7-9-2024

Developing Expertise and Multiculturally Informed Supervision Practices

Mary Martha Abernathy
University of Missouri-St. Louis, mma7cw@umsystem.edu

Developing Expertise and Multiculturally Informed Supervision Practices

Mary Martha Abernathy

M.A. in Counseling, May, 2012, Covenant Theological Seminary
B.S. in Human Development and Family Studies, May, 2007, Auburn University

A Dissertation Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri-St. Louis
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Education with an emphasis in Counseling

August
2024

Advisory Committee:

Phillip Waalkes, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Mary Edwin, Ph.D.

Bradley McKibben, Ph.D.

Emily Oliveira, Ph.D.

Abstract

The American Counseling Association (Media Kit, 2023) records state that 62% of their membership is made up of master's level clinicians, with 18.92% holding a doctorate and another 5.07% enrolled in a doctoral program. Membership is largely skewed toward master's level professionals and only 7.44% of ACA members report working in a counselor education setting (Media Kit, 2023). However, most research regarding supervision is based on supervisors practicing in an academic setting (Cook et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2019; Kemer et al., 2014; Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020). The objective of these studies is to understand how master's level supervisors develop their expertise as supervisors and how they broach and address multicultural issues and intersectionality in the supervision relationship. These studies highlight how supervision skills are developed when finding quality training in supervision is often challenging. These studies give insight to the lived experiences of supervision skill development. Changes need to happen to teaching and training expectations for supervisors to be better equipped to support new counselors and create more consistency across states.

Keywords: clinical supervision, supervisor training, supervisor development, multicultural competencies, broaching, expertise, expert clinical supervisor

Acknowledgments

This dissertation has been a journey as I have challenged and stretched myself to accomplish this, all while single parenting and working full time. First and foremost, thank you to Mitchell, my son for the joy, energy and enthusiasm you bring to my life. You have gotten a front row seat to the time and energy that has been required of me to complete school. Thank you for your patience and your support. I love you. Thank you to my parents, Gary and Lora Abernathy for the time and support you have committed to me and to Mitchell over the last 4 years. I would not have been able to complete this without your support.

To my classmates, your ongoing support, encouragement, and memes have gotten me through the last several years. COVID put a wrench in our school experience but your friendships and presence has meant more to me than I ever expected. Monica, my work wife, this journey has been shaped by our time together, our collaboration and our laughs and tears. Thank you. Leslie, your unwavering support of me, the tearful phone calls and many dinner dates has gotten me through to this point. I am excited to continue to cheer you on.

To my committee, thank you for your support and your patience during this journey. The timing of this did not go as I had planned or expected and you have all been flexible and supportive the whole way through. Thank you. To Dr. Waalkes, thank you for sitting with me through multiple rounds of tears, for your understanding and your encouragement. To Dr. Oliveria, Emily, I could not have done this without your support and the flexibility as I have worked and written the last several years. I am so thankful for your friendship. Dr. Edwin, thank you for challenging me and giving me guidance when

it comes to writing and finding a habit for my work. Dr. McKibben, thank you for sharing your expertise and knowledge. I am so thankful to get to work with you.

Lastly, thank you to all of my participants. It was an honor and a joy to sit with you and hear about your experiences as a supervisor. Thank you for giving me a brief glimpse into your world.

Contents

Section 1-Introduction

The following research studies explore the lived experience of master's level supervisors practicing in the field. According to the American Counseling Association (Media Kit, 2023), 62% of their membership is made up of master's level clinicians, with 18.92% holding a doctorate and another 5.07% enrolled in a doctoral program. The membership is largely skewed toward master's level professionals. Only 7.44% of ACA members report working in a counselor education setting (Media Kit, 2023). However, most research regarding supervision is based on supervisors practicing in an academic setting (Cook et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2019; Kemer et al., 2014; Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020). Supervision is a relationship which is evaluative and hierarchical, but also one in which the supervisor is a consultant and model (Bernard and Goodyear, 2019). Supervision is required for students who are learning to be counselors, but also counselors who are post-master's and working toward licensure. The goal of these studies is to understand how master's level supervisors develop their expertise as supervisors and how they broach and address multicultural issues and intersectionality in the supervision relationship. These studies are important because they highlight how supervision skills are developed throughout counselors' careers when finding quality training in supervision is often more challenging. These studies can lead to a better understanding of supervision skill development so that changes can be made to teaching and training expectations for supervisors to be better equipped to support new counselors. This research may also support new counselors in understanding what skills to look for when seeking a licensure

supervisor. Master's students and new counselors may not know what questions to ask or what skills supervisors should have before entering into a supervision relationship.

Supervision Training and Guidelines

In the ACA Code of Ethics (2014), there are guidelines for supervisors that state they need pedagogical and theoretical knowledge, as well as knowledge about different theories or models of supervision. It also states that supervisors are trained prior to practice. However, the guidelines for supervisors vary greatly state to state (Hendricksen et al., 2019). Each state has their own requirements for supervisors to be eligible to practice, with some having higher standards than others. The training supervisors receive will also vary depending on the source (i.e. a PESI training versus University of North Carolina-Greensboro's approved clinical supervisor training). Researchers have called supervision a "signature pedagogy" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019) for training new counselors. In other words, supervision is the "instructional strategy that most characterizes the preparation of mental health professionals" (Bernard & Goodyear, p.2). However, the oversight and training supervisors receive may not be sufficient for the expectations placed on supervisors. Not all supervisors have the time, interest, or ability to pursue doctoral education. Access to doctoral training or costly supervisor training may not be accessible to all potential supervisors. The current state of most research reflecting that experts are only in academia ignores the skills and expertise of the majority of supervisors practicing in the field.

Integrative Developmental Model

The Integrative Developmental Model provides a framework for supervisors to track supervisee development of skill across various levels (IDM; Stoltenberg & McNeill,

2010). IDM also has a model of supervisor development that assumes supervisors have progressed through all the stages of counselor development. IDM can help supervisors understand their development and expertise by providing clear markers of a supervisor's skill. The various stages of supervisor development can help to make the skills of an expert supervisor more explicit for this study. Use of the IDM in these studies will provide more clarity for understanding the skills and levels of development participants have experienced in their journey to be an expert supervisor.

MSJCC and Broaching

These studies will explore how supervisors build their skills and expertise as well as how they have built competencies when addressing multicultural issues and intersectionality in supervision. The Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2016) were developed for supervisors and educators to use with counselors. Fickling et al. (2019) have since applied the MSJCC model to supervisors and their work with supervisees. This model provides another framework for the study when conceptualizing the skills and practices of supervisors. Broaching behaviors are a skill addressed in the MSJCC. Broaching (Day-Vines et al., 2007) is a consistent and ongoing behavior in which culture, identity, and socio-political issues are addressed. These ongoing conversations with supervisees can create an openness or safety for the supervisee, but also model these behaviors for the supervisee to use with their client. Through these studies, I am seeking to understand how supervisors have developed these skills to practice competently with diverse supervisees.

Professional Importance

These articles are important for counseling and supervision as they illuminate the development of supervisors in the field. These studies can lead to more consistency of expectations across states as well as provide models of how skills are developed for master's level supervisors to follow. These studies will also bring clarity to some of the strengths and barriers of building supervision skills that are informed by multicultural and intersectional practices. As the ACA and other entities continue to work towards an interstate compact for all counselors, attention needs to be paid to the work of supervisors and the training they are receiving. Supervisors need to be prepared for multi-state supervision and better prepared for the growing diversity of counselors and clients. Supervisors often have little oversight or support if they are not engaging with academic programs. As site supervisors for CACREP programs, supervisors are provided training and support (CACREP, 2018) that can help them to advance their practice and skills. These studies can help to shape the training academic settings are providing to master's level supervisors as well as help current students have a clearer understanding of their path to becoming a supervisor. Through these studies I hope that master's level supervisors' voices and experiences are given voice so that their skills and expertise can be acknowledged and valued.

Article one, Broaching in supervision, will be submitted to *The Clinical Supervisor.* This journal is a refereed journal for multiple disciplines, focused on supervision and it being a "signature pedagogy" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Article one focuses on how expert supervisors are building their skills as a supervisor in the field, without doctoral training. *The Clinical Supervisor* seeks submissions that seek to understand supervisor education and advance practice, as well as submissions regarding

cultural responsiveness. Article one addresses these topics clearly as it explores supervisors broaching with supervisees and how they develop the skill or understanding of it.

Article two, a call for supervisor training, will be submitted to *Counselor Education and Supervision*. This journal focuses on research and preparation for the development of counselors and supervisors. Article two speaks to the gaps in training and preparation for master's level supervisors practicing in the field. It also speaks to how the majority of current supervision research is not reflective of the majority of the field. This article is a call to action for academia to be more reflective in our research as well as to broaden our understanding of an expert to include practitioners in the field and not just academics.

Section 2- Articles

Study 1- Multicultural Broaching and Competence in Supervision

The supervision relationship is one of the most significant ways new counselors are trained after graduation, as they put their counseling skills to practice in the field. Supervision is considered a signature pedagogy that is responsive, individualized, and effective in supporting the development of new counseling practitioners (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Bernard and Goodyear (2019) also categorized the supervision relationship as hierarchical and evaluative in nature and that supervision requires specific skills. The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) outlines that supervisors should have knowledge of supervision and its theories and frameworks. The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) also ethically mandates that supervisors remain cognizant of and address multiculturalism and diversity in supervision. Research of supervision is largely based on data collected from

supervisors who have doctoral degrees or are doctoral students practicing under supervision, most commonly in an academic setting. This is problematic as it does not accurately reflect the counseling field. According to ACA's media kit (2023), 62% of their membership (~53,000 members) hold a master's degree, while only 18.92% hold a doctorate and another 5% are current doctoral students. If the majority of practitioners in the field hold a master's degree, research needs to reflect the practices of these individuals and not only those in academia.

Research in supervision has begun to grow over the last several years looking at multicultural competence and shifting more towards cultural humility and social justice (Dollarhide et al., 2021; Fickling et al., 2019). Understanding the practices of current master's level supervisors in the field will better reflect the majority as well as more accurately expose how individuals are being trained post-master's degree for licensure. Researchers and practitioners continue to look for more clearly defined structures, methods, and procedures to promote practice from a multicultural and social justice lens (Dollarhide et al., 2021; Fickling et al., 2019; Kemer et al., 2022; Mitchell & Butler, 2021). Current supervisors in the field may not have had exposure to broaching or the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC), as some of these models and frameworks are more recently developed. Fickling et al. (2019) used the MSJCC (Ratts et al., 2016) model to outline ways to incorporate social justice into supervision, applying a multicultural framework to not just the supervision relationship, but all of life. The purpose of the present study is to explore how supervisors in the field experience broaching and addressing multicultural and social justice issues in the supervision relationship.

Parallel Process

The supervision relationship is a parallel process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019), in which the experiences that happen in supervision can mirror what happens in the counseling/client relationship. The experiences supervisees have in sessions with their clients can then be reflected in the relationship and experiences counselors have with their supervisor. Supervision is a setting and a relationship in which supervisees should have the freedom to talk about experiences with clients and concerns regarding identities and the intersectionality of those identities (Crenshaw, K.W., 1989; Falender et al., 2014). Issues that arise in the counseling relationship may also play out in the supervision relationship. Supervisors must be attuned to this in order to effectively address those issues and support supervisees as they care for their clients and for supervisors to support the supervisee. The parallel process that plays out in both supervision and the counseling relationship can inform skills and development of the supervisees. The supervisory relationship can be impaired if supervisor or supervisee are unaware of racial, ethnic or cultural issues impacting the relationship. However, due to the power dynamics of the supervision relationship, it is the supervisor's responsibility to broach these issues and create an environment in which they can be openly and honestly discussed. (Chopra, 2013; Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisees with marginalized identities may be at risk of experiencing microaggressions both in the counseling room and in the supervision relationship. If supervisors are not prepared to hear and support their supervisees, the supervisees can experience harm.

Creating a trusting and open relationship in supervision is imperative to the success of the supervision relationship. A trusting and supportive relationship can lead to

increased supervisee satisfaction and confidence, as well as self-efficacy in the counseling setting (Crockett & Hayes, 2015; Wong 2013). A supervisor's multicultural competence can contribute to the safety and support a supervisee experiences within the supervision relationship (Fickling et al., 2019). Building trust in a supervision relationship also leads to feelings of safety for supervisees. Supervisors have been trained as therapists to build rapport and create safety for their clients. However, the skills and practice in supervision may be a little different. When supervisees do not feel safe in supervision, it may lead to intentional or unintentional nondisclosure or withholding of information (Eklund et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2020; Cook & Welfare, 2018). Withholding in supervision can then impact skill and professional development of the supervisee as well as the care and clinical treatment clients receive. A supervisor's ability to navigate non-disclosure, safety, and trust are necessary for effective supervision. The supervision relationship experience should create opportunities for supervisees to explore intersectionality of their identities and those of their clients (King, 2020). Supervisors can create more opportunities for learning so that supervisees can provide more culturally reflective care to their clients, through ongoing conversations and reflective experiences. If the supervisee does not feel they can trust their supervisor, then nondisclosure can impact the client, the supervisee, and the supervision relationship. Therefore, it is important to better understand how supervisors build skills and develop competencies for addressing issues related to intersectional identities of their supervisees and addressing social justice issues in the relationship.

Supervisor Responsibilities

Supervisors need to attend to supervisee's needs that may not be strictly related to the client-counselor relationship. Supervisor's attention to countertransference and supervisee well-being can all lead to an increased working alliance (Vandament et al., 2021). Addressing countertransference or personal issues that arise during supervision or the counseling relationship are advanced skills in supervision practice (Nelson et al., 2003). Paying attention to those details is a skill that takes training and practice. The relationship between supervisor and supervisee is strengthened when supervisors practice openness to feedback and a willingness to own up to mistakes. Humility in supervision, on behalf of the supervisor can lead to an improved supervisory working alliance (Grant et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2003; Watkins et al., 2019). More specifically, when supervisees perceive their supervisor to be multiculturally competent, it leads to a stronger working alliance within supervision and supervisees who portray stronger self-efficacy (Crockett & Hays, 2015).

