being different would help them advocate for all people, especially minorities. The challenges became resources. She continued to underscore the growing

pain of the developmental process, and highlighted the importance of believing that racial and cultural differences within the field were making a difference even with the struggles. Ultimately, she believes that these differences are an asset to the profession.

CHAPTER FIVE: PARTICIPANT TWO

Textual Analysis

P-2 was born and raised in a Caribbean country. She came to the U.S. because her husband got a job here. She attended school in the U.S., but she could not complete her Ph.D. due to an illness. She has practiced clinically for 30 years and provided supervision for 16 years. Racially, she looked Caucasian. However, she had a thick Spanish accent when she spoke.

Lack of Minority Professionals in the Community and the Field

In her state, P-2 was one of the few minority clinicians when she started 30 years ago. She worked in a U.S. military base. She also noticed that her field lacked diversity when she attended both the state and the national conference back then. She thought that diversity was not promoted at that time. She was then the only therapist who was Hispanic and spoke Spanish or a different language, so clients who did not speak English were sent to her from a large area. She said, “I then got a lot of referrals from my state and two neighbor states, people who did not speak English and they needed a therapist. There is no therapist in my state at least that I saw...”

The lack of diversity unfortunately resulted in the lack of understanding of diversity. This led to the interesting experience that she was lumped into a category of non-English speaking people. This kind of stereotyping was common. She went on to describe the experience:

I found also at that time when I was working at the department of social services, they referred to me everyone that had an accent, Asian, Hispanic, German sometimes, whoever had an accent was referred to me, so I saw that people did not pay attention to the fact that that I do have an accent, but I only speak Spanish and English.

P-2 was aware that culture and race could impact therapy. She shared her assumption that minority clients' biases might impede the rapport building with majority therapists.

Minority therapists might also encounter the same challenge with clients from a different culture than theirs.

Clients have their own biases that some way I think slow down... I am not saying that Caucasian therapists will not be effective with Afro Americans, but probably it would take a longer time to develop trust at least needed in therapy. It might take a longer time...

She also had some concerns about effectiveness of therapy if Spanish speaking clients had therapy in English. Spanish clients were possibly short changed. She underscored the importance of a culture beyond a language, such as similar experiences, appearance, and knowledge. She also assumed that if a therapist was of the same race as a client's, a client would initially feel more comfortable with and like the therapist. Therefore, they would be more open to trusting and sharing in the therapeutic process.

As a matter of fact, I have found in my experiences with Hispanics who came to me and said that they don't speak the language and they have been therapy with English speaking therapists, I questioned the validity or effectiveness of therapy myself because you don't understand the language. How can you do the therapy? You know, that's one of the things that I assume. So, I think that we need more therapists who are from their cultural background in order to be able to... not only to understand the culture, but also to develop trust faster, so therapy would be probably a lot more effective if you are dealing with someone who looks like you and talks like you.

Professionals lacked multicultural competency since it was not promoted in the past. The lack of diversity in the field was her reason and motivation to be a supervisor. P-2 especially wanted to increase the number of Hispanic therapists in the field because "America was becoming more brown."

I decided to be a supervisor in order to see if I can motivate some Hispanics to be a therapist and at the same time other minorities to be a therapist because it was important to me that in my little world Hispanics get therapy when I am not going to be here.

As a foreigner in the U.S., she was able to understand her clients' challenges. She "tried her best to help them as much as she could" when there were cultural and linguistic differences between her and her clients. Because of the cultural differences and the strong accent when she spoke in English, there were some difficulties for both of them to communicate. Nevertheless, she was able to help them well and she got feedback from them that she was "a good therapist." This provided her with a lot of cultural experiences.

Diversity in the Military Community

P-2 also had a lot of cultural experiences from working in a U.S. military base. The U.S. sent its troops overseas and had its military bases all over the world. This made her U.S. military base a diverse community since soldiers brought back culture they experienced. She mentioned an example of challenges the diverse population had:

This community that was very culturally oriented because Army has a lot of different communities... people from Germany, people from Italy, a lot of Hispanics because they come from South America, even Asians because military goes to Korea, Japan... They happen to marry there and bring their wives here. So, I did a lot of work with wives of military members that were brought here and became very depressed because of the change of the environment.

Therefore, she ended up having a lot of experiences with cultural issues, and she also had supervision from a retired coroner of the Army who worked with culture due to the diverse community. She gave a lot of presentations about cultural issues, especially Hispanics in therapy. She also presented on military families since she worked in a military base.

Because of this diversity, she was able to easily “get people who wanted to learn about different cultures and wanted to do therapy with different cultures” for supervision. However, the majority of her supervisees were White. She had a few minorities such as a Caribbean and a Native American.

So, people knew I had a little bit of knowledge about cultural issues. So, they had an interest in getting that kind of clients there. That was my first group. I was fortunate enough to have people who wanted to do this work. They respected what I had to say. Since then, I have supervised many different cultures... I had done one Haitian, many groups of Hispanics... I have supervised about five Hispanics to become a therapist. I also supervised one gay... I have a lot of experiences... but I know that I am not an expert...

P-2 stated that they “wanted to learn how to do therapy with Hispanics” from her because she was considered culturally competent. At the same time, she was aware that she was not an expert on every culture.

Cultural Competency of the Interviewee

Throughout the interview, P-2 showed her cultural competency. However, she was not always culturally competent in her career. Race was less of a problem in her country of origin, so she went through a journey of developing cultural and racial awareness since she came to the U.S.

At the beginning when I came to the U.S. I began to study at University of Connecticut. It's a very big university. I had very good teachers. I did not know about discrimination, really, because I was born in my own country. I did not know when I came to the U.S. that you will be discriminated and I will be discriminated. Because I was from a country where I was equal and everyone was equal. For me, dark skin was not a problem because my father has dark skin like Caribbean. He was a brown Caribbean. The difference in culture and the difference in colors were not any problem for me. It was the behavioral problems, you know, the behavioral differences. So, some of those teachers challenged me to pay attention to the reaction of people towards me when I open my mouth. Because you see, I'm a clear skinned Caribbean, but when I went to many places, they accept me without any changes in behaviors. But, when I opened my mouth,

people looked like... 'Where are you from?' That kind of thing. You could see the difference in them... it's not that it was rejection, but some were surprised that I had an accent. There were some who changed totally because at that time, being from my country was not cool.

She was proud of her own culture and nationality. In this new context of the U.S., she was forced to learn about the stereotypes of people from her country.

I was very proud to be from my country. I'm still proud. Very proud to be from the country. In some way, it's a little bias in a sense that many Caribbeans move to the U.S. and there was a certain bias toward them because some of them were very poor and some of their behaviors were not good.

P-2 called this journey of cultural competency development "an educational process."

She faced the complicated intersection of multicultural variables of race, nationality, and gender. People in the U.S. questioned her credibility because she was a female Hispanic with a strong accent.

At that time, some people would not like to relate to people from my country. We still have people who are like that. It was easier for me being a light skinned person from my country. But when I showed I had an accent, the reception of people was totally different. Being a woman and Hispanic, when you say something, they will question it. Often when you have an accent, you are not perceived as being that smart. And then when I open my mouth and began talking with an accent, people would say, 'You know, you are not that dummy.' That kind of thing. I think it was a very educational process for me.

As an RE minority in the U.S., she developed sensitivity to any changes of reactions from others as she learned the biases toward her nationality from the U.S. culture. She continued to be aware of the reactions. As a result of this process, she also became aware of her own biases and her clients' biases to her. She made efforts not to let them interfere with the therapeutic and supervisory process and its effectiveness by examining her own values and the values of her family of origin.

It's okay to have your own biases because it's your value system... I remember my mother saying to me, 'Don't you ever bring a person with tattoo in my house.' I saw my son dating some people who have tattoo and said, 'If my mother sees this, she would not be happy.' Would I be happy? You would pay attention to those biases and explain that to supervisees. Your values are very present in any interactions you have. It does not mean that you are going to say that these values are okay. It means that you look back and say that this would not be accepted in my family system, so how can I pay attention so that it does not influence my interactions with my supervisees and my clients because I do have biases, too.

Multiculturalism as Everyone's Issue

P-2 was aware that everyone had biases including clients, so therapists needed to pay attention to it in order to provide therapy effectively. She thought that a therapist inevitably had to manage the biases of a client as well as their own. Therefore, a person would do a better job as a therapist if she or he paid attention to her/his values and assumptions. She shared, "If you have a Caucasian therapist doing therapy with an Afro American client, it's going to be biases if you like it or not."

She then expanded multicultural issues to even clinical issues. She advised all therapists to examine their biases, not only about traditional multicultural issues but also different aspects of their lives that were considered clinical issues such as a marital status.

Not only my nationality, my status of being married, my religion, my having children... all these things has made me who I am. That difference in some way is the way I am going to look at life and also influence the way how I look at a problem and look at an issue. When someone is divorcing, that will influence the way you view your own problem. I will pay attention to the supervisee's personal problems that they are divorcing. The couple is fighting a lot. Things like that some way influence divorce. When I do therapy, I go with the idea that being married is okay. You can work things out if you can talk, if you can communicate, if you don't go with anger toward marriage... when someone is divorcing, that's their own part of culture, when someone is divorcing, they go with their own anger into the session. They have to be aware of that. When I talk to a supervisee, I tell them that I have my own biases. I believe in marriage. I will not tell you, 'don't divorce if you want to divorce.' That's not... It's your

issue. I have my own biases. I am going to see ways you can communicate and I am going to see ways you can deal with each other to stay married if that's you want, be a better parent if you are a parent, and things like that. I am not going to be able to influence that client into a goal. I am not going to influence them into being married, but I am not going to influence them into divorce.

In addition to self-examination for developing multicultural competency, P-2 pushed the need to work on one's self-of-therapist issues to become a better therapist and to develop awareness of any biases in their lives on a more universal level. Since self-examination of cultural bias can be very personal, she talked about the need of addressing self-of-therapist issues, even by therapists getting their own therapy.

Because with supervisees I have to maintain certain boundaries that... talking to me about their personal life... when they begin talking to me about personal life, I would recommend them to go for therapy themselves. Sometimes, they come and say, 'I couldn't do this, I couldn't do that,' because of their own personal problems. Now I would say, 'You are not going to be a good therapist if you have to deal with your own problems. You have to have someone helping you with your problems. We think that we can handle everything with a language and with a skill, things like that. But, sometimes we need help ourselves.' That's what I tell my supervisees. Sometimes, we need to help ourselves...

While she discussed the need for self-of-therapist work, she was also aware of supervisory boundaries she had to maintain.

She tried to find her way to help supervisees address and resolve their issues in the context of supervision as a supervisor.

However, I am not their therapist, so I have to establish the boundary. I want them to understand that... I can gear them to either go to therapy or read some book, or to do something that might help them become a better therapist. That's my goal.

P-2 felt a strong sense of duty as a supervisor to help supervisees develop cultural and clinical competency.

Supervision Process

There was isomorphism between her general acculturation process and her supervision process. P-2 also discussed the parallel between therapy and supervision, that how supervisors influenced supervisees would subsequently impact how supervisees interacted with clients. Therefore, a supervisor had to pay attention to differences as well as their own biases towards these differences in supervision, so their supervisees would do the same in their therapy through a parallel process. As an RE minority supervisor, she tried to help supervisees develop multicultural competency, and the majority of her supervisees were White. In the process, she was questioned and challenged by supervisees when she asked them to ask themselves “What are my biases when I do therapy with someone who is from a different culture and how that interfere with the therapeutic process?” She shared that:

I had some supervisees who said that that wasn't going to make any difference... that they can do therapy with any different background... biases that they would come across. I had disagreed with them then, by the end of the supervisory process, they understood what I meant. I have had some resistance. But I think supervisees sometimes stay because they are challenged, sometimes their own views. When you are challenged, you run away or stay. Most of them stayed. Many wanted to learn.

P-2 continued to discuss the parallel process. When she challenged her supervisees, she experienced some “resistance.” Fortunately, most of her supervisees stayed and wanted to learn how to work cross culturally. She challenged her supervisees, so they could challenge their clients. At the same time, she had to face challenges from her supervisees, so she expected to be challenged by her supervisees.

I ask, ‘How can you work with someone you don't like. How can you help someone you don't like?’ If it is from your own culture or other cultures, you have to pay attention to that there are some clients that you are not going to like

because of their behaviors, or things they do. You have to challenge those behaviors sometimes in therapy. I also challenge these behaviors in supervision. I want them to understand there will be some clients you don't like even if they are from your own culture. Can you challenge these behaviors? I do challenge them and I expect that I am challenged sometimes.

At the same time, she tried to empathize with her supervisees by thinking about her own experiences with people from her country in the U.S. Here she talked about the stereotype of her people in the U.S. based on some of them being poor and behaving badly, "When you have, even from your own culture, behaviors that are not acceptable, you have a tendency to stay away from that group, if they are from your own culture or a different culture."

Some supervisees reacted to her when she challenged them. P-2 experienced that some supervisees became "distant" in supervision. She described the difficult and complex process of supervision, and she tried to tell herself "It's okay."

It's okay with me. You become distant, okay. Most of the time, I see that distance change with time. They begin to understand the process. Sometimes, they just go away. It's okay with me, you know. If you are a supervisee, I ask if you have a client, I challenge your behaviors, your supervision or therapy style, and whatever values and biases you have. And you decide to leave, that does mean that it's okay. You can leave. It's okay with me. I don't take it personally. I used to take it personally. No longer, you see. Yup. It's okay. That's the way you have to work in this kind of business, isn't it. You hope that a majority will stay, and that's what happened. The majority stayed. One or two in many years I have done therapy have left when they were challenged. It's okay. It means as a supervisor if you are not able to be challenged, that does tell you the quality of therapy these people are going to do. These people of mine in the future are going to be in trouble with clients because they are not able to connect with clients they have.

She took a risk of supervisees leaving supervision just like clients leaving therapy in order to challenge them to grow and develop. This was her duty as a supervisor to ensure

the quality of service. Nonetheless, it was hard for her when her supervisees left supervision because she personalized it. It also seemed that it was still hard for her to deal with because she still reassured herself that it's okay.

She also encountered resistance. Here she talked about how to deal with resistance.

You roll with resistance. You do not accept or understand what an older person is saying. We have a process that normally when we talk to somebody. We go about our own things. We begin to think about what we talk about. And many times, it happened to me, too that I said, 'I don't agree with what you are saying.' But when I go back, I begin to think about what other person said. You know, he or she has some point in this matter. I might be able to do things in a different way because of what s/he said. This is a process. There, you can become a little bit resistant or say, 'No, I did not agree with that,' or be upset about what you said. Normally, if you are a normal kind of person, you go back and think about it. You either accept it or don't accept it and it's okay.

P-2 tried to see resistance as a natural process of receiving, digesting, and finally accepting a different perspective. She also tried to embrace her supervisees' current developmental stage whether they accepted her feedback or not.

She used the cultural genogram as a tool in supervision to help supervisees "learn their own cultural background, the influence of their own background, and how that influences their interactions with clients."

When you are trying to help clients understand the interactions they have with their families, the problems they have with the families, how can you help them if you don't know your own cultural background and cultural biases and interactions? So, cultural genogram is very good to help them do that. I do get emotional sometimes when I hear some of their process some of the clients had and some of the supervisees had with their own clients or with their own interactions, because it remind me of my own interactions, especially minority supervisees. They do have some troubles adapting to the interactions they have with clients if the person is from a different culture.

She was definitely impacted by the clinical and supervision process. As she mentioned, her emotions were stirred up by stories of her clients and supervisees. She had more empathy for minority supervisees because of her own experiences as an RE minority.

Overcoming the Challenges in Supervision

Supervision can be a challenging process for a provider since it can evoke different emotions in both supervisees and supervisors. P-2 had to deal with difficult reactions from supervisees. Here she described her emotional experience of being disliked by supervisees.

It was hard. It was hard. Normally, people usually want to be liked. That's a need. That's one of the needs we have. We have needs that we should be liked by everyone. If you come from a small town in an island and you are accepted by almost everybody, you have a process of thinking that everybody should accept you, especially if you come from a family where you are well accepted. You have the premise that everybody should accept me or will accept me because my family does. You have the premise and you come from a family where you are not well liked, no one will like me because my family doesn't like me. You see. In the process, you come to the community and they are thinking everyone should accept me. Of course, you have the need. It's not easy. It hurts your feeling, doesn't it?

It was a painful process to learn how to come to terms with not being liked by supervisees, or anyone.

She further delineated the difficult process of dealing with and accepting being disliked by a supervisee in her early career as a supervisor.

I think experiences make you understand yourself that it's okay if people like and also if they do not like you or what you say. I think time and experience helped me begin to understand it's okay if you like me and it's okay if you don't. It's okay if you accept what I say. It's okay if you don't. I have to, very early if I want to stay in the business, understand that I don't have to take it personally. You know. I will continue doing the job I'm doing whether people don't want to do it with me. If people don't want to do it with me, they can do it with someone

else and that's okay. You see. I think the experience speaks sometimes and made me understand it's okay.

It was hard for P-2 not to take the reaction personally, or not to internalize it. However, she saw it as a requirement to survive the field.

She believed that getting old and more experienced helped her to accept not being liked in the helping profession. She also attributed her success to her well balanced life.

This has come to me with an old age. If you have a well-balanced life, meaning you do not have a lot of problems with your own family of origin and with your own family. I don't know if I told you, I'm married. I have kids. We are well in the community. My husband and I have been married for 40 years with the same person. When you have a balanced life, we are talking about not being perfect, a balanced life, you have more ability to adapt. You see. So, when you have a lot of problems in your own personal life and you have a lot of issues to deal with in your own personal life that are negative, it's very hard for you to adapt to negatives out there. In our work doing therapy, we work with the negative part of life, don't we? Everybody who comes through the door has problems. And if you have your own problems and you are not able to deal with your own problems, how can you help other people? So, I think that you adapt to things much faster when you have a balanced life.

She was protected by support from her husband, family, and community. A healthy and balanced life helped her adapt to these challenges. She then talked about more specific strategies she actively utilized to maintain the balance and health in her life.

I do a lot of meditation. I believe in mind and spirit balanced. I do a lot of meditation. I go into my stuff. I pray a lot. I come from Catholic background and I pray. I meditate and I do yoga. I exercise. I do a lot of things. You internalize some of these things and you have to do these things in order to be able to handle some of the things you hear in your therapy sessions and things that you experience yourself with some of the people that you try to help.

Her work requires managing and fending off negative effects of her clients' and supervisees' experiences while she understands and empathizes with them. This can take a toll on her, so P-2 intentionally did self-care to prevent internalizing these experiences.

Here she talked about one example of an emotional encounter with one of her supervisees.

I had, one time, an Afro American supervisee who began doing therapy with a Caucasian. I don't know if you know about this area, there are a lot of White supremacist people. That client came... When they gave the name of the therapist to the client, it sounded like an American name. The client did not realize that this was a black therapist. When the client came into the session, he realized that the therapist was black and he said to her, 'I am not going to have counseling with blah, blah, blah... because I do not believe in a black doing anything to me.' She realized that this wasn't one of those people. She... She did not know what to say to him.

She continued with the emotional story.

She said, 'Well, you know, if you don't feel comfortable, you can change counselors.' The guy said to her, 'I will not go to... I will not come back to... I do not want to work with any therapist who works with black, blah, blah, blah...'

When the therapist came and was discussing the client, she became emotional because she did not know how to respond to the person, but also she felt bad and discouraged. 'What will I do if I am alone out there doing therapy and if I don't have...?' You know. I became emotional myself because I felt very bad about it.

P-2 felt her supervisee's pain and fear, and she empathized with what she was going through.

She then shared with her supervisee how she dealt with her own situation with a sense of humor.

She was crying... I said to her, 'You are going to find a lot of people who are like that.' Sometimes in therapy, I had that experience myself. Someone told me, 'I have an accent that sounds a little like Greek or Italian or whatever.' I explain that to her that a client came and said my last name was ---. My last name was Greek. This lady saw me on internet and she thought I was Greek. When she came, she said, 'You know...' she was talking about the Hispanics who live in the farms and how she hated those women who were so submissive and things like that. I stayed quiet. I was going to jump across and strangle her, but I kept calm and I said, 'Well, you know, I think that you probably want to change therapists because my name is ---, but I am Hispanic.' She said, 'You are not Greek?' I said,

'No. My husband is Greek, but I am not Greek. I'm Hispanic and I'm from A Caribbean country.' She said, 'Well, then, I don't work with you.' And I said, 'I don't work with you, either.' 'So, you can leave.' I said, 'You can leave. It's okay. No one is holding you back.' So, the woman got up and left.

P-2 described what she did to deal with her own difficult client and how she experienced it. She needed to manage her strong emotions and stay calm with them.

She proceeded to explain the thought process behind the experience and how she helped her supervisee.

Sometimes you have to use humor when that happens. I use humor a lot in my therapy. The girl who was crying, when I said that in the way I said, 'I don't want to work with you, either.' She said, 'Yay, you actually said that?' I understood her pain and I gave her some tools to work with it, so learn to take it something you cannot change. This is something you cannot change. That something you are going to confront in the future. Plan ahead. If I find a client who is not going to like me, what I'm going to do with it. You can give them an option of staying to work with you even they don't like you or you can give them the option of... I said this to her... getting the hell out of your office. So, she began laughing and we laughed about it. I said 'Use humor or something or certain phrases that might help you. Make sure the person is not intimidating you. If you get intimidated, they will have their goal fulfilled. Sometimes, these people intimidate you. Don't fulfill their goals. That's what I tell them. So, she understood that. Maybe, humor might be a way to deal with that. She will have to understand that. When you asked me the question, 'how did you manage or handle some of the racial thing that happens.' I cannot change this. I cannot change who I am. I am a Hispanic woman from A Caribbean country... that I am not able to change. I will accept that and I will accept self-awareness. I will accept if you like me or if you don't like me. This is how I helped this supervisee. She brought some of the issues that sometimes had to do with culture and cultural differences. How she used humor to diffuse some of the tension that was in the session. I think she was already a good therapist...

P-2 was bold enough to say the comment her supervisee thought was impossible. At the same time, she mixed it with her sense of humor. She also shared her wisdom of not

feeling intimidated, maintaining self-awareness, and accepting who we were. Here, she really had faith in her supervisee.

Secret of Her Success and Maintaining the Balance

This line of work can be draining. P-2 was aware of her need for support. She exchanged “cheap therapy” and peer consultation with her professional friends for support.

I myself have a friend who is a social worker, clinical social work. She calls me and says, ‘I need to go lunch.’ ‘Okay, you need to go lunch. You need cheap therapy.’ She invites me to have lunch because she wants to talk to me about a problem. Sometimes, I invite her to have lunch, and ‘Okay, I need therapy now.’ So, we bounce from each other our issues. Although we are friends, we are able to help each other sometimes to look at things in a different way. So, I don’t have a therapist, but I have a friend who is a therapist and works with me. When we are together, we talk to each other about our personal things because we are friends. So, sometimes, supervisees need that. A co-therapist or friend who knows a little bit about therapy can work.

As much as she appreciated her friend’s support, her family was a huge part of her sustenance. Here she gave her husband credit for her success.

Umm... I never give him enough... but I think my husband did. He used to come home and I told him some of the issues. He would say, ‘you know, you don’t have to work. You can stay home.’ He was making good money, so he said, ‘You don’t have to...’ But, I said, ‘No, I’m going to be working.’ That’s the kind of stage that you don’t have to work. So, I don’t give him enough credits that he said that. I think that the support you have...

P-2 also considered herself lucky. She thought that she had “been in the right place at the right time” when she thought about her success. She thanked God for her “opportunities that fell on her lap.”

People mentored me. When I was a social worker at DSS, there was a chaplain from the Army who said, ‘You will make a good family therapist. Why don’t you come and take some classes? I will supervise you. Come.’ So I went there and I

began doing that. He mentored me through the years to be a licensed marriage and family therapist. He was a director for family center where I am working, met with me in a meeting and said, 'We don't have a Hispanic person. Why don't you come and work with us.' You know, that kind of thing. You might say luck. I would say 'God has been good to me.' You know. But, I think I'm like that.

She had good mentors who invited and guided her to become who she was today. She was mentored and supported well by them.

This experience resulted in her desire to mentor others. She wanted to "pass it on" because she made it.

At the stage of my life, I want to be a mentor to all the minorities. That's why, when you called me, I liked it. I said I am going to help as much as I can because I know that you are a minority, and that you are starting a life as a supervisor, you are starting a life as a doctoral student... I love that. I love to help minorities to do that. I don't think it is a need. It's something that makes me feel happy and good.

P-2 enjoyed mentoring and was also inspired by it. Here she described her sense of elation and pride from supervising a Hispanic supervisee and seeing his success in the field.

I have a mentor and two Hispanic therapists in this area. One moved to New York and the other works in my office. When he got licensed, it felt like my son had graduated again. You know what I am saying. It's a feeling of... He came to me and he said, 'Now I am going to compete with you.' I said, 'This is no competition, honey.' I want you to get your own best clients, so I'd refer them to you. I will not compete with you. But while I was joking with him and I said, 'You can't compete with me. There is no way you can compete with me.' I was so happy that he got his license. It's just like an accomplishment.

As mentioned before, she used her sense of humor as a resource. She also talked about how her mother in her childhood might have influenced her desire to help others and mentor others. This might be the reason why she got into the field in the first place.

I think that I grew up... in my culture... I saw my mother helping a lot of people. I grew up looking at helping other people in my own culture, you know, helping other people giving a lot of satisfaction to my mother. When I saw that, you know, something like helping other people will be a good thing for me. So, the satisfaction that I get from helping clients and helping students, I think that has been motivation than anything else.

Structural Analysis

Lack of Diversity in the Profession and Diversity in the Community

P-2 as an RE minority saw few minority professionals in the field in her region 30 years ago when she came to the U.S. from a Caribbean country. She noticed the scarcity at the state and national conferences and the lack of promotion of multicultural competency. Other professionals lacked the multicultural competency, so they assumed that she could work with any people who did not speak English or who spoke with an accent because she could speak two languages. She was categorized as a foreign therapist, so they thought she could work with any foreigners. She worked in a military base where there was more diversity in the community. Some soldiers brought back their partners from overseas. Some of them had a hard time with acculturating to a foreign country, the U.S. Consequently, she worked with a diverse set of clients.

Due to the lack of minority therapists and the lack of multicultural competency of other professionals, she was forced into a situation where she did not have a choice but to try “her best to help them as much as she could.” She at the same time had a lot of compassion for these clients because she had similar experiences and did understand them. This led to a lot of cultural experiences for her. Naturally, she developed awareness and sensitivity towards multicultural issues. She understood and knew that race and culture could affect a therapeutic process, and later a supervision process. She

was concerned that Spanish speaking clients were not getting competent and effective therapy from English speaking therapists since the language was a major component of their culture and who they were. She presumed that a therapist with the same race, culture, and language would be more facilitative and effective in therapy. These concerns transformed into her motivation to become a supervisor and mentor minorities, especially Hispanics to become therapists. The military base offered her a lot of opportunities, such as working with diverse clients and getting a supervisor who had cultural experiences. Once she started providing supervision, she easily got professionals who wanted to learn how to work with clients from different cultures since there was diversity in the community. However, she was culturally competent enough to say that she was not an expert on all cultures.

Developing Her Own Cultural Competency in a Foreign Country

P-2 did not necessarily have multicultural competency in the first place. She was very proud of her country of origin. She was the majority in her country, and race was not a major issue there. She was made aware of racial and cultural issues as an RE minority in the U.S. She called the process “an educational process.” She encountered multicultural issues as a person, as a student, as a therapist, and as a supervisor. She learned the negative stereotype of people from her country based on behaviors of a few people from the country, so it was not “cool” to be a person from her country when she initially came.

When she was in school, her teachers challenged her to become aware of and attend to the biases and reactions caused by the biases. She was able to pass as majority when she did not talk since she had a light skin. It was easier for her to be accepted.

However, when she spoke, her accent made it obvious that she was a foreigner and a cultural being. This surprised others. In turn, their reactions surprised her. People in the U.S. perceived that she was not smart because of her accent. They questioned her credibility because she was a Hispanic woman with an accent. This helped her develop awareness of any reactions of others or change of behaviors of others, based on this bias when she interacted with them. This process also helped her develop awareness of her own biases. This awareness encouraged her to examine the values she learned from her own family by thinking, “If my mother sees this...” By this self-reflection, she strived not to let her biases get in the way of providing effective therapy and supervision.

Culture, Biases, and Reactions in Supervision

Even as an RE minority, P-2 highlighted that everyone would face biases in cross cultural therapy or supervision. She went further to generalize this idea to other variables such as marital status and status of having children. She thought everyone had to be aware of both cultural and clinical biases to be effective. This could be a self-of-therapist issue in the process of dealing with a clinical issue in therapy. She was cognizant of a boundary between providing supervision and doing therapy with supervisees. She recommended her supervisees to seek therapy when their personal problems got in the way of providing effective therapy. She also identified and utilized the parallel process between therapy and supervision through which she tried to help supervisees with their work with their clients. She challenged and asked her supervisees about differences, their biases toward the differences, and their awareness of how the biases interfere with the therapeutic process. She also helped them explore how to work with some clients her

supervisees did not like because of behaviors, beliefs, or culture. She hoped that this would in turn help supervisees work with their clients more effectively.

As a result, she at times encountered resistance from her supervisees. Some of them thought cultural difference would not make any difference. Sadly a few left her supervision, but most stayed. She also faced reactions towards her from them. She went even further by asking them if they could challenge behaviors based on culture while simultaneously being sensitive to those cultural differences. She tried to teach both understanding and challenging cultural differences. At the same time, she was also aware of the human tendency to want to stay away from unacceptable behaviors regardless of whether or not they were culturally based. In addition, she experienced that some supervisees became distant to her because she challenged them. She risked the possibility of supervisees leaving her supervision in the process. This was initially painful for her not to be liked, so she used to “take it personally.” She claimed that she was “okay” with it today because this was part of her “business,” or work. However, she repeated the phrase “It’s okay with me” several times. This seemed to be an ongoing process for her. She still seemed to feel the hard feeling at times and had to continue to reassure herself that “It’s okay.” She also asserted that this risk taking was necessary for supervisors to ensure the quality of therapy supervisees provide. It was a supervisor’s duty.

She also had to manage a difficult experience of her an RE minority supervisee. The supervisee had blunt and harsh racism from her new client. She tried to manage the client professionally and respectfully, but the client continued to be rude and abusive. Her supervisee felt powerless and helpless with the situation and cried. P-2 “felt very

bad” for her. She disclosed a similar experience of hers and used a sense of humor in order to help her supervisee. Her supervisee was surprised and empowered by hearing that her supervisor said to her client, “I don’t want to work with you, either” when the client said, “I don’t want to work with her” just because P-2 was a Hispanic woman. There seemed to be a parallel here between being okay with not being liked by supervisees and by clients. She shared her wisdom to empower her supervisee not to feel intimidated by her clients. She also believed in her supervisee.