In the supervision relationship, supervisors model behaviors and skills for supervisees. Supervisees' experiences in supervision has the potential to then impact client care (Jones et al., 2019). If supervisees do not experience trust and support in the supervision relationship, they may be unable to provide the care that is appropriate and necessary for their clients. Eklund et al., (2014) found that supervisee's who felt cultural issues were ignored or avoided in the supervision relationship, led to situations in which clients could then be negatively impacted. They found that supervisees were less likely to bring up issues or ask for help if they were experiencing oppressive or racist behaviors from the supervisor. Supervisees are less likely to bring up issues of race, ethnicity, and culture if they fear a supervisor's response and the risk or potential harm it may bring to

them as supervisees (Jones et al., 2019; White-Davis et al., 2016). Understanding how supervisors develop the skills and knowledge to have these conversations with supervisees can inform better training and guidelines for future supervisors. On-going discussions, prompted by the supervisor regarding race, ethnicity and culture, have the potential to lead to supervisee's increased agency within the supervision relationship (White-Davis et al., 2016) because supervisors have begun to create a space in which these conversations are welcome and accepted. Racial identity development is an important part of a supervisor's individual work, necessary before and during the process of supervision (Fickling et al., 2019). Supervisors and supervisees need to discuss racial, ethnic, cultural and other identity differences (Chopra, 2013). Perceived sameness in supervision also has potential to prevent supervisors from broaching issues or identities that may be relevant to the relationship (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Fickling et al., 2019). A supervisor's cultural identity and awareness or lack thereof, can shape the work they do with their supervisees. It influences the way supervisors conceptualize cases as they are reported on by supervisees, as well as how they offer support and engage with the power dynamics of the relationship. A supervisor's multicultural self-awareness can shape and drive the relationship (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisors are responsible for being attuned to a supervisee's intersecting identities, as well as those of the client (Falender et al., 2013). The supervisor's ability to attend to the supervisee's identities models a skill for supervisees to then implement in the therapy relationship. Supervisor training and continuing development often has less structure and oversight than training for counselors. More research is needed to better understand how

supervisors develop these skills, and what has been effective or ineffective to their development as advanced practitioners in supervision.

Integrative Developmental Model

The Integrative Developmental Model (IDM) provides a detailed framework from which a supervisor can practice and assess for growth and development in both their supervisee and self. It categorizes counselor development in four levels (beginner, intermediate, advanced, and integrated advanced), within each of these levels supervisors are assessing for self-other awareness of the counselor, counselor motivation, as well as autonomy (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). IDM uses three markers (self-other awareness, motivation, and autonomy) at each level of development, to assess eight particular skills. This model of supervision allows supervisors to engage with their supervisees according to the supervisee's unique skills and competencies, tracking with growth over time and in ways that target different client issues. New supervisors can feel challenged in practicing IDM as they assess supervisees at differing levels of competence of skills using the different markers (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). However, expert supervisors use more advanced thought processes and track more information in a supervision session (Kemer, 2020). Supervisors have to move across levels, markers, and skills within a single supervision meeting when using the IDM. The framework, when applied to supervision, assumes that supervisors have worked through all the levels of the IDM framework as a counselor and have had training to provide culturally competent supervision (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). IDM is a helpful framework when considering expert or advanced supervisory skills, especially related to multicultural competence. Despite its complexity, it gives supervisors clarity in where to potentially focus time and attention. Gaining

understanding of how supervisors track development of supervisees and what shapes or influences their supervision practices helps to build consistency in counselor expectations across states.

Within IDM, supervisors bring their own interpersonal skills and processes to the supervision relationship. Therefore, different supervisors attend to different skills and supervisory tasks across the developmental levels of supervisees (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). This can be problematic if a supervisor is not actively addressing how race, culture or ethnicity is present in assessments or interventions the supervisor is using, but rather avoiding or glossing over these important topics. Sociopolitical and cultural factors shape a client's experience of life, as well as how a counselor engages with a client. A supervisor's inability or unwillingness to address these issues in supervision has the ability to impact not only the supervisee and supervision relationship, but also the client (Fickling et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019). A supervisee's inability to address their individual differences in the counseling relationship can be problematic for the supervisee to best support a client. If a supervisor is not culturally competent, they will be unable to broach issues of race, ethnicity, and culture in the supervision process, therefore not providing modeling or instruction for new clinicians who are then not learning skills necessary for conceptualizing their work with clients (Jones et al., 2019). A supervisors ability to track not only specific counseling skills, but also multicultural competencies is necessary when supporting new counselors in developing skills and establishing ethical practices.

Supervisors need to have sufficient skill and knowledge to effectively and appropriately supervise clinicians. If supervisors themselves have not worked through the

levels of the IDM model in their own counseling practice, they will not provide sufficient supervision. Specifically, if supervisors have not been trained or learned how to work with diverse populations, they will be unable to do so with their supervisees. Supervisees need supervisors who can affirm their identities and support the supervisee's emotional and mental health along with the client's (Bautista-Biddle et al., 2020). IDM is similar to Day-Vines et al's (2007) broaching continuum in that supervisors work across various levels. If a supervisor is a level one supervisor, they will often present with more anxiety in supervision and overlook addressing the necessary components of the supervisor's growth. One weakness of IDM, is if there is a pairing of supervisor/supervisee in which the supervisee is more advanced in clinical skills or multicultural competence, supervisees may attempt to "wait out" the experience of supervision and little growth happens for the supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Supervisors at level 2 of the IDM supervision model may withdraw from their supervisees due to struggles with motivation or conflict. This means the supervisor is not getting the necessary support which due to the power differential, may inhibit the supervisor from providing feedback to their supervisor for necessary changes or support (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Similarly with broaching, if a supervisor is not adequately addressing issues of intersectional identities in supervision, a supervisee may be less engaged, or not disclose in ways that would benefit both the client and the supervisee.

Supervisors need to recognize sociopolitical and cultural structures and influences at play within both the supervision relationship as well as the counseling/client relationship (Lenz, 2014). Supervisors who are unable to do this; risk stunting the supervisee's skill development and ability to best serve their client. Supervisors who lack

multicultural awareness also risk doing harm to the supervisee and the supervision relationship. A supervisor who is multiculturally competent can create a stronger working alliance between supervisor and supervisee (Wong et al., 2013). IDM does not specifically outline steps or skills for supervisors' multicultural competence, therefore use of other frameworks to understand multicultural competencies may be useful for supervisors.

Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies

The Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC) were adopted by the ACA in 2015 as a way to continue to move the field forward as client, counselor, students, and educators change (Ratts et al., 2016). Counselors and counselor educators need to address the growing diversity and intersectional identities of people in the counseling relationship and the MSJCC helps do that. It acknowledges the complexities of identities and relationships, while providing a framework for individuals to teach and practice. The MSJCC focuses on the intersectional identities of both counselor and client, and the ways these identities play a role in the therapeutic process. Intersectionality is a lens of understanding how and where power and oppression are present in identities and our interactions (Crenshaw, 1989). Oppression involves not only individuals' lived experiences, but also systems and organizations. Experiencing oppression has a profound impact on an individual's mental health (Ratts et al., 2016). The MSJCC helps to create a multilevel approach to the counseling relationship that more accurately reflects the complexity of human relationships, emotions, and oppressive systems. Attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, skills, and action are competencies within the MSJCC framework (Ratts et al., 2016). Practitioners grow through these competencies as

they learn and grow personally in their understanding of multicultural issues and social justice, moving toward action in their application of skills and knowledge.

Supervisors need to be competent in navigating complex issues of identity, oppression, and social justice with supervisees who may not identify exactly like their supervisor. Fickling et al., (2019) applied the MSJCC to the supervision relationship where both supervisor and supervisee should develop competencies in multicultural and social justice approaches (Fickling et al., 2019). The four developmental domains of the MSJCC applied to supervisors are as follows: supervisor self-awareness, supervisee worldview, supervisory relationship, and supervision and advocacy interventions. The supervisor self-awareness domain requires reflective work by the supervisor as they assess their own identities and intersection of their many identities. The supervision relationship being hierarchical and evaluative (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019) requires the supervisor to take the lead with the Supervisee Worldview domain. Supervisors need to educate themselves to better understand how systems, history, and identities play a role in their work with supervisees. The supervisory relationship domain is one of the key ways for clinicians to learn their practice. Supervisors need to be attuned to the supervision relationship through intersectional approaches of building trust, heeding the parallel process, and supporting counselor development. A supervisor's ability to practice through a multicultural lens can lead to a stronger working alliance (Crockett & Hays, 2015). Cultural humility from a supervisor is a practice that is regularly seen from advanced supervision practitioners (Cook et al., 2020; Grant et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2008; Vandament et al., 2021). Lastly, the MSJCC domain, (i.e., supervision and advocacy interventions) looks at supervisors and supervisees exploring and understanding

interventions from an interpersonal level all the way to a global perspective. Supervision interventions can be different from interventions with clients as supervisors offer support, training, and perspective. The MSJCC applied to supervision provides supervisors with a framework for conceptualizing their own development as well as competencies to move through and advance in their own multicultural skills and practices. Broaching is one of those skills that can be applied at every level of the MSJCC and the supervision relationship.

Broaching

Broaching research (Day-Vines et al., 2007) has mostly focused on the counselor-client relationship. Broaching is an ongoing process of addressing race and culture within the therapeutic relationship and how the intersection of identities may impact client issues and the counselor's interpretation of those (Day-Vines et al., 2007). In the counselor-client or supervisor-supervisee relationship, broaching works best when the individual holding power is consistently approaching the relationship with an open and genuine manner, in which to learn more about the other person and openness to learn more about self (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Fickling et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019). Broaching in supervision to address identities and the intersections of them can create a collaborative and effective experience for both the supervisor and supervisee, as well as improve the counseling work that supervisees are providing to diverse client populations (Eklund et al., 2014). The genuine and ongoing nature of the conversations related to the intersection of identities and the role of race and culture in the supervision relationship sets the stage for the supervision relationship to be open and honest; creating more safety for supervisees to explore the role of race and culture in the supervision relationship, but

also in the counseling relationship. If the counseling relationship should create a safe space for the client to explore topics that may be uncomfortable or not acceptable elsewhere, the supervision relationship also needs to hold space for some of those same conversations. This way supervisees can practice broaching and conversations related to race, culture, and ethnicity with their clients. When supervisors broach, the supervisee can choose to engage or not engage in topics (Day Vines et al., 2007; King and Jones, 2019), supervisees are not required to mutually disclose, especially if they feel unsafe to do so. Wong et al. (2013) found that supervisees who did not feel safe or worried about their experiences in the supervision relationship, disclosed experiences of harmful supervision practices from their supervisor.

Research regarding broaching race, culture, and ethnicity in supervision tends to be conceptual articles (Jones et al., 2019) or frameworks providing strategies for addressing intersectionality in the supervision relationship (Dollarhide et al., 2021; Mitchell & Butler, 2021). Few researchers have examined issues specific to the supervisor's experiences of broaching or the training received to increase one's own multicultural development and identity awareness. Day-Vines et al. (2007) developed four broaching styles along a continuum to identify an individual's practice of broaching in counseling: avoidant, continuing/incongruent, integrated/congruent and infusing. Each of these categories incorporate various degrees of skillfulness and awareness when working with clients. The broaching styles for counselors were then applied to the supervision relationship by Jones et al. (2019). Supervisors with an avoidant broaching behavior to supervision may hold a race-neutral perspective and not address the role that race, culture, and ethnicity plays in the supervision relationship or in the counselor-client

relationship (Jones et al., 2019). Supervisors may minimize supervisee or client experiences or perspectives as the supervisor does not deem racism or other differences an issue in the counseling or supervision relationships.

An avoidant broaching behavior in supervision may look like a supervisor taking a race-neutral perspective, avoiding conversations of race, ethnicity or culture (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Conversations between supervisor and supervisee may gloss over deeper issues at play in the supervision relationship (Jones et al., 2019). An avoidant style may look more like a supervisor who addresses general issues in supervision, not discussing personal or interpersonal issues that may arise.

Supervisors who use a continuing/incongruent pattern of broaching, may address cultural identities within the supervision relationship. A supervisor's anxiety or fear of discussing certain issues has potential to impede the follow through of a supervisor to have needed conversations on race, ethnicity, and culture (Jones et al., 2019). These individuals may also possess some knowledge and acceptance of the role that race, ethnicity and culture play in the relationship, but the supervisors lack of personal reflection and awareness can limit the work done with supervisees or potentially lead to harmful behaviors in supervision (Constantine & Sue, 2013; Fickling et al., 2019). King and Jones (2019) found that both supervisor and supervisee experienced hesitancy in broaching for different reasons. Yet, the prerogative to lead the broaching conversations, still lies with the supervisor, who holds more power in the relationship.

Supervisors with an integrated/congruent or infusing practice of broaching often have a more cohesive cultural identity. A more integrated cultural identity can lead to

more effective conversations with supervisees regarding intersectional identities and the role that race, culture, and ethnicity play in the supervision relationship. An integrated and intersectional practice is more a part of an individual identity than a strict supervision or relational technique to practice. (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Day-Vines et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2019). Infusing broaching behaviors more specifically, recognize the impact of larger systems on supervisor-supervisee relationships as well as the impact those systems have on the clients their supervisee's serve and bring attention to systems during supervision. Infusing practitioners carry these behaviors beyond the supervision relationship to their daily life.

Broaching for supervisors goes beyond supervision meetings. It is an ongoing daily life practice in which their identity and way of moving through life is shaped by a pursuit of equality and social justice. Fickling et al. (2014) outlined that broaching can happen between supervisor and supervisee, in the supervisee's conceptualization of the client during supervision, and also in the counseling relationship between the supervisee and the client. Understanding how supervisors have moved across the continuum and continue to develop their skills, has potential to help shape expectations and practices of counselors and supervisors and offer a model for how supervisors can develop MSJCC and broaching skills and beliefs. Having more clarity of how supervisors develop these skills and practices will benefit the field as we continue to advance skills and improve practices.