Surviving the Field

P-2 explained how she dealt with these challenges. She tried to see initial resistance to a different perspective as part of normal process of accepting the different perspective. She strived to embrace the level of her supervisees’ cultural development whether or not they accepted the perspective. She used cultural genogram to help supervisees examine their own culture, their bias from, and its influence on therapeutic work. This reminded her of her own experiences, so she became emotional at times, especially while working with minority supervisees. It was emotional for her to listen to hurtful experiences of her supervisees. However, this also helped her empathize with her supervisees’ struggles with a different culture.

She thought that her age and experiences helped her understand and come to terms with not being liked by her supervisees. She learned not to personalize it, so she could continue doing her work regardless. She also attributed a healthy well-balanced life to her success of surviving the field. She had support from her husband, family, mentors, and community. This was related to the work of self-of-therapist, so her own problems would not get in the way of providing effective therapy and supervision. She

actively worked on herself to maintain the healthy balance through meditation, prayer as a Christian, yoga, and exercise. This prevented her from compassionate fatigue and burnout when she empathized and felt experiences and reactions of clients and supervisees. She intentionally sought out support or “cheap therapy” from her professional friend in order to vent and process challenges of her work. She also appreciated her husband’s support since he was flexible about her career choices.

Mentor

P-2 felt blessed because she thought she was in the right place at the right time to get the opportunities she had. She had good mentors who invited and encouraged her to get into the field, guided her, and supported her through her professional and cultural development. This definitely contributed to her success. This experience motivated her to become a supervisor in order to mentor others, especially minorities. She wanted to provide the same support and encouragement to others. At the same time, she had delight in and inspiration from mentoring. She felt so happy and proud of her Hispanic supervisee when he became a licensed therapist. The feeling itself was her drive for continuing to mentor. Finally, she also mentioned her mother as a role model or mentor for her. The whole journey circled back to where she came from.

Textual-Structural Description

P-2 was born and raised in a Caribbean country. She came to the U.S. because her husband got a job here. She attended school in the U.S., but she could not complete her Ph.D. due to an illness. She has practiced clinically for 30 years and provided supervision for 16 years. Racially, she looked Caucasian. However, she had a thick Spanish accent, so the accent and her culture were conflicting to her appearance of being

White. This mismatch tended to surprise others. When she started clinical practice in the U.S., there were only few minority clinicians, not to mention minority supervisors. Due to the lack of diversity in the field, she had a lot of referrals of minority clients. This subsequently impacted her clinical experiences. She worked in a military setting and encountered a lot of diversity in her community, contrary to a lack of diversity in the professional field.

P-2 as an RE minority saw few minority professionals in the field in her region 30 years ago when she first came to the U.S. from her country of origin. She noticed this problem at the state and national conferences and consequently the lack of promotion of diversity. Professionals lacked multicultural competency to work with the diversity in her community. The military base increased the diversity in the community since soldiers brought back their partners from overseas. Some of them had a hard time with acculturating to the U.S, so these clients were referred to her. However, her referents assumed that she could work with any culture and language because she was an ethnic minority and spoke Spanish. She reflected on her experiences:

They referred to me anyone who had an accent. Asian, Hispanic, German, and whoever had an accent were referred to me. I realized that people did not pay attention to the fact that that I did have an accent, but I only spoke Spanish and English. I tried my best to help them as much as I could because I understood my own problems. Sometimes, they just needed somebody to talk to. They had a hard time understanding what I said at that time because of my accent. It's been a very good experience for me in a sense that I was a good therapist according to them.

As a matter of fact, I have found in my experiences with Hispanics who came to me and said that they don't speak the language and they have been therapy with English speaking therapists, I questioned the validity or effectiveness of therapy myself because you don't understand the language.

P-2 got a lot of referrals of diverse clients with different cultures and languages. There was a concern about how helpful therapy was when it was provided in a different language than a client's primary language. She did her best helping them by using her own experiences as a minority and two languages she spoke. Through experience, she developed multicultural competency and was able to help her clients. She understood and knew that race and culture could affect a therapeutic process, and later a supervision process. This cultural development process was "an educational process" to her. She also learned the negative stereotype through education in school and clinical work. Her light skin gave her a pass to be accepted as majority as long as she did not talk. She experienced the multicultural intersection of her light skin, gender, language, and culture. Others questioned her credibility because she was a Hispanic woman with an accent:

At that time, some people would not like to relate to people from my country. We still have people who are like that. It was easier for me being a light skinned person from my country. But when I showed I had an accent, the reception of people was totally different. Being a woman and Hispanic, when you say something, they will question it. Often when you have an accent, you are not perceived as being that smart. And then when I open my mouth and began *talking* with an accent [and continued to articulate], people would say, 'You know, you are not that dummy.'

P-2 initially was surprised to be treated differently and discriminated. Her ability was questioned because she was a Hispanic woman with a strong accent. Because of these experiences, she became sensitive to and cognizant of change of others' behaviors in reaction to her culture. This process also promoted awareness of her own biases by self-reflection. She worked hard to prevent her biases from getting in the way of providing good therapy and supervision.

Even with these experiences as an RE minority, P-2 highlighted that everyone would face biases in cross cultural therapy or supervision. She went further and generalized this idea to other variables such as marital status and status of having children. Clinicians also had to be aware of the biases based on all variables to be effective. She saw cultural variables and clinical variables in a continuum, and she did not see them separately. This was related to a self-of-therapist issue a therapist needed to address in the process of dealing with a clinical and cultural issue in therapy. She was cognizant of a boundary between providing supervision and doing therapy with a supervisee. She recommended her supervisees to seek therapy when their personal problems got in the way of providing effective therapy. She also identified and utilized the parallel process between therapy and supervision through which she tried to help supervisees with their work with their clients. This would in turn help supervisees work with their clients more effectively.

In order to facilitate cultural sensitivity, P-2 used cultural genograms to help supervisees examine their biases. This was at times an emotional process for her as well as for her supervisees. This also helped her empathize with her supervisees' struggles with different cultures. She explained the process:

So, cultural genogram is very good to help them do that. I do get emotional sometimes when I hear some of their process some of the clients had and some of the supervisees had with their own clients or with their own interactions, because it remind me of my own interactions, especially minority supervisees. They do have some troubles adapting to the interactions they have with clients if the person is from a different culture.

P-2 emotionally resonated with her supervisees and understood their struggles because she had similar experiences as an RE minority. Hence, she was able to validate their

experiences. At the same time, she challenged and asked her supervisees about differences, their biases toward the differences, and their awareness of how the biases interfere with the therapeutic process. In this process of challenging her supervisees, she also helped them explore another layer of a bias on how to work with clients her they did not like because of their behaviors, beliefs, or culture. When they were challenged, some supervisees challenged her back or left supervision:

I had some supervisees who said that that wasn't going to make any difference and that they could do therapy with any different background and any biases that they would come across. I had disagreed with them. By the end of the supervisory process, they understood what I meant. I have had some resistance. But I think supervisees sometimes stay because they are challenged sometimes with their own views. When you are challenged, you run away or stay. Most of them stayed. Many wanted to learn.

P-2 encountered resistance from her supervisees and had to manage it when she tried to promote cultural awareness. It was necessary for her to balance understanding and challenging cultural differences. At the same time, she was also aware of the human tendency to want to stay away from unacceptable behaviors regardless of whether or not they were culturally based. She risked the possibility of supervisees leaving her supervision in the process of challenging. Consequently, most of her supervisees stayed. However, she still needed to manage her own feelings against the reactions from her supervisees and she took the reactions personally and had hard feelings in the past. She thoughtfully discussed:

It's okay with me. If a supervisee becomes distant, it's okay. Most of the time, I see that distance change with time. They begin to understand the process. Sometimes, they just go away. It's okay with me, you know. If you are a supervisee, I ask if you have a client, I challenge your behaviors, your supervision or therapy style, and whatever values and biases you have. If you decide to leave, it does mean that it's okay. You can leave. It's okay with me. I don't take it

personally. I used to take it personally. No longer, you see. Yup. It's okay. That's the way you have to work in this kind of business, isn't it. You hope a majority will stay, and that's what happened. The majority stayed. One or two in many years I have done therapy have left when they were challenged. It's okay. It means as a supervisor if you are not able to be challenged, that does tell you the quality of therapy these people are going to do. These people in the future are going to be in trouble with clients because they are not able to connect with clients they have.

P-2 initially took resistance from her supervisees personally, which was a hard experience for her. Even a supervisor with power, she still had to face and manage these reactions with supervisees. She had to challenge biases and promote clinical competency in her supervisees while she was challenged back. Some of her supervisees became distant to her and even left supervision. It was difficult for her to feel disliked by her supervisees or anyone. She explained the natural tendency to take the experience personally, or internalize it as a human being. She attempted to understand and accept this hard fact as a RE supervisor.

It was hard. It was hard. Normally, people usually want to be liked. That's a need. That's one of the needs we have. We have needs that we should be liked by everyone. If you come from a small town in an island and you are accepted by almost everybody, you have a process of thinking that everybody should accept you, especially if you come from a family where you are well accepted. You have the premise that everybody should accept me or will accept me because my family does. You have the premise and you come from a family where you are not well liked, no one will like me because my family doesn't like me. You see. In the process, you come to the community and they are thinking everyone should accept me. Of course, you have the need. It's not easy. It hurts your feeling, doesn't it?

It was painful to experience this culture shock that P-2 was not accepted or even liked when she was so used to be part of culture and felt liked and accepted by everyone. She claimed that she was "okay" with it today because this was part of her work. This was a

hard and ongoing process for her. She had to continue to reassure herself that “It’s okay.” This is better, but still hard for her to experience even today. In spite of the challenge, she believed that this risk taking was necessary for supervisors to ensure the quality of therapy supervisees would provide.

Furthermore, P-2 had to help minority supervisees with their tough experiences as a minority. There was a gut wrenching experience that one of her RE minority supervisees had when a new racist client expressed blunt and harsh racism toward the supervisee. She tried to manage the client respectfully, but the client continued to be rude and abusive to her. P-2 had to help her through the hard experiences as a new RE minority professional. She described the emotional encounter:

When the client came into the session, he realized that the therapist was black and he said to her, ‘I am not going to have counseling with blah, blah, blah because I do not believe in a black doing anything to me.’ She realized that this was one of those people.

She said, ‘Well, you know, if you don’t feel comfortable, you can change counselors.’ The guy said to her, ‘I do not want to work with any therapist who works with black.’ When the therapist came to me and was discussing the client, she became emotional because she did not know how to respond to the person, but also she felt bad and discouraged. ‘What will I do if I am alone out there doing therapy and if I don’t have [any support]?’ I became emotional myself because I felt very bad about it.

Her supervisee as a professional felt discouraged and helpless against the client’s racism. She did not know what do. P-2 empathized with her pain and the struggle while she had to manage her own emotions because she felt her supervisee’s pain. She used a similar experience of hers and a sense of humor to validate her experience and empower her who was emotional because she felt abused and powerless over the abuse. P-2 continued to narrate the experience with her:

She was crying. I said to her, 'You are going to find a lot of people who are like that. Sometimes in therapy, I had that experience myself. Someone told me, 'I have an accent that sounds a little like Greek or Italian or whatever.' I explain that to her that a client came and said, 'My last name was ---. My last name was Greek.' This lady saw me on internet and she thought I was Greek. She talked about the Hispanics who live in the farms and how she hated those women who were so submissive and things like that. I stayed quiet. I was going to jump across and strangle her, but I kept calm and I said, 'Well, you know, I think that you probably want to change therapists because my name is ---, but I am Hispanic.' She said, 'You are not Greek?' I said, 'No. My husband is Greek, but I am not Greek. I'm Hispanic and I'm from a Caribbean country.' She said, 'Well, then, I don't work with you.' And I said, 'I don't work with you, either.'

P-2 exactly understood what her supervisee experienced, so she disclosed her own emotional experience of being judged and discriminated by her client. Her supervisee was surprised and also empowered by hearing about her supervisor's honesty and directness when she heard how she dealt with her own challenge with discrimination. P-2's wisdom as an RE minority helped her supervisee overcome her fear and anxiety. Through her own experiences as an RE minority, P-2 also learned to use sense of humor when she faced these challenges. She further reflected and explained how to manage difficult situations by using humor with her supervisee:

Sometimes you have to use humor when that happens. I use humor a lot in my therapy. The girl who was crying, when I said that in the way I said, 'I don't want to work with you, either.' She said, 'Yay, you actually said that?' I understood her pain and I gave her some tools to work with it, so learn to take it something you cannot change. This is something you cannot change. That something you are going to confront in the future. Plan ahead. If I find a client who is not going to like me, what I'm going to do with it? You can give them an option of staying to work with you even they don't like you or you can give them the option to 'Get the hell out of my office.' So, she began laughing and we laughed about it. I said, 'Use humor or something or certain phrases that might help you. Make sure the person is not intimidating you. If you get intimidated, they will have their goal fulfilled. Sometimes, these people intimidate you. Don't fulfill their goals.' That's what I tell them. She understood that. Maybe, humor might be a way to deal with that. She will have to understand that. I cannot change this. I cannot

change who I am. I am a Hispanic woman from a Caribbean country that I am not able to change. I will accept that and I will accept self-awareness. I will accept if you like me or if you don't like me. This is how I helped this supervisee.

Humor diffused the supervisee's anxiety and gave her an option that she thought was not possible. This also helped the supervisee be armed with a strategy against the dislike and intimidation from clients. Through her own experiences and wisdom, P-2 encouraged her supervisees to develop multicultural competency through self-awareness and acceptance. There was a parallel between being okay with not being liked by supervisees and by clients. She taught her supervisees what she had to do by herself in therapy. At the same time, P-2 had faith in her supervisee and her ability to manage difficult clients in the supervision process. This in turn promoted the supervisee's confidence.

As P-2 tried to help her supervisees develop multicultural competency, she faced challenges such as resistance from them. In the process of dealing with the challenges, she attempted to see initial resistance to a different perspective as part of the normal process of accepting the new perspective. She strived to embrace the level of her supervisees' cultural development, whether or not they accept her input. She elaborated the challenge:

You roll with resistance. You do not accept or understand what an older person is saying. We have a process that normally when we talk to somebody, we go about our own things. We begin to think about what we talked about. Many times it has happened to me, too. I said, 'I don't agree with what you are saying.' But when I go back, I begin to think about what other person said. You know s/he has some point in this matter. I might be able to do things in a different way because of what s/he said. This is a process. You can become a little bit resistant or say, 'No, I did not agree with that,' or be upset about what s/he said. If you are a normal kind of person, you go back and think about it. You either accept it or don't accept it and it's okay.

P-2 accepted resistance as a normal human reaction to a new perspective and an attempt to find a balance between holding onto their own perspective and accepting a new one. Her age and experiences helped her understand and come to terms with supervisees' being upset and not liking her in supervision process. She learned not to personalize the experiences, so she could continue doing her work regardless. However, it required her on-going efforts not to internalize them. She made sense of the process:

I think experiences make you understand yourself that it's okay if people like and also if they do not like you or what you say. I think time and experience helped me begin to understand it's okay if you like me and it's okay if you don't. It's okay if you accept what I say. It's okay if you don't. I have to. Very early if I want to stay in the business, I understand that I don't have to take it personally. You know. I will continue doing the job I'm doing whether people don't want to do it with me. If people don't want to do it with me, they can do it with someone else and that's okay. You see. I think the experience speaks sometimes and made me understand it's okay.

Her experiences helped her understand this difficult process, but it continued to be hard for her not to internalize their reactions. P-2 continued to reassure herself that "it's okay." It was necessary for her to survive the field. She learned that it was vital for her to have a healthy personal life in order to counteract the stress. Therefore, she recommended supervisees to have a well-balanced life in order to be effective and survive in therapy. In the process, she touched the self-of-therapist issue:

This has come to me with an old age. If you have a well-balanced life, meaning you do not have a lot of problems with your own family of origin and with your own family. I don't know if I told you, I'm married. I have kids. We are well in the community. My husband and I have been married for 40 years with the same person. When you have a balanced life, we are talking about not being perfect, but a balanced life. You will have a better ability to adapt. When you have a lot of problems in your own personal life, it's very hard for you to adapt to negatives out there. In therapy, we work with the negative part of life, don't we? Everybody who comes through the door has problems. If you have your own problems and you are not able to deal with your own problems, how can you help

other people? So, I think that you adapt to things much faster when you have a balanced life.

Therapeutic work is hard since clients bring in the negative parts of their lives. To maintain the healthy balance in life, P-2 actively worked on herself through meditation, prayer, yoga, and exercise. This helped her be adaptive and effective when she felt the experiences and reactions of her clients and supervisees. In addition, it shielded her from compassionate fatigue and burnout.

I do a lot of meditation. I believe in mind and spirit to be balanced. I pray a lot. I come from Catholic background and I pray. I do yoga. I exercise. I do a lot of things. You have to do these things in order to be able to handle some of the things you hear in your therapy and things that you experience yourself with the people that you try to help.

P-2 internalized some of clients' negative lives, so she utilized these self-care strategies. She also intentionally sought out "cheap therapy," or peer consultation from her professional friend to prevent herself from further taking in the negativities from clients. She vented and processed challenges of her work with her friend. P-2 also helped her friend in return. She did her self-of-therapist work with her friend, so her own problems would not get in the way of providing effective therapy and supervision. This helped her regain perspectives with her challenge.

I myself have a friend who is a social worker, clinical social work. She calls me and says, 'I need to go lunch.' 'Okay, you need to go lunch. You need cheap therapy.' She invites me to have lunch because she wants to talk to me about a problem. Sometimes, I invite her to have lunch, and 'Okay, you need therapy now.' So, we bounce from each other our issues. Although we are friends, we are able to help each other sometimes to look at things in a different way. So, I don't have a therapist, but I have a friend who is a therapist and works with me. When we are together, we talk to each other about our personal things because we are friends. So, sometimes, supervisees need that. A co-therapist or friend who knows a little bit about therapy can work.

P-2 liked this give and take of “cheap therapy” with her friend. It was helpful to her and gave her a new perspective, so she was aware that her supervisees also needed the same support. She attributed a healthy well-balanced life to her success of surviving the field. Her healthy life included support from her husband, family, mentors, and community. She appreciated her husband for support since he gave her options:

I never give him enough [credit], but I think my husband did [give me a lot of support]. He used to come home and I told him my issues. He would say, ‘You know, you don’t have to work. You can stay home.’ He was making good money. He said, ‘You don’t have to [work].’ But, I said, ‘No, I’m going to be working.’

Her husband listened to her and gave her an option of not working when she had challenges such as her medical issues. She was grateful, however, insisted to continue to work. She felt that she might not have shown him enough appreciation in the past. In addition to her husband, she had mentors who helped her succeed in the field.

Even though P-2 observed the lack of diversity in the field, she felt blessed because she was in the right place at the right time to get the opportunities she had. She had good mentors who invited and encouraged her to get into the field, guided her, and supported her through her professional and cultural development. This definitely contributed to her success.

People mentored me. When I was a social worker at DSS, there was a chaplain from the Army who said, ‘You will make a good family therapist. Why don’t you come and take some classes? I will supervise you. Come.’ So, I went there and I began doing that. He mentored me through the years to be a licensed therapist. He was a director for the family center where I was working. He met with me in a meeting and said, ‘We don’t have a Hispanic person. Why don’t you come and work with us.’ You might say luck. I would say, ‘God has been good to me.’

She had a lot of positive experiences due to the support she received. She felt welcomed and blessed by mentors as well as by God. This experience motivated her to become a supervisor and mentor others, especially minorities. Since she was grateful for mentoring, she wanted to pass it on to the next generation of therapists. She was delighted and inspired from providing mentorship. She particularly felt happy for her Hispanic supervisee when he became a licensed therapist. The feeling itself was a drive for her to continue mentoring. She proudly reminisced:

When he [her Hispanic supervisee] got licensed, it felt like my son had graduated again. He came to me and said, 'Now I am going to compete with you.' I said, 'This is no competition, honey.' I want you to get your own best clients, so I'd refer them to you. I will not compete with you. But while I was joking with him and I said, 'You can't compete with me. There is no way you can compete with me.' I was so happy that he got his license. It's just like an accomplishment.

P-2 felt her supervisee's accomplishment as her own child's. Her sense of humor and personality permeated in this occasion of pride and celebration. At the end of interview, she also mentioned her mother as a role model for her to help others. P-2 watched her mother help others, so P-2 got her nature to help others from her mother. Her cultural and professional journey in the foreign soil circled back to where she came from, her family and culture.

CHAPTER SIX: PARTICIPANT THREE

Textual Analysis

P-3 was originally from Asia. Among the participants in this study, she was the youngest and had lived for the shortest period, approximately 10 years, in the U.S. She also lived in a few different countries in the Middle East before she came here. She had practiced clinically for several years and provided supervision for about 5 years in the U.S.

Mentoring, Support, Diversity, and Positive Experiences

P-3 used to work with adolescents in her country before she came to the U.S. She wanted to expand the scope of practice to working with families. She decided to pursue a higher degree. In the process of her decision making, she had good support and guidance in her home country from faculty who heard her plan and interests.

I studied an undergraduate program in clinical and counseling psychology. I wanted to work with families. At that time, I worked with many adolescents in school. So, I wanted to work with families. My professors at university suggested that there were programs in the U.S. that focused on families instead of just working with kids. So, I came to the U.S. and applied for these programs.

P-3 was also new to the field and did not know the different disciplines in the mental health field in the U.S. Her professors studied and had the first hand exposure to these disciplines in the U.S. They helped her figure out the most suitable field for her when they heard her plan.

It happens to be my professors in clinical psychology and counseling psychology, one in developmental psychology when they were studying in the U.S. They noticed these professionals. When they heard my interest, they thought that this would be a good fit instead of applying for [a certain field]. I also thought about clinical psychology, not many of them were family focused.

This was a complicated decision making process, even with the right knowledge and support.

P-3 also described the process of how she researched and made a decision to select schools she attended. She always looked for a supportive environment for diversity.

I have consulted with people who have gone there or ask students who have gone there. When I chose the University 1, I talked to a professor who got Ph.D. there. She was in counseling psychology. She told me that she loved it... I knew about the counseling program at the University 2. They also focused on multiculturalism. That's one of their efforts. When I heard someone who went there had a great experience, I kind of knew that would work out for me. The university 2 was the same thing. At the university 2 for the program, you need to go to an onsite interview. When I went to an onsite interview, I talked to international students there. What impressed me was that they had so many impressive international students there. They survived and graduated. So, I knew that that environment would be supportive to me. Although it's harsh in some way, I know I am not alone. When I came to my current work place, I did not intentionally choose to work in this city. One of my colleague at the university 2, she was actually from the Middle East and got a job here before me. Before I applied for it, I actually talked to her about her experience here. She liked it and encouraged me to apply. I actually talked to someone.

P-3 found a diversity-friendly environment, international students, and supportive colleagues in the process.

When she came to the U.S., acculturation was hard initially. However, she thought that her experiences in the U.S. were positive in general. People did not necessarily understand what her struggle was, but they were open and supportive.

It was the supportive environment and people. Faculty, I have to be honest, most of faculty I encounter were white. Some of them might not have that much experience [with diversity], but I appreciate that they were willing to admit that they didn't know. They were open with that. They were open to listen to my experiences. I remember, you know Dr. ---, right? There was a time for me to go in and complain my experiences with him for an hour. He just sat there and

listened. Although he did not solve it, he listened. That was really good actually. I appreciate that he did that.

P-3 appreciated the faculty's efforts. She was also aware of the smaller number of minorities in the field, so she felt that she was fortunate to be able to meet and connect with other minorities.

She had been around a good number of students from her country, in addition to other international students when she went through her programs.

I think I'm just lucky to meet someone who's international, so I don't intentionally have to choose internationals. When I intentionally pick a job or school, I notice the minority rate is low. I also applied for some place where I knew that there were a lot of minorities, I would also ask them about their experiences to get sense of how it was supported.

At least, right now, I know seven students from my country. Yes, I know a lot. Two are still in school. Some have graduated. When I was going through my master's program, there were four people from my country. That's a lot. We also have quite a few Koreans. This is my second year and we had two Korean international students come in the program. One of my students is a Taiwanese international student.

P-3 proceeded to explain further why her experiences were positive in the U.S. She intentionally researched and chose schools that were diverse and/or culturally supportive.

When I went to the Midwestern university, the reason why I chose it was also famous for a lot of international students there. The cohort before me had one Korean, one Canadian... There was also a Chinese. They also had Taiwanese. In terms of supervision, when I was doing supervision training there when I first started, it was because my supervisor happened to be international. Although he was white, he was from Germany. So, he was quite sensitive toward this. Like I said when I started, although where I worked was a pastoral counseling center and pastoral counseling meant conservative, they had a lot of non-traditional students. When I talk about diversity, it's not just about race, or ethnicity, or sexual orientation... when I was in a West Coast state, they were open minded about sexual orientation. The university is very international and the place I worked as a supervisor, we had many non-traditional students. They are older, so in some way they also respected where I was coming from. When we were doing

supervision training, the supervisor and colleagues, one was from Korea and one that was me was from Taiwan... There was an African American and only one white student. Four of us were doing training. So, it's very diverse. Students were prepared to meet us.

Her environment was supportive to not only racial and ethnic diversity, but also sexual orientation and ages.

P-3 remembered that one faculty member took an extra effort to connect with and support international students.

At the Eastern university, I knew that there was one [international] faculty member who intentionally had a meeting with all the international students and got together and got feedback from them.

P-3 appreciated this extra effort to make a friendly community for the international students in the program. She also thought that her American colleagues were supportive.

She then moved on to discuss her current job in a different state.

[The area I work in] may not be a diverse place, but my colleagues really did respect me where I was coming from. In some way when I was doing supervision, when there is a thing relevant to culture and if I bring up, I know that my colleague would back me up. They would support me. In some way, when I am doing supervision with students, I won't feel like uncomfortable with how I am.

Her work place was not diverse, but her colleagues were supportive and respectful to differences. The support she received bolstered her sense of security and confidence.

You know what you do and there is someone that supports you on the back. When I was a student, I knew my supervisor support what I do. Now I am a supervisor, whenever I consult with my colleague, I tell my colleague what I think, she would support what I think. When we have issues with diversity and talk about it, what they think is similar to what I think, so I know that they would back me up with that. That would give me confidence that I have a lot to give and they then appreciate that. Other thing is I know if students complained about me, even they go back to faculty, to the department director, he would let me know. I know that it will come back to me.

As P-3 gained more experiences, she became more confident. She realized that her students were receptive to her. She received positive feedback directly from her students, which in turn reinforced her confidence.

What really boosted my confidence was, the second time when I was supervising students who were coming in at the same time, they were new. I was a little bit more experienced and we came in at the same time. So, in some way, I did not feel that I was someone new. I had a lot to give. I remember at that time student evaluation was really good. Students gave me feedback. My supervisor also appreciated someone who brought in a different perspective. I also use a lot of live supervision and give them direct feedback. What made me notice when students started to trust me was when they present something, I gave them feedback, they went back to a room, and it worked. Students then came back to me and said, 'Hey, P-3. You were right.' Sometimes, I notice about culture and give feedback and it turned out to have positive effects in therapy. It was positive when it came back to me like that.

Her supervisor appreciated her different perspective. Observing positive results in her students also encouraged her.

P-3 had insight into how to enhance diversity or openness to diversity in an academic program.

I think it's more about the program policy that people want to enhance diversity. I noticed at the Eastern university, they intentionally chose a group of minority and also non-traditional students, not all young students, so they all spread out. There were also older students and sexual minority students. So, in some way, international students are small part of it. When I talked to non-traditional students or older students, we also found something... It was good. I liked that. Or even religious minority groups. We did have these students, too. It was really nice to have that kind of [diversity]...

P-3 noticed intentional recruitment of diverse students and enjoyed the diversity that went beyond nationality. At the same time, she was not free from challenges as an international individual.

Challenges as a New Immigrant Supervisor in the U.S.

P-3 was a new student and a supervisor as an RE minority from Asia. Even with the support she had, she initially went through a hard time adjusting to a new culture as a normal part of acculturation.

I think when I started, because I was a new supervisor, I did not have confidence in myself. I had four Caucasians and one [minority]. She also considered herself Caucasian. She was from a different county and came to this country early, so she had adjusted to the culture there. I did feel like an outsider initially. I also questioned myself and my contribution as a supervisor. Later on, I did not have that issue. I know that I hesitated to be open and direct about what I thought, that did not show I was competent in some way. Because I consulted with my supervisor, she mentioned that when you were being new here, it's part of culture that students treated you this way. I took that very personally.

P-3 was initially unsure of herself because she was still learning the new culture, and she was new as a supervisor. She naturally did not feel very confident. As she gained more experiences, she felt that she knew what to do. She then acted accordingly. She then also became open to and proactive in soliciting feedback from students about her supervision.

In the next semester, I again supervised a group of all white students, but I had religious minority students. It was all white and young. There was also one non-traditional student. Although I was an international scholar, I got all my training in U.S. I knew what's culturally appropriate to do. In terms of professionalism, I showed that. I could see student open up to me and I felt more comfortable to contribute about diversity. I would be open and even ask students upfront in individual supervision how it was like for them to have an Asian supervisor and what was that experience for them... these kinds of questions. Or bring up another perspective. And I noticed my students were open for it. They actually appreciated having me there. That was a positive experience. Later in my second year, we started to recruit more international students there or minority students, so it became more comfortable for me after all.

P-3 soon started to feel that she and her work were appreciated. This led to her positive experiences. When they started to have more international and minority students, she felt even more comfortable.

She now works at University 3. People in her program tried to recruit diverse students, but it was a little complicated.

We try to, but we have to be honest that not many people want to come to this state and it's not fun. It's flat and cotton field. So, if they want to come, we want it to be culturally diverse, but we don't take you because you are a minority. If your career did not meet others' need. We do have some... I think our students are also aware that they are supported if they come. One of my colleagues told me that fact that I was there made a difference. There was someone who would understand their experiences. Although if there is an international student who asks me what's like there, I'd say it's good, but you can also check out other places. I don't force them to come. That's my style. I want them to check and tell them what's good here. Clients here compared to California would be different.

They struggled to have diverse students, but they tried to be upfront and transparent to them about the climate and culture. P-3 felt appreciated and supported because her colleague told her that her presence sent a message that they were open to diversity and there was at least one person who would understand different experiences in the program. She here discussed her acculturation process today.

I feel more like an international scholar, not just directly from my country. If I go back to my country, I feel more like American. Yes, there is an Asian part, but it's not totally Asian because I am also Americanized. But, I also don't say I am totally American. I don't tell people that. In the faculty meeting when I interact with my colleagues, I also noticed that, because maybe I don't feel totally competent enough, I am seen as a quiet scholar because I don't speak up much. As an Asian, we are good at observing and noticing the atmosphere. If you feel comfortable, you expose yourself. That's very Asian of me. I don't just jump in. As an Asian woman, my Asian friends say, 'you are very opinionated and...' See, that's why I said... but I think in America as a female scholar, I am not the kind

of female who speaks up her mind. I will personally, but not in the... It's hard to define that.

P-3 felt different cultural identity depending on a specific context. She described herself being in between two cultures. As much as she paid attention to a specific culture, she also observed universal characteristics.

Universal Approach in Supervision

P-3 discussed how to manage multicultural issues in supervision as an RE minority supervisor. She saw diversity even within one cultural group that is seemingly homogeneous. Both white students and minority students had variety within their respective groups, so she paid attention to the more universal variables such as personality. She tried to be sensitive to the variety within one group, or variable.

I think it's more about personalities and characteristics. If you asked where I stand, I am more a Universalist. I do have a liberal white student and a conservative Asian student. I also have American students who are quiet. When they are quiet in group and people perceive them they don't talk much. They may be introverted, so I am sensitive to that. I give them more chances. I try to observe that. Here is the thing. I do not supervise that much master's students. I only supervise master's students during summer. Most of my supervision is with Ph.D. students. Our Ph.D. students are always from accredited master's programs, so I am lucky. My supervisees may be international, but they were already trained in a master's program.

P-3 mainly supervised doctoral students, so these students might have had more training and knowledge. It was easier for her.

She thought that everyone had a different culture. Therefore, everyone needed to work on multicultural competency. She was aware that it was a life-long developmental process. She tried to teach her supervisees this by using herself and her own experiences.

I see cultural sensitivity is a growth area. It is on-going and it never stops. I don't force students to reach the same level. I believe each student comes from a

different culture. When we are working as a professional, we cannot choose what kind of presenting problem, so you will have diverse clients no matter what... unless you intentionally say I don't want to see this... If you want to be helpful, you will have different kinds of clients we cannot choose, I am training them to work... They can start working with me to learn to work with others. You can learn how to get along with a minority colleague to work with others. I tell them that I learned so much about American culture from my American colleagues. I present it that way, so they know that's helpful. I also see everyone have a different comfort level in terms of culture, so I don't force them to reach a certain level. If I can make a little bit of a difference and at least they are aware that I'm so privileged a certain way, maybe for this student that's enough. I do it gradually. I also tell students that it's an on-going process. Even my experiences as a supervisor, I told them, 'Today, I am this way. I don't know about 10 years later. I might be something different.

Multicultural competency was a growth area for herself as much as for her supervisees.

P-3 was aware that her approach to diversity could be different in the future as she gained more experiences. She also tried to integrate culturally specific issues to universal issues.

She broached this topic in a direct manner.

I explain that to my students that it can be your race and ethnicity, but it can also be your experiences by coming from an alcoholic family or you are from a non-divorced family, it might be hard for you to understand other people. I intentionally bring that up in my individual supervision at the beginning of supervision.

P-3 saw multicultural issues and clinical issues on the same spectrum that made clients feel different or misunderstood. They both can impact the therapeutic process in a similar way, in terms of understanding and connecting with clients.

Managing Diversity with a Cultural Focus

Even when P-3 saw multicultural issues from a universal perspective, she was also sensitive to culture specific issues. She was aware of discomfort of minority students in a group setting, so she made accommodation for them to be successful.

I understand that minority students would not feel comfortable talking in group. I intentionally give them space to do that. I check with them in individual supervision. They told me that they appreciated that. That in some way empowered me. A supervisor is someone with power. As a minority supervisor who has power, I intentionally used power as a supervisor to promote this kind of environment because I know sometimes other supervisors don't need to... it's not their priority. Because of my experiences and who I am, when I have time, I intentionally do that to create a good experience. 10 years later, everyone is the same. Right now where I am now, I don't intentionally put diversity... but if I notice, I will bring that up.

P-3 used her supervisory power judiciously to empower her supervisees in regard to multicultural competency while she attempted to be collaborative. This is because she was cognizant that not all supervisors strived to create a diversity friendly environment.

At this point, she did not intentionally broach the topic of diversity unless she observed cultural issues in supervisory interactions. She then would bring them up. She also needed to manage the obvious issue of language for students who spoke English as a second language. However, she looked at the challenge from a strength-based perspective.

In terms of language, international students are not efficient compared to American students. I see that they are good at their own language skills. Other thing is that my supervision style does not only focus on language. I am more an experiential therapist. I focus on non-verbal behaviors and emotions. That's why I look at these things rather than relying on language. I also notice that my Asian students with language barriers, that I think in some way helps. They can ask a lot of questions. I experienced that, too. I don't see that as a barrier. I see it as a tool. I think they got it in their master's programs. I don't have an issue with it in my Ph.D. program. They might have an accent. At the beginning when we have a group of students, some of my colleagues were concerned about it and the accent, so their clients might not come. I am not concerned at all. I'm glad that the students proved that they were doing well with clients. I am not worried.

P-3 considered "a language barrier as a tool." It gave her students permission to ask questions and to make sure they understood their clients, instead of assuming that the

students knew them. Most of her students proved that they could manage the language and cultural differences with clients.

She mentioned that she definitely focused on culture and helped students examine and reflect on their culture in a specific context in supervision, especially in a more private setting of individual supervision.

Whenever I start individual supervision, I asked a student a question about culture of themselves. I intentionally asked about contextual level in terms of culture. They think they might be something they are good at or they are sensitive, so they can be a trigger.

P-3 was direct enough to ask supervisees to reflect on their cultural selves. At the same time, she tried to be collaborative. She prepared students for the supervision process and made it transparent. She also shared her own experiences as an Asian student to model risk taking of self-reflection and self-disclosure.

That prepares students to know this is my style. When I introduce myself to students, I talk about my supervision model. I don't try to hide who I am. I intentionally tell them I am from Asia and I got my training here. My language may be a little barrier. Because I travel a lot, when I come back and teach summer practicum, it is hard to adjust. I am used to speaking my first language and later I speak English. I have an accent and lose an accent. I prepare students for that. By living experiences, I model what I experience for students and prepare them for it. When they see a supervisor doing that and being comfortable, they are more comfortable talking about it themselves because I show my vulnerable part, too. But, I still have to say I also don't tolerate if there is disrespect. I know that this is kind of sensitive because you are showing your vulnerability or talking about a hot topic when there is argument outside, I also care that students feel comfortable inside.

P-3 showed both her vulnerability as an RE minority and intolerance to disrespect towards differences. In addition to her collaborative model, she also talked about how she strived to make the supervisory environment safe and comfortable.

I try to create a comfortable environment for them. To educate my students, I told them bluntly that in my training I feel like I learned most from my colleagues. It's not directly from a supervisor. I came from a very collaborative model. When I say collaborative, I tell them each of you has different experiences. Some of you may be from a different country, race, where you grow up, different experiences... I see that influence clients. In my supervision style, I ask people for feedback about who they are, when they see clients, they might not have thought about the situation. I train them how to provide feedback to your colleague. But when you have so many different feedbacks, it's about how you take it. So, that's way I train them. I give them equal opportunity. I also train them there is no right or wrong answer. As a supervisor, I sometimes use my power for safety issues or something. When you see a client and how you see a client problem and what you can do, there is no definitely right or wrong answer.

P-3 learned more from fellow students and colleagues than her supervisors, so she encouraged supervisees to learn how to give and take feedback with their fellow students. She strived to balance being collaborative and directive.

She also educated supervisees and modeled the process of looking at the same issue from a different perspective, especially when they got stuck in the therapeutic process.

With collaborative diversity, I ask them see in a different way. I sometimes say it when we work with clients, we may be stuck with a blind spot. When you have someone with a different perspective come in, that might change something. So, that's why I educate and prepare them. When we have this kind of diversity talk, it would be easier in the group. Sometimes in the supervision, we do not have that much time. I don't always go in that depth, but at least I can give them feedback. In terms of depth about how sensitive, I do that individually with my supervisees. I will get their permission that I will ask you a very hard question. Or I will use self-disclosure... I use a lot of self-disclosure about my experiences to them. Several of my young female students said that they did not have much experience such sexual abuse, addiction... they think that will be a struggle. I use my self-disclosure. When I first came here, I didn't know much about sexual abuse. There was no divorce in my family. I shared that and that made them feel comfortable to talk about these issues.

P-3 used her self-of-supervisor and her own experiences to educate and help students learn multiculturalism. She continued to treat diversity issues and clinical issues on the same level.

Contrary to her collaborative approach, she had an experience of learning diversity issues in supervision which was painfully direct and challenging. She saw a place for it and respected it, but she thought that it was not her style.

I know that sometimes when people talk about diversity, you make people angry or cry. I am not that kind [of a supervisor]... I am upfront that it could be helpful, but... I had a supervisor that way in my country actually. When she spoke, it was like a knife went right into your heart. I understand that we have to face that, so I kind of respect that.

While this direct and confrontational approach was not for her, P-3 struggled with resistant students who were unaware of being resistant. She did not push them to look at their cultural biases since she saw “pushing” as working on a self-of-therapist issue which supervisees could see as personal. She suggested it tentatively and used group process to address it.

I think one of my challenges is that when I see that student are resistant, but they say they aren't resistant. That was hard. They said it was comfortable, but everyone else could see that it was not. I am still learning how to approach that. With where I am at, I don't push. Maybe in the future when I become a very old professor, I could get use to that and push a little. But now, I don't. Supervision is not therapy. So, I know if I push too much, sometimes I kind of dig personal issues. You don't know if students are ready to make that change or they want to deal with that issue yet, unless they say I want to seek out therapy to work on this issue. But, if I see it harmful for clients, I use it in a more objective way. I might say, ‘maybe you can look at it from another perspective.’ In terms of diversity, I haven't gotten to the point to challenge that. But, I know that that could be hard. My struggle is I notice there is a student who is resistant... I use a lot of group format and I am not only one feeling that way, if other students or colleague feel that way, I don't really want to push that, unless the student wants to work on that in individual supervision.

P-3 made suggestions of different perspectives, but she did not “push” at this point of her career.

She used her cultural self to educate supervisees through a direct experience of supervisees with her, without being forceful.

Here I do still keep a lot of traditional culture. I prefer using an experiential approach, so I also focus on Buddhist perspective. This is something I model to students. I tell my students that I am a Buddhist. In the Catholic conservative area, I am a religious minority. A good thing is that for some reason our director likes mind-body thing. So, I implement that and focus on mind-body, students like me for that. I bring that perspective in.

Fortunately, people in her program were receptive to her cultural approach even if they were in the culturally conservative area. P-3 trained and mentored more international students today.

She still felt that she needed to continue to grow in the area of multicultural competency. However, this was complicated because of politics of higher education.

I also see myself training students who are international and some of them are supervisors now... They are doing great. We are very supportive to each other. To be honest, I don't feel successful yet. It's an on-going process. I don't feel successful to help developing cultural competency yet, to be honest. I just do what I can do or I feel competent to do. I just feel like, because I am a professor and a supervisor, I have power to do something. I am also cautious that as an assistant professor, you don't need to do something too extreme.

P-3 had more power than before, but she also had to be careful what she did as RE minority faculty in terms of developing multicultural competency in students. She also discussed the politics of the field and publication.

It's also my intentionally doing international supervision studies. I know as a student, when I do the study, I don't want to piss off my professor. Our profession is a small field. You know what you said and we all know who said that. That wouldn't be great. Now I am a supervisor, so I don't mind. Maybe,

they don't mind. It's a different level. Some people say, 'why don't you do international supervisor's experiences?' I then say there is not much, so if you publish people would know who said it. I will see it later on.

While P-3 was aware of the need for research in diversity, she was also cautious not to put herself in a difficult situation by pushing the research.

Therefore, she still needed support. She continued to strive to connect with international and minority professionals and have support from them. She still appreciated mentoring from others while she mentored her students.

What will be helpful is that I continue to have a dialogue with colleagues. I still have friendship with international supervisors and minority supervisors. Most of my friends are, I have to be honest, international supervisors who were students and then became supervisors now. We still have these dialogues. The reason why I present at conference is that I want to draw someone who has [similar experiences.] It's to educate someone who doesn't know about it, but also to draw someone who has a similar interest and we can discuss ways because we do have struggles. Some people struggle earlier or later. We can share that. It has to be my first year. My Turkish colleague came here earlier than I did. She told me and prepared me for what's coming, so I know what I might go through, without feeling or saying, 'Oh, it's because of me...' It's kind of a common thing that everyone in your situation may go through. You can also hear someone go through successfully or get over their experiences. That's why I want to continue to do that like teaching new people for that. I know there were not too many international supervisors yet. There is a group raising and I will have contact with them. We discuss it. It was nice actually.

P-3 learned from both successful and struggling stories of other minority colleagues. She was excited that the number of minority supervisors was increasing. She enjoyed connecting and discussing with them.

Structural Analysis

Search for Support Friendly to Diversity

When P-3 decided to pursue a higher degree in her country of origin, she had good support and guidance in her home country from faculty who heard her plan and interests. She was foreign to the mental health field and did not know different disciplines in the field in the U.S. Her professors were willing to guide her through the process. Her professors studied and had the first-hand exposure to the different disciplines in the U.S. They helped her find the most suitable discipline for her when they heard her plan to work with families. This could be a complicated decision making process, even with right knowledge and support. She was aware that she needed to look for a supportive environment to diversity. She intentionally picked universities where people had good experiences and multiculturalism was emphasized. She found the facts through talking to current and past students in these programs. She also witnessed the excellence in diversity directly at some universities. She knew that it would be a lot of work to get a degree, but she felt confident that she would get through it with the support. She found international students and supportive colleagues along with a diversity friendly environment in the process. One of her colleagues encouraged her to get a job at her current university.

P-3 experienced the process of acculturation to the U.S. culture when she initially came here. It was hard. At the same time, she thought that her experiences in the U.S. were positive in general. Most of her faculty in her programs was White, so they did not necessarily understand what her struggle was. She “appreciated that they were willing to admit that they didn’t know.” They were open to listening to her and supportive. She

appreciated their efforts. Even when a program lacked diversity, she felt respected and supported. Her supervisor appreciated her different perspective. She was comfortable with who she was and what she did, including broaching cultural issues. The support she experienced boosted her confidence and ability. This created a positive cycle for her. As she gained more experiences, she became more confident. She also realized that her students were receptive to her. Her suggestions to students produced positive results. She then received positive feedback directly from her students, which in turn reinforced her confidence.

P-3 found her international supervisor was “quite sensitive toward” diversity and took an extra effort to connect with and support international students. She appreciated that the faculty had a meeting with all the international students and got together and got feedback from them. She was also aware that there were still few minorities in the field, so she felt that she was fortunate to be able to meet and connect with other minorities. She had been around a good number of students from her country, in addition to other international students when she went through her programs. She intentionally researched and chose schools that were diverse and/or culturally supportive, and it paid off. She also enjoyed the openness to other cultural issues such as age, spirituality, and sexual orientation. She had an insight on how to enhance diversity or openness to diversity in an academic program. She thought that a program policy needed to encourage and promote diversity, so it was important to recruit diverse students including older students and religious minorities. She is now faculty at a university. She tried to recruit diverse students while she needed to be selective. It was complicated. She struggled to have diverse students, but she tried to be upfront and transparent to them about the climate and

culture that were “not fun” and not diverse. She wanted potential students to explore their options for a good match.

Acculturation to the U.S. Culture

P-3 was a new student and a supervisor as an RE minority from Asia. Even with the support she had, at the beginning she went through a hard time to adjust to a new culture. She did not feel confident as a new supervisor. She felt “like an outsider initially.” She “questioned herself and her contribution as a supervisor.” This did not show to her students that she was competent since she was not open and direct about her thoughts. She also learned that it was “part of culture that students treated her” in a certain way as a new supervisor. She took the cultural process personally then. As she gained more experiences, she felt that she knew what to do and acted accordingly. She then became open and proactive to feedback from students about her supervision. Her students in turn also became open. Getting more diverse students later helped her feel even more comfortable. She soon started to feel that she and her work were appreciated. This led to her positive experiences.

As a part of the process of acculturation, P-3 felt she was in between being Asian and American. She felt “more like an international scholar, not just directly from her country.” She could not totally identify any of these cultures. She felt her Asian side stood out in the U.S. On the other hand, she felt more American in her country of origin. She was perceived as opinionated among Asians while she was seen as quiet and not speaking up much. She felt different cultural identity was highlighted, depending on a specific context, so it was hard for her to define her cultural identity.

Universalist in Supervision

As much as P-3 paid attention to a specific culture, she also observed universal characteristics. When she managed multicultural issues in supervision as an RE minority supervisor, she observed diversity within one cultural group. Both White students and minority students had a variety or diversity within its group, so she paid attention to the more universal variables such as personality. She tried to be sensitive to the variety within one group, or variable. She paid more attention to the personality of introverts rather than a quiet American or a traditional Asian personality. She also thought that everyone had a different culture. Since it was inevitable to work with diverse clients, she underscored that everyone needed to work on multicultural competency. She saw “cultural sensitivity” as a life-long process in which supervisees developed at their own pace. She experientially taught her supervisees how to work with different people by using herself and her own experiences. Multicultural competency was a growth area for herself as much as for her supervisees. She was aware that her approach to diversity could be different in the future as she gained more experiences. She also integrated culturally specific issues to universal or clinical issues such as divorce and substance use. She broached this clinical topic in a direct manner. She saw multicultural issues and clinical issues on the same spectrum. They both could impact the therapeutic process in a similar way, in terms of understanding and relating to clients. In a more private setting of individual supervision, she also brought up the cultural issues more directly.

Managing Culture in Supervision and Beyond

Even when P-3 saw multicultural issues from a universal perspective, she was also sensitive to culture specific issues. She was aware of discomfort of minority

students in a group setting, so she made accommodations for them to be successful by giving them more space and time and getting feedback from them. As an RE minority, she intentionally used her supervisory power to promote a culturally sensitive environment because she knew that this was not a priority for majority supervisors. In turn, she was empowered since minority students appreciated it. At this point, she did not intentionally broach the topic of diversity unless she observed cultural issues in supervisory interactions. She then would bring them up.

P-3 also needed to manage the obvious issue of language for students who spoke English as a second language. She was aware that students who spoke English as a second language were not as proficient as American students while they were proficient in their own language. However, she looked at the challenge from a strength-based perspective. She focused on and, by her modeling, had these students focus on non-verbal behaviors and emotions as a universal language. She considered “a language barrier as a tool.” It gave her students permission to ask a lot of questions and to make sure they understood their clients, instead of assuming that the students knew experiences of the clients. Most of her students proved that they could manage the language and cultural differences with clients.

P-3 definitely was more direct and focused on culture and helped students examine and reflect on their culture and its specific context in supervision, especially in a more private setting of individual supervision. It was to prevent their own cultural biases from becoming a “trigger” to therapeutic processes while she helped them identify their own cultural strengths. At the same time, she tried to be collaborative. She prepared students for her supervision process and made it transparent. She also shared her own

experiences as an Asian student to model risk taking of self-disclosure and to facilitate comfort with self-reflection. She discussed with students her challenges as a cultural person including struggles with language. She showed both her vulnerability as an RE minority and intolerance to disrespect towards differences. In her collaborative model, she attempted to make the supervisory environment safe and comfortable by exercising her supervisory power. She encouraged students to learn from each other since it was her experience that she learned more from peers than her supervisor. Therefore, she taught students how to give and receive feedback from each other. She worked hard to balance being collaborative and directive. She also educated and modeled supervisees to see the same issue from a different perspective, especially when they got stuck in clinical work. She used both group and individual supervision to facilitate this process. She used herself of supervisor and her own experiences to educate and help students learn multiculturalism and be comfortable with it. She continued to treat diversity issues and clinical issues on the same level.

Contrary to her collaborative approach, P-3 as a student had an experience of learning diversity in supervision which was intended to be painfully direct and emotionally challenging. She saw a place for this approach and respected it, but she thought that it was not her style, at least for now in her career. While this direct and confrontational approach was not for her, she struggled with resistant students who were unaware of being resistant. She did not push them to look at their cultural biases since she saw it as work on a self-of-therapist issue. Self-of-therapist work could be sensitive and personal for supervisees, so she was very careful not to cross the supervisory boundary into therapy. She tentatively suggested supervisees' cultural biases and used

group processes to address them. If necessary, she also suggested therapy for her supervisees. She was aware that she was still learning how to manage this kind of situation effectively. She thought that she might push more if she got older. She used her Asian self to show supervisees a different perspective through a direct cultural experience with her, without being forceful. Fortunately, people in her program were receptive to her cultural approach, even when they were in the culturally conservative area. She trains and mentors a greater number of international students today.

P-3 still felt that she needed to continue to grow in the area of multicultural competency. However, this was complicated with the politics of higher education. She was “cautious not to do anything too extreme.” She had more power than before, but she also had to be careful what she did as RE minority faculty in terms of developing multicultural competency in students. She faced the politics of the field in terms of publication. While she was aware of the need for research in diversity, she was also cautious not to put herself in a difficult situation by pushing the research agenda. Since the field was small and this kind of research was still lacking, people would know it would be her research.

Therefore, P-3 still needed support. She continued to strive to connect with international and minority professionals and have support from them. It helped her not to personalize and internalize a situation, so she appreciated mentoring from others while she mentored her students. She learned from both successful and struggling stories of other minority colleagues. She was excited that the number of minority supervisors was increasing. She enjoyed connecting and discussing with them.

Textual-Structural Description

P-3 was originally from Asia. Her family was relatively conservative as an Asian family, but her father was more liberal. Among the participants in this study, she was the youngest and had lived for the shortest period, approximately 10 years in the U.S. She also lived in a few different countries in the Middle East. She was in the counseling related field in her country of origin and worked with adolescents then, and she later wanted to work with families. She came to the U.S. to pursue higher education for that reason. In general, she had positive experiences in the field in the U.S., but she also had some challenges as an immigrant from Asia. She still travels back to her country and keeps her tradition and culture. She said, “The reason why I am successful is to have a good supportive group of people and I intentionally find a supportive group.” Because of her multiple roles of work in an academic setting, she discussed teaching, supervising, and researching in an integrated manner. She had practiced clinically for several years and provided supervision for about 5 years in the U.S.

When P-3 planned to pursue a higher degree in the U.S., she had good support and guidance in her home country from her professors who heard of her intention. She was foreign to the mental health field in the U.S and did not know different disciplines in the field. Her professors were willing to guide her through the process. Some of them studied and had the first-hand exposure to U.S. mental health care. They helped her find the most suitable discipline when they heard of her desire to work with families. She knew that she needed to look for a diversity supportive environment. She intentionally picked universities where people had good experiences and multiculturalism was emphasized. She found the facts through talking to current and past students in these

programs. The excellence in diversity she also witnessed directly at some universities also helped her make the decision to choose the right program:

The reason why I chose [the university] was also [because it was] famous for a lot of international students there. The cohort before me had one Korean and one Canadian. There was also a Chinese. They also had Taiwanese. In terms of supervision, when I was doing supervision training there when I first started, it was because my supervisor happened to be international. Although he was White, he was from Germany. He was quite sensitive toward [diversity].

P-3 found supportive international students, colleagues, and supervisors along with diversity friendly environment in the process. It would be a lot of work to get a degree, but she felt confident that she would get through it with good support. One of her fellow students graduated from the same program and got a job first. Her friend encouraged and supported her to get a job at the university she worked. When she initially came here to study, she experienced the process of acculturation to the U.S. culture. Although it was hard, her experiences in the U.S. were positive in general. Even when her programs lacked diversity, she felt respected and supported:

It was the supportive environment and people. Faculty, I have to be honest, most of faculty I encounter were White. Some of them might not have much experience [with diversity], but I appreciate that they were willing to admit that they didn't know. They were open with that. They were open to listen to my experiences.

P-3 appreciated their efforts to listen. Her supervisor also valued her unique perspective. She was comfortable with who she was and what she did, including broaching cultural issues. The support she experienced boosted her confidence and ability. This created a positive cycle for her. As she gained more experiences, she became more confident. She also realized that her students were receptive to her. Her suggestions to students

produced positive results. She then received positive feedback directly from her students, which in turn reinforced her confidence.

An international supervisor P-3 had was “quite sensitive toward” diversity and took an extra effort to connect with and support international students. She appreciated that the faculty had a meeting with all the international students and got together and solicited feedback from them. There were still few minorities in the field, so she was fortunate to be able to meet and connect with other minorities. She had been around a number of students from her country, in addition to other international students when she went through her programs. It paid off for her to intentionally research and to choose schools that were diverse and/or culturally supportive. She also enjoyed the openness to other cultural issues such as age, spirituality, and sexual orientation.

P-3 had an insight on how to enhance diversity or openness to diversity in an academic program. She thought that a program policy needed to encourage and promote diversity, so it was important to recruit diverse students including older students and religious minorities. She was now faculty at a university. It was necessary to recruit diverse students while she wanted to make sure students fit with the program. It was complicated. She struggled to have diverse students, but she tried to be upfront and transparent to them about the climate that was “not fun” and culture that was not diverse. Potential students were encouraged to explore their options for a good match.

When P-3 initially came to the U.S. from Asia, she was a new student and a new supervisor as an RE minority. Even with the support she had, at the beginning she went through a hard time to adjust to a new culture. This initially did not make her feel confident as a supervisor. She recounted the experience:

I did feel like an outsider initially. I also questioned myself and my contribution as a supervisor. Later on, I did not have that issue. I know that I hesitated to be open and direct about what I thought, so that did not show I was competent. Because I consulted with my supervisor, she mentioned that when you were new here, it's part of culture that students treated you this way. I took that very personally.

P-3 initially personalized the cultural behaviors from students. As she gained more experiences, she felt that she knew what to do and acted accordingly. She then became open and proactive to feedback from students about her supervision. Her students in turn became open. Getting more diverse students later helped her feel even more comfortable. She soon started to feel that she was appreciated as well as her work. This led to positive experiences.

As a part of the process of acculturation, P-3 faced bicultural identity development. Her experiences were between being Asian and American. She felt "more like an international scholar, not just directly from her country." She could not fully identify with any of these cultures. Her Asian side stood out in the U.S. On the other hand, she felt more American when she was with other Asians. She was perceived as opinionated among Asians while she was seen as quiet and not speaking up with Americans. Her different cultural identity was highlighted, depending on a specific context, so it was hard for her to define her cultural identity.

As much as P-3 paid attention to a specific culture and a specific context, she also observed universal characteristics. When she managed multicultural issues in supervision as an RE minority supervisor, there was diversity within one cultural group. She articulated:

I think it's more about personalities and characteristics. If you asked me where I stand, I am more of a universalist. I do have a conservative White student and a

liberal Asian student. I also have American students who are quiet. When they are quiet in group and people perceive them they don't talk much. They may be introverted, so I am sensitive to that.

Since there was the inner group difference, P-3 empathized with any students who did not fit in the norm. Everyone had a different culture. Hence, it was inevitable for everyone to work with diverse clients. She underscored that everyone needed to work on multicultural competency. She saw "cultural sensitivity" as a life-long process in which the supervisees developed at their own paces. She experientially taught her supervisees how to work with different people. She said, "They can start working with me to learn to work with others. You can learn how to get along with a minority colleague [in order to learn how] to work with others [minorities]."

P-3 used herself and her own experiences to educate others about diversity. Multicultural competency was a growth area for herself as much as for her supervisees. She was aware that her approach to diversity could evolve in the future as she gained more experiences. She did not "push" students with diversity at this point. She also integrated culturally specific issues into universal or clinical issues such as marital status and substance use. She broached this clinical topic in a direct manner. The supervision process where she challenged her supervisees was:

I explain that to my students that it can be your race and ethnicity, but it can also be your experiences by coming from an alcoholic family or you are from a non-divorced family, it might be hard for you to understand other people.

P-3 saw multicultural issues and clinical issues on the same spectrum. Both of these issues could impact the therapeutic process in a similar way, in terms of understanding clients and relating to them. In a more private setting of individual supervision, she also brought up the cultural issues more directly.

Even when P-3 saw multicultural issues from a universal perspective, she was also sensitive to culture specific issues. The discomfort of minority students in a group setting was obvious to her, so she made accommodations for them to be successful by giving them more space and time and getting feedback from them purposefully.

As a minority supervisor who has power, I intentionally used power as a supervisor to promote this kind of environment because I know sometimes other supervisors don't need to... it's not their priority. Because of my experiences and who I am, when I have time, I intentionally do that to create a good experience.

Her minority students appreciated her efforts and the environment P-3 created. In turn, she felt empowered by the results. At this point, she did not intentionally broach the topic of diversity in group unless she observed cultural issues in supervisory interactions. They then would be brought up in group supervision.

P-3 also needed to manage the obvious issue of language for students who spoke English as a second language. These students were not as proficient in using English as American students, but they were good in their native language clinically and linguistically. Furthermore, she looked at the challenge from a strength-based perspective. She emphasized that:

In terms of language, international students are not efficient compared to American students. I see that they are good at their own language skills. Other thing is that my supervision style does not only focus on language. I am more an experiential therapist. I focus on non-verbal behaviors and emotions. That's why I look at these things rather than relying on language. I also notice that my Asian students have language barriers, but I think in some way [having these barriers] helps. They can ask a lot of questions. I experienced that, too. I don't see that as a barrier. I see it as a tool.

The language barrier gave her students permission to make sure they understood their clients, instead of assuming that the students knew them. The deficit became an

advantage. Most of her students proved that they could manage the language and cultural differences with clients. In a private setting of individual supervision, P-3 definitely was more direct and focused on culture and helped students examine and reflect on their culture and its specific context. She helped students prevent their own cultural biases from becoming a “trigger” to therapeutic processes while she encouraged them to identify their own cultural strengths. At the same time, she tried to be collaborative. She prepared students for her supervision process and made it transparent. Through self-disclosure, she also shared her experiences as an Asian student to model risk taking and to facilitate comfort with self-reflection.

I don't try to hide who I am. I intentionally tell them I am from Asia and I got my training here. My language may be a barrier. I travel a lot. When I come back and teach summer practicum, it is hard for me to adjust. I am used to speaking my first language and later I speak English. I have an accent and lose an accent. I prepare students for that. By living experiences, I model what I experience for students and prepare them for it. When they see a supervisor doing that and being comfortable, they are more comfortable talking about it themselves because I show my vulnerable part, too.

P-3 used her vulnerability as an RE minority and also intolerance to disrespect towards differences help her supervisee develop cultural sensitivity. Her difference was an asset. In her collaborative model by exercising her supervisory power, she attempted to make the environment safe and comfortable. Since it was her experience that she learned more from peers than her supervisor, she encouraged students to learn from each other. Therefore, she taught students how to give and receive feedback from each other. It was a key for her to balance being collaborative and directive. She also educated and modeled supervisees to see the same issue from a different perspective, especially when they were stuck in clinical work. To help students learn multiculturalism and comfort

with it, she used her self-of-supervisor and her own experiences. In the process, diversity issues and clinical issues were treated on the same level.

Contrary to her collaborative approach, she had an experience of learning diversity issues in supervision which was painfully direct and emotionally challenging. She saw a place for it and respected it, but she thought that it was not her style, at least for now in her career. While this direct and confrontational approach was not for her, resistant students were challenging to her. She reflected on the encounter:

I think one of my challenges is that when I see that students are resistant, but they say they aren't resistant. That was hard. They said it was comfortable, but everyone else could see that it was not. I am still learning how to approach that. With where I am at, I don't push. Maybe in the future when I become a very old professor, I could get used to that and push a little. But now, I don't. Supervision is not therapy. I know if I push too much, sometimes I kind of dig personal issues. You don't know if students are ready to make that change or they want to deal with that issue yet...