Jones and Welfare (2017), through a phenomenological study, found that licensed counselors took many approaches to broaching, both direct and indirect. Many of them preferred for the client to take the lead in bringing up multicultural issues. In supervision,

the power dynamics of the relationship, due to its evaluative nature, may prevent supervisees from bringing up issues of intersectionality. Due to holding more power in the relationship, supervisors are responsible for addressing these issues and creating an environment in which intersectional identities can be openly discussed (Fickling et al., 2019). Supervisors who have a successful practice of broaching are open and flexible when working with their supervisees (King, 2021). Part of possessing a humble approach as a supervisor is when a supervisor is capable of being open with themselves and able to admit their own mistakes or limits to their knowledge or experience (Watkins et al., 2019). A supervisor's ability to be open, genuine, and respectful in supervision has the potential to minimize a supervisee's nondisclosure (Cook et al., 2020). Jones and Welfare (2017) found that counselor willingness and openness to discuss culture is one of the keys to broaching in counseling. Likely, it is the same in supervision when looking at the continuum of broaching behaviors, MSJCC domains, and skillfulness of a supervisor. If counselors are unwilling to broach or see value in broaching issues related to race, culture, and ethnicity they will continue to ignore or avoid issues of intersectionality. Broaching in supervision not only models the practice for supervisee's but also can address important parts of a supervisee's identity and how it impacts the counseling relationship.

Research Question

The following research study uses Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) to explore participants' experiences of broaching in supervision and perceptions of multicultural competency. Supervisors play an important role in the development of new clinicians and shaping counselor identity and client care (Bernard and Goodyear, 2019).

Broaching and the MSJCC (Fickling et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019) serve as frameworks for addressing intersectional identities within the supervision relationship. Yet, few researchers have examined how supervisors build competency and practice skills of addressing multicultural issues in supervision. Additionally, much of the research on supervision explores supervision during a master's or doctoral program. The field needs a better understanding of the practices of supervisors outside of academia, not practicing in academic settings. Supervisors in the field have less oversight and training expectations vary by state compared to supervisors for CACREP programs. This research aims to develop a better understanding of how expert supervisors experience broaching (Day-Vines et al., 2007) in supervision.

RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience the supervisor-supervisee relationship when addressing multicultural issues?

RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors develop skills in broaching and addressing intersectional identities in the supervisory relationship?

Method

Paradigm Justification

IPA is a phenomenological approach to qualitative research that is interpretative and is informed by hermeneutics as participants work to make sense of their lived experiences (Smith, 1996). It is an appropriate fit for this research because it asks the participant to consider fully their experience, taking into account their thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and somatic responses (Miller et al., 2018). IPA explores in detail the experience of the particular person and the particular event, in this case wanting to understand the phenomenon of supervision through the eyes of the supervisor. Through

an IPA approach, the supervision relationship and how broaching and multicultural competencies inform supervision practices can be more distinctly explored, so that the supervisor and their experience can "speak clearly" (Miller et al., 2018) to the phenomenon. This embodied practice that comes from Merleau-Ponty (1962) is another critical component of IPA, specifically to understand how social justice fits into the study, as the lived experiences of people with different racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, etc., shape how individuals then encounter supervision relationships and move through the world (Smith et al., 2009). An embodied perspective is also critical because participants' bodies are interconnected with their identities. Between supervisor and supervisee, there will be a conglomeration of various intersectional identities. Adding in the supervisee/client relationship increases the number and variations of identities. Participants being connected with their bodies in space and time shapes and influences how they move through the world and their perceptions of supervision experiences. The supervisor's embodied identities shape how they interact in the supervision relationship, what they broach, or how they view issues. Each participant's experiences differ due to their intersecting identities. Honoring their embodied experiences of moving through time, space, and relationships, while working within systems are all important factors to the research as each unique body shapes how the participant knows their world (Smith et al., 2009).

As the supervisor/supervisee relationship is already one of power, hierarchy, and evaluation (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009), supervisors need to acknowledge the privilege and power associated with their intersecting identities and the role those identities can play in further shaping the power dynamics. Awareness of their embodied experiences

using IPA can illuminate how supervisors navigate power in supervisory relationships. Supervisor and counselor attunement to power, is part of the decolonization process discussed in the MSJCC (Singh et al., 2020). Fickling et al. (2019) advocate for the supervision relationship to be a place in which both supervisor and supervisee grow and develop competencies in multicultural and intersectional practices. This attention to detail of a participant's experience in IPA of the supervision relationship dynamics can provide more depth of insight to their lived experiences, as well as give more comparisons across accounts (Hays & Wood, 2011). Continuing to develop an understanding of various unique experiences of broaching and addressing intersectional identities in supervision will allow for the field to continue to improve practices, develop competent counselors, and create spaces for individuals to fully show up in their unique identities as competent and accepted counselors and supervisors.

IPA will allow readers to understand broaching in supervision through a participant's specific and contextualized experiences. IPA is useful in social justice research, like the present study, due to the two layers of analysis, first seeking to understand the individual experience of the phenomenon, then the second moving toward interpretation of the data while looking at the role systems and social context play on the individual experience (Miller et al., 2018). This allowed the researcher to explore challenges faced by participants in supervision relationships that may be part of a larger systemic problem and not just the individual relationships. For the present study, it is critical to view broaching in supervision from a larger systemic perspective like this in order to understand practices and barriers or challenges that supervisors face within their

supervision relationships, but also the larger systems and processes that shape their work.

Researchers have used IPA in counselor education (Giegerich et al., 2020; Pulliam et al., 2019) and supervision research (Cook & Sackett, 2018). IPA is different from other phenomenological traditions in wanting to capture specific experiences of specific people. It is less about discovering generalizable data that can be applied widely (Smith et al., 2009). Hermeneutics, much of which comes from Heidegger's (1927) work, shapes the process of analysis, which is more iterative as the analyst shifts back and forth between data and different levels of analysis (Smith et al., 2009). IPA's multistep analysis creates a process for more in depth work as well as looking more broadly at the systems that influence the data. Lastly, idiography is a major component of IPA as it looks at the particular experience of practicing multicultural awareness in the supervision relationship (Smith et al., 2009), and how participants make meaning of their experiences addressing multicultural issues in supervision. The focus on individual experiences of the particular relationship and the particular process is what makes IPA's idiography different from other forms of phenomenology. In other words, generalization is less of a focus and done in a more careful way than with other phenomenological inquiries. Idiography is important to this study because each supervision relationship is unique to the individuals in the relationship. Much can be learned from the individual experiences and help to shape practices in supervision training and education through exploring the depth of experiences of unique individuals (Chan et al., 2019). Participant experiences of supervision and broaching are always happening in relation to other phenomena, including the supervisee, the setting or system they work in, and the interpersonal racial

dynamics. Nothing happens in a vacuum since all supervisory interactions are part of larger systems. IPA allowed for individual evaluation of each participant report, therefore allowing the unique context, identities and experiences of systems to shine through and complexities of these things to be explored.

Critical theory is the paradigm that shapes this research study. White, male voices have shaped education and much of higher education is still predominantly White. Critical theorists recognize that phenomena are often shaped by social injustices and inequalities in systems (Hays & Singh, 2012). This study brings light to individual experiences of supervision and broaching, making known how race, ethnicity, and culture may or may not intentionally show up in supervision. Use of critical theory framed participants' own realizations of how they practice within social norms and expectations or if they are practicing in ways that disrupt social norms and inequalities, they and their supervisees experience (Heppner et al., 2016). Supervisor's recognition of their power, inherent to the relationship, but also regarding other identity factors can shape the supervision relationship. Recognizing power structures within supervision relationships as well as larger systems that influence supervisors, supervisees and clients is important for making changes in practice (Fickling et al., 2019). Use of critical theory is appropriate for this study to help change the practices of supervisors and counselor educators, therefore moving the field forward and making impactful changes for all clients.

Participant Eligibility Criteria

Participants in this study identified as clinical supervisors in the counseling field. They have completed those processes for the state in which they practice and supervise. The participants have engaged in clinical counseling practice for a minimum of twelve

years, with a minimum of five year's experience as a supervisor. Previous supervision expert studies have had eligibility criteria for expert supervisors range from 8-40 years of experience, with a mean experience of 20-25 years of practice between two recent studies on multicultural supervision (Kemer et al., 2014; Kemer, 2020). Another study identified subject matter experts for supervision with a mean supervision experience of 14.78 years (Neuer Colburn et al., 2016). For this study:

- Participants hold a master's degree in the counseling profession (e.g., clinical mental health counseling, marriage and family).
- Participants had not completed a doctoral program. Some states require doctoral supervision coursework to be eligible to supervise, therefore those who have completed a course in supervision were not excluded (Arkansas Board of Examiners in Counseling and Marriage & Family Therapy, 2021).
- Participants were actively practicing in the field, supervising individuals.
- Participants self-identified as being wise, experienced, or an expert in supervision.
- Participants identified as being flexible in their cognitive thought processes (e.g. nuanced awareness of supervisee needs, balancing challenge/support, adjusting supervisor roles based on supervisee needs).
- Participants were skillful with confrontation, conflict, and evaluation in supervision.

- Participants had knowledge of and practiced self-reflection regarding the impact of power and privilege on the supervision and counseling relationships.

Kemer (2020) defines an expert as having complex and high-level thought processes that are flexible and refined and the ability to self-monitor their own skills and practice. Much of the research on supervisors who are identified as experts have participants who are primarily academics (Grant et al., 2012; Kemer et al., 2014; Nelson et al., 2008). Yet, many of the supervisors practicing in the field do not have doctoral degrees. Doctoral degrees require time and money that not everyone has the ability to access and pursue. Experts can still exist in the field without a doctoral degree or formal doctoral training. Therefore, in this research study, I sought to understand the experiences of experts without a doctoral degree, as these individuals can provide a broader and more inclusive definition of expert in ways that have not been previously researched. IPA studies look for participants' homogeneity to allow for clearer exploration of convergence and divergence in the experience (Smith et al., 2009). The participants in this study were supervisors, trained in clinical mental health or marriage and family, who practice in a clinical setting will allow for homogeneity.

Sampling & Recruitment

After IRB approval, participants were recruited through online media platforms, including ACA Connect, Facebook, LinkedIn, and other mental health related social networks. Snowball sampling, though not generally used with IPA (Smith, 2009), was used as many supervisors have connections with peers who may qualify for the study and be hard to reach with other sampling methods. Word of mouth through other counselor

and supervisor colleagues was used so that intentional recruitment could take place to find a diverse representation of supervisors in the field. Participants received $100 for each interview they completed as compensation for their time at a level more equivalent to how much they might charge clients or supervisees. An initial online survey link (Appendix B) was provided to interested participants, collecting basic demographic information as well as details about their length of time as a supervisor and supervisory experiences. The initial survey allowed the researcher to evaluate potential participant fit for the study and use purposive sampling to invite individuals who perceived themselves to meet survey criteria. Participants were deemed an appropriate fit for this study based on this survey if they had supervision experience, depth of knowledge of themselves as a supervisor, and awareness of their intersecting identities. Participants completed a semi-structured interview (Appendix C) through Zoom. I was intentional about creating an open dialogue with participants that allowed them to reach out or contact me for follow up discussion or if other details arose. Through setting expectations prior to the interview, sharing a little about myself and my experiences, and using counseling skills to communicate active listening and interest, participants engaged in sharing their experiences (Miller et al., 2018).

The sample consisted of six participants, who each completed two interviews. Three participants identified as White, one as Black, one as White/Hispanic, and one as other/Hispanic. One participant was male identifying and five were female identifying. Participants ranged in years of counseling experience from 13 to 34 years (M = 18.3) years and as a supervisor for 6 to 16 years (M = 11.6). All participants were master's level clinicians. Participants lived in five different states and were licensed to supervise in

six different states. Half of the participants were currently employed in a community mental health agency, and the other half were in private practice. All of the participants started off in community mental health agencies in their careers as a counselor. Those currently in community mental health had a side business of providing supervision or counseling, or provided supervision as a part of their current role. Participants had supported a range of 16 to 50 ($M = 26.6$) supervisees over the course of their supervision career. IPA looks at the quality of the data available versus the quantity of participants in the study, considering instead the depth and range of data collected (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). Two rounds of interviews with participants allowed for more depth and quality of data than one solo interview. A consideration for this study was identifying/recruiting participants with interest in the topic and experience of supervision in order to lead to greater depth in discussion and quality of data (Miller et al., 2018). The purpose of the study as well as the procedures were clearly communicated with participants. The researcher communicated to participants information about the study and offered them the opportunity to be involved in the data analysis process. However, none of the participants were interested in following up with data review or analysis.

Instrument & Data Collection Method

Data collection was conducted through semi structured interviews (Appendix C), a common format in phenomenological studies (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). A brief demographic and information survey (Appendix B) was also used as a part of participant selection. Interviews being semi-structured allowed the researcher to engage with the participants in the here and now to further explore answers to prompts and collect more details as needed (Miller, 2018). The semi-structured interview also allowed for more

in-depth conversations while also providing an outline to follow that helped to ensure the research questions were addressed. There were two interviews of 45-60 minutes for each participant, which allowed for building of the relationship between interviewer and participant and to create depth of discussion. In depth interviews are the most common format of IPA which allow for rapport to be established with the participants as they share about their particular experiences and the researcher can engage empathically with the participants (Smith et al., 2009). Interviews were conducted and recorded via a secure zoom with participants, to allow for review of the data and transcription. Interview recordings and data were stored on a password protected computer, on a secure server.

The interview protocol developed by the researcher followed structures and guidelines for IPA (Smith et al., 2009) and was created prior to interviewing participants. Participants received the interview protocol prior to the meeting in order to allow participants time to reflect on their experiences or bring other artifacts/data with them that were reflective of their experience. The protocol also included the following definition of multicultural issues in supervision to help frame the conversation and provide participants with more clarity on the topic. Multicultural supervision is

> a working knowledge of the factors that affect worldview; . . . self-identity awareness and competence with respect to diversity in the context of self, supervisee, and client or family; competence in multimodal assessment of the multicultural competence of trainees . . . models diversity and multicultural conceptualizations throughout the supervision process; models respect, openness, and curiosity toward all aspects of diversity and its impact on behavior,

> interaction, and the therapy and supervision processes; initiates discussion of diversity factors in supervision. (Falendar & Shafranske, 2004, p.149)

Participants were not required to bring artifacts but encouraged to do so if there were items that represent their supervision experiences or practices. Participants were provided with examples of artifacts that may be salient with their experience (supervision notes, emails, a video clip, a specific book, tool or learning material) of broaching in supervision. Participants were reminded of strategies to maintain the confidentiality of their supervisee and clients in sharing their artifacts. The interview protocol was a map for the interview, which allowed the interview to be specific to the participant's experiences. The researcher used broaching at the beginning of the interview with each participant, sharing parts of their salient identities (e.g., being a mom, a private practice owner, having a life altering health condition). Broaching at the beginning of the interview provided participants with more context as well as more connection with the researcher and the research, further building trust and rapport (Smith et al., 2022). The interview moved from more broad to more specific discussion, using open ended questions with prompts for more details. Provided are a few questions asked during the interview process:

- How have you experienced discussing multicultural issues in supervision?
- Tell me about your approach to broaching (discussing race, gender, culture, etc.) in your supervision relationships.
- How do you feel your own identities influenced your broaching behaviors or multicultural practices in supervision?