P-3 did not push them to look at a diversity issue since she saw the work as a self-of-therapist issue. It's sensitive and personal for supervisees, so she was very careful not to cross the supervisory boundary into therapy. She suggested it tentatively and used group process to address it. If necessary, personal therapy for her supervisees was also recommended. She was aware that she was still learning how to manage this kind of situation effectively. She thought that she might push more if she got older and had more experiences. In the meantime, her Asian-self provided a direct cultural experience to educate supervisees through her on a different perspective, without being forceful. In this approach, her cultural self was used:

I do still keep a lot of traditional culture. I prefer using an experiential approach, so I also focus on Buddhist perspective. This is something I model to students. I tell my students that I am a Buddhist. In the Catholic conservative area, I am a religious minority. A good thing is that for some reason our director likes mind-

body thing. So, I implement that and focus on mind-body. Students like me for that. I bring that perspective in.

P-3 had a lot of Asian in her, and she took advantage of it. Fortunately, people in her program were receptive to her cultural approach in the culturally conservative area.

Later, she had more international students to train and mentor. She still felt that she needed to continue to grow in the area of multicultural competency. However, this was complicated with politics of higher education. She highlighted that “I just feel like, because I am a professor and a supervisor, I have power to do something. I am also cautious that as an assistant professor, you don’t need to do something too extreme.”

P-3 had more power than before, but she also had to be careful how she exercised the power as RE minority faculty, in terms of developing multicultural competency in students. The politics of the field and publication confronted her. While she was aware of the need for research in diversity, she was also cautious not to put herself in a difficult situation by pushing the research agenda. She articulated the challenge:

I know as a student, when I do the study, I don’t want to piss off my professor. Our profession is a small field. You know what you said and we all know who said that. That wouldn’t be great. Now I am a supervisor, so I don’t mind. Maybe, they don’t mind. It’s a different level. Some people say, ‘Why don’t you do international supervisor’s experiences?’ I then say, ‘There is not much [research]. If you publish [a research article], people would know who said it.’

P-3 was cautious about the research agenda in order to survive the field. Consequently, she still needed support. She continued to strive to connect with international and minority professionals and have support from them. It helped her not to personalize and internalize a situation, so she appreciated mentoring from others while she mentored her students. She learned from both successful and struggling stories of other minority colleagues. The number of minority supervisors was increasing, which made her excited.

Her source of vitality and success was connecting and discussing with these supervisors.

She enjoyed the diversity as support.

CHAPTER SEVEN: PARTICIPANT FOUR

Textual Analysis

P-4 was born and raised in Canada. He had a first-generation Asian father and second-generation Asian mother. Among all participants in this study, he was the only person who was in Canada and did not go through immigration by himself. He has been practicing clinically and providing supervision for a few decades.

Diverse city, Lack of Diversity in Profession, and Different Country

P-4 was born in Canada and had lived there for over 50 years. The city he lived in was very diverse due to a major industry it had. They had a lot of people from all over the world as educated and trained workers in this lucrative industry.

[The city I live in] is very diverse. There are a lot of Chinese, not so many Japanese. Lots of Koreans it seems these days. Lots of people from India, African Caribbean people... Most of black people are Caribbean decent. Lots of Somalis. Very diverse... This city is the head office for the most of these companies... There are a lot of Hispanics, right, because some of Latin American countries like Mexico, Venezuela... a lot of people who are skilled as an engineer or a geologist in the major industry.

P-4 had two professional identities in the counseling related field. He was more attracted to one of them. He felt most comfortable and fit for this profession because its approach took relationship and context into account.

My professional identities are in competition between two professions. There is no license for [the first profession] in our province. In most of provinces, there is no licensure for the profession. The only license I could have was [for the other profession]. But from nearly 25 or 35 years ago when I was in training in my master's, I was very interested in systemic approaches. You know, I am much more at home at national conference of the first profession than national conference of the latter profession.

Historically, the majority of supervisees he had were predominantly Caucasian until a few years ago. He realized, “Before this year, I can’t think of a single supervisee who was not white... Most of them have been, before last year or two years ago, I can’t think of anybody who is not white.”

P-4 had more RE minority supervisees in the past few years. When he was asked about his experience as an RE minority supervisor, he struggled to answer the question. He went back and forth between reflecting that there was and there was not an influence of diversity on his clinical and supervisory experiences.

I actually do not experience my racial or ethnic identity most of the time, not having much of effect on what I do. Now as I say it, I think about more effect on what I do. But, it has not been an obstacle because I have not felt people are polarized or reactive in any way. I do not know if it is a particular positive.

P-4 reflected on and processed his experiences as we interviewed. He thought that Canada was less polarized and divided in regard to the racial and cultural issues than U.S., so people were less heated and less emotional over this topic. One of his family members also noticed this.

I think we are less polarized than U.S. My niece studies in the U.S. She noticed in Indiana all the White kids and all the Black kids were totally separate from one another. I think that’s polarized there. I could be wrong. We got all the problems with race here. I think we are less polarized here.

As he reflected, he again went back and forth between thinking that culture was problematic and it was not in Canada.

I was going to say we did not have the kind of racism imbedded in law in the same way as the U.S. did. That’s not actually true... because the U.S. and Canada both had Chinese being barred from immigration and both had internment of Japanese people in World War II. They interned other nationalities... The problem has not been as visible... I think probably our ethnic minorities have assimilated better. I may be getting off topic, but the U.S. has been always

described as a melting pot. Some people in Canada have said to contrast us to the United States, we are not melting pot. We are a mosaic. But, it's paradoxical because we are more of a mosaic, but I think we are more assimilated people. But, they are not pressured to assimilate.

P-4 initially thought that Canada and the U.S. had different histories, but he then rethought that there were a lot of similarities between them. The cultural and political climate was a little different in Canada, so he thought that the lower pressure to acculturate in Canada paradoxically facilitated people to adjust to the culture more appropriately and effectively.

Cultural Tradition

In the past decade, P-4 has been reflecting and reconnecting with his family and their immigration history.

I have been more aware of not only where I came from, but also the migration my family has gone through... I have been spending more time with the extended family of my father's side... And then I started thinking about it and having conversations... When you start getting older, you start thinking that kind of stuff.

He was also getting old, and his age made him wonder and contemplate the family roots.

We just recently had more time to travel. Some of their kids were getting married, so we saw each other more in the last three or four years. In the last 15 years, there were those weddings. And then I started thinking about [the family's immigration history] and having conversations. That was the impetus.

P-4 experienced his relatives' major family life events, and he started having dialogues about his family's history.

He was also encouraged to examine and to pay attention to his own cultural and ethnic identity development when he went through his clinical training. In the process, because he had Asian background, he became aware that he thought "quite differently"

than the way other people think about the world. He further elaborated on the difference of the sense of happiness and emotional expressions.

The notion of happiness is different. If you are Asian, it's like, you know it's good enough. I have enough to eat. So, then I sometimes notice that hardship is kind of part of life. We got enough to eat. Yeah, you have to work 16 hours a day. Big deal. Sometimes, you know, when I am doing therapy, my internal dialogue is like, 'What are you complaining about?' Right? The other thing is emotional expression. I think there is a different mode of emotional expression... Very little vocabulary or permission for emotional expression, which is very common with many Asian people. So, when I see other Asian people, I had a sense of their history I can connect or connect with the idea of other Asian nationalities. I can connect with the idea of family degree, saving face... all that stuff. When I am seeing people who are Caucasian and living in Canada for a long time, I think they have a different idea of emotional expression and idea of happiness. Sometimes, I see that in supervisees, too.

P-4 paid attention to his own cultural history and attitude in supervision and used them to connect with his supervisees. He also was aware that these could impact the therapeutic relationship and process, so he tried not to let cultural biases interfere with the therapeutic and supervisory processes.

Addressing Culture in Supervision

When P-4 was asked about the cultural issues in supervision, he took a lot of time to reflect and answer questions. At times, he responded he had not thought about cultural topics. He said, "This is an interesting thought I never realized before." This interview was an insightful and reflective process for him. In supervision, he stated, "I have been able to connect with supervisees about common experiences that are in some way based on race or ethnicity."

One woman who was black and had a Caribbean roots. And another was Jewish. So, I was always trying to find a way to connect. With the Jewish supervisee, there was some common experience about Jews and Chinese being outcasts and minorities, and banned from doing certain kind of jobs. History of both

communities, right? Relying on being entrepreneurs, right? So, I connect with them where they are at now. I connected with a black supervisee around her experiences of being different from 80 % of other kids from the class, right? Sometimes, it might supply a point of connection and shared experiences. But, with Caucasian supervisees, I always found something else to connect with them about. Some other kind of common experiences. I utilize it in that way.

P-4 also utilized the same strategy with Caucasian supervisees. When he saw cultural issues affected a therapeutic process, he tentatively challenged his supervisees to examine their biases and their effects on the therapeutic process.

I don't think I do this in a bashing-a-head-with it way, but I think I challenge them about... to deconstruct their ideas about happiness and emotional expression. Step back and think maybe other ways people experience that. So, I kind of invite them to reflect on it. There is a point of difference or point of... sometimes, supervisees come up against that. I invite them to think about it.

P-4 looked for the teachable moment in discussing cultural encounters the supervisees experienced in therapy. He tried to be gentle by inviting them to "deconstruct" and reflect on their assumptions on their culture in contrast to their clients.

He intentionally broached and utilized issues of culture in supervision when he noticed it.

My Black supervisee last year had a name... It's an unusual name, a Celtic first name. Her last name was a typical Caucasian English name. So, a Celtic or Irish kind of name. She had no accent or Caribbean accent, right? She had a Canadian accent. But, she said, 'When I go up to a waiting room, people expect to see an Irish girl, right?' She was a black girl, right? That was kind of interesting. She was quite a reserved person. So, I said, 'What do you think about that? People are taken aback first, or do you think you've gotten away in your engagement?' She goes, 'Well, probably after a few minutes, you didn't. People are surprised and say with the name, 'I should be Irish.'" So, she raised it. My Jewish woman I was supervising. Sometimes, we talk about using a Colombo approach, 'I don't know' sort of approach, playing dumb, right? She would do that. She would use her Jewishness and because of religion, Yiddish she would say, 'My grandmother would have said you are little pisher.' A little kid who doesn't know what he was doing, right? She used those things and her ethnicity. It was quite delightful. I

encouraged her to use it in a careful way. That worked for me. My view is that people should use themselves and whatever different about themselves. She was doing that. That opened up the conversation about ethnic identity...

P-4 was receptive to his supervisees when they talked about cultural issues. He also encouraged his supervisees to use their culture as strength cautiously without assumptions. He enjoyed this kind of interaction with supervisees.

On the other hand, he did not think that culture influenced his own supervisory experiences. At the same time, he seemed to be aware of culture more often than he indicated. He went back and forth on the topic of cultural influence on his supervision experiences.

My difference with 95% Caucasian clients was cross cultural or whatever. It's always back of my mind. I'm really interested in people's immigration or migration stories and families. The difference is... I'm not an immigrant, but my dad was an immigrant. He came to Canada and moved within Canada. With his family, there are a lot of migration stories there. I'm interested in those stories and I think that actually creates more commonality than difference. I think the distinction isn't necessarily as much like race or ethnicity... If you lived in the same place for the last 30 years or generations, or have you been on a move? I can connect with people... A Somali client who lived in a refugee camp came to Canada and was working an unskilled job... Even when they were professionals, they worked at a slaughter house where they were taking apart cows. The experience of a Pakistani man who was a teacher, but did not speak English and was driving a taxi. These experiences were more real to me and I feel quite close to these experiences. I'm attuned to these experiences of migration and hardship.

P-4 was always mindful of his cultural heritage and history, so he was able to empathize with his clients and their cultural stories. They felt "more real" to him. This helped him establish rapport with them.

Nevertheless, he first focused more on the general and/or clinical issues. When therapy got stuck, he started to look at and managed cultural factors. He tried to "look for openings" for cultural conversations.

If therapy is going well, my supervisee is like, ‘Okay, the family is engaged. A change is happening.’ And then it doesn’t get on my radar. I am more worried... I’m kind of a theory map. I’m more interested in how is my supervisee... what’s their theoretical orientation, how they are executing it. Are they acting consistently with the theory? Is the theory helping them inform their observation? All that stuff. Now that I think about it, I only think about ethnicity if the work does not seem to be going well.

When therapy or supervision was not going well, P-4 would actively start looking for a different explanation. This was because he assumed and trusted that his supervisees had done the work on their multicultural issues and had developed self-awareness because he knew the schools they came from.

When he broached the topic of culture, he “usually raised it tentatively.” He thought:

Diversity issues would manifest in a relationship or an alliance. Either an alliance between a supervisor and a supervisee or between a therapist and a client. I’d focus on, like the work isn’t going well, the first place I look at is the alliance. Is there not a connection? Do you think that you are talking about different goals? Do you think there are sort of cross purposes in terms of that of therapy? And then I would tentatively sort of put it out there as a question. Do you think their reacting to your ethnicity is getting in the way of connection? That’s when it becomes sort of my business. Another thing I have my personal thing about is even in supervision or therapy, there is a lot of stuff that’s not my business. If your ethnicity or culture is interfering with the connection, then that becomes my business as a supervisor. So, then I would look at or I would inquire whether a supervisee thinks it’s interfering.

P-4 helped his supervisees examine how their cultures impact the therapeutic process. He was mindful that work on culture of a therapist could be personal, so he tried to be tentative and draw a boundary between therapy and supervisory work. He thought that he would bring up the topic of culture if it prevented a working alliance from forming

effectively. Otherwise, he tried to stay away from the topic since it could be personal.

He thought that this worked well since he strived to be “tentative” with the topic.

I don't think it's useful for me as a supervisor to say, 'I know what's going on. You are missing the boat in this way.' That's not a useful sort of supervision practice. Whatever it is, whether it is about a supervisee's ethnicity or... One of my supervisees last year... My first meeting with her usually... if you have a first meeting with a supervisee, let's get to know each other, what are your goals, what kind of therapy do you do... The first thing that amounted was crying, 'Ah...' because it was the first day. The first day she spent away from her 11-month-old son. So, her concern as a mother... I almost never go, 'This is what it is,' you know... 'Here is where you are missing the boat.' Do you think the fact that your history as a refugee has an effect on this? Or do you think that because you have been through so much hardship, you have a hard time and are taking this family's problem as trivial to you. Do you think the fact that you are so conflicted about being away from your kid, do you think that's... so I will propose... whether it's related to ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, or whatever, I will always raise these tentatively.

P-4 paid attention to broader issues of multiculturalism, from being a mother of an infant to being a refugee. He always attempted to be gentle and thoughtful when he talked about culture with a supervisee.

Since this was done to help supervisees see “blind spots”, he had to find a way to manage their inability to see the blind spots when he brought them up.

I'm really patient... Of course, you want to provide a good service, and you want to protect a client's welfare. It's about development of a supervisee. I can't afford not to be patient. I can raise it. 'Yeah, maybe, the fact that I'm black, the client isn't relating to you, well.' If there is something we can do about it. They might be tentative and say, 'I don't think that's it.' So, they don't make connections, even if I'm right, so to speak. You don't think anything about it. I have to be patient. And maybe part of my job is... I believe part of my job as a supervisor is to nudge a supervisee about their blind spots. So, in my supervision model, one of my roles is to be a catalyst. Raising awareness of an issue that might interfere with the supervisee's effectiveness.

In this developmental process, P-4 had to be patient when he “nudged” supervisees to increase the awareness of their blind spots with cultural issues. He tried to be a “catalyst” to increase supervisees’ self-awareness and therapeutic effectiveness.

He and his supervisees did not experience strong emotional reactions when he nudged them because cultural issues are less polarized in Canada, and his supervisees had good training for multicultural competency. He believed that they already had good self-awareness. He also cautioned not to make cultural discussions too political.

Whether it’s in class or supervision, I think that conversations have to be practical. I think that sometimes we lose students when these conversations are too theoretical or too political. Or too blaming of white... usually male, right. I think we lose... I don’t know if you had this experience of either being a student or teaching about diversity, somebody’s rolling their eyes, usually guys. Geez, this crap again.

This also might help his supervision not to be too heated. He tried to make cultural discussions practical to his supervisees’ work, so he would not lose their interest in these discussions. He said, “Okay, you are black and the family is a recent immigrant from Croatia. Is that getting in a way of your relationship with the family? It has to be practical. Otherwise, it’s not useful.”

P-4 helped supervisees connect their own culture with a therapeutic issue and their clients. When he was asked how he would work with a supervisee with the same Asian background, he said:

The process would be the same, but the content might be different. Because I might ask tentatively... If I have an Asian supervisee... You know about the stereotype about tiger mother, right? Asian parenting is very directive and picky, which is my experience as a kid, right? So, I might ask or I might use those kind of... I think the tiger mother thing has a cultural meaning, right? Was that your experience if it’s an Asian supervisee... I usually use self-disclosure sort of strategic sort of laughing at myself way. Oh, yeah. My mom was on my case all

the time. Blah, blah, blah. What about you? So, I would use that to ask about it. Or they work all the time. If it's an Asian supervisee, they work all the time. They work 16 hours a day. Or saving everything and not wasting anything. There is this internet thing. You know Chinese when... they got 1500 yogurt containers... stuff like that. [These are] some of easy things that are cultural bridges that I can raise and use because I am older than most of my supervisees. I can raise that in a self-deprecating making-fun-of-myself kind of way. I think that's my approach. There is some connection. Or male... I'm an Asian guy... I was a participant in his thesis. As part of conversation, what did your parents think when you said you wanted to do master's in counseling, right? You can't make money doing that. We were joking back and forth about it. Using it to find a connection, but the process would be the same.

P-4 did not change the process of supervision when he worked with an Asian supervisee, but he was aware of and paid attention to cultural experiences and meanings of supervisees. He used these to connect with his supervisees and also to help supervisees see how they influenced their therapeutic work.

He gained satisfaction from seeing supervisees learn and grow clinically, so this was his motivation to continue to train and supervise. He said, "I love supervision because I actually love seeing people put it together. I love seeing people develop. I love seeing people making connections." P-4 could do supervision as his main professional activity. He thought that he was a good supervisor, so he wanted to put a lot of time and energy into it. Therefore, he believed that he could maximize his influence and do the most good by doing supervision and training.

Key Mentors for his Successful Career

P-4 had four mentors who contributed to his success today. Their comments and discussions "turn into career mentoring" for him. He continued to believe that "relationships are a key" in his career, just like in therapy and supervision. Two of his

mentors were his supervisors from his graduate program and his Ph.D. program. The third person was one of his friends.

[He] first hired me to start and eventually run an educational program. I worked for him for 8, 9 years. He was a key contact. He was an educational administrator. A lot of my success in business has been because of contracts he and I had developed together. We had a couple of different contacts for school based service delivery.

His friend was a great business partner as well as a mentor to him. His mentor helped him launch and establish his career.

The fourth person, Bill O'Hanlon, is well known and encouraged him to write and present.

[He] encouraged me to write about... I sort of wrote about... I am one of the first people to write about the similarities and differences between Narrative and Solution Focused. He supported me a little bit to get out as a workshop presenter.

P-4 thought "if it was for them, I wouldn't have this career." He was grateful for the relationships and mentorships. He gave a reason why the mentorship from these mentors was helpful to him. He had great respect for each one of them.

I'm pretty self-confident. For me when I usually made a decision, I'm very decisive. If I'm going to that direction, I'm going that direction. But each of these four people... My respect for them comes out of the fact that they actually do know a lot more than me about whatever it is, right. There are very few people I respect... I shouldn't say that way, but... where I would really defer to their opinion. I may disagree with you, but the track record has been that you know best. I don't like to listen to other people, but these are four people who can tell me what to do.

His mentors' knowledge and experience made him have respect for them, so P-4 felt he had better listen to them for his own benefit even when he was confident and decisive on his own.

He is now in a “senior role” and people come to him for mentorship. He tried to give what he received back to the field in spite of the economic disadvantage of providing supervision.

That’s really important, even if it’s not part of university duties. Sometimes, I do... some of these things I do, do it as paid. If it’s supervision, I make much less money doing supervision than I do other things, right. People in my practice, because I have private practice, 12 people at work in my practice, they got whatever time with me for nothing. Economically, it’s not very good. I’m trying to pass it on. If people show an interest, I try to support it. The key is relationships.

P-4 had a sense of duty to the field and wanted to pay it forward to the next generation of professionals in addition to having love and passion for providing supervision.

Structural Analysis

Race/Ethnicity Is Less of a Problem in Canada

The city P-4 lived in was very diverse due to a major industry. They had a lot of people from all over the world as educated and trained workers in this lucrative industry since the city had the head offices for these companies. On the other hand, the majority of supervisees he had were predominantly Caucasians till a few years ago. He had more RE minority supervisees in the past few years. When he was asked about his experience as an RE minority supervisor, he took time to answer the question. He went back and forth between reflecting that there was and there was not an influence of diversity on his clinical and supervisory experiences. He did not experience his RE minority status as a challenge, so his supervision experience as an RE minority was neutral. When he reflected on and processed his experiences as we interviewed, he thought that Canada was less polarized and divided in regards to the racial and cultural issues. Hence, people were less reactive emotionally over this topic. His niece studied in the U.S and witnessed

more segregation and polarization in the U.S. than Canada. He again went back and forth between thinking that culture was problematic and it was not. He initially thought that Canada and the U.S. had different histories, but he then rethought that there were a lot of similarities between these countries. He admitted that there also were problems with race in Canada, but these problems were less visible there. He thought both the U.S. and Canada had discriminatory laws, immigration history, and treatment during wars. He used the analogy of a melting pot in the U.S. versus a mosaic in Canada. The cultural and political climate was a little different in Canada, so he thought that the lower pressure to assimilate in Canada paradoxically facilitated people to acculturate more appropriately and effectively. People from different cultures were allowed to maintain their own cultures, and they were more accepted there.

While P-4 was aware of his cultural background, he has been reflecting and reconnecting more with his family and their immigration history in the past decade. He was also getting old, and his age made him wonder and contemplate the family roots. He experienced his relatives' major family life events, and he spent more time with them. He then started having more conversations with his extended family members and thinking more about his family's history.

P-4 was also encouraged to examine and to pay attention to his own cultural and ethnic identity development when he went through his clinical training. In the process, because he had Asian background, he became aware that he thought "quite differently" than the way other people think about the world. He was aware of Asian cultural values. The meaning of happiness was different. For some Asians, hardship was part of life, so what made a person happy was very simple, such as having enough to eat. Asians also

accepted it as a norm to work a lot of hours, often for little in return. This definitely influenced P-4 in therapy when his clients complained about what he thought petty. Asians also had “very little vocabulary or permission for emotional expressions.” This culturally specific knowledge helped him connect with other Asians. He paid attention to his own cultural history and attitude in supervision and used them to connect with his supervisees. At the same time, he was also knowledgeable of Caucasian culture, so he utilized it with Caucasian clients and supervisees. He was aware that different cultures could impact the therapeutic relationship and process, so he tried not to let his cultural biases interfere with the therapeutic and supervisory processes.

Manage Cultural Issues in Supervision without Getting Too Personal

When P-4 was asked about the cultural issues in supervision, he took a lot of time to reflect and answer questions. At times, he responded he had not thought about cultural topics. “This is an interesting thought I never realized before,” he said. This interview was a reflective and insightful process for him.

In supervision, P-4 first focused more on the general and/or clinical issues such as working alliance, theoretical lens, application of theory, and therapeutic progress since these were his “business,” or duty as a supervisor. When therapy got stuck, he started to look at and manage cultural factors. He tried to “look for openings” for cultural conversations. He would actively search for a different explanation. He did not have to push cultural issues, because he trusted that his supervisees had done the work on their multicultural issues and had developed self-awareness in their past training. He knew the programs and schools they came from. When he broached the topic of culture, he “usually raised it tentatively.” He thought, “Diversity issues would manifest in a

relationship.” He helped supervisees pay attention to a connection and an agreement on therapeutic goals. If there was a problem with a relationship or a therapeutic goal, he helped them examine and reflect on their clients’ and their own reactions to race and culture in the therapeutic process. He was mindful that work on culture of a therapist could be personal, so he was tentative and drew a boundary with his supervisees between therapy and supervisory work. He thought that he would bring up the topic of culture if it prevented a working alliance from forming effectively. Otherwise, he tried to stay away from the topic since it could be personal. He thought that his approach worked well since he strived to be “tentative” with the topic.

Interestingly, P-4 did not think that culture influenced his own supervisory experiences. At the same time, he seemed to be aware of culture more often than he indicated. He again went back and forth on the topic of cultural influence on his supervision experiences. He always attempted to be gentle and thoughtful when he talked about culture with a supervisee. Since his goal was to help supervisees see “blind spots”, so he had to find a way to manage their inability to see them when he brought up the blind spots. In the process, patience was the key. He was tentative with the topic of culture, even when he thought that he was right on the target and his supervisee did not see it. In this developmental process, he had to be patient when he “nudged” supervisees to increase the awareness of their blind spots with cultural issues. He tried to be a “catalyst” to increase supervisees’ self-awareness in order to improve therapeutic effectiveness. He and his supervisees did not experience strong emotional reactions when he nudged them. This might be because he had a gentler approach. In addition,

cultural issues are less polarized in Canada, and his supervisees had good training for multicultural competency. He believed that they already had good self-awareness.

P-4 cautioned not to make cultural discussions too political. Otherwise, he could lose students, or their curiosity. This might help his supervision not to be too heated or emotional. He tried to make cultural discussions practical and useful to his supervisees in their therapeutic work, so he would not lose their interest in these discussions. He helped supervisees connect their own culture and clients' culture with a therapeutic issue. He also broached cultural issues by using cultural bridges "in a self-deprecating making-fun-of-myself kind of way" and joked about some aspects of a culture. He thought his being older than supervisees also helped in the process. He did not change the process of supervision when he worked with an Asian or minority supervisee, but he was aware of and paid attention to cultural experiences and meanings of supervisees. He used these to connect with his supervisees and also to help supervisees see how these experiences influenced their therapeutic work. He got satisfaction from seeing supervisees learn and grow clinically, so this was his motivation to continue to train and supervise. He could do supervision as his main professional activity since he loved providing supervision. He thought that he was a good supervisor, so he wanted to put a lot of time and energy into it. Therefore, he believed that he could maximize his influence and do the most good by doing supervision and training.

Using Culture as a Bridge to Connect

In supervision, P-4 had "been able to connect with supervisees about common experiences that were in some way based on race or ethnicity," regardless of minority/majority status. With a Jewish supervisee, he identified and utilized common

experiences such as “being outcasts and minorities,” the history of “being banned from certain kinds of jobs,” being community oriented, and “being entrepreneurs.” With a black supervisee, he used the experience of being a minority in a community and classroom. He was also able to find commonalities with Caucasian supervisees, so he utilized the same strategy with Caucasian cultures for these supervisees. He knew that most of his encounters with others were cross cultural as an RE minority in the field that was predominantly White. This made him interested and curious about culture, especially immigration stories. He was attuned and felt close to these experiences and their hardship since his family had a recent history of immigration. He was always mindful of his cultural heritage and history, so he was able to empathize with his clients and supervisees and their cultural stories. These experiences felt “more real” to him. This helped him connect with his clients and supervisees.

Even with this cultural attunement, P-4 still paid attention to broader issues of multiculturalism, from being a mother to being a refugee. He saw clinical issues and cultural issues on a continuum. When he saw cultural issues affected a therapeutic process, he tentatively challenged his supervisees to examine their biases and their effects on the therapeutic process. He did not think that he used a confrontational approach with his supervisees. He looked for the opportunities to discuss cultural encounters his supervisees experienced in therapy. He then gently invited them to “deconstruct” and reflect on their assumptions on their culture in contrast to their clients, in order to see a different perspective or a big picture. He intentionally broached and utilized issues of culture in supervision when he noticed it. He was receptive to his supervisees when they talked about cultural issues. He also encouraged his supervisees to use their culture as

strength cautiously. This in turn opened up more dialogues about race and culture. He enjoyed this kind of culturally focused interaction with supervisees.

Mentors for His Success

P-4 has been successful as a clinician, a supervisor, and an educator. He had four mentors who contributed to his success today. Their comments and discussions “turn into career mentoring” for him. He continued to believe that “relationships are a key” in his career, just like in therapy and supervision. Two of his mentors were his supervisors from his graduate program and his Ph.D. program. The third person was one of his friends. His friend was a great business partner as well as a mentor to him. His mentor helped him launch and establish his career. He helped P-4 develop business contracts that were successful. The fourth person is well known. Bill O’Hanlon encouraged him to write and publish and also present workshops. He thought, “If it wasn’t for them, I wouldn’t have this career.” He was grateful for the relationships and mentorships. He thought these mentors were helpful to him because he had great respect for each one of them. His mentors’ knowledge and experience made him have respect for them, so he felt he’d better listen to them for his own benefit even when he was confident and decisive on his own. He is now in a “senior role” and people come to him for mentorship. He tried to give what he received back to the field in spite of the financial disadvantage of providing supervision. He had a sense of duty to the field and wanted to pay it forward to the next generation of professionals, in addition to having love and passion for providing supervision.

Textual-Structural Description

P-4 was born and raised in Canada. He had a first-generation Asian father and second-generation Asian mother. Among all participants in this study, he was the only person who did not go through immigration by himself. He lately started to connect with his cultural and familial roots since he was aging and had family events that made him more curious about his family immigration history. The Canadian culture was also familiar to him since he had lived there for several decades since birth. He lived in a city that was a major hub for international industries which attracted diverse population to the community. In the interview, he often needed to take time to reflect on questions on diversity. The topic of diversity was less controversial in Canada according to him. This definitely influenced how he experienced supervision. Since diversity issues was less polarized, his cultural challenges were less poignant in his experiences as an RE minority supervisor than other participants' in this study. He has been practicing clinically and providing supervision for a few decades.

The city P-4 lived in was very diverse due to a major industry. The city had the head offices for these companies, and they had a lot of workers from all over the world who were educated and trained for this lucrative industry. On the other hand, the majority of supervisees he had were predominantly Caucasians until a few years ago. He started to have more RE minority supervisees in the past few years. When he was asked about his experience as an RE minority supervisor, he took time to answer the question. His reflection went back and forth between there was and there wasn't an influence of diversity on his clinical and supervisory experiences. He did not experience his RE

minority status as a challenge, so his supervision experience as an RE minority was neutral. He recalled and processed his experiences:

I actually do not experience my racial or ethnic identity most of the time, not having much of effect on what I do. Now as I say it, I think about more effect on what I do. But, it has not been an obstacle because I have not felt people are polarized or reactive in any way. I do not know if it is a particular positive.

When he was interviewed, P-4 thought that Canada was less polarized and divided in regards to the racial and cultural issues. Hence, people were less reactive emotionally over this topic. His niece studied in the U.S and witnessed more segregation and polarization in the U.S. than Canada. He again went back and forth between thinking that culture was problematic and it was not. He initially thought that Canada and the U.S. had different histories, but he then rethought that there were a lot of similarities between these countries. He admitted that there also were problems with race in Canada, but these problems were less visible there. Both the U.S. and Canada had discriminatory laws, immigration history, and treatment during wars such as internment camps. He used the analogy of a melting pot in the U.S. versus a mosaic in Canada. The cultural and political climate was a little different in Canada, so he thought that the lower pressure to assimilate in Canada paradoxically facilitated people to acculturate more appropriately and effectively. People from different cultures were allowed to maintain their own cultures, and they were more accepted there:

I was going to say we did not have the kind of racism imbedded in law in the same way as the U.S. did. That's not actually true because the U.S. and Canada both had Chinese being barred from immigration and both had internment of Japanese people in World War II. They interned other nationalities. The problem has not been as visible. I think probably our ethnic minorities have assimilated better. I may be getting off topic, but the U.S. has been always described as a melting pot. Some people in Canada have said to contrast us to the United States, we are not melting pot. We are a mosaic. But, it's paradoxical because we are

more of a mosaic, but I think we are more assimilated people. They are not pressured to assimilate.

While he was aware of his cultural background, P-4 has been reflecting and reconnecting more with his family and their immigration history in the past decade. He was also getting old, and his age made him wonder and contemplate his family roots. His relatives had major family life events such as weddings lately, and he spent more time with them. This then facilitated him to start having more conversations with his extended family members and thinking more about his family's history.

P-4 was also encouraged to examine and to pay attention to his own cultural and ethnic identity development when he went through his clinical training. In the process, because he had Asian background, he became aware that he thought "quite differently" than the way other people think about the world. His Asian cultural values impacted him.

The notion of happiness is different. If you are Asian, it's like, you know it's good enough. I have enough to eat. So, then I sometimes notice that hardship is kind of part of life. We got enough to eat. Yeah, you have to work 16 hours a day. Big deal. Sometimes, you know, when I am doing therapy, my internal dialogue is like, 'What are you complaining about?' Right? The other thing is emotional expression. I think there is a different mode of emotional expression... Very little vocabulary or permission for emotional expression, which is very common with many Asian people. So, when I see other Asian people, I had a sense of their history. I can connect or connect with the idea of other Asian nationalities. I can connect with the idea of family degree, saving face... all that stuff. When I am seeing people who are Caucasian and living in Canada for a long time, I think they have a different idea of emotional expression and idea of happiness. Sometimes, I see that in supervisees, too.

The meaning of happiness was different. For some Asians, hardship was part of life, so what made a person happy was very simple, such as having enough to eat. Asians also accepted it as a norm to work a lot of hours, often for little in return. This definitely

influenced P-4 in therapy when his clients complained about what he thought was petty. Asians also had “very little vocabulary or permission for emotional expressions.” This culturally specific knowledge helped him connect with other Asians. He paid attention to his own cultural history and attitude in supervision and used them to connect with his supervisees. At the same time, he was also knowledgeable of Caucasian culture, so he utilized it with Caucasian clients and supervisees. Different cultures could impact the therapeutic relationship and process. Therefore, he tried not to let his cultural biases interfere with the therapeutic and supervisory processes.

When P-4 was asked about the cultural issues in supervision, he took a lot of time to reflect and answer questions. At times, he responded he had not thought about cultural topics. “This is an interesting thought I never realized before,” he said. This interview was a reflective and insightful process for him.

In supervision, he first focused more on the general and/or clinical issues such as working alliance, theoretical lens, application of theory, and therapeutic progress since these were his “business” or duties as a supervisor. When therapy reached an impasse, he started to look at and manage cultural factors. He tried to “look for openings” for cultural conversations. He would actively search for a different explanation. He believed that:

If therapy is going well, my supervisee is like, ‘Okay, the family is engaged. A change is happening.’ And then it doesn’t get on my radar. I am more worried... I’m kind of a theory map. I’m more interested in how is my supervisee... what’s their theoretical orientation, how they are executing it. Are they acting consistently with the theory? Is the theory helping them inform their observation? All that stuff. Now that I think about it, I only think about ethnicity if the work does not seem to be going well.

P-4 did not have to push cultural issues because he trusted that his supervisees had completed the work on their multicultural issues and had developed self-awareness in

their past training. He knew the programs and schools they came from. When he broached the topic of culture, he “usually raised it tentatively.” He thought, “Diversity issues would manifest in a relationship.” He helped supervisees pay attention to a connection and an agreement on therapeutic goals. If there was a problem with a relationship or a therapeutic goal, he helped them examine and reflect on their clients’ and their own reactions to race and culture in the therapeutic process. His supervision process was:

Do you think their reactions to your ethnicity are getting in the way of connection? That’s when it becomes sort of my business. Another thing I have my personal thing about is even in supervision or therapy, there is a lot of stuff that’s not my business. If your ethnicity or culture is interfering with the connection, then that becomes my business as a supervisor. So, then I would look at or I would inquire whether a supervisee thinks it’s interfering.

P-4 was mindful that work on culture of a therapist could be personal, so he was tentative and drew a boundary with his supervisees between therapy and supervisory work. He thought that he would bring up the topic of culture if it prevented a working alliance from forming effectively. Otherwise, he tried to stay away from the topic since it could be personal. He thought that his approach worked well since he strived to be “tentative” with the topic.

I don’t think I do this in a bashing-a-head-with-it way, but I think I challenge them about... to deconstruct their ideas about happiness and emotional expression. Step back and think maybe other ways people experience that. So, I kind of invite them to reflect on it. There is a point of difference or point of... sometimes, supervisees come up against that. I invite them to think about it.

Interestingly, P-4 did not think that culture influenced his own supervisory experiences. At the same time, he seemed to be aware of culture more often than he indicated. He again went back and forth on the topic of cultural influence on his supervision

experiences. He always attempted to be gentle and thoughtful when he talked about culture with a supervisee. Since his goal was to help supervisees see “blind spots”, he had to find a way to manage their inability to see them when he brought up the blind spots. In the process, patience was the key. He was tentative with the topic of culture, even when he thought that he was right on the target and his supervisee did not see it.

His approach was:

I’m really patient... Of course, you want to provide a good service, and you want to protect a client’s welfare. It’s about development of a supervisee. I can’t afford not to be patient. I can raise it. Yeah, maybe, the fact that you are black, the client isn’t relating to you well. Maybe, there is something we can do about it. They might be tentative and say, ‘I don’t think that’s it.’ So, they don’t make connections, even if I’m right, so to speak. You don’t think anything about it. I have to be patient. And maybe part of my job is... I believe part of my job as a supervisor is to nudge a supervisee about their blind spots. So, in my supervision model, one of my roles is to be a catalyst. Raising awareness of an issue that might interfere with the supervisee’s effectiveness...

In this developmental process, P-4 had to be patient when he “nudged” supervisees to increase the awareness of their blind spots with cultural issues. He tried to be a “catalyst” to increase supervisees’ self-awareness in order to improve therapeutic effectiveness. He and his supervisees did not experience strong emotional reactions when he nudged them. This might be because he had a gentler approach. In addition, cultural issues are less polarized in Canada, and his supervisees had good training for multicultural competency. He believed that they already had developed self-awareness.

P-4 cautioned not to make cultural discussions too political. Otherwise, he could lose students, or their curiosity. This might help his supervision not to be too heated or emotional. He tried to make cultural discussions practical and useful to his supervisees in

their therapeutic work, so he would not lose their interest in these discussions. He helped supervisees connect their own culture and clients' culture with a therapeutic issue.

Whether it's in class or supervision, I think that conversations have to be practical. I think that sometimes we lose students when these conversations are too theoretical or too political. Or too blaming of white... usually male, right. I think we lose... I don't know if you had this experience of either being a student or teaching about diversity, somebody's rolling their eyes, usually guys. Geez, this crap again.

P-4 also broached cultural issues by using cultural bridges "in a self-deprecating making-fun-of-myself kind of way" and joked about some aspects of a culture. Being older than supervisees also helped in the process. He did not change the process of supervision when he worked with an Asian or minority supervisee, but he was aware of and paid attention to cultural experiences and meanings of supervisees. He used these to connect with his supervisees and also to help supervisees see how these experiences influenced their therapeutic work. He gained satisfaction from seeing supervisees learn and grow clinically, so this was his motivation to continue to train and supervise. He could do supervision as his main professional activity since he loved providing supervision. He thought that he was a good supervisor, so he wanted to put a lot of time and energy into it. Therefore, he believed that he could maximize his influence and contribution to the field by providing supervision and training.

In supervision, P-4 had "been able to connect with supervisees about common experiences that were in some way based on race or ethnicity," regardless of minority/majority status. With a Jewish supervisee, he identified and utilized common experiences such as "being outcasts and minorities," the history of "being banned from certain kinds of jobs," being community oriented, and "being entrepreneurs." With a

black supervisee, he used the experience of being a minority in a community and classroom. He talked about how to connect with an Asian supervisee by sharing his cultural experience:

You know about the stereotype about tiger mother, right? Asian parenting is very directive and picky, which is my experience as a kid, right... I usually use self-disclosure sort of strategic sort of laughing at myself way. 'My mom was on my case all the time... What about you?' I would use that to ask about it. They work all the time. If it's an Asian supervisee, they work all the time. They work 16 hours a day. Or saving everything and not wasting anything.

Self-disclosure was used to connect. P-4 was also able to find commonalities with Caucasian supervisees, so he utilized the same strategy with Caucasian cultures for these supervisees. Most of his encounters with others were cross cultural as an RE minority since the field was predominantly White. He was mindful and interested and curious about culture, especially immigration stories. He was attuned and felt close to these experiences and their hardship since his family had a recent history of immigration. He was always mindful of his cultural heritage and history, so he was able to empathize with his clients and supervisees and their cultural stories. These experiences felt "more real" to him. This helped him connect with his clients and supervisees. He explained his thought process:

My difference with 95% Caucasian clients is cross cultural or whatever. It's always on the back of my mind. I'm really interested in people's immigration or migration stories and families. The difference is... I'm not an immigrant, but my dad was an immigrant. He came to Canada and moved within Canada. With his family, there are a lot of migration stories there. I'm interested in those stories and I think that actually creates more commonality than difference. I think the distinction isn't necessarily as much like race or ethnicity... If you lived in the same place for the last 30 years or generations, or have you been on a move? I can connect with people... A Somali client who lived in a refugee camp came to Canada and was working an unskilled job... Even when they were professionals, they worked at a slaughter house where they were taking apart cows. The

experience of a Pakistani man who was a teacher, but did not speak English and was driving a taxi. These experiences were more real to me and I feel quite close to these experiences. I'm attuned to these experiences of migration and hardship.

Even with this cultural attunement, P-4 still paid attention to broader issues of multiculturalism, from being a mother to being a refugee. He saw clinical issues and cultural issues on a continuum. When he saw cultural issues affected a therapeutic process, he tentatively challenged his supervisees to examine their biases and their effects on the therapeutic process. He did not think that he used a confrontational approach with his supervisees. He looked for the opportunities to discuss cultural encounters his supervisees experienced in therapy. He then gently invited them to "deconstruct" and reflect on their assumptions on their culture in contrast to their clients, in order to see a different perspective or a big picture. He intentionally broached and utilized issues of culture in supervision when he noticed it. He was receptive to his supervisees when they talked about cultural issues. He reflected on one of supervisee's use of culture:

She would use her Jewishness and because of religion, Yiddish she would say, 'My grandmother would have said you are little pisher.' A little kid who doesn't know what he was doing, right? She used those things and her ethnicity. It was quite delightful. I encouraged her to use it in a careful way. That worked for me. My view is that people should use themselves and whatever different about themselves.

P-4 encouraged his supervisees to use their culture as strength. This in turn opened up more dialogues about race and culture. He enjoyed this kind of culturally focused interaction with supervisees.

P-4 has been successful as a clinician, a supervisor, and an educator. He had four mentors who contributed to his success today. Their comments and discussions "turned into career mentoring" for him. He continued to believe that "relationships are a key" in

his career, just like in therapy and supervision. Two of his mentors were his supervisors from his graduate program and his Ph.D. program. The third person was one of his friends. His friend was a great business partner as well as a mentor to him. His mentor helped him launch and establish his career. He helped P-4 develop business contracts that were successful. The fourth person is well known. Bill O'Hanlon encouraged him to write, publish, and also present workshops. He thought, "If it wasn't for them, I wouldn't have this career." He was grateful for the relationships and mentorships when he reflected:

I'm pretty self-confident. For me when I usually made a decision, I'm very decisive. If I'm going to that direction, I'm going that direction. But each of these four people... My respect for them comes out of the fact that they actually do know a lot more than me about whatever it is, right. There are very few people I respect... I shouldn't say that way, but... where I would really defer to their opinion. I may disagree with you [mentors], but the track record has been that you know best. I don't like to listen to other people, but these are four people who can tell me what to do.

These mentors were helpful to P-4 because he had great respect for each one of them. His mentors' knowledge and experience made him have respect for them, so he felt he needed to listen to them for his own benefit, even when he was confident and decisive on his own. He is now in a "senior role" and people come to him for mentorship. He tried to give what he received back to the field in spite of the financial disadvantage of providing supervision. He had a sense of duty to the field and wanted to pay it forward to the next generation of professionals, in addition to having love and passion for providing supervision.

CHAPTER EIGHT: PARTICIPANT FIVE

Textual Analysis

P-5 was born and raised in Mexico. He came to the U.S to obtain his Master's degree and then Doctoral degree. It has been over 10 years since he came to the U.S. He has provided clinical services and supervision for more than 10 years. His primary roles in his current work are a researcher and a teacher.

Negative and Positive Experiences in the U.S.

P-5 is originally from Mexico. Since he has established his career, P-5 has a good life in the U.S. he cannot afford in Mexico. He goes back to Mexico to work during summer to do field work and training. He has had both positive and negative experiences in the U.S. Some of them include racism because he has been racially and ethnically discriminated against. Some instances were blatant and others were subtle. For example, he was treated differently at a grocery store due to his race and ethnicity. When he asked a store clerk a question, s/he talked to his wife instead of him because she had blond hair and looked more White. He was not answered directly and felt invisible due to his race and ethnicity. His experiences with racism made him aware of his Latino identity and sensitive to the issues of racism and privilege.

However, his experiences with education in the U.S. were positive. He recounted his training experience:

It's been pretty positive. The way of training people is very inviting... I think the training we have is really good. Many of us loved our practicum experiences... Their focus on practicum was very strong. There was a good understanding of the issue of privilege and social justice... It was a good learning experience. People truly got it, the issue of discrimination, privilege, and oppression.

P-5 experienced that the program and faculty were supportive and culturally competent. The issue of social justice was addressed well in his training.

He did not have a Latino faculty or supervisor, but he had a minority supervisor, which he thought was valuable. He elaborated:

Definitely having an ethnic minority supervisor was helpful. My ethnic minority supervisor was Ken Hardy at a Northeastern university. With him, I had the initial conversations of power, privilege, and race. That was very important. At a Southern university I did not have any ethnic minority supervisors, but people were truly committed to cultural diversity. Although it's pretty powerful when an ethnic minority supervisor opens the possibility for you to address these issues, it also can be powerful with non-ethnic minority supervisors... After having both, I think it would have been a loss if I did not have an ethnic minority supervisor.

P-5 had his first discussion about racism with his minority supervisor, which was the beginning of his social justice work. While he initially thought that both minority and majority supervisors would be helpful, he found having a minority supervisor was more influential. His experiences in education helped him to be aware of multicultural issues.

Cultural Competency

The faculty members at universities P-5 attended were mostly White, but the programs have been very supportive to diversity. He has developed multicultural competency through his education, training, and research in addition to his personal experiences of racism. He has identified himself as Latino because he is aware that there is racism in Latin America and there is a debate about the terms between *Hispanic* and *Latino* related to the racial issue.

I don't use the term, Hispanic. There is a big debate in Latin America about the terms, Hispanic and Latino. I abide by the scholars who express that Latino incorporates our Indian roots. In Latin America, there is pervasive racism. When you talk about European ancestors, it's good. You don't talk about Indian ancestors. That's why I identify myself as Latino.

I am a Mexican-origin first-generation immigrant which is pretty different from other Latino subgroups. We have what is called 'mixed race' which the majority of us are. It's an integration of Indian and Spaniard. But there are also some lines of Latino who are more European. You see those physical traits. Within mixed race, we have a wide variation. Within the indigenous population, there is a wide variation. There are hundreds of indigenous groups within Mexico.

I'm mixed race. It is pretty much an integration of Spaniards and Indian ancestors. It's very hard to tell where that came from.

P-5 is aware of a variety of groups within Mexican people such as indigenous or Indian population, Spaniards, and mixed race people. Therefore, he identifies himself as mixed race and calls himself Latino to emphasize the Indian roots. It is because racism exists in Latin America that silences Indians and gives privileges to Spaniards and other Europeans. Much of discrimination is related to skin color.

[Skin color] is a big issue. The lighter skin color you have, the more privileged you are and the less discriminated you are against. As a matter of fact, there is a saying. When a baby's born, people say, 'I hope my child is born white-ish.' It's pretty pervasive, but we don't talk about it.

It's like taboo. People joke about it. People make heavy jokes about it. In Mexican society, you will see people with lighter skin in the position of power. But we don't talk about it clinically.

Since the lighter skin is given more privilege, Mexican people recognize that people with a lighter skin hold greater power, which starts at birth. However, they are not socially allowed to discuss the issue of racism other than making a joke about it even when there is obvious difference in power on the spectrum of the skin tone between darker and lighter skin.

Since he was aware of the fact of racism and his own privilege, P-5 strived to figure out how to address this challenging issue at the different levels of therapy,

supervision, and supervision training. He described some of issues he needed to be mindful of:

There have been pieces of ethnicity as a Latino scholar. How do I address overt and covert racism in therapy? How do I help my supervisees address those issues? Right now, I am teaching a class on supervision, so how do I help supervisors in training address those issues. I think there are multiple ways to go about it.

P-5, however, has to comply with the requirement from the dominant culture in order for him to accomplish his work. He said, “Sometimes when I write grants, I use the term, Hispanic because of the grant writing process. That’s the category they go by.” Through his personal and institutional experiences, P-5 is aware that racism still happens today. He has to address diversity issues at different levels and tactfully balance social justice work and requirements from the dominant culture.

How to Address Inequality and Social Justice

P-5 thought that there were multiple ways to address cultural diversity in order to advocate for social justice. He elaborated on two approaches. The first strategy is to expose oneself to different cultures and learn to respect the differences. The second is to challenge supervisees about inequality and social justice. He implied the first approach is inadequate by sarcastically saying that it was “good.” He said:

I think, for me the major thing is to have a discussion that one notion of cultural diversity is a popular notion that we have different traditions, we love each other, and we admire each other, and like that. *It is good.* I am a little sarcastic when I say that. You know it’s a popular notion.

The popular notion of cultural diversity, which is simply to learn about different cultures, is nice, but it is not sufficient enough to address important issues of racism and oppression. Therefore, a further action is needed, which is to discuss both celebrating diversity and advocating for social justice. This requires people to deconstruct privileges

in society. He thought, “The truly important notion in our work is how cultural differences associate with social inequality... And the topic that I really think moves these conversations forward is the issue of privilege.”

In supervision, P-5 focuses more on social inequality and privileges and directly addresses these issues with his supervisees. In order to accomplish this, he utilizes self-disclosure in supervision. He shares his own experiences to address social justice and helps supervisees develop critical awareness.

I self-disclose the way I have been discriminated against... I came here to learn English for a year at age 18, and then I went back to Mexico... I bring it up head-on. I don't engage in the issue of 'does racial discrimination exist?' I address it head-on with life examples of my own.

P-5 firmly believes that social justice work is crucial for clinical training. He does not let the question that asks if racism still exists stop his work. However, what determines how well supervision goes is supervisees' ability to comprehend social justice issues and to take accountability for their privileges.

As a supervisor whenever I have a supervisee who gets the concept of privilege and owns it, the supervision process is very smooth. When I have a supervisee who does not get it, the typical response that I get to a question like 'Have you wondered how he experiences that as a Latino?' is "Well, what about us, the poor?' Whenever supervisees do not get the issue of privilege, they become defensive and put another issue of oppression. The concept of institutional oppression and owning privilege allows you to go into all of these emotional experiences. At the end of the day, we are very privileged. We are in our clinic working with other underserved Latinos with low income who will struggle to find what to eat tomorrow. I think for me owing my own privilege has been a corner stone of cultural diversity in my supervision.

In this situation, P-5 faced resistance from his supervisees when they became anxious with the topic of their own privilege. They switched the topic and focused on their lack of privilege before taking responsibility for the privilege they had. He thought that it was

necessary for his supervisees to overcome the defensiveness and take ownership for their privilege in order to make supervision a meaningfully emotional experience.

In the process, he had to practice what he asked his supervisees to do and model it by self-disclosing his own experiences of racism and oppression he had committed. He had an understanding of what made supervisees defensive and how to diffuse it. He explained his understanding of this resistance and his strategy to address it:

[Self-disclosure] tends to elevate defenses in the beginning. Particularly with people who have never questioned their privileges. And then immediately after talking about that, I talked about ways I have discriminated against others by owning my privileges. That doesn't have to be an overt discrimination such as the way in which the class discussions were dominated by males. I have done that a lot. Sometimes I have remained quiet. That helps a lot because people see the duality... I am an experiential therapist, so I bring in intensity. That's the way I approach supervision. Self-disclosure is going to raise intensity, either because people feel bad or because people do not want to see the privilege. With self-disclosure, sometimes people would say, 'Oh, crap. You are right. I have been there and I have not done anything as a White person.' But I can tell you with half of supervisees I had, the immediate response after I had self-disclosed was that they shift the topic to the way they had been oppressed. I redirect the conversation and say, 'We will get to that, but you need to hear my experiences of oppression.' And then we address that piece. The initial supervision processes with people who have not worked on diversity issues can be pretty intense. As long as I present myself as somebody who is an oppressor as well, yes. If I just come across as 'I have been discriminated against and you are holding the privileges,' it never goes anywhere. If I present myself as a whole, some ways I am discriminated against and some ways I have oppressed others, it opens discussions that the problem is the way we find ourselves in the continuum of diversity. I think people get defensive when people feel labeled or when they feel like they are in a cage. When you deconstruct that and say, you are sometimes inside the cage and you are sometimes closing the cage on others. It's very liberating.

In his experiential approach, P-5 raises anxiety by utilizing self-disclosure. It is inevitable that addressing social justice issues in supervision can be emotionally intense.

In order to contain the anxiety, he balances the duality of oppression between how he is

oppressed by others and how he oppresses others at the same time. He is also direct to stay focused on one issue at a time when his supervisees try to switch topics to their own oppression because of their anxiety. He addresses one social justice topic at a time in order to process it thoroughly. He finds this duality “liberating” in the process of addressing social justice in supervision.

Institutional Support Is Crucial for Challenging Racism and Doing Social Justice Work

In addition to the challenges from supervisees when oppression is discussed in supervision, P-5 also believes that social justice work can be challenging if there is no institutional support. His approach to addressing diversity is influenced by feminist and social justice approaches that pay attention to power and privilege, instead of just learning about different cultures. He is aware that it is hard for the field as a whole to address social justice. He explains that:

[Diversity education] has continued and will continue to head in multiple directions. I think there is a risk of addressing diversity as we are different and focusing on differences. The direction I have tried to inform my work and the work of people I have followed is about how diversity is informed by power and privilege and how people are placed in different places in the society based on the diversity they represent. But, it’s hard for us to make it [social justice] happen in the field as a whole... For instance, social workers have a more uniformed approach on social justice. We have a more uniformed approach on systemic thinking, but not necessarily on the issue of diversity.

P-5 thinks that the lack of the uniformity in educating about social justice is problematic. In addition to educating supervisees about differences, he feels the need to teach them about how privileges influence people based on the differences. What matters is what a person symbolizes rather than what the person is. He had other concerns about

addressing diversity issues. He thinks that there is a shift to put more weight on clinical issues at the expense of the focus on diversity and social justice.

There is still a need for research to start documenting how to address this issue more effectively from an organizational and structural point of view. He perceives that “rigidity and too much structure” prevent a program from addressing social justice. He finds an integrated and inclusive approach is helpful. He describes that:

The beginning of the [training] program was open to the issues of culture diversity, but it did not understand the difference. They were nice because we were different. With cultural diversity, we wear power and privilege lens. It was not only addressing the clinical activities, but we also could talk about these issues in every class. [Cultural diversity was] integrated to the program... I went to a Southern university because the faculty there, White faculty was working very heavily with a Latino population. That was incredibly successful.

I think having opportunities to work with Latino population within research [was helpful.] I do not know of any clinics with a heavy representation of Latino clients. I don't know of any university based clinics with a strong representation of Latino clients. It helped me a lot that my program of research was applied to the Latino community at a Southern university. The program of research that I belonged to [at a Southern university] was immersed in the Latino population as well as the program of research that I am carrying here [at University Three]. We do not have a strong representation of Latinos in clinic, but our program of research does.

P-5 felt that it was effective that diversity was integrated throughout the training programs. Therefore, he was able to talk about culture in every class. He also thought that his having opportunities to work with Latino population contributed to his success.

He feels it is important for him to have support from all institutional levels, a program, department, and university, in order to be successful to address social justice.

I think it's a matter of structure of how a program is integrated by the faculties who are committed to the issue of diversity and privilege. That's a major plus. But the program also needs to be imbedded within the department that is

committed with this issue. You know we, faculty tend to be overworked in terms of limited resources and a large cohort. If these courses are congruent at institutional level, I think that's for me the most important thing. You know I have my friends and I have my colleagues. But if I don't have a program that is committed to the issue of diversity and if I am not in a department and a university that is committed, it becomes extremely difficult. If you have to address these issues of diversity with supervisees who get mad at you, you know you would be supported by faculty. If that supervisor goes to the chair, the chair is going to be supportive. It's not about oppressing students, but you know students many times get reactive when addressing the issue of diversity. I think if you have a basic supportive structure in faculty, programs, department, and university, you then can do the work. Otherwise, it's very challenging.

P-5 underscores that it is important for faculty to commit to social justice and diversity issues to be integrated into the program. Since social justice work can raise anxiety and make supervisees upset with a supervisor, it is extremely important for a supervisor to have support from all levels at university. Without the support, it would be hard to challenge students' privileges, if it is not impossible.

He had this support at different levels at different universities. The support helped him succeed to different degrees at different universities he belonged to.

In a Northeastern university, I had it at the program level. They had a lot of struggles at the department and university levels. The program eventually ended up closing. I had the support at a Southern university. Now that's our experience at University Three. We are extremely supported. We have a cohesive group of faculty and we are very supported by the department and university. That's how things can move along. They have been very open. We have expressed current needs and concerns and administrators are responsive. There is a commitment to that really.

At a Northeastern university, P-5 had the support only at a program level, which led to a lot of struggles. The program closed as a result. However, he had an integrated support at all levels at the other universities, so his experiences were positive at these universities. These experiences contributed to his success today.

Structural Analysis

Experiences in the U.S.

P-5 has established his career and a comfortable life in the U.S., which he cannot afford in Mexico. During summer, he has opportunities to go back to Mexico to do field work and provide training. He has had both positive and negative experiences in the U.S. Some of them include racism where he has been racially and ethnically discriminated against. Some instances were blatant and others were subtle. For example, he was treated differently at a grocery store due to his race and ethnicity. When he asked a store clerk a question, the clerk talked to his wife instead of him because she had blond hair and looked more White. He was not answered directly and felt invisible due to his race and ethnicity. His experiences with racism made him aware of his Latino identity and sensitive to the issues of racism and privilege.

On the contrary, P-5's experiences with education in the U.S. were positive. He felt that the programs welcomed diversity and integrated it throughout. He found the training was excellent since faculty was committed to and practiced social justice work in the programs. He saw that faculty in the programs truly comprehended the issues of privilege and oppression, so he experienced that the programs and faculty were supportive and culturally competent. Social justice was sufficiently addressed in his training. Nevertheless, he did not have a Latino faculty or supervisor, but he had an RE minority supervisor, Ken Hardy, at a Northeastern university, which he thought was valuable. P-5 had his first discussion about racism with Hardy, which was the beginning of his social justice work. Ken Hardy had a reputation for diversity and social justice work, so it was powerful for P-5 to discuss diversity issues with him. While he initially

thought that both minority and majority supervisors would be helpful, having a minority supervisor was more influential. His training helped him develop cultural sensitivity.

Multicultural Competency

The faculty members at universities P-5 attended were mostly White, but the programs have been very supportive of diversity. In these environments, he has developed multicultural competency through his education, training, and research in addition to his personal experiences of racism. He has identified himself as Latino because he is aware that there is racism in Latin America and there is a debate about the terms between *Hispanic* and *Latino* related to racism. The term Hispanic highlights more European or Caucasian roots while the term Latino is inclusive of their Indian roots according to researchers. Latinos with European ancestry are considered good and were in a position of power. In contrast, Indian ancestry is little discussed.

P-5 is aware of a variety of groups within Mexican people such as indigenous or Indian population, Spaniards/other Europeans, and mixed race people. He acknowledges that he, as a first-generation Mexican immigrant, is different from other Latino subgroups in the U.S. He identifies himself as mixed race and utilizes the term Latino to emphasize the inclusion of Indian roots. It is because racism exists in Latin America that silences Indians and gives privileges to Spaniards and other Europeans. Much of the discrimination that occurs in Mexico is related to skin color.

Light skin color symbolizes the European roots. Since the lighter skin is given more privilege, Mexican people recognize that people with lighter skin hold greater power, which starts at birth. They wish for babies with lighter skin. However, they are not socially allowed to discuss the issue of racism other than making a joke about it even

when there is obvious difference in power on the spectrum of skin tone between dark and light skin. Since he is aware of the racism and his own privilege, P-5 strives to figure out how to address this challenging issue at the different levels of therapy, supervision, and supervision training. At the same time, he has to comply with the requirement from the dominant culture in order for him to accomplish his work. When he writes grants, he has to use the term Hispanic as a technical term commonly used in the field, even when he endorses the term Latino to empower the less privileged Indian roots. Because he is aware of racism that still occurs today, he has to address diversity issues at different levels and tactfully balance social justice work and requirements from the dominant culture.

Addressing Social Justice in Supervision

P-5 thinks that there are multiple ways to address cultural diversity in order to advocate for social justice. One way is to expose oneself to different cultures and learn to respect the differences. Another is to address inequality and social justice. In interview, he implied the first approach is inadequate by sarcastically saying that it was “good.” The popular notion of cultural diversity, which is simply to learn about different cultures, is nice, but it is not sufficient enough to address important issues of racism and oppression. Therefore, further action is needed, which is to discuss both celebrating diversity and advocating for social justice. This requires people to deconstruct privileges in society. He believes that the topics of privilege and oppression advance the cultural discussions to social justice. In supervision, he focuses more on social inequality and injustice and directly addresses these issues with his supervisees. He utilizes self-disclosure to accomplish this work.