The researcher consulted with the dissertation committee regarding the interview protocol to determine appropriateness for IPA and for the study content. The researcher also consulted with other counseling supervisors regarding their experiences of broaching in supervision to help with question formulation.

The researcher followed up with participants, allowing them to review their transcript and assess for accuracy of the data as well as provided the opportunity to add corrections or edits (Creswell & Poth, 2013). Through email communication, the researcher invited participants, if interested, to share what stood out to them within their transcribed data, which allowed the participant to share what surprised them, emphasize their words, or reframe what was previously stated.

Data Analysis

Data analysis looked at each participant's experience of multicultural competence and broaching in the supervision relationship and how they made meaning of it. Data analysis using IPA allowed the researcher to first develop an account of the participant's lived experience and then interpret events and experiences of the participants within social context as well as theoretical understandings (Larkin & Thompson, 2012; Miller et al., 2018). Through the IPA data analysis, the researcher looked at similarities across participant reports as well as where the data is diverse, using a process that was both iterative and inductive in nature (Miller et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2009). The first round of analysis carefully examined participants' individual experiences and the distinct data from the individual participants, to gain a better understanding of how participants made meaning of their lived experiences. IPA though takes the analysis experience further. After a close round of analysis of the individual participant's experience, a second round

of analysis was completed by then doing more interpretation of the data with consideration of how society, culture, theory or systems informed the participants' experiences (Miller et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2009). Attention was given to the individual participant experiences, so as to not lose the individual voices, while also exploring the whole of the data and how participant's experiences were unique across all participant experiences.

The data was analyzed by the researcher reading through data that was collected several times, as well as listening to the recorded interviews, making initial notes from observations in the data and any personal observations that were made. Given the IPA approach to analysis, an idiographic approach of focusing on each individual case in detail took place first (Smith et al., 2009). Through multiple exposures to the data, the researcher began making notes of linguistic, conceptual, and descriptive comments related to details that appeared central to the participant's experience to understand their world, word choices, and how the participant made sense of multicultural components of supervision (Smith et al., 2009). Each participant case was examined and analyzed individually, to make sense of the particular experiences of each participant. Next, analysis of the data moved back and forth between looking at the individual interviews and the whole of the data from all participants, looking for similarities across participant reports as well as where their experiences differed and were unique. Coding was done according to each individual report, followed by an integrative approach to coding, looking at codes across all the transcripts. The researcher continued to follow the same framework, looking at descriptive, linguistic and conceptual details that were similar amongst participant reports. Quotes from participants were used for coding purposes or a

representation of themes, when they clearly captured how participants made meaning of their lived experience as a supervisor (Alase, 2017). Quotes were used when they clearly represented a participant's experience. After assessing for patterns in the transcripts, themes were developed by sorting through notes and comments made to the participant transcript, focusing on the participant's experience as a supervisor. Once each individual case was analyzed, interpretation of the participant experience began, exploring how the participant experience was positioned within society, culture, education, and other frameworks. The interpretative component of IPA focused on the participant's experience as a supervisor in their particular context, to understand how they position themselves and experience their supervision relationships. Themes arose out of each individual interview transcript, focusing on the idiographic reports. Themes were also developed based on the overall collection of interviews when there were similarities between participant reports, therefore moving back and forth between the individual and the whole. Within IPA, it is imperative to allow each individual case to develop its own emergent themes and honor the individual voices (Smith et al., 2009). Themes were based on repeating words, experiences, similarities amongst the data, looking for commonalities amongst participants, but also where there was divergence in their personal experiences (Smith et al., 2009). Once the themes were developed, the researcher sorted through what had been developed to determine the superordinate themes and other minor themes, grouping together similarities from each participant report as the researcher explored patterns in participant experiences. Not all themes applied to all participants, creating uniqueness to the data collected. The researcher

continued to seek support from the dissertation committee throughout the course of the analysis process in order to maintain reflexivity.

Reflexivity and Trustworthiness

Researcher reflexivity is important in IPA research, as it is in other qualitative and phenomenological approaches (Hays & Singh, 2012). As a White counselor educator, I have experiences providing supervision cross-racially and with individuals who have different lived experiences than me. Having supervised students during practicum and field, and counselors seeking licensure, I have encountered many opportunities for broaching and building relationships with supervisees who are different from me in various ways. I have practiced broaching with my supervisees as well as studied research on broaching. I have had both positive and challenging supervision experiences. An awareness of my identity and experience is important as it shapes my interpretation of the data and considering my frames of reference can help me avoid missing important parts of my participants' experiences. I have done reflective work to grow and challenge my understanding of sociopolitical and cultural structures and how my identities benefit or are challenged by them. I have spent time reflecting on my own experiences as both supervisee and supervisor, as well as discussed it with others, in order to bracket thoughts, feelings, and assumptions about the supervision process.

To ensure trustworthiness of the data collection and analysis, I took several steps. Through development of the study, dissertation committee members processed with me emotional reactions to the data and my responses from reading and reflecting on participant's reports. Thick description was used throughout the data analysis process and accounting of the research, to ensure that there was a depth of experiences and participant

understanding gathered in the data (Hays & Singh, 2012; Smith et al., 2009). Journaling was an important part of the reflexivity process as I reflected on my own assumptions and made notes of my own experience and thoughts (Miller et al., 2018). Writing these notes took place after interviews. I used this writing after interviews in order to reflect on thoughts, feelings, and themes. Note taking was used throughout as the researcher listened to interview recordings. Finally, participants were invited to review the transcripts once they had been recorded and offer corrections or additions to the document. Participants were also invited to provide their own thoughts on the themes that they saw in reflecting on their transcript. The participant involvement assures that the data collected was correct and accurate to the participant report (Hays & Singh, 2012).

Results

The themes of direct approach, understanding a supervisee and their skills, supervisor identity and experiences inform approach, and personal growth and development were identified to explain master's-level supervisors' experiences of broaching and how they developed skills to broach. Each of these themes are described in more detail in the section below. Quotes from participants are used to demonstrate the themes of the study.

Direct Approach

All of the participants expressed using a direct approach with their supervisees when discussing multicultural issues, either within the supervision relationship or when addressing the supervisee/counselor-client relationship. For many of the participants, their direct approach in supervision developed over time with age and experience. The participants shared that being open and honest with their supervisees, as well as setting

clear boundaries and expectations up front led to a better supervision relationship. Participant 4 used it as a way to share their own identities and begin discussions around identities and multicultural issues that may arise in counseling or the supervision relationship.

> But for me, I found that I'm [broaching] up front and just discussing what it is and laying the foundation helps more as we move through [supervision]. And then maybe at some times I'm challenging them, it gives us a, you know, a foundation to say, remember when we talked about, I instead of just, like bringing it in all the sudden. (Participant 4)

Participants used self-disclosure early in the supervision relationship, often during the first few meetings to discuss their own intersectional identities and those that supervisees felt comfortable disclosing. Self-disclosure or broaching of their identities, clarified who they were as humans and as supervisors. It also modeled for supervisees as well as set the tone for future conversations, allowing supervisors to directly address multicultural issues that might arise in the counseling or supervision relationship. In the quote below, this participant shared how they begin sharing and exploring identities with their supervisees as a starting point for understanding the supervisee and their practice as a counselor. Participant 4 disclosed why they share their identities with supervisees and how those identities may present in the context of counseling as well.

> What makes me who I am personally and professionally, what makes them who they are, what's unique about them and then roll into the multicultural [issues] okay. Let's talk about how that could influence our therapy and our supervision and then just roll, you know, roll from there based on the conversation to get it

> started. And then once we discuss that and kind of lay that out and... I'll measure how self-aware they are. It gives me an idea of okay, where are we going to go with this? And then make my initial assessment because I'd be lying to say I didn't and then kind of monitor as I'm doing case studies with them or reviewing tapes and then I bring those to the surface. (Participant 4)

Participants carried those conversations forward in supervision, reflecting things they noticed in the supervisee's practice or case presentation, using direct questions to help supervisees more carefully assess how their identities or the identities of the client were showing up. Participants supported supervisees in acknowledging and understanding their perspectives when working with their clients, helping them to make explicit what might be more implicit or sometimes brushed over. Participant 2 worked to make it conversational as they notice things and encourage further exploration. "I'll just say [to my supervisee], hey, wait a minute, let's talk about this a little more. You made this comment, what does this mean to you? What is your understanding, you know, kind of asking that direct question" (Participant 2).

Through supervision, participants supported supervisees in understanding more about their client's identities, but also challenged supervisees when assessing their capacity for working with clients. Participants challenged supervisees as needed regarding their counseling work and awareness of their identities and their impact on the counseling relationship.

> Helping [supervisees] identify what their culture is and then . . . understanding about the clients that they're working with. So looking at ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity and racial background, age, sex, you know all the

> things that seem relevant. So when I'm reading their progress notes, I'm taking notes like okay, it seems like they missed something here. And so I make a note of that and then talk to them about it. What's your understanding of what's going on with this client? The other thing is that I will have a supervisee do some research on some cultural experiences and present it to the group. And then I've challenged people's ability to work with some clients just based on their inability to really understand. (Participant 5)

Supervisors beginning the supervision relationship from a place of openly and directly discussing their identities, as well as the identities of their supervisees, facilitated ongoing discussions. Supervisors were also able to address supervisee identity as it related to the supervision relationship or to client care because they had previously addressed some of these issues in the supervision relationship. Participant 6 used a direct approach as well as curiosity in their approach to working with supervisees and addressing multicultural issues in supervision.

> As far as my approach, in most things direct, open, and curious. I try not to make too many assumptions. I like to think of myself as an intuitive person. So when my intuition doesn't feel like it's in conflict and let me just gently put this out there and see if I'm right or not. (Participant 6)

Supervisors in the study engaged with their supervisees from a place of curiosity and desire for their supervisees to learn and grow.

Understanding Supervisees and Their Skills

Participants expressed a desire for their supervisees to gain knowledge, experience, and skill as clinical professionals. Participants often used education/teaching

to inform supervisees of history or address current events, historical trauma, redlining, LGBTQ+ history, gun violence, or immigration. Participants not only provided information, but they also had supervisees participate in some of their own research or learning. The following quote shares how a supervisor wanted his male supervisee to understand how his presence can influence a counseling relationship, as well as the power and privilege that comes from being in a male body:

> [My supervisee], he's if I read it in a book then that's the way I'm going to do it and he doesn't always look at these other pieces. That's something that I've had to bring up with him quite a few times. Just because you read this technique or something, I really want you to look at how this is going to impact the person that is sitting in front of you...How is that woman sitting in front of you going to react to you saying those things? You have to have an extra level of mindfulness of how you're going to present that material to somebody...he's a much larger guy...your presentation in the room and how you bring subjects up is going to have a big impact on the counseling session. (Participant 1)

Through the supervision relationship, the participant used the supervisee's book knowledge to help him make sense of his work. The supervisee's power and privilege as a White man was also discussed in supervision as a way for the supervisee to understand their identities and those of the clients they see. Participant 1 reported when they are addressing multicultural issues in supervision they feel they "always have to be very delicate, it has to be something where I have to give a lot of thought to how I'm going to say something and how I'm going to bring the topic up." The participant broaching power and privilege with a supervisee and working to address their approach as a therapist is

something the participant wanted to be intentional but careful in their discussions. Broaching in supervision and discussion of ethics and the counselor role at the beginning of the supervision set the stage for ongoing conversations in supervision, allowing supervisors to address issues as they arose. Most participants discussed the importance of addressing ethics during supervision. Ethics were discussed in the beginning as a refresher, addressed when issues arose, or used as a framework for ongoing teaching and learning in the supervision relationship. Ethics and counseling best practices were also used as a way to explore with supervisees how to connect with the needs and experiences of various cultures.

> I like to start off my supervision sessions with ethics and multicultural issues. And so I like to give a broad overview because sometimes we have green students right. Then, sometimes we have very experienced people who have gone back to school. So really doing a refresher and trying to set the stage for success…And then I like to do some exercises sometimes…to kind of prompt and then share together, where do I come from, right? What makes me who I am personally and professionally? What makes them who they are, what's unique about them? (Participant 4)

Supervisor Identity and Experience Informs Approach

All of the participants held at least one marginalized identity. All of the participants' supervision practices were informed by their own identities and experiences. All of the participants reported having participated in on-going training but many found little help from training when it came to multicultural practices. For some participants, their LGBTQ+ identities informed how they shared historical information, the questions

they asked in supervision (making sure supervisees were asking about sexual and gender orientation during intake), and how they helped supervisees to navigate gender or sexual differences in the counseling-client relationship. Participants who held the identity of mom, shared how it influenced boundary setting and values in regards to work/life balance. One participant reported how her health status and neurodivergence influenced her directness in supervision,

> Once I was diagnosed with lupus, that was a turning point for me…I'm like, oh, I could die out of nowhere. I should probably tell people how I feel and be open with them because I don't want them to guess … I want to say that was probably the turning point of where I kind of naturally did this. So the truth is more important than anything to me and being able to communicate that and see that it doesn't give me all these negative consequences. (Participant 6)

All of the participants shared experiences from earlier in their supervision career of mistakes they had made or learning experiences that shaped their practice. The mistakes made and the learning journey of the supervisor participants, has helped to shape not only their identity as a supervisor but also the practices they implement. One participant had a supervisee who had sex with their client. That led the supervisor to have boundary discussions with supervisees at every meeting.

> I insist every time I meet with the supervisee that they talk about a boundary experience they had with a client. And I'm just as passionate and just as intense about that because I want them to notice that they're dealing with boundaries. Every interaction they have with clients, I don't want them to forget that it's not a

> boundary issue just because there's an ethical dilemma that we deal with boundaries at all times. (Participant 5)

This experience of a boundary violation by one of her previous supervisees now informs how she approaches all of her supervisee relationships and the expectations she has for the supervisees: “I did feel betrayed. What that did for me was it helped me to understand a little bit better what the relationship within the team was” (Participant 5). This experience influenced how she moved forward as a supervisor, the decisions she made in supervision, and ways in which she assessed counselor-client relationships. Participant 2 shared how she shares some of her identities with supervisees as well as sets boundaries with her supervisees from the beginning of the relationship:

> I'm very open that I'm a Latina counselor. This is who I am. . . in the beginning [supervisees] know my values are my family. My family comes first and so we talk a lot about this is what you can expect from me. I'm here for you and I'm supportive, but I also have really clear boundaries with my schedule and so if you miss supervision, then I don't have a lot of windows to make that right up. Things like that, talking about what my boundaries are in relation to my culture and my values…I don't know if it's luck but I think that because I feel like I'm pretty transparent with people and I create this sort of open dialogue right from the beginning that it's not hard for us to talk about hard things in supervision like we'll often talk about. (Participant 2)

Participant 2 felt that through her honest and open approach to supervision, supervisees were able to engage in supervision even when topics may be more challenging. Participants also shared how their experiences and identities have given them a lens and

an ability to see things that their supervisees may not yet see or recognize. Supervisors used their knowledge to support supervisees in seeing client's identities as well as their own and how it might show up in supervision.

> So cis, hetero. Pronouns are she/her for me and I identify as HSP (highly sensitive person). Yeah, as well as a mom, I always kind of put that in the beginning of any presentations or like supervisions I do, because that informs my work, how I do my work, and how I balance my work with my life...So from the beginning, I like to set that tone that I recognize that we are different and that you have a lot of things that I may not know about or understand. And then it comes up in case consultation for sure. I always have them identify as part of their case review presentation whether it's a brief one or extended one. What are some cultural issues that may be impacting this client? I also am realizing that I recognize a lot of these things that maybe the supervisees don't. (Participant 3)

Supervisors, through embracing their identities and leaning in to their experiences, changed their supervision practice over time. Most have made these changes due to trial and error with supervisees and because they value practicing from a place that acknowledges the many identities they, their supervisees, and the clients hold.

Personal Growth and Development

Participants reported that most of their growth and development in regards to multicultural issues was due to their own work and education. All of the participants had engaged in various trainings, however few found them helpful in regards to addressing multicultural issues in supervision. Several participants said they needed to develop a training to address this issue as a result of the training gaps they identified in their

interviews. Only one participant reported still actively using supervision-of-supervision throughout her career. Others used consultation with peer supervisors for support, but not on a regular basis. Therapy and self-reflection helped the participants to have more awareness of their identities and what that means within their supervision relationships.

> It was just lots of trying things. And I mean being aware [that growth around multicultural issues] needs to happen and it needs to be something that's like brought into the supervision and I think that's the only piece. . . there are a lot of trainings available about multicultural issues and things like that just because of the diversity that's in our state. I think that it's something that is definitely talked about a lot which is good. But there isn't that next kind of step into now how [should this be applied] in supervision? (Participant 1)

Participants expressed humility in their practices as a supervisor, through not knowing how to handle every situation, not having the lived experiences of their supervisees or clients and being open to learning, or through admitting they messed up. One participant shared how they have had limited exposure to different cultures. They identified as growing up in the Army and moving many different places, but always on base surrounded by other White people. Where they live now is primarily White. “I just don't have enough experience with people of different cultures. I just don't. I think that's the bottom line…I hope [supervisees] notice, but I don't know. I mean, I'm pretty transparent about it” (Participant 5). Participant 5 shared about an early experience as a supervisor in which she did not have the skills or understanding how to broach, relying on her supervisee to confront her and address what ruptures may have occurred:

> I was relatively clueless and I was open to learning about her (supervisee) experience and different tribes and the history around this area. I didn't count on her to educate me, but I think there was enough that I didn't know that was upsetting. So I probably made some assumptions that she didn't call me on and I felt a kind of this pull back. (Participant 5)

Another participant shared about her incremental growth as a supervisor: “For me it's not a lightbulb moment. For me it's much more of a progressive, like learning a little bit each time and then putting that into a pattern of working differently with someone” (Participant 3). She used each supervision relationship and the interactions she had with her supervisees as an opportunity to continue to learn, grow, and make adjustments. Another participant shared how she reflected and worked through some of her own identities and experiences when a supervisee disclosed viewing her as ‘intimidating’:

> It was a lightbulb for me. It's like I used to take things personally and I said wait a minute, that could have gone a bad way, right? Because if I stayed offended and didn't address that, it could have really been an impasse in our relationship because of course I could get a little defensive. So it reminded me that I need to make sure that I continue to be self-aware… I tend to be over critical of myself sometimes, back then a long time ago, which is why it was a lightbulb moment for me. I recognized that night, as I went home and thought about it. I immediately thought that what he said was critical, right and I had to do some peeling back the onion there for a minute too. I connected it to my childhood and some of the things that had happened and wait a minute, OK, I need to work through this a little bit. (Participant 4)

Participant 4's ability to be reflective and acknowledge her own identities and experiences, allowed her to engage differently with her supervisee the next session. What could have been an ongoing rupture, the participant was able to repair and receive feedback from the supervisee to understand and explore what the supervisee meant.

Discussion

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to understand the experiences of master's level supervisors broaching and addressing multicultural issues and intersectionality in the supervision relationship. The research provides more understanding of the lived experiences of how supervisors' skills have developed over time and how supervisors engage supervisees in issues of multicultural and intersectional practices. The findings from this study provide insight into experiences of master's level supervisors practicing in the field where state guidelines vary. Due to the majority of counseling practitioners in the field holding a master's degree and not a doctoral degree (ACA Media Kit, 2023), understanding their experiences can help to better shape training of master's students as well as the potential development of other training and clearer expectations for supervisors. This research moves beyond existing conceptual models or frameworks of multicultural supervision (e.g., Dollarhide et al., 2021; Fickling et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019; Mitchell & Butler, 2021) to look at lived experiences of site and licensure supervisors not in academia. Much of the previous research looks at the experiences of doctoral students or faculty providing supervision (Cook et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2019; Kemer et al., 2014; Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020), but not of supervision outside of academia. The themes from this study were: (a) supervisors used a

direct approach, (b) understanding a supervisee and their skills, (c) supervisor identity and experiences inform approach, and (d) personal growth and development.

All participants reported broaching throughout the supervision relationship, including naming their identities, and inviting supervisees to as well. Participants used broaching from the beginning of the supervision relationship, disclosing important personal identities as well as setting boundaries and expectations for supervision. Despite the importance of broaching in supervision cited by participants and in the research literature (Jones et al., 2019; Jones & Branco, 2020; King & Jones, 2019; King et al., 2020), the counseling field does not have formalized and standardized guidelines to support supervisors in broaching identities and exploring intersectionality with supervisees. Additionally, much of the research that supervisors outside of academia need access to in order to learn about current practices and research regarding broaching and multicultural practices in supervision require payments that limit their accessibility (Hays et al., 2019; Murray, 2009). The ACA Code of Ethics only outlines that, "counseling supervisors are aware of and address the role of multiculturalism/diversity in the supervisory relationship" (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014). As participants in this study described, application of strategies or approaches for broaching and addressing multicultural issues in the supervision relationship was something they had to figure out through trial and error. This study illuminates the need for the development of accessible formalized guidelines for supervisors as well as more explicit training regarding broaching supervision practices to support supervisor development outside of academia.

Day-Vines et al. (2007) discussed broaching as a continuum and many of the participants in the present study, due to their years of practice, worked more from an

integrated/congruent or infusing approach. Participants' conversations regarding culture and identities were not a one-time occurrence, but recurred (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2019; King et al., 2020) as a part of ongoing interactions in supervision, consultations, and case reviews. Participants in this study valued discussions of intersecting identities and multicultural issues with their supervisees, which meant they may have had more conversations than the average supervisor (Jones & Branco, 2020). Although the MSJCC was never mentioned by participants, they still worked to address various parts of the MSJCC with their supervisees throughout supervision. Broaching and identity discussions of supervisor, supervisee, and client were ongoing to help supervisees to build a better understanding of their own identities as a counselor and human. The use of the case reviews helped the participants to support supervisees in better understanding client perspectives and lived experiences (Ratts et al., 2016; Fickling et al., 2019). Although participants in this study never used the words cultural humility, they expressed openness and genuineness when approaching supervision and multicultural identities. Supervisors also acknowledged they did not understand all of their supervisees' lived experiences and that differences in intersectional identities created opportunities for curiosity and ongoing learning. Cultural humility, flexibility, and openness are important characteristics of a supervisor practicing from a multicultural perspective (Fickling et al., 2019; Jones & Branco, 2020). The journey for supervisors to get to this point or specific factors that contribute to these characteristics is still unclear, but participants in this study were intentional in their choices in developing and using these skills. Further research is needed to understand how supervisors develop and implement these skills in supervision relationships to more intentionally support this

development. Participants in this study acknowledged their identities and those of their supervisees, recognizing that supervisees pursued supervision relationships with them due to their skills, identities, or experiences which validates other research, acknowledging the importance of the working relationship between supervisor and supervisee (Fickling et al., 2019; Hook et al., 2017; Wilcox et al., 2022). The supervision relationship is an opportunity for supervisees to have skills and processes modeled for them. This research answers calls for more understanding of supervision practices when broaching and addressing identities in supervision (Jones et al., 2019). Supervisors in this study intentionally and reflectively drew from their time and experience when they established supervision relationships, used broaching skills, and addressed multicultural issues in supervision. Their reflective practices and growth mindset as supervisors created opportunity for expertise to be developed (Elvira et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020) and these skills more consistently practiced. The reflective practices of participants also helped to lead to more effective supervision relationships. Through intentionality with supervisees, participants addressed ethical and cultural issues as they arose in supervision. This attention to the relationship is a key domain within the MSJCC, further reflecting participants skill and expertise as supervisors (Fickling et al., 2019).

Within a licensure-focused supervision relationship, supervisees have more freedom to find supervisors who are meeting a specific need- skill set, theoretical orientation, identities or values. Licensure-focused supervision is different from supervision in counseling training programs as supervisees have more choice in who they work with than in an internship placement experience. Having choice in a supervision relationship also allows the supervisor to be intentional in choosing who they work with

for supervision. In the present study, participants' supervisees sought them out because of their racial identities, gender presentation, age, experience, or specific skills. Supervisors in this study intentionally and reflectively drew from their time and experience when they established supervision relationships, used broaching skills, and addressed multicultural issues in supervision. Their reflective practices and growth mindset as supervisors created opportunity for expertise to be developed (Elvira et al., 2017; Kemer et al., 2017) and these skills more consistently practiced.

The current practices of the participants in the study was shaped by their experiences. All participants had some experience working in community mental health, which provided a different learning experience than going straight into private practice. Some participants found that being in a larger company created leadership and growth opportunities. However, training for supervisors was not something they easily found through their employer. Therefore, they pursued their own learning and further education to improve their practices. Counselors in these settings encounter barriers to build specific skills needed to be effective supervisors, and not just leaders in community mental health or private practice groups. Participants in this study had to independently apply the skills they learned from trainings, readings, and practice to improve as supervisors with little support from their employers. For example, one participant shared they used business leadership books to learn and translate to their clinical supervision practice. Another participant was able to access leadership training through their large mental health agency, however, they had to make the next step of application to their supervision practices. Supervisors in community mental health and in private practice both need support and oversight of their practices as supervisors. Without oversight or

clear guidelines for learning and expectations, it can result in supervisees receiving insufficient training and skill development. Those interested in supervision need more access to materials regarding supervision, that are not just academic. The creation of accessible materials and learning for those practicing in the field, has potential to benefit not only practitioners but those seeking mental health support as well.

Expert supervisors in previous studies (Kemer, 2020) also supported supervisees through connecting theory with practice by increasing multicultural awareness and using the here and now to directly process supervisee experiences. According to IDM, supervisor development happens through level progressions (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Participants in this study self-identified as experts in supervision, and their practices reflect Level 3 or 3i supervisors. Participants' ability to be flexible to address supervisee needs and shift between the role of consultant, teacher, evaluator, or counselor, meant they were able to address ruptures, validate supervisees experiences, or teach specific skills for supervisees to be effective counselors. Participants spoke of their passion for supervision and desire for supervisees to grow, also reflective of a level 3 or 3i supervisor. All of the supervisors' current practice was shaped by their experiences as a counselor and a supervisor. Some participants found that being in a larger company created leadership and growth opportunities. However, training for supervisors in community settings was not something they easily found through their employer.

Participants in this study did not have doctoral degrees and were either in private practice or community mental health. They supervised interns or individuals pursuing licensure, as well as clinical teams of practitioners that were a mix of social workers and counselors. These experiences vary from those found in other supervision research which

mostly looks at supervision relationships that take place as a part of practicum or internship, not those supervising for licensure or as a part of their clinical role in an agency. Most of the participants reported that much of their growth and development was due to their own pursuit of learning. Participants reported there was a lack of training for addressing multicultural issues within the supervision relationship and how to support supervisees in addressing multicultural issues in counseling (Borders et al., 2023). The participants received multicultural training, through their agency or one-time programs. However, the next step of applying their learning to supervision was often lacking. Participants recognized the value of addressing race, culture, and ethnicity in supervision. However, not all supervisors may hold those same values. This study is unique in that the participants all saw value in addressing multicultural issues. Supervisors' inability to address multicultural issues in supervision has the potential to impact supervisee practice, disclosure in supervision, and the overall feeling of safety supervisees might experience in supervision (Jones & Branco, 2020). Understanding the process of a broader group of licensure supervisors will be important to shape and build competencies for effective supervision practices. One participant reported using supervision of supervision while others would use consultation with peers for support when needing assistance to navigate challenging supervision issues. Supervision of supervision is one way in which supervisors can receive ongoing training and support, as is consultation. Supervision of supervision is a key form of training for supervisors, though it is most often cited in a group format versus individual experiences. (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Borders et al., 2023). However, it is not always an easily accessible tool or method of learning, especially for folks in non-academic settings. Supervision of supervision requires

individuals to pay a fee for the service and finding a skilled supervisor with advanced experience may not always be easy.