In supervision, P-5 shares his own experiences to address social justice and helps supervisees develop critical awareness. He firmly believes that social justice work is crucial for clinical training. As he discloses his own experiences of racism, he does not let his supervisees who question that racism still exists stop his work. However, what determines how well supervision goes is supervisees' ability to comprehend social justice issues and to take accountability for their privileges. When his supervisees can accept that they have privilege and take responsibility and action for it, he has found supervision progresses smoothly. Nevertheless, he inevitably has faced resistance from some of his supervisees in their counselor development. When they become anxious with the topic of their own privilege because they cannot understand it or are not willing to examine it, they switch the topic and focus on their lack of privilege before taking responsibility for the privilege they have. P-5 thought that it was necessary for his supervisees to overcome the defensiveness and take ownership for their privilege in order to make supervision a meaningfully emotional experience. In the process, he had to practice what he asked his supervisees to do and model it by self-disclosing his own experiences of racism and oppression he had committed. He thought people in a graduate program were privileged, especially compared to underprivileged clients they served at a clinic. He found that it was the essential for him to examine and be responsible for his privileges when he addressed diversity in supervision. He had an understanding of what made supervisees defensive and, through self-disclosure, knew how to diffuse it.

In his experiential approach, P-5 utilizes self-disclosure to address social justice. His disclosure often has raised their anxiety in supervision as an experiential strategy in addition to the fact that addressing social justice issues in supervision can be emotionally

intense. He understands that this can make his supervisees feel guilty and/or does not want to see the privilege. In order to contain the anxiety, he balances the duality of oppression between how he is oppressed by others and how he oppresses others at the same time. He is also direct to stay focused on one issue at a time when his supervisees tried to switch topics to their own oppression because of their anxiety. He addressed one social justice topic at a time in order to process it thoroughly. Without addressing both sides, the supervision tended to end up in an impasse. He found this duality open conversations and “liberate” the process of addressing social justice in supervision. However, he also discussed that social justice work could be difficult if there was not institutional support, which follows in the next section.

Support Is Essential for Social Justice Work

In addition to the challenges from supervisees when oppression is discussed in supervision, P-5 also believes that social justice work can be unsuccessful if there is no institutional support. His approach to addressing diversity is influenced by feminist and social justice approaches that pay attention to power and privilege, instead of just learning about different culture. He is aware that diversity education has taken different directions, depending on the discipline. He has a concern when diversity discussions only focuses on differences in people, but they do not go beyond to address how their differences give privilege and power to what these people represent. He thinks that there is also a shift in trend to put more weight on clinical issues and less focus on diversity. He is aware that it is hard for the field as a whole to address social justice because he thought that the lack of the uniformity to educating social justice is problematic.

P-5 perceived that “rigidity and too much structure” prevent a program from addressing social justice. He found his programs that focused on social justice issues were helpful and effective in training. He experienced that diversity was integrated throughout his training programs, so he appreciated that he could discuss power and privilege in every class. There is still a need for research to start documenting how to address this issue more effectively from an organizational and structural point of view.

P-5 had a faculty member who researched Latino population at a Southern university. As a result, he had opportunities to work with Latino population, which contributed to his success. He found it helpful to have direct experiences with the population and to be able to apply his knowledge to his work with them. Based on these experiences, he feels it is important for him to have support from all institutional levels: faculty, program, department, and university in order to be successful to address social justice. He does not find support from friends and colleagues sufficient. He thinks that commitment to it needs to come from each level and that each level has to support the others, especially with the current financial climate where faculty is overworked with limited resources.

P-5 underscores that it is important for faculty to commit to social justice and diversity issues to be integrated into the program. Since social justice work can raise anxiety and make supervisees upset with a supervisor, it is extremely important for a supervisor to have the support from all levels at university. Without support from institution and trust toward it, it would be ineffective for a supervisor to challenge supervisees’ privileges, if it is not impossible, when they could file complaint against him or her. He had this support at different levels at different universities, so the support

helped him succeed. At a Northeastern university, he had the support only at a program level, which led to a lot of struggles. The program closed as a result. On the other hand, he had consistent support at all levels from faculty to university at the other universities. As a result, his experiences were positive at these universities. He greatly appreciated their responsiveness and commitment. These experiences contributed to his success today.

Textual-Structural Description

P-5 is originally from Mexico. He visited the U.S. to study English when he was 18 years old. He was granted a scholarship and came back to obtain his Master's degree and then Doctoral degree. He initially wished to go back to his country of origin. However, he has been successful and established his career and life here, which he cannot afford in Mexico, so he plans to stay in the U.S. He goes back to Mexico to do field work and provide training during summer. It has been over 10 years since he came to the U.S. He has experienced racism as a mixed-race Latino. However, his experiences in his educational and training programs have been positive. He has provided clinical services and supervision for more than 10 years. His primary roles in his current work are a researcher and a teacher. He has conducted research on diversity issues such as gender and culture, especially Latino population.

P-5 has had both positive and negative experiences in the U.S. Some of them include racism where he has been racially and ethnically discriminated against. Some instances were blatant and others were subtle. For example, he was treated differently at a grocery store due to his race and ethnicity. When he asked a store clerk a question, the clerk talked to his wife instead of him because she had blond hair and looked more

White. He was not answered directly and felt invisible due to his race and ethnicity. His experiences with racism made him aware of his Latino identity and sensitive to the issues of racism and privilege.

On the contrary, his experiences with education in the U.S. were positive. P-5 felt that the programs welcomed diversity and integrated it throughout. He recounted that:

It's been pretty positive. The way of training people is very inviting... I think the training we have is really good. Many of us loved our practicum experiences... Their focus on practicum was very strong. There was a good understanding of the issue of privilege and social justice... It was a good learning experience. People truly got it, the issue of discrimination, privilege, and oppression.

P-5 found his graduate training in the U.S was excellent since faculty was committed to and practiced social justice work in the programs. He saw that faculty in the programs truly comprehended the issues of privilege and oppression, so he experienced that the programs and faculty were supportive and culturally competent. Social justice was sufficiently addressed in his training. Nevertheless, he did not have a Latino faculty or supervisor, but he had an RE minority supervisor, Ken Hardy, at A Northeastern university, which he thought was valuable. P-5 had his first discussion about racism with Hardy, which was the beginning of his social justice work. Ken Hardy had a reputation for diversity and social justice work, so it was powerful for P-5 to discuss diversity issues with him. He reflected on the supervision experience:

Although it's pretty powerful when an ethnic minority supervisor opens the possibility for you to address these issues, it also can be powerful with non-ethnic minority supervisors... After having both, I think it would have been a loss if I did not have an ethnic minority supervisor.

While he initially thought that both minority and majority supervisors would be helpful, having an RE minority supervisor was more influential. His training helped him develop cultural sensitivity.

The faculty members at universities P-5 attended were mostly White, but the programs were very supportive of diversity. In these environments, he has developed multicultural competency through his education, training, and research in addition to his personal experiences of racism. He has identified himself as Latino because he is aware that there is racism in Latin America and there is a debate about the terms between *Hispanic* and *Latino* related to racism. He elucidates:

I don't use the term, Hispanic. There is a big debate in Latin America about the terms Hispanic and Latino. I abide by the scholars who express that Latino incorporates our Indian roots. In Latin America, there is pervasive racism. When you talk about European ancestors, it's good. You don't talk about Indian ancestors. That's why I identify myself as Latino.

The term Hispanic highlights more European or Caucasian roots while the term Latino is inclusive of their Indian roots according to researchers. Latinos with European ancestry are considered good and were in a position of power. In contrast, Indian ancestry is little discussed.

P-5 is aware of a variety of groups within Mexican people such as indigenous or Indian population, Spaniards/other Europeans, and mixed race people. He acknowledges that he, as a first-generation Mexican immigrant, is different from other Latino subgroups in the U.S. He identifies himself as mixed race and utilizes the term Latino to emphasize the inclusion of Indigenous Indian roots. It is because racism exists in Latin America that silences Indians and gives privileges to Spaniards and other Europeans. As much of the discrimination that occurs in Mexico is related to skin color, he elaborates:

[Skin color] is a big issue. The lighter skin color you have, the more privileged you are and the less discriminated against you are. As a matter of fact, there is a saying. When a baby's born, people say, 'I hope my child is born white-ish.' It's pretty pervasive, but we don't talk about it.

Light skin color symbolizes the European roots. Since the lighter skin is given more privilege, Mexican people recognize that people with lighter skin hold greater power, which starts at birth. They wish for babies with lighter skin. However, they are not socially allowed to discuss the issue of racism other than making a joke about it even when there is obvious difference in power on the spectrum of skin tone between dark and light skin. P-5's mixed race has made him aware of the racism and his own privilege, which drives him to figure out how to address this challenging issue:

There have been pieces of ethnicity as a Latino scholar. How do I address overt and covert racism in therapy? How do I help my supervisees address those issues? Right now, I am teaching a class on supervision, so how do I help supervisors in training address those issues?

P-5 is constantly mindful of social justice at the different levels. At the same time, he has to comply with the requirement from the dominant culture in order for him to accomplish his work. When he writes grants, he has to use the term Hispanic as a technical term commonly used in the field, even when he endorses the term Latino to empower the less privileged Indian roots. Because he is aware of racism that still occurs today, he has to address diversity issues at different levels and tactfully balance social justice work and requirements from the dominant culture.

P-5 thinks that there are multiple ways to address cultural diversity in order to advocate for social justice. One way is to expose oneself to different cultures and learn to respect the differences. Another is to address inequality and social justice. In the interview, he implied the first approach is inadequate by sarcastically saying that it was

“good.” The popular notion of cultural diversity, which is simply to learn about different cultures, is nice, but it is not sufficient enough to address important issues of racism and oppression. Therefore, further action is needed, which is to discuss both celebrating diversity and advocating for social justice. This requires people to deconstruct privileges in society. He believes that the topics of privilege and oppression enhance the cultural discussions to include social justice.

In supervision, P-5 shares his own experiences to openly address social justice and, by doing so, he helps supervisees develop critical awareness. He firmly believes that social justice work is crucial for clinical training. He explains:

I self-disclose the way I have been discriminated against... I came here to learn English for a year at age 18, and then I went back to Mexico... I bring it up head-on. I don't engage in the issue of 'does racial discrimination exist?' I address it head-on with life examples of my own.

As P-5 discloses his own experiences of racism, he does not let his supervisees who question the reality of racism stop his work. However, what determines how well supervision goes is supervisees' ability to comprehend social justice issues and to take accountability for their privileges. When his supervisees can accept that they have privilege and take responsibility and action for it, he has found supervision progresses smoothly. Nevertheless, he inevitably has faced resistance from some of his supervisees in their counselor development. When they become anxious with the topic of their own privilege because they cannot understand it or are not willing to examine it, they switch the topic and focus on their lack of privilege before taking responsibility for the privilege they have. P-5 thought that it was necessary for his supervisees to overcome the defensiveness and take ownership for their privilege in order to make supervision a meaningfully emotional experience. In the process, he had to practice what he asked his

supervisees to do and model it by self-disclosing his own experiences of racism and oppression he had committed. He thought people in a graduate program were privileged, especially compared to underprivileged clients they served at a clinic. He found that it was the essential for him to examine and be responsible for his privileges when he addressed diversity in supervision. He had an understanding of what made supervisees defensive and, through self-disclosure, knew how to diffuse it.

In his experiential approach, P-5's self-disclosure often raises his supervisees' anxiety in supervision because addressing social justice issues can be emotionally intense. He articulates the supervision process:

I am an experiential therapist, so I bring in intensity. That's the way I approach supervision. Self-disclosure is going to raise intensity, either because people feel bad or because people do not want to see the privilege. With self-disclosure, sometimes people would say, 'Oh, crap. You are right. I have been there and I have not done anything as a White person.' But I can tell you with half of supervisees I had, the immediate response after I had self-disclosed was that they shift the topic to the way they had been oppressed. I redirect the conversation and say, 'We will get to that, but you need to hear my experiences of oppression.' And then we address that piece. The initial supervision processes with people who have not worked on diversity issues can be pretty intense. As long as I present myself as somebody who is an oppressor as well, yes. If I just come across as 'I have been discriminated against and you are holding the privileges,' it never goes anywhere. If I present myself as a whole, some ways I am discriminated against and some ways I have oppressed others, it opens discussions that the problem is the way we find ourselves in the continuum of diversity.

P-5 understands self-disclosure can make his supervisees feel guilty and try to avoid seeing the privilege. In order to contain the anxiety, he balances the duality of oppression between how he is oppressed by others and how he oppresses others at the same time. He also directs his supervisees to stay focused on one issue at a time when they try to switch topics to their own oppression because of their anxiety. This is done to address and

process social justice thoroughly. Without addressing both sides, the supervision tends to end up at an impasse. He finds this duality opens conversations and “liberates” the process of addressing social justice in supervision. However, he also discusses that social justice work can be difficult if there is not institutional support, which follows in the next section.

In addition to the challenges from supervisees when oppression is discussed in supervision, P-5 also believes that social justice work can be unsuccessful if there is no institutional support in addressing the issue. His approach to addressing diversity is influenced by feminist and social justice approaches that pay attention to power and privilege, instead of just learning about different cultures. He is aware that diversity education has taken different directions, depending on the discipline. He expresses his concern about diversity education:

I think there is a risk of addressing diversity as we are different and focusing on differences. The direction I have tried to inform my work and the work of people I have followed is about how diversity is informed by power and privilege and how people are placed in different places in the society based on the diversity they represent.

P-5 thinks there is also a shift in trend to put more weight on clinical issues and less focus on diversity in counselor education and training. He is aware that it is hard for the field as a whole to address social justice because the lack of the uniformity to educating about social justice is problematic.

He found his training programs that focused on social justice issues were helpful and effective in promoting multicultural competency to address the issues in his work. He experienced that diversity was integrated throughout his training programs, so he appreciated that he could discuss power and privilege in every class. He perceives that

“rigidity and too much structure” prevent a program from addressing social justice, which leads to a need for research to start documenting how to address this issue more effectively from an organizational and structural point of view.

P-5 had structural support at a Southern university as a researcher. There was a faculty member who specifically researched the Latino population there. As a result, P-5 had opportunities to work with the Latino population, which contributed to his success with his career and addressing social justice through research. He found it helpful to have direct experiences with the population and to be able to apply his knowledge to his work with them. Based on these experiences, he feels it is important for him to have support from all institutional levels—faculty, program, department, and university—in order to successfully address social justice. He does not find support only from friends and colleagues sufficient in general. He thinks that commitment to social justice needs to come from each level and that each level has to support the others, especially with the current financial climate where faculty is overworked with limited resources. These difficult conditions may become an obstacle since social justice work can be taxing to faculty.

P-5 underscores that it is important for faculty to commit to integrate diversity issues into the program when implementing social justice work. He elaborates its challenge:

If you have to address these issues of diversity with supervisees who get mad at you, you know you would be supported by faculty. If that supervisor goes to the chair, the chair is going to be supportive. It’s not about oppressing students, but you know students many times get reactive when addressing the issue of diversity. I think if you have a basic supportive structure in faculty, programs, department, and university, you then can do the work. Otherwise, it’s very challenging.

Since social justice work can raise anxiety and supervisees can become upset with supervisors, it is extremely important for supervisors to have the support from all levels at university. Without support from an institution and trust toward it, it would be ineffective for supervisors to challenge supervisees' privileges, if not impossible. Faculty has to take a chance in addressing these uncomfortable issues knowing that supervisees can file a complaint against him or her. P-5 shared that half of his supervisees struggled with his challenging them. However, P-5 had support at different levels at different universities, so the support helped him succeed. At a Northeastern university, he enjoyed the support at a program level. However, the program did not gain the support from the department and university levels, which led to a lot of struggles. The program closed as a result. On the other hand, he had consistent support at all levels from faculty to university at the other universities. Consequently, his experiences were positive at these universities. He greatly appreciates their responsiveness and commitment, knowing these experiences contributed to his success today.

CHAPTER NINE: COMPOSITE DESCRIPTION

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the composite description as the final step of the data analysis. From the individual textual-structural descriptions I constructed previously, I have compiled the *invariant structures* of the phenomenon, or a composite description that represents the *essence* of the experience of the supervisors with verbatim quotes of participants representing the group as a whole.

These supervisors' experiences as RE minorities varied considerably. However, themes have emerged from the data analysis. Four major structures are identified. They are: 1. Distinct experiences as an RE minority; 2. Managing diversity issues with a cultural focus; 3. Embracing the difference and its challenge; and 4. Support and mentorship are crucial to success. Two of these major structures have substructures. The second major structure, Managing diversity issues with cultural focus, has two substructures: (a) Challenging supervisees with diversity issues; and (b) Using self-disclosure. Under the third major structure, Embracing the difference and its challenge, there are also two substructures: (a) Managing diversity issues universally; and (b) Using a difference as a motivator and strength. This section describes each of these structures and substructures with the participants' quotes.

Distinct Experiences as a RE Minority

Although all five participants have successful careers, their race and/or ethnicity colored their experiences in the U.S. or Canada. The experiences facilitated their development of awareness of their own culture and forced them to pay attention to diversity issues in therapy and supervision. The participants were also conscious of the

lack of diverse professionals in their fields. Because four of them were first-generation immigrants, they experienced acculturation to the U.S. culture, which impacted their supervision.

The ways the participants experienced supervision varied depending on how the context influenced them and specifically on how much support they had from their training and work settings. Three participants experienced microaggressions that made their experiences challenging. Nevertheless, these three participants showed remarkable resiliency against them. The atmosphere was the harshest on P-1 due to the international crisis and how her country was perceived in the U.S. Therefore, P-1 had numerous challenges throughout her career here in the U.S. P-2 and P-5 also had experienced discrimination, but these two had more support from their mentors, education, and work settings that made their experiences positive in general. P-2 also could pass as White with her light skin until she spoke with an accent. P-5 faced racism as a Latino in his personal life, but not in his training. P-3 intentionally sought an environment supportive of diversity from the beginning, so her experiences were mostly positive. However, she also had her share of challenges, such as acculturation and language difference. Since P-4 was the only one in Canada and he did not experience a direct immigration process and racism, his experiences were different from the rest of the participants'. He said his experiences as an RE minority were neutral because Canada provided a different atmosphere for diversity. It did not force minorities to assimilate, which paradoxically helped them integrate into the Canadian culture.

P-1: In [the movie] Aladdin, they have all these Middle Eastern bad guys with very thick Arabic accent, and so that's Disney's way of making this ingrained in kids' perception of this. As kids grow and think about this kind of accent, they automatically think about bad guys. These people are no good, or up to no good.

And it got complicated with diplomatic crises. It got complicated with political turmoil in my country. It is a very complicated history between the U.S. and my country. I got smacked right in the middle of it. When I arrived in this country was right after the diplomatic crisis. People hated, hated, hated us.

P-2: At that time [when I came to the U.S.], some people would not like to relate to people from my country. We still have people who are like that. It was easier for me being a light skinned person from my country. But when I showed I had an accent, the reception of people was totally different. Being a woman and Hispanic, when you say something, they will question it. Often when you have an accent, you are not perceived as being that smart. And then when I opened my mouth and began *talking* with an accent [and continued to articulate], people would say, “You know, you are not that dummy.”

P-3: I did feel like an outsider initially. I also questioned myself and my contribution as a supervisor. Later on, I did not have that issue. I know that I hesitated to be open and direct about what I thought, so that did not show I was competent. Because I consulted with my supervisor, she mentioned that when you were new here, it’s part of culture that students treated you this way. I took that very personally.

P-4: I actually do not experience my racial or ethnic identity most of the time, not having much of effect on what I do. Now as I say it, I think about more effect on what I do. But, it has not been an obstacle because I have not felt people are polarized or reactive in any way. I do not know if it is particularly positive.

P-5: It’s been pretty positive [in training]. The way of training people is very inviting. I think the training we have is really good... There was a good understanding of the issue of privilege and social justice...

I was discriminated against in overt and covert ways. I continued to be discriminated in other ways. My wife is from Mexico, but she is blond. When we go to Sam’s and I asked them questions, they respond to her.

Managing Diversity Issues with Cultural Focus

All the participants dealt with cultural discussions in supervision. They underscored culture when they managed the issues of diversity. However, the specific approaches were different among them. There are two substructures under this structure: Challenging supervisees with diversity issues and using self-disclosure.

Challenging Supervisees with Diversity Issues

As RE minorities, it was obvious that all the participants had attempted to cultivate the supervisees' awareness of cultural issues. They challenged their supervisees with multicultural issues to a different degree when they felt it was appropriate. Nevertheless, the ways they managed diversity varied. P-1, P-2, and P-5 directly challenged supervisees with cultural and social justice issues. Therefore, they inevitably encountered resistance from some of their supervisees and had to find a way to deal with the resistance, which was difficult for them to experience. P-1 and P-5 articulated the importance of acknowledging a person's duality of being oppressed and oppressing others at the same time. They, as supervisors with power over supervisees, first had to be accountable for their privilege before they could encourage their supervisees to be aware of and responsible for their power and privilege. P-2 tried to accept supervisees at their developmental level, even if it meant that some of her supervisees left her supervision. On the contrary, P-3 and P-4 were more tentative and did not push the agenda too much. These two have Asian heritage, and their cultural values might have had an impact on their supervisory approach. They both felt that they had to be careful not to cross the boundary into supervisees' personal issues when they addressed diversity issues because it could be too personal to discuss cultural issues in supervision. It might be best to address it in personal therapy not to cross an ethical boundary between therapy and supervision.

There was another challenge when they faced supervisees' resistance. Three participants used to take supervisees' resistance or behaviors personally, which was a hard experience for them. These experiences pushed them to learn not to internalize the

reactions or microaggressions from supervisees in order to be effective and survive the field.

P-1: I usually say, 'What I am about to say may be emotional for all of us at different levels. This is going to be difficult, so tell me how this is affecting you. What I'm about to challenge you about may be something you didn't think you would be challenged on.'

I, over time, have become very conscious that what I say matters, that I have to be careful, that I have to make sense, that I have to do something to balance my own perception and other person's perception, and that many of these people haven't been exposed. There was a time I was frustrated and thought "Why can't White people know more about the challenges that minorities have?" Over time, I realized that they just haven't been exposed.

P-2: If supervisees become distant, it's okay. Most of the time, I see that the distance changes with time. They begin to understand the process. Sometimes, they just go away. It's okay with me, you know. If you are a supervisee, I ask if you have a client. I challenge your behaviors, your supervision or therapy style, and whatever values and biases you have. If you decide to leave, it does mean that it's okay. You can leave. It's okay with me. I don't take it personally. I used to take it personally. No longer, you see. Yup. It's okay. That's the way you have to work in this kind of business, isn't it?

P-3: One of my challenges is when I see that students are resistant, but they say they aren't resistant. That was hard. They said it was comfortable, but everyone else could see that it was not. I am still learning how to approach that. With where I am at, I don't push. Maybe in the future when I become a very old professor, I could get used to that and push a little. But now, I don't. Supervision is not therapy. I know if I push too much, sometimes I kind of dig personal issues. You don't know if students are ready to make that change or if they want to deal with that issue yet...

P-4: I can't afford not to be patient. I can raise it. Maybe because of the fact that you're black, the client isn't relating to you well and if there is something we can do about it. They might be tentative and say, "I don't think that's it." So, they don't make connections, even if I'm right, so to speak. You don't think anything about it. I have to be patient.

P-5: I self-disclose the way I have been discriminated against... I bring it up head-on. I don't engage in the issue of "does racial discrimination exist?" I address it head-on with life examples of my own.

Using Self-Disclosure

To educate their supervisees about diversity issues and establish credibility with them, all participants used themselves and their own experiences as examples of a cultural issue or social justice issue. As RE minorities, their supervision with their supervisees was often cross-cultural encounters, on which they capitalized and used as teaching opportunities. Since P-1, P-2, and P-5 experienced racism first hand, they self-disclosed and used their own experiences to help supervisees develop awareness of how a privilege in a given context influenced an experience. P-2 disclosed her own experience similar to her supervisee's in order to empower her supervisee as an RE minority therapist who encountered blatant racism from a client. P-3, through the use of her Asian race and culture, tried to educate about different perceptions as well as model risk taking of being vulnerable in the therapy room. P-4 focused on building relationships by self-disclosing his cultural experiences and finding common experiences that bridged differences between him and his supervisees.

P-1: Because at that time I was going through [the process], I thought that I was crazy. I'm no good. It's my issue. It's not a program's issue. It's no one else's issue except mine. Now I understand that it's not my issue. So, I tell the students that 'It's not you. It's the context that creates the situation for you.'

P-2: This lady saw me on internet and she thought I was Greek. She talked about the Hispanics who live in the farms and how she hated those women who were so submissive and things like that. I stayed quiet. I was going to jump across and strangle her, but I kept calm and I said, 'Well, you know, I think that you probably want to change therapists because my name is ---, but I am Hispanic.' She said, 'You are not Greek?' I said, 'No. My husband is Greek, but I am not Greek. I'm Hispanic and I'm from a Caribbean country.' She said, 'Well, then, I don't work with you.' And I said, 'I don't work with you, either.'

P-3: I intentionally tell them I am from Asia and I got my training here. My language may be a barrier. I travel a lot. When I come back and teach summer practicum, it is hard for me to adjust. I am used to speaking my first language and later I speak English. I have an accent and lose an accent. I prepare students for

that. By living experiences, I model what I experience for students and prepare them for it. When they see a supervisor doing that and being comfortable, they are more comfortable talking about it themselves because I show my vulnerable part, too.

P-4: I usually use self-disclosure strategic-laughing-at-myself way. “My mom is on my case all the time... What about you?” I would use that to ask about it... If it’s an Asian supervisee, their parents work all the time. They work 16 hours a day. Or saving everything and not wasting anything.

P-5: I am an experiential therapist, so I bring in intensity. That’s the way I approach supervision. Self-disclosure is going to raise intensity, either because people feel bad or because people do not want to see the privilege. With self-disclosure, sometimes people would say, “Oh, crap. You are right. I have been there and I have not done anything as a White person.” But I can tell you with half of supervisees I had, the immediate response after I had self-disclosed was that they shift the topic to the way they had been oppressed. I redirect the conversation and say, “We will get to that, but you need to hear my experiences of oppression.” And then we address that piece. The initial supervision processes with people who have not worked on diversity issues can be pretty intense.

Embracing the Difference and Its Challenges

This structure has two substructures: managing diversity issues universally and using a difference as a motivator and strength.

Managing Diversity Issues Universally

All the participants integrated race and ethnicity into clinical issues in supervision. They used universal, integrated, or social justice approaches to discuss a difference that created a distinct experience, without narrowly focusing on race and ethnicity. P-1 taught her students that both RE minority and majority people face their own challenges based on their differences. Everyone is affected by a challenge of lack of power and privilege stemming from a difference; therefore, everyone needs to be aware of it and deal with it. P-5 described the duality of a person being both an oppressor and oppressed. He highlighted the importance of accepting the duality and taking responsibility for the whole self in social justice work. P-2 explained that many people went through a similar

process of understanding and accepting a new perspective. No matter what their status was, people initially questioned or disagreed with a different perspective, but most of them eventually reflected on and came to understand it. P-3 and P-4 paid more attention to universal variables such as personality and working alliances while they were aware of culture. This universal perspective combined with the cultural perspective was used to help them and their supervisees not personalize their challenging experiences, so they could continue with effective work without the distraction of self-pity.

P-1: I tell them, 'What I'm about to say may be even more emotional because you may feel judged or challenging to you. If you are a woman, I can be challenging you about providing good therapy to men. If you are a man, I may be challenging you by saying you are clueless about what's happening to women.' If a client comes with culture, I may need to challenge you and say, 'You do not have an understanding of what's happening to this person.' I'll handle culture the same way as I handle any other topic.

P-2: We have a process that, normally when we talk to somebody, we go about our own things. We begin to think about what we talked about. Many times it has happened to me, too. I said, "I don't agree with what you are saying." But when I go back, I begin to think about what other person said. You know s/he has some point in this matter. I might be able to do things in a different way because of what s/he said. This is a process. You can become a little bit resistant or say, "No, I did not agree with that," or be upset about what s/he said.

P-3: I think it's more about personalities and characteristics. If you asked me where I stand, I am more of a universalist. I do have a conservative White student and a liberal Asian student. I also have American students who are quiet. When they are quiet in group and people perceive them they don't talk much. They may be introverted, so I am sensitive to that.

P-4: I was always trying to find a way to connect. With the Jewish supervisee, there was some common experience about Jews and Chinese being outcasts and minorities, and banned from doing certain kind of jobs. It's a history of both communities, right? Relying on being entrepreneurs, right? So, I connect with them where they are at now. I connected with a Black supervisee around her experiences of being different from 80% of other kids from the class, right? Sometimes, it might supply a point of connection and shared experiences. With Caucasian supervisees, I always found something else to connect with them about, other kind of common experiences.

P-5: As long as I present myself as somebody who is an oppressor as well, yes. If I just come across as “I have been discriminated against and you are holding the privileges,” it never goes anywhere. If I present myself as a whole, some ways I am discriminated against and some ways I have oppressed others, it opens discussions that the problem is the way we find ourselves in the continuum of diversity.

Using a Difference as a Motivator and Strength

A cultural difference is viewed as strength or a tool in supervision. P-1 said that being a minority pushed her to work harder and be better. She also thought that the difference was a gift because it gave the field a different perspective, a unique story, and a new discussion. P-2 saw the lack of diversity in the field, so it was her motivation to mentor minority professionals. Her experiences as a minority also made her empathic to experiences of her clients and supervisees. She was a good clinician and supervisor because of her cultural experiences. P-3 saw a language deficiency as an opportunity to ask questions. She used her culture and its difference in her experiential teaching. She also intentionally exercised her supervisory power to create a safe environment for her students, especially minorities. P-4 used culture as a bridge to connect him with his clients and supervisees. He tried to find common experiences through the differences each participant experienced. P-5 experienced racism in the U.S., which made him more conscious of his Indian heritage as Latino and mindful of privilege, oppression, and social justice work. This awareness was reflected in his work with Latino population.

P-1: I was able to understand that this was hard because I was different and was from another culture, and then I thought it added a bonus to me because I had to become better at what I did and I wanted to prove that I knew what I was talking about. Overcompensating helps all of us.

P-2: I understood her pain and I gave her some tools to work with it, so learn to take it something you cannot change. This is something you cannot change. That something you are going to confront in the future. Plan ahead. If I find a client who is not going to like me, what am I going to do about it? You can give them an

option of staying to work with you even they don't like you or you can give them the option to 'Get the hell out of my office.' So, she began laughing and we laughed about it. I said, 'Use humor or something or certain phrases that might help you. Make sure the person is not intimidating you. If you get intimidated, they will have their goal fulfilled. Sometimes, these people intimidate you. Don't fulfill their goals.' That's what I tell them. She understood that. Maybe, humor might be a way to deal with that. She will have to understand that. I cannot change this. I cannot change who I am. I am a Hispanic woman from a Caribbean country that I am not able to change. I will accept that and I will accept self-awareness. I will accept if you like me or if you don't like me. This is how I helped this supervisee.