All of the participants shared various experiences of rupture and repair that happened in their supervision relationships and discussed how they directly addressed issues that arose in the supervision relationship. Most of the repair experiences took from several supervision sessions up to several months to work through. In some cases, ruptures led to the end of the relationship. Rupture and repair is a part of every supervision relationship and can lead to important supervisee growth (Watkins et al., 2016; Watkins, 2021). The clear examples of rupture and repair in this study offer new learning experiences for researchers to better understand supervision relationship dynamics. In the supervision relationship, broaching is the responsibility of the supervisor, as we consider all the power dynamics that are at play. One participant shared about an experience of a rupture that happened in supervision that they were unclear if there was a specific incident or misunderstanding. However, the supervisor never explicitly addressed it in supervision, but waited for the supervisee to do so. This participant experience led to the supervisee pulling away in the relationship and the supervisee's identities and concerns when unaddressed. This supervisor has since changed some of their supervision practices, asking more questions to have a better understanding of others identities and advocating for clients and supervisees. This participant experience provided a clear example of avoidant broaching behaviors as well as the power dynamic that is at play in the supervision relationship. For practicing supervisors, this is a reminder to check the power held in the supervision relationship and to not expect supervisees to always address the issues they are experiencing in the

supervision relationship. Being curious about how you are experiencing a supervisee or naming the things you are noticing have potential to lead to discussion about the supervisee experience and dynamics in the supervision relationship. It also speaks to the importance of reflective work and learning from ruptures in supervision to improve practices and do better (Borders, 2014). This study provides examples of supervisors who used their own reflective practices and openness to growth, to improve and make changes as they encountered different supervisees and relational dynamics, which may serve as a helpful model for therapists in developing their own supervision skills.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

IPA illuminates an individual's unique lived experience, emotions and thoughts utilizing participants from a similar group (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). This can make broader generalization more challenging. However, it can help counselor educators understand others' experiences and take those into account when it comes to teaching, training, research, and policy.

One limitation to this study is participants self-identifying as an expert. Some possible participants may have not been included due to not self-identifying as an expert. The other perspective is that participants who did participate and self-identify as an expert, may not have many of the skills reflective of an expert in their practices.

Self-report is a limitation in that participants may choose to not disclose or forget important details. As a White, woman researcher, some participants may not have felt comfortable sharing all of their identities or experiences with me. Participants in this study worked in both community mental health agencies and private practice. Several participants spoke explicitly about clinical versus administrative supervision, others more

indirectly. Supervision experiences and supervision relationships may look different between community mental health agencies and private practitioners. Future research may be beneficial to explore more of the differences between these and the impact of varying roles as a supervisor on the supervision relationship (Borders et al., 2023; Hutman et al., 2021). Future research of other homogenous groups would allow for exploring the unique experiences of various groups on broaching and how it shapes the supervision relationship. A case study of a supervision dyad would also be beneficial research to explore both the supervisor and the supervisee's experiences of broaching in the relationship.

Implications

Training

As counselor educators, intentional training of both master's and doctoral students in the use of broaching techniques and addressing multicultural issues in supervision is an imperative (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Day-Vines et al., 2007, Jones et al., 2019). As counselor educators, further exploration is needed for how to bridge the gap between theories of broaching in supervision and the informed practice of supervisors in the field (Jones et al., 2019, Jones & Branco, 2020). How can information be made more accessible to supervisors with clear guidelines to support their intentional practices? As frameworks for practice are created, how can counselor educators better disseminate information to those that may actually benefit from the structure or knowledge that has been discovered?

Supervision information on the ACA website is often difficult to find and supervision trainings often require payment. For example, searching for "ACA

supervision guidelines" on Google finds the information more quickly than trying to navigate the ACA website. Academic institutions often place less value on book publications for purposes of promotion and tenure, but that format may be more accessible for those practicing in the community to be able to learn about supervision.

For counselor educators training doctoral students as supervisors, doctoral students need to have intentional training and practice using these skills with students they are supervising. Through training doctoral students to intentionally address multicultural issues, new counselors can have better examples of qualities to look for in a future supervisor. Intentional conversations with master's students regarding expectations of supervisors and ethical practices gives master's students and new counselors more opportunities to advocate for themselves and seek healthier supervision relationships when possible (Vandament et al., 2021; Wind et al., 2020).

When training master's level students, who are still in early stages of their skill development within an IDM framework (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010), it may not seem appropriate to be teaching them supervision skills. However, counselor educators can use practicum and internship as opportunities to discuss the importance of supervision and qualities to look for in a supervisor. Internship courses present an opportunity to provide an initial introduction to students of various supervision frameworks, supervision best practices, and supervision contracts. Although master's students are still building their skills as a counselor, exposing them to information about supervision can help to shape their expectations for supervision, provide an understanding of the supervision relationship, and potentially give students more voice to advocate for their own needs when they have a better understanding of what is expected. These discussions during

internship courses can help prepare students for finding a licensure supervisor and potentially plant a seed for future development as a supervisor.

Practice

For current and future supervisors, building a reflective practice as a supervisor is a good starting point to creating multicultural practices in supervision (Jones & Branco, 2020; Kemer et al., 2014). Self- awareness in a targeted area of development within the IDM model of supervision (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Individuals who are still developing their skills as a counselor within an IDM model can create intentional practices of self-reflection to build awareness of their own identities and how they may show up in counseling relationships. Connecting with other supervisors in the field is an important way in which current supervisors can seek support. That can be done via live virtual or in person groups, through Facebook groups, or within a larger agency setting. Seeking out professionals a few steps ahead of you for supervision or consultation allows supervisors to also grow their skills through intentional support (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Kemer et al., 2014). Many of the participants used consultation as a way to seek support and gain perspective on their experiences. Supervision consultation groups or supervision of supervision can also create opportunities for discussion and feedback from other professionals. Motivation is another marker within the IDM framework (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) and an ongoing pursuit of further skill development and learning from others may help individuals continue to advance through the IDM model to become more effective supervisors. Another strategy for current supervisors is to make sure you are using evaluation tools (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender & Shafranske, 2004) to gauge your supervisee's experience in the supervision relationship

and what they are getting from the experience. This can open up the potential for dialogue to make changes in the supervision relationship that can benefit both the supervisor and the supervisee.

Conclusion

Supervision is a fundamental part of training and teaching new counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) states that supervisors remain cognizant of and address multiculturalism and diversity in supervision. This research explores the experiences of master's level supervisors practicing in the community as they have developed expertise in their multicultural practices. This research is unique as it explores the experiences of those who do not hold doctoral degrees as well as those who are practicing in the community and not a part of academia. As supervisors work to practice from a multicultural perspective, supervisors can be reflective of their own identities and skills and how it informs their supervision practice. Speaking directly with supervisees regarding multicultural issues while taking into account the supervisees skills and abilities, has potential to help supervisees grow. Supervisors must be open to ongoing growth and learning as multicultural practices are a lifelong journey.

Study 2- A Call for Supervisor Training

Supervision of new counselors is a key component of counselor training and development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Nationally, new counselors are expected to obtain a required number of hours practicing under the supervision of an experienced and licensed counselor. However, expectations of supervisors vary greatly across the United

States and territories (Hendricksen et al., 2019). Most research regarding supervision explores the experiences of doctoral students and academics who are supervising students in a master's program. There is little research about supervision that takes place during the licensure process by those practicing in the community. Once counselors are practicing in the field, there is often less oversight regarding their development. Variability in supervisor training and experience can contribute to new counselors experiencing a wide range of training and support. Research has previously looked at the experiences of doctoral trained supervisors deemed to be experts and how their skills differ from newer supervisors (Kemer, 2020). However, few have researched the expertise of supervisors practicing in non-academic settings without doctoral training. Due to supervision being a key component of counselor development, a better understanding of non-doctoral supervisor skills development and expertise is needed. This knowledge can lead to better training and guidelines to support supervisor growth and development, as well as more intentional training of new counselors. Understanding how expertise in the field is developed can also shape how supervision is explained and taught.

Supervisor Expectations & Training

Few have researched post-masters supervisors training in supervision. Many researchers have examined supervisors-supervisees working together, the impact the supervisor can have on the supervisee and the client, and supervisor expertise (Jones et al., 2017; Cook et al., 2018; Crockett & Hays, 2015). Doctoral trained professionals who are supervising as a part of an academic expectation or doctoral students practicing in an academic setting under the supervision of faculty make up a majority of research

participants (Cook et al., 2018; Kemer et al., 2017; White-Davis et al., 2016). Supervisee relationships in the research literature tend to focus on individuals in a master's or doctoral program who may not be fully licensed clinicians. Yet, supervisors across the U.S. provide quality supervision and training to post-master's clinicians and they are mostly ignored in the research literature.

Training expectations for clinical supervisors for post-master's students vary greatly across states and most supervisors have not received formal training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Hutman et al., 2021). More research is needed to determine what makes for an expert supervisor without a doctoral degree and what training is accessible to supervisors. Understanding supervisor training and requirements across states can make supervisors better equipped as the portability of a counseling license continues to shift. Portability of a counseling license is most often the context for looking nationally at supervisor requirements (Henricksen et al., 2019). Portability allows for the transfer of a counseling license and/or a supervision distinction across state lines. More conversations need to address the disparities of training expectations for supervisors as well as the amount or types of training supervisors participate in prior to becoming supervisors, and their ongoing learning to continue growth and sustain skills (Hutman et al., 2021). For example, supervisors may not discuss multicultural and social justice issues in supervision, due to lack of training or awareness (Fickling et al., 2019) which could lead to harm of the client or supervisee. The disparity between supervisor and supervisee training is drastic and one that needs to shift (Hutman et al., 2021). Counselors spend years in training to develop their skills, have several years of oversight in their clinical practice, and are required to obtain CEUs. Supervisors however, may or may not be

required to practice under supervision of supervision, receive extensive skill training as a supervisor, or have supervisor specific CEU expectations (Hendricksen et al., 2019; Hutman et al., 2021). Supervisors may not provide competent modeling and teaching if they have not been trained in supervision theory and techniques. It puts undue expectation on a supervisee to have knowledge and experience in a relationship in which they inherently have less power due to the evaluative and hierarchical nature of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Fickling et al., 2019; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Supervisors need to be competent in counseling skills and practice in order to communicate effectively those skills to new practitioners. If supervisors are ill prepared or equipped to do so, supervisees may have to seek knowledge and support elsewhere or they may not feel adequately prepared for independent practice.

Supervision is an integral part of counselor development and through the supervision relationship, counselors hone their skills and refine their identity as a counselor (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervision of counseling is a requirement for master's student counselors and post-master's counselors who are pursuing licensure. Supervision of supervision is believed to be effective and necessary for training supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019), but little research has been conducted regarding the supervision of supervision outside of an academic setting (Grant et al., 2012; Hutman et al., 2021; Nelson et al., 2008). Steward and Johnson (2021) categorize Supervisors in Training (SIT) into four hierarchical categories of development. However, those categories are shaped by an academic setting, with proficient (the highest level) supervisors being postdoctoral licensure candidates in psychology. Do supervisors

without doctoral experience have the potential to still be proficient supervisors? If so, what are the skills and or experiences that make them proficient or expert?

Vandament et al. (2021) expressed a need for supervisors to have more than a textbook or academic training experience when it comes to providing clinical supervision, they also need to know and understand cultural humility. Just because supervisors are trained to work with diverse clients, does not mean they have training to work with diverse supervisees (Constantine and Sue, 2007). Supervisor training needs to be different from the training counselors receive, as the skills of a supervisor are different from that of a counselor. Supervisors who lack the ability to effectively address those developmental needs can do damage to the supervisee's competency and supporting counselor identity growth and development, as well as potentially putting the client at risk. Competent supervision involves more than just teaching and evaluation of skills, but also modeling of professional behaviors (Wong et al., 2013). Professionalism and ethical practice are a critical component to counseling and supervisees often need support in navigating multicultural components of the relationship (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014).

Supervisors need to have the ability to recognize the sociopolitical and cultural structures and influences at play within both the supervision relationship as well as the counseling/client relationship (Lenz, 2014). Supervisors who are unable to do this, risk stunting the supervisee's skill development and ability to best serve their client. Supervisors who lack multicultural awareness also risk doing harm to the supervisee and the supervision relationship (Jones & Branco, 2020; Soheilian et al., 2014; Vandament et al., 2021). A supervisor who is multiculturally competent, can create a stronger working alliance between supervisor and supervisee (Wong et al., 2013).

Integrative Developmental Model

The Integrative Developmental Model (IDM; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) is a helpful framework when considering expert or advanced supervisory skills. IDM helps supervisors to effectively track the growth and development of their supervisee through specific skill areas and targets as well as help supervisors gauge their own skill growth and development. The IDM, when applied to counselor development, happens in four levels (beginner, intermediate, advanced, and integrated advanced), within each of these levels supervisors assess for self-other awareness of the counselor, counselor motivation, and autonomy; while also paying attention to skills (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). IDM as a supervision framework can feel challenging for new supervisors to follow as they assess supervisees at differing levels of skills competency (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). To be effective, supervisors have to be skilled enough to assess all of the IDM components in a single supervision meeting, therefore making it a useful tool for considering the skills of expert supervisors. IDM helps supervisors track their skills and behaviors more clearly. In other words, using IDM as a framework for determining skill level can give clarity to the practices of supervisors.

IDM also provides a helpful framework for conceptualizing supervisor skill growth and development. By using the IDM, supervisors can assess their own levels of skill development. At different stages of supervisor development, different supervisors attend to different skills and supervisory tasks across the developmental levels of supervisees (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). This can be problematic if a supervisor is not actively discussing how race, culture, or ethnicity impacts supervisor assessments and interventions, but rather avoiding or glossing over these important topics. Supervisees

who are unable to address their individual differences in the counseling relationship can lead to the supervisee being unable to fully support a client's identity and needs. If a supervisor is not culturally competent, they will not broach issues of race, ethnicity, and culture in the supervision process, therefore not providing modeling or instruction for new clinicians to learn skills necessary for conceptualizing their work with clients (Jones et al., 2019). IDM relies on the supervisor to be skilled in addressing multicultural issues with the supervisee.

IDM for supervision states that expert supervisors have themselves worked through all levels of the framework as a counselor and as a supervisor (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). When considering advanced supervisor skills, training to provide culturally competent supervision is also necessary. If supervisors themselves have not worked through the levels of the IDM in their own counseling practice, they will not be able to provide sufficient supervision. Specifically, if supervisors have not been trained or learned how to work with diverse supervisee populations, they will be unable to do so with their supervisees. Supervisees need supervisors who can affirm their identities and support the supervisee's emotional and mental health along with the client's (Bautista-Biddle et al., 2020). IDM is similar to Day-Vines et al.'s (2007) broaching continuum in that supervisors work across various levels. This developmental broaching continuum provides more clarity for understanding more advanced or expert skills in supervision. A level one supervisor will present with more anxiety in supervision and be less able to address the necessary components of the supervisor's growth. One weakness of IDM, is if there is a pairing of supervisor/supervisee in which the supervisee is more advanced in clinical skills or multicultural competence, supervisees may attempt to "wait

out" the experience of supervision and little growth happens for the supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Supervisors at level 2 of the IDM supervision model, may be less engaged with their supervisees due to struggles with motivation or conflict. This means the supervisee is not getting the necessary support and due to the power differential, may inhibit the supervisor from providing feedback to their supervisee for necessary changes or support (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Similarly, with broaching if a supervisor is not adequately addressing issues of intersectional identities in supervision, a supervisee may be less engaged, or not disclose in ways that would benefit both the client and the supervisee.

Expertise

Expertise is often built over time and through the course of learning, practice, and building skills (Attri, 2019). Researchers have outlined many varying factors as to what characteristics experts possess. One study exploring the expertise of pediatric rehabilitation therapists (King et al., 2008) defined expertise as "the ability to show appropriate, exceptional, or adaptive performance/behavior in response to a situation that contains a degree of unpredictability or uncertainty, based on a set of skills, knowledge, personal qualities and characteristics, and skills and abilities" (p. 7). Wallin et al. (2019), in a cross disciplinary, integrative literature review exploring work-based higher education, found these skills to be the most prevalent: knowledge and the ability to integrate it, problem solving skills, reflection, learning from mistakes, and managing boundaries. Wallin et al. (2019) found that to develop expertise individuals need to be supported but also have freedom to work independently as they build agency and explore their skills.

Expertise development is unique to each individual, as each person experiences various challenges that shape their skill development. Ongoing support of an individual helps to shape and build their expertise (Wallin et al., 2019). Expertise can be built over time, though it is not a guaranteed part of skill development (King et al., 2008). It is also something that is on-going and depends on the context and the individual. Five to fifteen years of experience is needed to build expertise (Manley & Garbett, 2000; Goodyear, 1997).

Individuals who are considered experts in their field hold several different types of knowledge: conceptual, practical, and self-regulative (Elvira et al., 2017). Conceptual/theoretical knowledge is information that is learned often though formalized education like a counseling master's program. Practical knowledge comes through experience and exposure in the counseling practice. This is the hands-on experience individuals gain from working with clients in unique settings and addressing specific issues. Lastly, self-regulative knowledge includes the individual's ability to reflect, track their own progress, and engage in a meta process of learning and action (Elvira et al., 2017). Experiencing the support of a more advanced practitioner while navigating the various types of knowledge helps individuals to move into the role of expert. Supervision can create an opportunity for individuals to have the space to reflect and receive feedback on the skills and knowledge learned as well as practiced to develop all three of these kinds of knowledge. Supervision is an integral part of learning for counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Expertise has been studied more explicitly within counseling supervision.

Expertise in Counseling Supervision

Researchers have conducted several studies to assess skills or practices of "expert" or "wise" supervisors (e.g., Grant el al., 2021; Kemer, 2020; Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer et al., 2014; Nelson et al., 2008). Participants in these studies are mostly doctoral trained, academic professionals with the majority of the supervision being with pre-licensed, master's students with a range of supervision experience from 6-40 years (M=20). These previous studies provide data regarding the practices of experts in the field and a useful framework for defining an expert supervisor. Supervision that happens outside of an academic setting for licensure may not be provided by an individual with a doctoral degree. Therefore, this study will examine non-doctoral trained supervisors and their experiences of building skills and expertise in the role as a supervisor. Due to most supervisors in the field not holding doctorates (ACA Media Kit, 2023; Hutman et al., 2021) understanding their skills or experiences toward developing their expertise can help to determine better strategies for training supervisors and creating policies to best support supervisors and new counselors.

Kemer et al.'s (2017) study of 16 expert supervisors aligned with previous research on expert supervisors (Grant et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2008), reporting that expert supervisors are open and humble, maintain flexibility in their practice and are responsive to their supervisees and the clients' needs. Expert supervisors also practice regular self-reflection and self-evaluation in their work with their supervisees and on their own time. Nelson et al. (2008) found that relational approaches in supervision were one of the keys to addressing conflict in supervision. Supervisors must work to develop trust in the supervision relationship. Supervisors' humility and willingness to admit mistakes also plays a key role in commonalities amongst expert participants.

In a mixed methods qualitative study through in-depth interviews with 16 participants, Grant et al. (2012) found four approaches in how supervisors managed challenges that arose in supervision: relational, reflective, confrontation, and avoidance. The relational approach involved supervisors using their counseling skills to build rapport, but also to directly address difficulties in the counseling or supervision relationship, parallel process, or supervisor missteps. Humility when working with supervisees was a key component to expert supervisor practice. A reflective approach had supervisors engaging in their own process of reflection on their supervision work and responses, as well as supporting the supervisee in reflection. Confrontation was most often used by supervisors when the relationship and reflective approaches were ineffective. Avoidant approaches were used most infrequently amongst participants. The supervisor's ability to be reflective and flexible were key characteristics of the participants.

The supervisor role requires one to pay specific attention to the supervision relationship and how that can shape working alliance and the functioning of the relationship, as well as maintain awareness of the evaluative and hierarchical nature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Kemer et al. (2014) used concept mapping to explore cognitions of supervisors and, similar to Nelson et al.'s (2018) findings, determined that expert supervisors were self-reflective and practiced humility. Kemer et al. (2014) acknowledged that none of their 18 participants supervised in practice settings, as participants were chosen based on academic performance criteria, which limited their research findings. Kemer (2020) evaluated cognitions of expert supervisors versus early practitioners through concept mapping. Newer supervisors in this study were doctoral

students who had participated in one class for supervision, one semester of supervision practice, and no prior training in clinical supervision. The study found that expert supervisors had more complex thought processes and comprehensive practices in supervision. Expert supervisors also had a more nuanced and intentional practice when meeting with supervisees. Expert supervisors in the field may not have explicit clinical supervision training depending on the state in which they earned their supervisor credential. However, some of these supervisors may have pursued other forms of training and skill development that have built skills and expertise that mirror the skills and expertise of doctoral trained 'experts' in supervision. Due to the majority of supervisors in the field not having doctoral training in supervision, an understanding is needed of how supervisors develop skills and expertise as they practice from a multiculturally informed approach. The current research will explore experiences of supervisors in the field to understand how their skills are developed and the similarities and differences to the skill development of supervisors in academia.

Training Guidelines for Supervisors

Supervision training and guidelines vary across the United States and territories, with less than 25% of these requiring any specific type of training prior to becoming supervisors, as well as variability in the number of years of required practice before becoming a supervisor (Henriksen Jr. et al., 2019). This is problematic as supervisors providing supervision to new clinicians are going to present variable outcomes. Supervisors with varying degrees of training and experience may also lead to inconsistencies in adhering to the ethical guidelines set out by the ACA (2014). Guidelines and standards for supervisors are often recommended practices and vague

guidelines, lacking clarity for specific supervision training requirements (Borders et al., 2023).

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs

According to the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2016), supervisors for practicum may be a faculty member, a student supervisor practicing under supervision, or a site supervisor who is under contract working with a counseling program. A clinical mental health site supervisor is required to have a minimum of a master's degree in counseling or a related profession, be licensed, have two years' experience, have knowledge of program expectations and requirements, and have attended "relevant training in supervision" (CACREP, 2016). Relevant training in supervision is a vague statement which leaves room for interpretation for programs. According to CACREP (2016), clinical mental health programs are required to provide training to site supervisors. Programs have the freedom to determine the extent and content of training for site supervisors. This creates inconsistencies across programs and site supervisors as different programs may offer different levels of training or resources to site supervisors. Additionally, site supervision may be time consuming and poorly compensated. Site supervisors, by being part of an academic training site, may have access to more training resources or information than other licensure supervisors.

The variability of training for supervisors needs to be considered from a multicultural lens as well. Students pay a lot of money to pursue a doctorate degree and take many years to complete it. These factors mean that a doctoral degree is not

accessible to all counselors who have an interest in supervising. Clinicians practicing daily in the field may have more experience, or more recent experience than some clinicians with a doctoral degree who have been out of the clinical setting for many years. Access to doctoral education assumes access to resources that are not equitable. Master's level practitioners in the field make up the majority of the ACA membership at 62% (ACA Media Kit, 2023). Supervisors in the field have experience that needs to be better reflected in research as few studies have examined counseling supervisors outside of academic settings. Understanding master's level supervisors knowledge can help illuminate what is shaping and guiding supervisor development so counselor educators can better prepare future clinicians and supervisors for competent practice. There were 2,917 doctoral students enrolled in CACREP programs in 2018 (CACREP, 2019). In 2017, there were 2,561 enrolled in doctoral programs, with 71.38% of faculty identifying as White and 55.33% of doctoral students and 59.75% of master's students identifying as White. The field continues to remain predominantly White in its practice even as client populations are more and more diverse. When most supervision research is based in academia, privilege is centered. White supervisors, holding a doctoral degree, do not represent the majority of clinicians in the field practicing or providing supervision. Therefore, research focusing almost exclusively on supervisors in academia continues to marginalize voices of non-White practitioners. Research needs to reflect the practices that are happening in the field and not just academia. Practitioners who have not received a doctorate may be just as effective and advanced in practice. The privilege and power held by those with the various degrees shapes the direction of the counseling field and yet those individuals are not the practicing majority of supervisors (Dollarhide et al., 2021).

ACA

The ACA outlines in their Code of Ethics (2014) guidelines for supervisors that supervisors are expected to have theoretical and pedagogical knowledge of supervision, including models of supervision, as well as an understanding of boundaries in professional supervision relationships. Supervisors competence, supervisor and supervisee responsibilities, care for clients, boundaries in supervision, evaluation, gatekeeping, and endorsement also are all outlined within the ACA Code of Ethics (2014). Supervisor exposure to the Code of Ethics may be limited to their ethics class during their master's degree, unless their state requires regular ethics training for continuing education. Supervisors may be unaware of the knowledge they need to possess in order to fulfill the role of a supervisor. Supervisors are expected to be trained in supervision techniques and methods and pursue continuing education related to their counseling and supervision skills (ACA, 2014). Many of the guidelines provide direction, and yet allow for interpretation. Newer supervisors or those with minimal formal training may be unaware of what is required in their role. The guidelines for ACA are set forth for members of the organization at all levels of practice and in various practice settings. However, not all supervisors are members of ACA or closely track what is laid out within the codes regarding the role of a supervisor. This lack of clarity in training expectations may create disparities in how supervisors develop their skills and expertise, in turn, creating supervisors who may not have adequate training to support the needs of supervisees and clients.

State Boards

Henriksen Jr. et. al. (2019) found a complex array of requirements for supervision across all 50 states and US territories. The type of professional background, the frequency of supervision, the number of supervisees per supervisor, and the training required to supervise all varied. There were some similarities between state requirements, but no overall consistent expectation for supervisors of post-master's counselors in training. This is problematic for the counseling field as there is no overarching standard of practice or structure in supervision for developing counselor identity and practice, other than the ACA Code of Ethics. CACREP oversees the training and education of counselors and counselor educators, once practitioners are in the field there is little oversight or direction for counselor development. Supervisor training varies greatly across states, therefore the skills or expertise required of supervisors is not regulated to maintain a standard of practice in the field. In order to create more consistency, more research is needed to determine what type of training supervisors are receiving and what is most effective. Research will help determine what skills supervisors are being taught and how those skills are then applied to the supervision relationship.

Understanding supervisors' experience of training and development will provide more data for future guidelines to be developed and gaps in supervisor and supervisee needs to be addressed. If supervisors across states are being trained consistently with clear guidelines and expectations, it can lead to supervisees receiving more consistent guidance in their counselor identity and skill development. Neuer Colburn et al. (2016) looked at what skills, knowledge, and attitudes new doctoral student supervisors needed to provide effective supervision. A similar study focused on expert supervisors who provide clinical supervision to post-master's counselors in their licensure process, like the

present one, would illuminate targets for shaping training and development based on how experts built their skills in the field. Understanding the knowledge and skills that create expertise in the field has the potential to help create consistency in supervision teaching and training across all states and territories, as well as create standards of practice for supervisors across levels of academic education. This study provides examples of how supervisors develop skills and expertise without having doctoral training. The present research provides information on skills and knowledge necessary supervisors in the field have developed as experts in practice. Supervision during a master's program is often provided by doctoral students, who may or may not hold a counseling license, but supervise with oversight from the faculty. Post-master's supervision requirements are different and those that are unlicensed are often not acceptable supervisors, but those that are licensed may not be trained in supervision to the same extent that doctoral supervisors are (Henriksen Jr. et al., 2019). This can create disparities in power and privilege when those that are unlicensed but pursuing a PhD are considered to have more skills and knowledge in supervision than those who have been practicing in the field for 10-20 years.

As mentioned, the inconsistencies in supervision requirements across states are complex and create standards for supervisors that are disparate (Henriksen Jr. et al., 2019). For example, comparing Alabama and Missouri licensure board requirements gives a brief look at how different expectations are for supervisors. Missouri regulations state: "Training and experience in counseling and in supervisory activities involving counseling with a resume or vitae detailing course work, workshops, supervision training, and experience as a supervisor of professional counselors or other mental health

disciplines" (20 CSR 2095-2.021, 2023). The state of Missouri provides no clear requirements for what type of training or how much training. Two years of licensed practice is a minimum requirement. Another document on the website states supervisors need "activities or experiences," but not that both are required. It also stated that "oversight of student interns, practicum or internship students, employment or personnel oversight" (Committee for Professional Counselors, n.d.) is sufficient to meet the requirements to be a supervisor in Missouri. It also does not specify a requirement for ongoing training after approval. The minimal requirements for a supervisor in Missouri are problematic in that supervisors may have no training or knowledge of supervision frameworks, roles or expectations of a supervisor, or how the supervisor role differs from the role of a counselor.