P-3: In terms of language, international students are not efficient compared to American students. I see that they are good at their own language skills. Other thing is that my supervision style does not only focus on language. I am more an experiential therapist. I focus on non-verbal behaviors and emotions. That's why I look at these things rather than relying on language. I also notice that my Asian students have language barriers, but I think in some way [having these barriers] helps. They can ask a lot of questions. I experienced that, too. I don't see that as a barrier. I see it as a tool.

P-4: A Jewish woman I was supervising. Sometimes, we talk about using a Colombo approach, 'I don't know' sort of approach, playing dumb, right? She would do that. She would use her Jewishness. Because of religion, Yiddish she would say, 'My grandmother would have said you are little pisher.' A little kid who doesn't know what he was doing, right? She used those things and her ethnicity. It was quite delightful. I encouraged her to use it in a careful way. That worked for me. My view is that people should use themselves and whatever different about themselves.

P-5: There have been pieces of ethnicity as a Latino scholar. How do I address overt and covert racism in therapy? How do I help my supervisees address those issues? Right now, I am teaching a class on supervision, so how do I help supervisors in training address those issues? I think there are multiple ways to go about it.

Support and Mentorship Are Critical to Success

All the participants underscored the importance of support and mentoring in their professional development. The amount of support and mentoring they received impacted their experiences in the field. Sadly, P-1 had little support throughout her career, so her experiences have been accentuated with hardship. P-2 also experienced challenges as a

minority both personally and professionally. However, she was fortunate to have mentors who invited, encouraged, and supported her to pursue her career. P-3 purposely sought a diversity-supportive environment in the U.S. even before she arrived here. She thought some faculty did not necessarily understand her experience, but they were willing to listen to her. This led to her positive experiences and even academic and professional success in the United States. P-5 had supportive faculty who understood and exercised social justice in his education, which resulted in his fruitful training experiences and career despite the racism he experienced in his personal life. P-4's experiences were neutral in Canada. Nonetheless, he attributed his success in his career to the guidance he received from his mentors.

P-1: I didn't have any mentors. I did not have anyone telling me I was good at anything. All I heard when I was in a graduate school was that I was not going to be successful. No one told me I was going to be okay.

P-2: People mentored me. When I was a social worker at DSS, there was a chaplain from the Army who said, 'You will make a good family therapist. Why don't you come and take some classes? I will supervise you. Come.' So, I went there and I began doing that. He mentored me through the years to be a licensed therapist. He was a director for the family center where I was working. He met with me in a meeting and said, 'We don't have a Hispanic person. Why don't you come and work with us.' You might say it was luck. I would say, 'God has been good to me.'

P-3: I think the reason why I am successful was having a good supportive group of people and I intentionally found a supportive group.

P-4: I'm pretty self-confident. For me when I usually made a decision, I'm very decisive. If I'm going to that direction, I'm going that direction. But each of these four people... My respect for them comes out of the fact that they actually do know a lot more than me about whatever it is, right. There are very few people I respect... I shouldn't say that way, but... where I would really defer to their opinions. I may disagree with you, but the track record has been that you know

best. I don't like to listen to other people, but these are four people who can tell me what to do.

P-5: There was a good understanding of the issue of privilege and social justice... It was a good learning experience. People truly got it, the issue of discrimination, privilege, and oppression... If you have to address these issues of diversity with supervisees who get mad at you, you know you would be supported by faculty. If that supervisor goes to the chair, the chair is going to be supportive. It's not about oppressing students, but you know students many times get reactive when addressing the issue of diversity. I think if you have a basic supportive structure in faculty, programs, department, and university, you then can do the work. Otherwise, it's very challenging.

Summary

The participants experienced their RE minority status differently. Four of the participants were first generation immigrants, and the acculturation process impacted their experiences in the United States. P-4 was the only one among the participants who was a second/third generation immigrant and lived in Canada. He was aware of the role of culture in therapy and supervision; nonetheless, he gave less importance to it than therapeutic common factors and theoretical concepts, and his experiences as minority were quite different from that of the other participants. He thought that minorities were better assimilated in Canada than the United States. P-1 and P-2 felt that Americans viewed their foreign cultures unfavorably when they came to the U.S., which consequently influenced their experiences negatively. P-5 encountered racism in his personal life in the U.S., but he had positive experiences in his education and training. P-3 was the youngest participant. She actively sought out a diversity-friendly environment even before she came to the U.S., which contributed to her positive experiences and success. All participants managed cultural issues in supervision, but their approaches differed. Three participants utilized a direct approach, while two did not push the issue.

These two had Asian heritage, which might have caused them to employ a more tentative approach since Asian traditional cultures tend to emphasize indirectness and harmony. Three participants highlighted the importance of program support when they challenged supervisees to address diversity issues. Without the support, it can be difficult to accomplish a high level of multicultural competency. All the participants balanced the culturally specific focus and universal issues. They therefore integrated these issues coherently in therapy and supervision. All of them used cultural differences, including their own, as tools to help their supervisees; minority supervisees especially benefitted from this practice. All of the participants emphasized that support and/or mentors were crucial for them to survive and succeed in their fields.

CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSION

Discussion

This section discusses the findings from textual, structural, textual-structural, and composite descriptions presented in the previous sections. In the discussion, I continued to use systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race theory as well as my personal experiences as a RE minority as guides.

This study was initially designed to explore the phenomenon of cross-cultural supervision as an RE minority supervisor in the United States. The focus was on how the U.S. context influences their experiences as RE minority supervisors. One participant lived in Canada, so the research parameter was expanded to include Canada. All the participants were born outside of the U.S. and grew up in different cultures. As they described their supervision experiences, they also discussed their personal life experiences including their education and training. Because they have multiple roles in their current jobs, they also referred to their experiences as RE minorities in other roles such as educators and researchers. Each participant experienced their RE minority status differently, but several common themes were identified.

Each participant's race and ethnicity accentuated different experiences for her/him in the U.S. or Canada, even though they had successful careers. Since four of the participants were first-generation immigrants, they were new to the U.S. culture. This transition accentuated their experiences in the U.S. The participants' experiences were influenced by the way Americans or Canadians perceived their races, ethnicities, and nationalities in the U.S. or Canada. If their cultures were seen as favorable or neutral, their experiences were more positive. If people in broader social context deemed their

culture as different or strange, the participants faced more challenges. This pressured them to prove themselves to the majority.

Some of the participants still personally experience racism or oppression today. The participants in the United States were very conscious of continuing to experience racism and oppression in general. All of them were conscious of the lack of diverse professionals in their fields, especially because they were RE minorities themselves. These experiences promoted the awareness of their own cultures in the context of the broader culture. As a result, they developed multicultural competency to address diversity issues among supervisees in therapy and supervision, which then impacted their own supervision. The ways they experienced supervision varied, depending on how the context of supervision influenced them.

Every participant was aware of cultural issues. They all managed discussion on diversity and challenged their supervisees on social justice issues in supervision when they felt it was appropriate. Nonetheless, each of them managed multiculturalism differently. Three participants addressed the diversity issues directly to raise the intensity and awareness of them. The other two participants did not push the agenda. Instead, they addressed diversity tentatively since they felt cultural issues could be personal and outside of the boundary of supervision. They all experienced resistance from their supervisees when they addressed multicultural issues in supervision. However, there were differences in their approaches on how to manage this resistance. Some participants used a more private setting such as individual supervision. Others addressed everyone's duality of both oppressing and being oppressed to help supervisees see and take their responsibility for social justice. These experiences were challenging for some of the

participants, which caused them to take supervisees' resistances personally. In their own supervisor development process, the experiences pushed them to learn not to internalize the reactions from supervisees in order to survive and be effective in the field. They, in turn, taught their supervisees to do the same with their clients' resistance. This was accomplished with and without mentoring and support, depending on how receptive to diversity and/or social justice a participant's environment was.

To address diversity issues with supervisees, all participants used their cultural selves including their cultural philosophy of mindfulness and their distinct experiences as foreigners. As RE minorities, supervision with their supervisees was often a cross-cultural encounter, which they used as opportunities to teach multiculturalism. Some of the participants self-disclosed and used their own experiences of culture and oppression to help supervisees develop awareness of how a privilege in a given context influences their experiences. All the participants balanced culture-specific issues and universal issues to provide supervision. They all, however, coherently integrated these seemingly different topics in therapy and supervision. Both racial and ethnic issues were incorporated into clinical issues. They used an integrated and/or social justice approach to address differences in supervision, without narrowly focusing on race and ethnicity. This universal perspective combined with the culture-specific perspective helped both supervisors and supervisees to avoid internalizing challenging experiences, so they could continue working effectively without the distraction of their own emotional experiences of being marginalized.

All the participants viewed cultural differences as strengths in supervision. They used differences as tools to help their supervisees, especially their minority supervisees,

because they shared many common experiences with the minority supervisees. Their experiences as RE minorities motivated most of them to become better at their work, mentor other minorities, or advocate for social justice. As a result, their uniqueness as RE minority supervisors provided the field with alternative perspectives, a different discourse, and new approaches to supervision.

The participants emphasized that support and/or mentorship were vital for them to survive and succeed in their fields. The extent of support and mentorship they received influenced their experiences in the field. Inadequate support heightened hardship in their careers and resulted in feelings of hurt, loneliness, frustration, and anger. In contrast, participants had positive experiences when they had mentorship and support in a training program and/or a community. Three participants highlighted the importance of program support when they challenged supervisees to address social justice issues. Without this support, it was difficult for the supervisors to promote supervisees' multicultural competency, especially when they faced resistance or reactions from their supervisees. Supervisees could file complaints to the program or the department when their personal beliefs and values on social justice were challenged. Some of the participants still continued on the journey of proving their credibility to supervisees and others. Therefore, it is ideal for supervisors, especially minority supervisors, if the support comes from all levels in order to achieve social justice in the field of mental health.

Significance

The following discussion evaluates the identified structures of this study in relation to the literature review, highlighting similarities as well as differences through the lenses of systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race

theory. After completion of the data analysis, I went back to triangulate my findings with the existing literature. This section presents my findings in the context of the broader literature.

Distinct Experiences as RE Minorities

The discourses of all the participants evidenced that they were keenly aware of culture, which stems from their RE minority statuses. Similar to Chung's (2009) findings, some of the participants experienced racism or discrimination. In the context of the dominant culture, their RE minority statuses made them aware of their own race and ethnicity, which in turn helped them to develop racial and cultural awareness. This resulted in progressive racial identity interactions in supervision where a supervisor had higher racial identity development than supervisees. According to Bhat and Davis (2007) and Ladany et al. (1997), progressive racial identity interactions help supervisors have strong supervisory working alliances through the interactions, which makes supervision more effective. The findings also confirmed the research by Hird et al. (2004) that RE minority supervisors had higher multicultural competence and spent significantly more time discussing cultural issues. This was related to supervisees' multicultural competency and supervision satisfaction in the past research. The challenge was the fact that supervisees were in the process of developing racial and/or ethnic identity and had some resistance or reactions when they were challenged about their privileges unconsciously possessed.

The complexity of culture, ethnicity, and race was evident in this study, which has been discussed by Fukuyama (1990). These variables were intertwined, which made it difficult to discern which factor was most influential. As one participant experienced, a

racial majority person could have the most difficult time with career due to the ethnicity and political tension tied to the nationality as well as lack of support and training around diversity issues (Chao et al., 2011; Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005; Watt et al., 2009). Ethnicity can be a target of discrimination more than race, depending on its context. Her accent and physical features in addition to her ethnic attire might have made it obvious to Americans that she was from a different country. As a result, she experienced racism, which evoked a number of negative feelings such as loneliness, hurt, frustration, or anger (Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005). Another participant had the appearance of a Caucasian, but he experienced racism in his personal life. He had positive experiences and success in his graduate programs, which supported him and promoted his awareness of and action for social justice. He had one RE minority faculty/supervisor whom he thought was more powerful and influential with social justice work than White faculty. Therefore, he purposefully identified himself as Latino to highlight his Indian ancestry. Some participants shared a feeling of needing to prove themselves as RE minority supervisors, which was consistent with Priest's (1994) assertion.

Challenging Supervisees with Diversity Issues

These RE minority supervisors were in unique positions to encourage supervisees to process direct cross-cultural contacts as Dickson et al. (2010) claimed. Their RE minority status provided the first direct cross-cultural contact to many supervisees. Every participant in this study challenged their supervisees with diversity issues in different ways, ranging from addressing them directly to indirectly or “not pushing it.” The approaches also varied depending on each supervisor's focus, such as cultural difference

or social justice. These efforts often caused resistance or reactions in supervisees, which confirmed the past research (Boysen, 2010; Chung, 2009; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Estrada et al., 2004; Ladany et al., 1997; Priest, 1994). The finding also concurred with Brown's (2009) finding that the color blind attitude was common in supervision. The exposure to resistance was related to the participants' efforts of proving themselves to others, including supervisees, who questioned their credibility noted by Priest (1994). Consequently, supervisory relationships in cross-cultural supervision could be more fragile because supervisees doubt supervisors' credibility (Beaumont, 2010; Bhat & Davis, 2007).

When the supervisors experienced resistance, they needed to find a way to manage it (Chung, 2009; Priest, 1994). It was the responsibility of the supervisors who possessed power and privilege to deal with supervisees' reactions as part of the supervision process (Christiansen et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2006), regardless of their minority statuses. Since the challenge of diversity training was often the supervisees' lack of direct cross-cultural contacts, this put minority supervisors in a position to support much of supervisees' multicultural development, including their emotional reactions. It also speaks to the burden that is placed on minority supervisors who feel that they have to address it with their supervisees because it is obvious that it is not effectively addressed during other aspects of their training.

As Dickson et al. (2010) underscored, this dynamic imposed a variety of personal and professional experiences that were difficult to manage for supervisors. Some participants discussed the topic of separation between therapy and supervision that requires work on the self-of-therapist while working on a diversity issue. Supervisors

should not cross the boundary between supervision and therapy, but some of the participants had to take the risk with the boundary when they addressed diversity issues, especially when focusing on social justice since it required supervisees to examine personal values and beliefs (McGeorge et al., 2006).

At the same time, the participants could not take the supervisees' resistance personally. If they internalized the microaggression, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for them to continue social justice work in the field. Therefore, they had to manage their own negative feelings stemming from the resistance and their minority status (Estrada et al., 2004; Priest, 1994), especially when there was a lack of support from an institution. One approach for supervisors was to normalize resistance as a natural human reaction when people were introduced to new information or feedback. Another approach for supervisors was to balance the duality of being an oppressor and being oppressed. Since everyone is an oppressor, everyone needs to look at power and privilege and be responsible for their own part. Through these approaches, the participants also needed to help supervisees work through negative emotions in the process of owning their privileges, which showed effectiveness of supervision and reduction of biases (Boysen, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011; Hardy & Laszloffy; 1995; 1998). Therefore, multicultural supervision is difficult even after several decades of emphasizing diversity in the mental health field (Christiansen et al., 2011; Watt et al., 2009).

Using Self-Disclosure

The participants used the self-of-supervisor such as their race, ethnicity, culture, and nationality in an experiential approach. This coincided with Ladany et al. (1997) who emphasized that supervisors with a different cultural background than their

supervisees had an inherent opportunity to provide them with the direct cross-cultural experience in order to promote their multicultural competency. The participants also self-disclosed their experiences as RE minorities to educate about perceptions and experiences of a minority person as Dickson et al. (2010) and Vereen et al. (2008) recommended experiential learning for effective multicultural training. They modeled self-disclosure to teach supervisees how to take risks by sharing their own experiences and managing their own vulnerability with their clients. This was rarely addressed in the past research.

Most participants also advocated for social justice. They used their own experiences of marginalization to educate supervisees about the dynamics of oppression and privilege and to illustrate emotions that accompanied their experiences as an RE minority in the U.S. (Priest, 1994). This experiential approach intensified emotions such as anxiety, frustration, and guilt in supervisees, which coincided with the findings of Christiansen et al. (2011) and Priest (1994). A supervisor had to be multiculturally competent enough to manage and contain the emotions effectively in order to facilitate the development of supervisees' multicultural competency (Beaumont, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011; Constantine et al., 2005; Inman, 2006). This could be emotionally exhausting to both supervisees and supervisors, especially to minority supervisors (Christiansen et al., 2011; Priest, 1994).

Managing Diversity Issues Universally

Participants saw racial and ethnic issues in three universal ways, but these approaches were all integrated in their coherent supervisions. The first approach was to look at racial and ethnic issues through the lens of multiculturalism, which is inclusive of

other variables such as gender, age, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and religion as Fukuyama (1990) recommended. This prevented the participants from being too narrowly focused on one cultural variable and arguing what cultural issue needed to be addressed. This also implies that everyone, including supervisors, supervisees, and clients has at least one multicultural variable that poses a challenge.

The second strategy, which was not addressed well in past research, was to equate clinical issues with diversity issues. It could be difficult for some supervisees to empathize with clinical populations such as single parents, addicts, or military veterans, if the person did not have the experience. The third was to use the social justice lens to focus on and deconstruct power, privilege, and oppression that affect any marginalized population, which was consistent with the assertion of McGeorge et al. (2006).

When the participants addressed social justice, some of them integrated these approaches into the concept of “duality” in which everyone is an inflictor and a recipient of oppression. Therefore, everyone must be accountable for their marginalization of others while they also experience challenges of being oppressed themselves. If supervisors did not acknowledge this duality, the discussion became fragmented and divisive since it tended to turn into an argument about who was the most oppressed. This duality prevented supervisees from being trapped with their own feelings of marginalization (Heppner, 1994; McGeorge et al., 2006). However, this approach can be extremely challenging for a supervisor who experiences and deals with multiple oppressions due to different minority statuses in gender, race, religion, and ethnicity, especially if they do not have support from the institution.

Using a Difference as a Motivator and Strength

In order to handle challenges specific to being RE minority supervisors (Ponterotto et al., 2010; Rastogi & Wieling, 2005), the participants found different ways to reframe their challenges as assets. The distinct experiences made them conscious of their heritages and cultures (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Hird et al., 2004; Ladany, 1997) and in turn mindful of privilege, oppression, and social justice as supervisors and scholars. This led to the journey to prove themselves to be as good as the majority (Chung, 2009; Priest, 1994). As a result, the experiences made them work harder and become better clinicians and scholars. However, there is a lack of research that explores how minorities use differences as assets.

This study found that these experiences, combined with the lack of diversity in the field, became the participants' motivation for mentoring and increasing the number of RE minority professionals and faculty in the field. In the process, RE minority supervisors developed sensitivity for the needs of both minority and majority supervisees and found ways to use their supervisory power judiciously in order to make their supervision safe and socially just for everyone, especially minority supervisees. One participant observed that this was not a priority for some majority faculty or supervisors. Some of the supervisees spoke English as a second language and lacked English proficiency. However, a participant highlighted that this disadvantage gave supervisees advantageous permission to ask questions for clarification rather than making assumptions. The participants also took advantage of their own cultures and races to teach supervisees different perspectives through using the self of supervisors. The cultural differences became a bridge to find commonality and connect with supervisees.

Support and Mentorship Are Critical to Success

Generally, the experiences of most of the participants were positive, which was consistent with Burkard et al. (2006), even when some lack of support was indicated. All participants observed there was still little diversity in the field, especially very few diverse professionals and faculty members. The extent to which supervisors had support from mentors and institutions in addition to friends and family determined their experiences as well as their success in the field. The more support and mentorship they had, the more positive and successful their experiences in the field were. The support and mentorship tended to be a buffer to the negative effects from microaggressions as well as more overt discriminations. Therefore, it is important for minorities to do research and find a diversity friendly environment in order for them to thrive. Unfortunately, this is an additional burden on minority supervisors. This area is not well explored in the past research.

Most of the participants learned how to manage diversity discussions on their own. Some of the participants indicated the lack of training for supervisors, especially as RE minority supervisors, on how to challenge supervisees on social justice issues. This coincides with the finding that some supervisors lacked training and support to manage the emotional reactivity that contributes to the lack of cultural discussions in supervision (Constantine, 1997). One participant in this study reported half of his supervisees initially had some resistance with his challenge for social justice. When there was a minority faculty member who encouraged social justice, the participant's training experience as a trainee was more positive in this study as Burkard et al. (2006) emphasized. The support and mentorship to the supervisors, particularly minority supervisors, are crucial for

supervisees', especially minority supervisees' success in the process. A participant stated that it was challenging for a supervisor to confront supervisees on social justice issues when they could become upset or complain about her/him to the program or department. Therefore, it is important to integrate or infuse social justice in an institution to provide the support at all the levels in order to facilitate the work of changing the status quo of social injustice (McGeorge et al., 2006; Ponterotto et al., 1995; Stadler et al., 2006).

Research Limitations

This section identifies and critiques the limitations of this research project. There are several limitations that may affect the credibility and transferability of the study. This study was phenomenological research, and its purpose is not necessarily to generalize the findings. Readers have to interpret and apply the results cautiously. The interpretive component of data analysis in a phenomenological method could bias the results of the study even if the researcher tried to bracket his/her experiences and assumptions.

This researcher utilized a small and purposive sample of five participants. The sample is not a representative sample. This study focused on a sample of RE minority supervisors from the U.S. or other countries who had lived in the U.S. or Canada for several years, had experiences with direct clinical services, had supervision education and training including supervision mentoring, and currently provided supervision to supervisees in the U.S. or Canada. This assumed working in the counseling field for several years, having sufficient experiences providing supervision cross-culturally in the U.S. or Canada, and having developed high RE identity level and MC level as a result.

In addition, the sample may be biased since the response rate was about 20 percent to the total requests to participate in the study. Four of the participants are first

generation immigrants and they speak English as a second language. The fifth participant was born and resides in Canada, and the context of supervision experiences varies between the U.S. and Canada. He is also the only one who speaks English as a first language. When the participants answered the demographic questionnaire, their identification of race was self-reported and subjective, so it was not clear if their physical appearances and racial identifications matched. Two participants identified themselves as White, but they were selected for this study because of their ethnicity, nationality, and first language. One of them, at least to this researcher, had distinct physical features that could be considered non-Caucasian. This researcher failed to recruit African, African Americans, or Native American participants as examples of large RE groups in the U.S., so the results were not inclusive of all the racially and ethnically marginalized voices.

Videoconference media allowed this researcher access to minority supervisors who have access to videoconference anywhere in the U.S. and Canada. However, the researcher speaks only English and Japanese, so participants will be supervisors who can speak English or Japanese.

This study only focused on the RE variable at the expense of other multicultural variables. The participants might have more than two minority statuses that may be affecting their personal and professional lives, which could complicate the findings. This study utilized a sample of five participants, which was a purposive sample that needed to be relatively homogeneous by the research criteria.

The sample was diverse in several other demographic variables such as age and length of clinical and supervisory practice. All of these variables may be confounding

variables and deserve some attention. The increasing diversity in the community may have some impact on RE minority supervisors' experiences in supervision.

It was evident to this researcher that the participants had advanced racial and ethnic identity development and multicultural competency. However, this was a subjective evaluation since there were no objective measures utilized to assess their developmental levels. The minority supervisors' RE identity and MC were not measured by instruments, so the study did not quantitatively examine how their RE identity development level, MC, and their supervisory experiences interacted with each other to affect experiences in cross-cultural supervision.

In the process of recruiting participants, two major lists of potential participants were constructed from AAMFT and ACA conferences. This researcher could not recruit any participants from the list from the ACA conference. Most of the participants identified as an MFT. One participant had a professional identity split between psychology and MFT. Each professional field may have a slightly different philosophy and strategy toward multicultural education and training, which was suggested by one participant in the study. These participants had more supervision training than other professionals since they are AAMFT approved supervisors. It is required for them to have supervision education and supervision mentoring in order to be approved by AAMFT. Their experiences in supervision may be also influenced by the level of supervision education/training, supervision experiences, and their specific discipline, such as psychology, counseling, MFT, or social work that they have identified with as a professional. Future studies may need to represent all the different professional disciplines related to the field of counseling and mental health treatment.

Implications and Recommendations

This section, based on the findings, elaborates on the implications and recommendations for three different areas: supervision practice, training for supervisors, and future research.

Supervision Practice

Society diversifies, and so does diversity education with its approaches. However, there is still a question about how effectively diversity issues are addressed in supervision in conjunction to clinical issues. Diversity education has shifted its focus to social justice, which is still difficult to address today due to resistance and insufficient training and support for it. Minority supervisors may have a key role in addressing social justice and deconstructing it in clinical work. Therefore, the recruitment and training of minority supervisors is crucial to effectiveness in clinical work as well as counselor education and supervision. However, the work of social justice has to be shared by both majorities and minorities.

Educators and supervisors need to intentionally and directly help supervisees address power and privilege in the therapy room. It can be delicate to challenge supervisees with social justice since supervisees may feel marginalized in the process of addressing it and can complain about supervisors as a result. Supervisors need to know how to effectively manage supervisees' reactions, including resistance to seeing the issues of power and privilege. One of the key approaches is to address the duality of a person oppressing and being oppressed at the same time. Supervisors have to model how to accept themselves as oppressors in some areas. Self-disclosure can be a useful and effective tool to teach experiences of minorities and model how to be vulnerable by

disclosing the self-of-therapist with their clients. Minority supervisors can use the cultural self to provide supervisees with direct cross-cultural contact that promotes their multicultural competency. When working with minority supervisees, supervisors can highlight and utilize their differences as assets in the therapeutic process. At the same time, supervisors may have to validate and help minority supervisees process their distinct experiences as minorities. Ideally, minority supervisees develop multicultural competency in which they can consider their minority statuses as assets that enrich their therapeutic work. A diverse cohort in training and supervision can also enhance supervisees' multicultural competency in the process. Therefore, academic programs need to recruit and retain minority students even more intentionally than they currently do.

In supervision, the complexities of race, ethnicity, nationality, and international conflicts/politics need to be embraced in addition to other multicultural variables such as gender, sexuality, and socioeconomic status. Supervisors also need to encourage supervisees to pay attention to the context in which their clients exist, which can either oppress or support the clients in a certain multicultural variable from perspectives such as systems theory, social constructivism, postmodernism, and critical race theory. At the same time, it is important to balance cultural issues and universal/clinical issues, as multiculturalism continues to be peripheral in the counseling education and professional field, even though the field claims to strongly espouse it. However, social justice is closely tied to clinical issues. Therefore social justice needs to be one of the critical and essential components of counselor education and supervision and should be infused into its curriculum.

As a result of this complexity, clinical issues need to be treated with a good understanding of power and privilege in the current and historical context of a client if therapy is to be effective. In addition, supervisees need to have good understandings of themselves in a given context. Without this self-awareness, their work may not be effective or may be biased since they have authority and are part of the therapeutic context in the therapy room. For all of these components to come together, institutional support at different levels is very important. Consequently, integration or infusion of social justice work, especially at the organizational level, is recommended in order to achieve supervisees' multicultural competency and, in turn, good clinical outcomes with clients.

Training for Supervisors

Counseling-related academic programs need to continue to recruit and train minorities in order to increase the number of these professionals, including supervisors and educators. Once minorities are recruited, it is more crucial, if not more essential, for them than the majority students to have mentors and support in order to remain and succeed in the field since they may have a higher rate of attrition. Therefore, a program has to intentionally provide support and mentorship to minority supervisors for their effective social justice work in supervision and their survival as new professionals. This is especially important when they can experience oppression such as resistance and microaggressions from their supervisees and institutions. The larger number of minority supervisors and faculty would increase opportunities for direct cross-cultural experiences students need in diversity education. This can put an additional burden on minority supervisors, so it is a strong indicator to the counselor education field that diversity issues

need to be more integrated into the curriculum and training as it is the responsibility of all supervisors not just minority supervisors. It would be optimal, if not essential, that a department and a university support social justice.

The training of all supervisors needs to focus more on power, privilege, oppression, and social justice rather than education and discussions of mere differences. A training program also needs to train all supervisors to address social justice since the work can challenge personal values and beliefs of supervisees. Consequently, supervisees may have reactions such as resistance and microaggressions. The training needs to incorporate education on how to best manage resistance from supervisees and also institutions in supervision. It may be a key for a supervisor to balance accepting where supervisees are with multicultural competency and challenging them to push social justice work further. Supervisors and educators need to know that a program or a department will back them up when they challenge supervisees and, as a result, supervisees can get upset and even file a complaint against them. This requires majority faculty and a program as a whole to have high multicultural competency since the number of minority faculty and supervisors is still low in the field. The support is extremely important for new supervisors and faculty to be successful.

In training, it may be helpful to educate educators and supervisors how to address the duality of the same person oppressing and being oppressed in order to avoid the game of arguing about “who is most oppressed.” The integration of all the multicultural variables and clinical issues may also be critical. Therefore, social justice must be integrated and infused into a training program to improve the counseling and mental health field and ultimately our clients’ mental health.

Future Research

In this study, RE minority supervisors utilized different approaches to multiculturalism in training, especially supervision. Researchers need to continue to address how supervisors effectively promote social justice and multicultural competency in supervision. In the end, this is related to development of supervisees' clinical competency and how they serve the simultaneously overrepresented and underserved minority populations as clients in the field. Answers to the question may be key to ultimately reducing health care costs since these answers can improve the effectiveness of counseling.

The variety of approaches used in cross-cultural supervision witnessed in this study may be a result of the field's inability to effectively manage resistance from supervisees in supervision or a lack of research on how to best train supervisors to accomplish supervisees' multicultural competence in the face of resistance as a part of MC development. Since there is diversity even within a cultural population, a larger sample may give the study a clearer picture of how minority supervisors experience and manage cross-cultural supervision. A more diverse sample that includes African American and Native American supervisors is needed to learn about different experiences and approaches since these groups have a longer history in the U.S., not to mention their experiences with racism may be quite different than other minority groups' experiences. This researcher invited a few African American and Native American supervisors, but failed to secure any of these participants. This may represent their mistrust to research or academia.

The multicultural competency of a supervisor may have more influence on how effectively a supervisor promotes social justice than their mere race or ethnicity. Therefore, mixed method research may be important to find a relation between the supervisors' multicultural competency levels and their experiences in cross-cultural supervision, in addition to the in-depth interviews. There is also a need for research to assess how effectively social justice is integrated and carried out in an institution, especially when there is still a lack of diverse professionals in the counseling field. It may be critical for minority supervisors to have mentors and support within an institution in order to succeed in the counseling field. There needs to be more institutional funding and encouragement for this type of research.

Summary

As the U.S. population continues to diversify, the demographics of students in the counseling related fields follow the trend very closely. However, the increase in the number of minority mental health professionals is slow. As a result, the minority populations continue to be underserved by receiving less effective or appropriate mental health services. In order to improve the quality of services, RE minority supervisors play key roles as mentors and gatekeepers for these minority students to move forward to becoming competent licensed professionals.

These RE minority supervisors' stories diverge and are unique to them. Some of them unfortunately continue to experience racism and other forms of oppression. Because of their race and ethnicity, they all have wisdom that contributes to the diversifying field, which historically has not fully tapped into their knowledge. The RE minority supervisors are the trail blazers of the multiculturally growing field, which motivate them to nurture

and mentor the next generation of RE minority professionals. They also assume a key role to advance social justice in mental health work since they are profoundly aware of ways that a context and its power can affect a person's wellbeing.

It is the wish of this researcher that the stories of these RE minority supervisors help the field learn something new and innovative. Hopefully, this further enriches and enhances the field as a whole for the future generations to come.

REFERENCES

- Abt-Perkins, D., & Hauschildt, P. (2000). Becoming multicultural supervisors: Lessons from a collaborative field study. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision, 16*(1), 28-47.
- Adams, D. M. (2010). Multicultural pedagogy in the supervision and education of psychotherapists. *Women & Therapy, 33*(1), 42-54. doi: 10.1080/02703140903404713
- Aducci, C. J., & Baptist, J. A. (2011). A collaborative-affirmative approach to supervisory practice. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 23*(2), 88-102. doi: 10.1080/08952833.2011.574536
- Alexander, C. M., Kruczek, T., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Building multicultural competencies in school counselor trainees: An international immersion experience. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*(4), 255-266.
- Allen, J. (2007). Multicultural assessment supervision model to guide research and practice. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 38*(3), 248-258. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.248
- American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. (2012, September/October). Membership report. *Family Therapy Magazine*, p 13.
- American Counseling Association. (2013). CACREP Vital Statistic. *Counseling Today, 55*(8), p. 62.
- American Counseling Association. (2005). ACA Code of ethics, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Resources/CodeOfEthics/TP/Home/CT2.aspx>

- American Counseling Association. (2013). ACA membership report on 1/3/2013. Retrieved from ACA membership and association service in ACA phone directory
- American Psychological Association. (2010). Current major field of APA members by membership status. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ads/about/ad-demographics.pdf>
- Ancis, J. R., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*(3), 277-284.
- Anderson, H. (1997). Conversation, language, and possibilities: A postmodern approach to therapy. New York, NY: BasicBooks.
- Arkin, N. (1999). Culturally sensitive student supervision: Difficulties and challenges. *Clinical Supervisor, 18*, 1-16.
- Arthur, N., & Achenbach, K. (2002). Developing multicultural counseling competencies through experiential learning. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 42*(1), 2-15.
- Atkinson, D. R. (2004). Counseling American Minorities (6th ed.). New York, NY: McCraw-Hill.
- Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1998). Counseling American Minorities (5th ed.). New York, NY: McCraw-Hill.
- Awad, G. H. & Cokley, K. O. (2010). Designing and interpreting quantitative research in multicultural counseling. In Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (Eds.) (2010). *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling (3rd ed.)* (pp. 385-396). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bash, L. (2009). Engaging with cross-cultural communication barriers in globalized higher education: The case of research-degree students. *Intercultural Education*, 20(5), 475-483. doi: 10.1080/14675980903371340
- Beaumont, R. (2010). *The influence of supervisor multicultural competence and racial microaggression on supervisory working alliance, supervisee multicultural competence, and supervisee disclosure within supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Becvar, D. S., & Becvar, R. J. (2013). *Family therapy: A systemic integration* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Beckett, J. O., & Dungee-Anderson, D. (1996). A framework for agency-based multicultural training and supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 4(4), 27-48.
- Berkel, L. A., Constantine, M. G., & Olson, E. A. (2007). Supervisor multicultural competence: Addressing religious and spiritual issues with counseling students in supervision. *Clinical Supervisor*, 26(1), 3-15. doi: 10.1300/J001v26n01.02
- Bernard, J. M. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, Priest, and Fukuyama. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 34(2), 159-171.
- Bhat, C. S., & Davis, T. E. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 35(2), 80-91.

- Biggerstaff, D. & Thompson, A. R. (2008). Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Qualitative Methodology of Choice in Healthcare Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 5(3), 214-224. doi: 10.1080/14780880802314304
- Borders, L. D. (2005). Snapshot of clinical supervision in counseling and counselor education: A five-year review. *Clinical Supervisor*, 24(1), 69-113. doi: 10.1300/J001v24n01.05
- Boyle-Baise, M. (1999). Bleeding boundaries or uncertain center? A historical exploration of multicultural education. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, 14(3), 191-215.
- Boysen, G. A. (2010). Integrating implicit bias into counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 49(4), 210-227.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2002). The new handbook of counseling supervision. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, S. (2009). *Race and color-blind racial attitudes in supervision: Implications for the supervisory relationship*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri - Kansas City). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Brubaker, M. D., Puig, A., Reese, R. F., & Young, J. (2010). Integrating social justice into counseling theories pedagogy: A case example. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 50(2), 88-102.
- Buchanan, G. F. (2006). *The multicultural supervisor competency indicator: A behaviorally anchored rating scale approach*. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>

- Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Hess, S. A., Madson, M. B., Pruitt, N. T., Contreras-Tadych, D., Kozlowski, J. M., & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and unresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(3), 288-301. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.288
- Burkard, A. W., Ponterotto, J. G., Reynolds, A. L., & Alfonso, V. C. (1999). White counselor trainees' racial identity and working alliance perceptions. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*(3), 324-329.
- Butler, S. K. (2003). Multicultural sensitivity and competence in the clinical supervision of school counselors and school psychologists: A context for providing competent services in a multicultural society. *Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 125-142. doi: 10.1300/J001v22n01_09
- Cary, D., & Marques, P. (2007). From expert to collaborator: Developing cultural competency in clinical supervision. *Clinical Supervisor, 26*(1), 141-157. doi: 10.1300/J001v26n01.10
- Chandras, K. V. (1997). Training multiculturally competent counselors to work with Asian Indian Americans. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 37*(1), 50-60.
- Chang, C. Y., Crethar, H. C., & Ratts, M. J. (2010). Social justice: A national imperative for counselor education and supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(2), 82-87.
- Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., & Milliken, T. F. (2009). Addressing social justice issues in supervision: A call for client and professional advocacy. *Clinical Supervisor, 28*(1), 20-35. doi: 10.1080/07325220902855144

- Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., & Shoffner, M. F. (2003). Cross-racial supervision: A developmental approach for white supervisors working with supervisees of color. *Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 121-138. doi: 10.1300/J001v22n02_08
- Chao, R. C., Wei, M., Good, G. E., & Flores, L. Y. (2011). Race/Ethnicity, Color-Blind Racial Attitudes, and Multicultural Counseling Competence: The Moderating Effects of Multicultural Counseling Training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(1), 72-82. doi: 10.1037/a0022091
- Christiansen, A. T., Thomas, V., Kafescioglu, N., Karakurt, G., Lowe, W., Smith, W., & Wittenborn, A. (2011). Multicultural supervision: Lessons learned about an ongoing struggle. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 37*(1), 109-119. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00138.x
- Chung, M. (2009). *International supervisors' social influence, self-efficacy, and acculturation in cross-cultural dyads of clinical supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Constantine, M.G. (2001). Multiculturally-Focused Counseling Supervision: Its Relationship to Trainees' Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*, 87-98.
- Constantine, M. G. (2001). Perspectives on multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*(2), 98-101.
- Constantine, M.G. (2001). The relationship between general counseling self-efficacy and self-perceived multicultural counseling competence in supervisees. *Clinical Supervisor, 20*, 81-90.

- Constantine, M. G. (2002). Racism attitudes, white racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*(3), 162-174.
- Constantine, M. G., & Derald, W. S. (2007). Perceptions of racial microaggressions among black supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(2), 142-153. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.142
- Constantine, M. G., Warren, A. K., & Miville, M. L. (2005). White racial identity dyadic interactions in supervision: Implications for supervisees' multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(4), 490-496. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.490
- Corey, G., Haynes, R., Moulton, P., & Muratori, M. (2010). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Corbin, J., & Stauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) 2009 Standards*. Retrieved from [http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20 cover.pdf](http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf)
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Daniels, J., D'Andrea, M., & Kyung Kim, B. S. (1999). Assessing the barriers and changes of cross-cultural supervision: A case study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*(3), 191-204.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: an introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Dickson, G. L., Argus-Calvo, B., & Tafoya, N. G. (2010). Multicultural counselor training experiences: Training effects and perceptions of training among a sample of predominately Hispanic students. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 49*(4), 247-265.
- Dickson, G. L., & Jepsen, D. A. (2007). Multicultural training experiences as predictors of multicultural competencies: Students' perspectives. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 47*(2), 76-95.
- Dinsmore, J. A., & England, J. T. (1996). A study of multicultural counseling training at CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 36*(1), 58-76.
- Dressel, J. L., Consoli, A. J., Kim, B. S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful multicultural supervisory behaviors: A delphi poll. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 35*(1), 51-64.
- Duan, C., & Roehike, H. (2001). A descriptive 'snapshot' of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*(2), 131-146.

- Durham, J. C. (2002). *Multicultural and diversity issues in counseling field supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Estrada, D. (2005). Multicultural conversations in supervision: The impact of the supervisor's Racial/Ethnic background. *Guidance & Counseling, 21*(1), 14-20.
- Estrada, D., Frame, M. W., & Williams, C. B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 32*, 307-319.
- Fuertes, J. N. (2004). Supervision in bilingual counseling: Service delivery, training, and research considerations. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 32*(2), 84-94.
- Fukuyama, M. A. (1990). Taking a universal approach to multicultural counseling. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 30*(1), 6-17.
- Fukuyama, M. A. (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to supervision research. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(2), 142-151.
- Gainor, K. A., & Constantine, M. G. (2002). Multicultural group supervision: A comparison of in-person versus web-based formats. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(2), 104-112.
- Garcia, M., Kosutic, I., McDowell, T., & Anderson, S. A. (2009). Raising critical consciousness in family therapy supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 21*(1), 18-38. doi: 10.1080/08952830802683673

- Gardner, R. M. D. (2002). Cross cultural perspectives in supervision. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 26(2), 98-106.
- Gardner, S.K. (2008). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 125-138.
- Garrett, M. T., Borders, L. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural SuperVISION: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 29(2), 147-158.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 29(2), 102-113.
- Gay, G. (2004). Beyond brown: Promoting equality through multicultural education. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, 19(3), 193-216.
- Gladding, S. T. (2010). Family therapy: History, theory, and practice (5nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Glosoff, H. L., & Durham, J. C. (2010). Using supervision to prepare social justice counseling advocates. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 50(2), 116-129.
- Grant, B., & McKinley, E. (2011). Colouring the pedagogy of doctoral supervision: Considering supervisor, student and knowledge through the lens of indigeneity. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 48(4), 377-386. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2011.617087

- Guanipa, C. (2002). A preliminary instrument to evaluate a multicultural issues in marriage and family therapy supervision. *Clinical Supervisor, 21*(1), 59-75.
- Hage, S. M., Hopson, A., Siegel, M., Payton, G., & Defanti, E. (2006). Multicultural training in spirituality: An interdisciplinary review. *Counseling & Values, 50*(3), 217-234.
- Hanks, B. (2008). *The supervision experience and process through the eyes of the hearing supervisor, deaf counselor-in-training, and the sign language interpreter: A case study*. (Doctoral dissertation, Idaho State University). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Hardy, K. V., & Laszloffy, T. A. (1995). The cultural genogram: Key to training culturally competent therapists. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 21*, 227–237.
- Hardy, K., & Laszloffy, T. (1998). The dynamics of a pro-racist ideology: Implications for family therapists. In M. McGoldrick (Ed.), *Re-visioning family therapy* (pp. 118–128). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hartung, P. J. (1996). Transforming counseling courses: From monocultural to multicultural. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 36*(1), 6-13.
- Hays, D. G., & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*(2), 134-145.
- Helms, J. E. (2008). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a white person or understanding the White persons in your life* (2nd ed.). Handover, MA: Microtraining Associates.

- Heppner, M. J., & O'Brien, K. M. (1994). Multicultural counselor training: Students' perceptions of helpful and hindering events. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(1), 4-18.
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). Research design in counseling (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thompson Higher Education.
- Hill, N. R. (2003). Promoting and celebrating multicultural competence in counselor trainees. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*(1), 39-51.
- Hinrichsen, G. A. (2006). Why multicultural issues matter for practitioners working with older adults. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 37*(1), 29-35. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.37.1.29
- 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 & Development, 29*(2), 114-130.
- Hird, J. S., Tao, K. W., & Gloria, A. M. (2004). Examining supervisors' multicultural competence in racially similar and different supervision dyads. *Clinical Supervisor, 23*(2), 107-122. doi: 10.1300/J001v23n0207
- Hubble, M. A., Duncan, B. L., & Miller, S. D. (Eds.). (1999). *The Heart & Soul of Change: What Works in Therapy*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hughes, L. (2006). Reflections on... the colour blindness of counselling. *Healthcare Counselling & Psychotherapy Journal, 6*(4), 4-5.

- Hyun, E., & Marshall, J. D. (1996). Inquiry-oriented reflective supervision for developmentally and culturally appropriate practice. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision, 11*(2), 127-44.
- Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 32*(1), 73-85.
- Jennings, L., D'Rozario, V., Goh, M., Sovereign, A., Brogger, M., & Skovholt, T. (2008). Psychotherapy expertise in singapore: A qualitative investigation. *Psychotherapy Research, 18*(5), 508-522. doi: 10.1080/10503300802189782
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Differences Making a Difference: Cross-Cultural Interactions in Supervisory Relationships, *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 12*, 2-3, 61-103.
- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C., & 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 & Supervision, 36*(4), 284-304.
- 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.
- Lampropoulos, G. K. (2002). A common factors view of counseling supervision process. *Clinical Supervisor, 21*(1), 77-95.

- Lassiter, P. S., Napolitano, L., Culbreth, J. R., & Kok-Mun Ng. (2008). Developing multicultural competence using the structured peer group supervision model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 47*(3), 164-178.
- Lawless, J. J., Gale, J. E., & Bacigalupe, G. (2001). The Discourse of Race and Culture in Family Therapy Supervision: A Conversation Analysis. *Contemporary Family Therapy, 23*, 181-197.
- Lee, R. M., Chalk, L., Conner, S. E., Kawasaki, N., Jannetti, A., LaRue, T., & Rodolfa, E. (1999). The status of multicultural counseling training at counseling center internship sites. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 27*(2), 58-74.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Wagner, N. S. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? what we need to know? *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(2), 117-130.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Marshall, J.P., & Wieling, E. (2003). Marriage and Family Therapy Students' Phenomenological Experiences of Cross-Cultural Supervision. *Family Therapy, 30*, 167-187.
- Martinez, K., McNally, P., York, F., Rigano, D., & Jose, G. (2001). Conceptualising intercultural contact in the supervision of indigenous student teachers. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 22*(3), 307-321. doi: 10.1080/07256860120094028
- McGeorge, C. R., Carlson, T. S., Erickson, M. J., & Guttormson, H. E. (2006). Creating and evaluating a feminist-informed social justice couple and family therapy

- training model. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 18(3), 1-38. doi:
10.1300/J086v18n0301
- McGoldrick, M., Almeida, R., Preto, N. G., Bibb, A., Sutton, C., Hudak, J., & Hines, P. M. (1999). Efforts to incorporate social justice perspectives into a family training program. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 25(2), 191-209.
- McNeill, B. W., Hom, K. L., & Perez, J. A. (1995). The training and supervisory needs of racial and ethnic minority students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 23(4), 246-258.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Miklitsch, T. A. (2005). *The relationship between multicultural education, multicultural experiences, racial identity, and multicultural competence among student affairs professionals*. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Mittal, M., & Wielings, E. (2006). Training experiences of international doctoral students in marriage and family therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 32(3), 369-383.
- Moreno, J. (2009). *Multicultural events within group supervision: Minority experiences and supervision satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>

- Morgan, M. M., & Sprenkle, D. H. (2007). Toward a common-factors approach to supervision. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 33(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2007.00001.x
- Mori, Y. (2010). *Supervising international trainees: Influence of working alliance, supervisor multicultural competence, and supervisor self-disclosure on cultural discussion and nondisclosure in supervision*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Lehigh University). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Mori, Y., Inman, A. G., & Caskie, G. I. L. (2009). Supervising international students: Relationship between acculturation, supervisor multicultural competence, cultural discussions, and supervision satisfaction. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 3(1), 10-18. doi: 10.1037/a0013072
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mwaba, K., & Pedersen, P. (1990). Relative importance of intercultural, interpersonal, and psychopathological attributions in judging critical incidents by multicultural counselors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 18(3), 106-117.
- Nelson, M. L., Gizara, S., Hope, A. C., Phelps, R., Steward, R., & Weitzman. (2006) A feminist multicultural perspective on supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 34(2), 105-115.
- Nichols, M. P., & Schwartz, R. C. (2010). *Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

- Nilsson, J. E. (2007). International students in supervision: Course self-efficacy, stress, and cultural discussions in supervision. *Clinical Supervisor, 26*(1), 35-47. doi: 10.1300/J001v26n01.04
- Nilsson, J. E., & Anderson, M. Z. (2004). Supervising international students: The role of acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 35*(3), 306-312. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.35.3.306
- Nilsson, J. E., & Dodds, A. K. (2006). A pilot phase in the development of the international student supervision scale. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 34*(1), 50-62.
- Nilsson, J. E., & Duan, C. (2007). Experiences of prejudice, role difficulties, and counseling self-efficacy among U.S. racial and ethnic minority supervisees working with white supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 35*(4), 219-229.
- Ober, A. M., Granello, D. H., & Henfield, M. S. (2009). A synergistic model to enhance multicultural competence in supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48*(3), 204-221.
- Odegard, M. A., & Vereeri, L. G. (2010). A grounded theory of counselor educators integrating social justice into their pedagogy. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(2), 130-149.
- Page, M. L. (2003). Race, culture, and the supervisory relationship: A review of the literature and a call to action. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision, 18*(2), 161-174.

- Paul, B. D. (2001). *Qualitative inquiry of biased and exemplary practices of white supervisors in multicultural supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Peters, S. W. (2007). Cultural awareness: Enhancing counselor understanding, sensitivity, and effectiveness with clients who are deaf. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 35*(3), 182-190.
- Pinterits, E. J., & Atkinson, D. R. (1998). The diversity video forum: An adjunct to diversity sensitivity training in the classroom. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 37*(3), 203-211.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Alexander, C. M., & Grieger, I. (1995). A multicultural competency checklist for counseling training programs. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 23*(1), 11-20.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (Eds.) (2010). *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Porter, N. (2010). Feminist and multicultural underpinnings to supervision: An overview. *Women & Therapy, 33*(1), 1-6. doi: 10.1080/02703140903404622
- Priest, R. (1994). Minority supervisor and majority supervisee: Another perspective of clinical reality. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(2), 152-158.
- Rastogi, M., & Wieling, E. (Eds.). (2005). *Voices of Color: First-Person Accounts of Ethnic Minority Therapists*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Ratts, M. J., & Wood, C. (2011). The fierce urgency of now: Diffusion of innovation as a mechanism to integrate social justice in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(3), 207-223.
- Reynolds, A. L., & Pope, R. L. (1991). The complexity of diversity: Exploring multiple oppressions. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70* (1), 174-180.
- Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). README FIRST for a user's guide to Qualitative Methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Riley, S. M. (2004). *An investigation of the relationship between counseling supervisors' multicultural counseling competencies and the supervisory working alliance*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Rizq, R. (2012). 'There's always this sense of failure': An interpretative phenomenological analysis of primary care counsellors' experiences of working with the borderline client. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 26*(1), 31-54. doi: 10.1080/02650533.2011.579695
- Robinson-Pant, A. (2009). Changing academies: Exploring international PhD students' perspectives on 'host' and 'home' universities. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(4), 417-429. doi: 10.1080/07294360903046876
- Rowell, P. C., & Benschoff, J. M. (2008). Using personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses to foster students' ethnic identity development. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48*(1), 2-15.

- Ruelas, S. R. (2000). *Multicultural counseling competencies*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Sangganjanavanich, V. (2008). *The development and validation of the multicultural supervision scale*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Seto, A., Young, S., Becker, K. W., & Kiselica, M. S. (2006). Application of the triad training model in a multicultural counseling course. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45*(4), 304-318.
- Sheehan, D., & Jansen, D. (2006). The development of a national bicultural and interprofessional programme in clinical teaching and supervision in new zealand. *Journal of Interprofessional Care, 20*(6), 591-601. doi: 10.1080/13561820601029577
- Shulman, L., & Safyer, A. (2006). Introduction. *Clinical Supervisor, 25*(1), 1-2. doi: 10.1300/J001v25n01•01
- Smith, J. A. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2007). Pain as an assault on the self: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of the psychological impact of chronic benign low back pain. *Psychology & Health, 22*(5), 517-534. doi: 10.1080/14768320600941756
- Sommer, C. A., Derrick, E. C., Bourgeois, M. B., Ingene, D. H., Ji, W. Y., & Justice, C. A. (2009). *Multicultural connections: Using stories to transcend cultural*

- boundaries in supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 37(4), 206-218.
- Stadler, H. A., Suh, S., Cobia, D. C., Middleton, R. A., & Carney, J. S. (2006). Reimagining counselor education with diversity as a core value. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 45(3), 193-206.
- Stark, M. D., Frels, R. K., Chavez, R. R., & Sharma, B. (2010). The practice of psychotherapy in Mexico: Past and present. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 38(1), 27-38.
- Steele, J. M. (2008). Preparing counselors to advocate for social justice: A liberation model. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48(2), 74-85.
- Steward, R. J., & Phelps, R. E. (2004). Feminist and multicultural collaboration in counseling supervision: Voices from two African American women. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 32, 358-365.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. (1992). Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A Call to the Profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Suet, L. H., Shui, L. N., & Kwok, K. F. (2010). Functions of social work supervision in Shenzhen: Insights from the cross-border supervision model. *International Social Work*, 53(3), 366-378. doi: 10.1177/0020872809359864

- Suthakaran, V. (2011). Using analogies to enhance self-awareness and cultural empathy: Implications for supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 39*(4), 206-217.
- Taylor, B. A., Hernández, P., Deri, A., Rankin, I. P., & Siegel, A. (2006). Integrating diversity dimensions in supervision: Perspectives of ethnic minority AAMFT approved supervisors. *Clinical Supervisor, 25*(1), 3-21. doi: 10.1300/J001v25n01•02
- Todd, T.C., & Storm, C.L. (2002). The complete systemic supervisor: Context, philosophy, and pragmatics. Lincoln, NE: Authors Choice Press.
- Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 32*(2), 66-83.
- Torres Jr., S., & Ottens, A. J. (1997). The multicultural infusion process: A research-based approach. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 37*(1), 6-18.
- Torres-Rivera, E., Phan, L. T., Maddux, C., Wilbur, M. P., & Garrett, M. T. (2001). Process versus content: Integrating personal awareness and counseling skills to meet the multicultural challenge of the twenty-first century. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*(1), 28-40.
- Tsong, Y. V. (2004). *The roles of supervisee attachment styles and perception of supervisors' general and multicultural competence in supervisory working alliance, supervisee omissions in supervision, and supervision outcome.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>

- Tummala-Narra, P. (2004). Dynamics of Race and Culture in the Supervisory Encounter. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 21*, 300-311.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2001). Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity – A Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK44243/pdf/TOC.pdf>
- Utsey, S. O., & Gernat, C. A. (2002). White racial identity attitudes and the ego defense mechanisms used by white counselor trainees in racially provocative counseling situations. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*(4), 475-484.
- Utsey, S.O., Gernat, C.A., & Hammar, L. (2005). Examining White Counselor Trainees' Reactions to Racial Issues in Counseling and Supervision Dyads. *Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 449-478.
- Vallaster, C. (2005). Cultural diversity and its impact on social interactive processes. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 5*(2), 139-163. doi: 10.1177/1470595805054490
- Vander Kolk, C. J. (1974). The relationship of personality, values and race to anticipation of the supervisory relationship. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 18*(1), 41-46.
- Vargas, H. L., & Wilson, C. M. (2011). Managing worldview influences: Self-awareness and self-supervision in a cross-cultural therapeutic relationship. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy, 22*(2), 97-113. doi: 10.1080/08975353.2011.577684

- Vereen, L. G., Hill, N. R., & McNeal, D. T. (2008). Perceptions of multicultural counseling competency: Integration of the curricular and the practical. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 30*(3), 226-236.
- Villalba, J. A., & Redmond, R. E. (2008). Crash: Using a popular film as an experiential learning activity in a multicultural counseling course. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 47*(4), 264-276.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972). The History and Status of General Systems Theory. *Academy Of Management Journal, 15*(4), 407-426. doi:10.2307/255139
- Watt, S. K., Curtis, G. C., Drummond, J., Kellogg, A. H., Lozano, A., Nicoli, G. T., & Rosas, M. (2009). Privileged identity exploration: Examining counselor trainees' reactions to difficult dialogues. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 49*(2), 86-105.
- Wieling, E., & Marshall, J. P. (1999). Cross-cultural supervision in marriage and family therapy. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 21*(3), 317-329.
- Wieling, E., & Rastogi, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Voices of Color: First-Person Accounts of Ethnic Minority Therapists*. Thousand Oak, CA: SAGE.
- Williams, C. B. (1999). The color of fear and blue-eyed: Tools for multicultural counselor training. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 39*(1), 76-79.
- Wilson-Duff, M. (2006). *Self-reported multicultural competence and provider interest in multicultural training and supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, Antioch New

- England Graduate School). Retrieved from
<http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Wong, L. C. J. (2001). *What helps and what hinders in cross-cultural clinical supervision: A critical incident study*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia (Canada). Retrieved from
<http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Yang, P. H. (2004). *The effects of supervisor cultural responsiveness and ethnic group similarity on Asian American supervisees' perceptions of supervisor credibility and multicultural competence*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>
- Young, R. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 32(1), 39-49.
- Zapata, A. (2010). *A qualitative study examining discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University). Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mnsu.edu/>

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Key informants from 2011 AAMFT annual conference:

1. Dr. Manijeh Daneshour at St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN, USA
2. Dr. Karen Quek at Alliant International University, CA, USA
3. Dr. Ting Liu at Kean University, NJ, USA
4. Ms. Maria Velazquez-Constas, NC, USA
5. Dr. Kenneth Hardy at Drexel University, PA, USA
6. Dr. Mei Ju Ko at Texas Tech University, TX, USA
7. Dr. J. Maria Bermudez at University of Georgia, GA, USA
8. Dr. Jeff Chang at Athabasca University, Canada

Key informants from 2013 ACA conference:

1. Fred Bemak
2. Patricia Arredondo
3. Rita Chi-Ying Chung
4. Clemmont E. Vontress
5. Kevin Feisthamel
6. Paula Britton
7. Lynn Zagzebski Tovar
8. Syntia D. Santos

Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

Dissertation Study

You are invited to take part in research about cross-cultural supervision experiences as a racial and ethnic (RE) minority supervisor in the counseling-related field. You are a potential participant because you are an RE minority supervisor and interested in diversity or multiculturalism. The research is being conducted by Masa Sato under the supervision of Dr. Aaron Jeffrey at Minnesota State University, Mankato. We ask that you read this form and discuss any questions with the project staff before agreeing to participate in this dissertation research project.

Purpose

The purpose of the research is to find out more information about how RE minority supervisors experience cross-cultural supervision. We are interested in learning more about how RE minority supervisors facilitate cultural discussions and emotional reactions in cross-cultural supervision within the counseling field. We also want to examine the needs of RE minority supervisors in their practice.

Procedures

If you are willing to participate in this research, we ask that you read and sign a consent form. You then fill out a demographic questionnaire to check the interviewee criteria. The questionnaire should take only a few minutes to determine if you meet the criteria to be a participant for this study. Once you agree to have an interview, we will schedule a Skype™ (video conference) interview time by phone or e-mail. If you do not have Skype on your computer, you will need to download it or you will need to use a computer that has Skype. It will be one interview per participant. An interview will be conducted via Skype and will take 45 to 90 minutes of your time. The interview will be audio-recorded for the purpose of transcription and data analysis. You will be encouraged to review the report on obtained results for its accuracy.

Risks and Benefits

The questionnaire will directly ask you about demographic data such as nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, and disability. The interview will involve questions about your experiences in cross-cultural supervision as an RE minority supervisor. Some of the questions may be personal and difficult to answer, but the information will not be shared with anyone else. You may refuse to answer any questions on the form. You may still experience negative feelings about your experiences when you answer questions. We can provide you with information about programs and services that you can contact for help if you need it. The information will remain confidential. However, Skype is not a secure program, so there is a risk for others looking into the interview. The dissertation will be published with altered identifiable information. A benefit of the study would be to have an opportunity to discuss issues that are not talked about often. Another benefit would be contribution to improvement of the counseling field. The risk level of this research is considered to be minimal.

Confidentiality

The interview will take place in a private room of a participant's choice and the researcher's private office. The recordings and transcripts will be kept in a secure computer in a locked office; only the researchers for this study will have access to the records. Please keep in mind that Skype is not a secure program. Anything you tell us will be kept confidential, except for the dissertation

publication. In any sort of report of the dissertation study, your information will stay anonymous. We will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Your name and other identifying information will be altered to conceal identity. The recordings will be erased at completion of the study.

Voluntary nature of study

Your decision whether or not to participate in this research will not affect your current or future relations with Minnesota State University, Mankato, or the staff helping with this study. Even if you sign the consent form, you are free to withdraw from this study at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences.

Cost/compensation

There will be no cost or compensation from participating in this study. However, you will be asked to use your computer and internet access, in order for us to have an interview via Skype.

Contact

The researchers conducting this study are Masa Sato and Dr. Aaron Jeffrey. You may contact Masa Sato, the co-researcher at MSU, Mankato, by calling (320) 420-7903 or sending an e-mail to masahiko.sato@mnsu.edu. Dr. Aaron Jeffrey can be contacted via email at aaron.jeffrey@mnsu.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the treatment of human subjects, contact:

MSU IRB Administrator, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Institutional Review Board, 115 Alumni Foundation
(507) 389-2321

I have read the above information and understand that the participation in this study is voluntary and I may stop at any time. I consent to participate in the study by signing this form below.

Signature of participant

Date

Signature of researchers

Date

Participant received a copy.

MSU IRB LOG #: 478496-4
Date of MSU IRB approval: 6/20/2013

Appendix C

Demographic questionnaire

Your initials: _____

Please fill out this questionnaire to check the criteria for research participants.
(*questions are required.)

1. *Have you had education and training for providing supervision?: Yes/No
2. *Do you have current supervisees you supervise?: Yes/No
3. *Length of clinical practice: ___ years
4. *Length of supervisory practice: ___ years
5. *Your country/nationality of origin: _____
6. *Length of being in the U.S.: ___ years
7. *Culture/ethnicity you identify with: _____
8. *Race you identify with: _____
9. Primary training: Psychology, Counseling, Social Work, Marriage & Family Therapy
10. Practice region: rural/suburb/urban; East/Midwest/Central/West/South; International
11. Gender/sex: _____
12. Highest level of education: master's degree, doctoral degree, post doctoral fellowship
13. Age: _____
14. Socioeconomic status: _____
15. (Dis)ability: _____
16. Spirituality/religion: _____
17. Sexual orientation: _____

Appendix D

Dissertation interview questions:

1. What have your experiences been as an RE minority supervisor in the counseling field in the U.S.?
2. How do you perceive, understand, and manage cultural discussions in supervision, especially emotionally?
3. What do you perceive as your need to continue to supervise as an RE minority supervisor?