In the state of Alabama, supervisors need five years of continued full-time practice in the field before they are eligible to supervise. They also outline three specific forms of training in order to qualify as a supervisor: university coursework, certification from a governing body (e.g. NBCC), or a state board approved training that is a minimum of 24 education hours (255-X-3-.03, 2022). On top of specific training requirements, supervisor applicants in Alabama must also have three endorsements and a statement of their supervision philosophy, expressing knowledge of supervision knowledge and modalities. A study of supervisors in the state of Alabama found that of respondents, all held a graduate degree, 44% a master's degree and only 26% held a doctorate (Evans et al., 2021). The study only had a 35% response rate for the 502 supervisors in the state of Alabama. Despite the low rate of response for this study, it still speaks clearly to the need

for research to be reflective of the field, where the majority of supervisors hold a master's degree.

The Alabama guidelines provide more clear guidance and direction for supervisors than the Missouri guidelines. Supervisors' development of skills and knowledge may be more consistent when more clear expectations are defined. If supervisors are not required to receive specific training as a supervisor, how then are the skills and expertise developed? This study will explore how supervisors are developing their expertise and skills to look at similarities and differences that may be useful in creating more specific guidelines for supervisors.

Multicultural Competence and Training

Fickling et al. (2019) suggested that supervision is a place in which both the supervisor and the supervisee develop multicultural and social justice practices. When considering IDM, supervisors grow in their skills and develop in stages. The Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2015) has been applied to the supervision relationship as a way to explicitly integrate practices into the supervision relationship (Fickling et al., 2019). In a scoping review of supervision training by Border et al. (2023), half of the programs reviewed covered topics of multicultural and diversity issues. If supervisors are not being consistently trained in these topics, it may decrease the likelihood of supervisors addressing these topics in the supervision relationship. Research is needed to understand how supervisors develop skills and increase their own cultural identities and awareness. With a better understanding,

training programs and policies can be created to better support the needs of the supervisors.

Research Question

The following research study uses Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) to explore participants' experiences of multicultural competency and training for supervisors. Most site supervisors receive further training from CACREP programs and are often vetted by counseling programs (CACREP, 2016). Outside of a master's program there are varying guidelines for supervisor training and expectations across the various states (Hendriksen et al., 2019) and this can lead to inconsistencies in supervisors having training and instruction. Supervisors in many states have the ability to choose their own training path before embarking on the role of supervisor. With no clear and consistent guidelines for supervisors and the counseling compact becoming more of a possibility for more states (Hendricksen et al., 2019), supervisors need to have training and experience beyond what their supervisees have. State regulations and guidelines at this point vary for both counselors and supervisors. The Counseling Compact, is an interstate agreement, allowing licensed counselors to practice across state lines, as long as the state is a part of the compact (Counseling Compact, 2023). More consistency across all states regarding the expectations of not only counselors but supervisors will be necessary to promote safe and effective care for clients and appropriate supervision support for new clinicians. This study explored the experiences of supervision training of expert supervisors who hold a master’s degree as their highest degree. Understanding the experiences of supervisors in the field (i.e., outside of academia), is necessary to better understand needs and direction for future training and support.

Much of the research on expert supervisors uses data from participants who identify as having doctoral degrees, however many of the practicing supervisors throughout the US do not have doctoral degrees. According to the ACA, of their more than 53,000 members, 62% hold a master's degree, while only 18.92% hold a doctorate degree. (ACA, 2023). The aim of this study is to explore what makes an expert supervisor amongst individuals who have not earned a PhD. In current research, participants who are considered to be experts in the field hold a doctoral degree. However, privilege and access is currently shaping how an expert is defined when doctoral level degrees are linked to expertise despite so many supervisors in the field holding a master's degree and decades of experience supervising. This study will illuminate how master's level supervisors develop expertise. Exploring the training experiences and practices of supervisors holding a master's degree without doctoral training, expands knowledge in the field beyond academia to those who are daily practicing and make up the majority of the field. Focusing on master's trained supervisors can provide a more accurate reflection of skill development and practices of supervisors. Supervisors play an important role in shaping and supporting the growth of new clinicians (Bernard and Goodyear, 2019) and many may still be highly qualified for the work, despite not holding a doctorate. This study looks specifically at non-Doctoral supervisors with over 10 years of experience because these individuals make up a majority of the counseling field. Understanding how supervisors develop their skills and expertise can help shape how CACREP programs support field placement supervisors as well as others practicing in the field.

RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience building expertise?

RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors experience learning as they build their own multicultural competence?

Method

IPA is a phenomenological approach to qualitative research that is interpretative and is informed by hermeneutics as participants and the researcher work to make sense of the lived experiences of participants (Smith, 1996). IPA can provide in depth reports of the experiences of individual participants as supervisors and of their experiences of supervision training, so that the participant and their experience can "speak clearly" in the study's findings (Miller et al., 2018). IPA uses a smaller sample size than other phenomenological inquiries, allowing for single-case analysis, looking at each specific case before then comparing across all participants' experiences (Miller et al., 2018). Participant experiences of building expertise as a supervisor and training in supervision happen in relation to other phenomena: the model of training and the trainer, the setting or system they work in, and racial dynamics are just a few that shape the individual's experiences. Nothing happens in a vacuum since every experience and interaction is part of larger system interactions. Acknowledging and honoring participant's intersectional identities is key when understanding how participants make meaning of their experiences in a specific context. Participant's unique identities and perspectives, as well as the systems they move through that shape their context are all central to IPA. IPA is helpful in illuminating each of participants' individual voices as supervisors while also acknowledging similarities or differences across the experiences of all participants. Understanding the idiographic roles of supervisors and the training that shaped and informed their practices, can help the field begin to establish clearer expectations for

supervisors across states. Using IPA and paying close attention to the individuality of participants will also help promote diversity in voices and experiences, while also finding commonality amongst the data (Miller et al., 2018).

Critical theory is the paradigm that shapes this research study. Use of critical theory with IPA will help to identify and highlight the voices and experiences of participants as well as interpret their lived experiences as supervisors (Alase, 2017). Education has been shaped by White, male voices and much of higher education is still predominantly White. Critical theory recognizes that phenomena are often shaped by social injustices and inequalities in systems, as well as the various constructs of economics, politics, and history (Hays & Singh, 2012). Use of critical theory in this study acknowledges the systems and hierarchies in place in society and provides a framework through which to understand participant experiences and bring voice to those experiences. Supervisors are the individuals who often hold more power in the supervision relationship, due to its hierarchical and evaluative nature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisor training and development is often shaped according to their own interests and theoretical leanings. Supervisors' ability to acknowledge their own frameworks, identities, and those of their supervisees is part of the modeling and teaching process of supervision (Jones et al., 2019). Acknowledging power and privilege in the supervision relationship, and how it shapes supervisors, supervisees, and the relationship through critical theory is crucial to research as we continue to work to advance equity in the field. In this study, critical theory will allow me to examine power and privilege and acknowledge systems and social justice as a lens through which I analyze and report the data.

Methodology Justification

IPA asks the participant to consider comprehensively their experience, taking into account their thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and somatic responses (Miller et al., 2018). Supervision training is an individual journey for each supervisor, impacted by what learning opportunities were available or accessible, as well as experiences in various settings. Supervisors pursue training based on their interests and often what they are exposed to in their counseling practice. Embodied practice that comes from Merleau-Ponty (1962) is another critical component of IPA (Smith et al., 2009) and is applicable because supervisors experience training and training paradigms based on their own intersectional identities. Embodiment is a way in which we view the world through our own interactions and experiences, and our intersectional identities shape how we interact and move through life (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, Ratts et al., 2016). Training is then applied to individual and unique supervision relationships, based on the identities of supervisor/supervisee/client. Intersectionality of individuals is a multicultural and social justice practice, as people with different racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, etc. identities, experience training, supervision, and their lives differently (Crenshaw, 1991; Ratts et al., 2016; Singh et al., 2019). Therefore, it is important to bring attention to intersectionality in research to better understand the lived experiences of individuals as they practice intersectional approaches and build their expertise in these practices. Supervision and the training of supervisors is based on knowledge which is a form of power. The supervision relationship is based on power dynamics of the supervisor/supervisee. IPA as a research approach seeks to understand how individuals make sense of their experiences. Understanding the identities of participants and how they have experienced training and

development through each of their unique perspectives can bring a better understanding to how supervisors are trained and what changes need to be made in the field.

Using IPA in the present study allows readers to understand multicultural development and training through a participant's specific experiences, as well as social justice applications to research and policy, due to the two layers of analysis, with the second looking at systems and social context (Miller et al., 2018). This allows the researcher to explore challenges participants faced in training and development that may be part of a larger systemic problem and not just the individual experience.

Researchers have previously used IPA in counselor education research (Giegerich et al., 2020; Pulliam et al., 2019) and supervision research (Cook & Sackett, 2018). The individualized report of supervisors' training experiences may help to paint a better picture of what is accessible to supervisors, as well as how expert skills are developed by supervisors. Exploring individual experiences of supervisors' multicultural growth and development allows for the researcher to address both the individual experience and the experience of supervisor training at a more systemic level. Lastly, idiography is a major component of IPA as it looks at the particular experience of supervisor's acknowledgement and development of multicultural competence and supervisor skill (Smith et al., 2009). The need to explore individual experiences of a supervisor's development and the particular training processes is what makes IPA's idiographic components important to this study. The individual intersectionality of supervisors and the systems of power lends a complexity to the issues of access, power and privilege that needs to be explored as this can shape practices in supervision training and education.

Participant Eligibility Criteria

Participants in the study were individuals who provide clinical supervision in the counseling field. If the state in which they practice required approval for supervision, they had completed those processes to be supervisors. Specific participant criteria included:

- Participants have practiced counseling for a minimum of twelve years, with a minimum of five years' experience as a supervisor.
- Participants hold a master's degree in the counseling profession (clinical mental health counseling, marriage and family).
- Participants have not completed a doctoral program. Some states use doctoral supervision courses as a requirement to be certified as a supervisor, therefore coursework for supervision will not prohibit interested individuals from participating. (Arkansas Board of Examiners in Counseling and Marriage & Family Therapy, 2021).
- Participants identified as holding advanced skills, being wise, experienced, or an expert in supervision.
- Participants identified as being flexible in their cognitive thought processes (e.g. nuanced awareness of supervisee needs, balancing challenge/support, adjusting supervisor roles based on supervisee needs).
- Participants identified as skillful with confrontation, conflict, and evaluation in supervision.
- Participants reported knowledge of and practice self-reflection regarding the impact of power and privilege on the supervision and counseling relationships.

Much of the research on supervisors who are identified as experts or wise have participants who are primarily academics (e.g., Grant et al., 2012; Kemer et al., 2014; Nelson et al., 2008). Yet, many of the supervisors practicing in the field do not hold doctoral degrees. Doctoral degrees require access to time and money that is not feasible for all. Experts can still exist in the field without a doctoral degree or doctoral training. IPA studies look for participants to be homogenous in some form to allow for clearer exploration of convergence and divergence in the experience (Smith et al., 2009); therefore, this study achieves homogeneity by requiring participants to hold a master's degree in clinical mental health or marriage and family, and have practiced in a clinical setting for at least twelve years to allow for maximum homogeneity. One aspect of IPA is promoting the individual voices of participants and this study promotes the unique experiences of the individual and the perspective their intersectional identities contribute to the data.

Sampling & Recruitment

After IRB approval, participants were recruited through online media platforms (e.g., Facebook supervision groups, ACA Connect, and LinkedIn), and word of mouth through other counselor and supervisor colleagues. Recruitment of participants was purposive so as to recruit participants that would provide detailed and rich experiences of their training as a supervisor as well as diverse perspectives. Word of mouth through other counselor and supervisor colleagues was also used so that intentional recruitment could take place to find a diverse representation of supervisors in the field. Participants received $100 for each interview they completed as compensation for their time at a level equivalent with how much they might charge clients or supervisees. Participant

recruitment targeted individuals who had 5-20 years of supervision experience and identified as being skilled in the practice of supervision. They had completed self-study or training in supervision. The participants in this study were in five different states, with supervision training hour requirements ranging from 6 clock hours to 45 clock hours of training. However, when individuals in this study were pursuing state supervision certification, the states may have required fewer hours to obtain supervision certification. Potential participants were invited to participate through an initial online survey (Appendix A), to collect basic demographic information, as well as details regarding years of experience as a supervisor, number of supervisees, and training(s) completed for supervision. The initial survey allowed for purposive sampling to best determine fit of the individuals for the current study, making sure they met minimum experience requirements, state supervision requirements, as well as various training experiences.

IPA design emphasizes the quality of the data available versus the quantity of participants in the study, considering instead the depth or richness and range of data collected (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). The sample consisted of six participants, who each completed two interviews. Three participants identified as White, one as Black, one as White/Hispanic, and one as other/Hispanic. One participant was male identifying, five were female identifying. Participants had a range of counseling experience from 13-34 years (M = 18.3) and had practiced as a supervisor for 6 to 16 years (M = 11.6). Only one participant held an Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) title through NBCC. Participants pursued training through the Clinical Supervision Academy, ACS approved trainings, or other state approved supervisor trainings. Only one participant officially held the ACS credential offered through the Center for Credentialing and Education (NBCC).

Four of the participants completed enough supervision training hours or courses to qualify for the ACS credential. It is unclear how many hours of supervision training the final two participants had completed, however, both had completed the hours and material required to be approved supervisors in their state. All participants were master's level clinicians. Half of the participants were employed in a community mental health agency, and the other half in private practice. All of the participants started off in community mental health. Those currently in community mental health have a side business of providing supervision or counseling. Participants had supported 16 to 50 (M = 26.6) supervisees over the course of their career. The purpose of the study as well as the procedures were clearly communicated with participants prior to and after each interview. The researcher communicated to participants information about the study and offered them the opportunity to be involved in the data analysis process. However, none of the participants were interested in following up with data review or analysis.

Instrument & Data Collection Method

Data was collected via semi-structured interviews, a common format in phenomenological studies (Hays & Singh, 2012). A brief demographic and information survey was used as a part of participant selection. Zoom interviews being semi-structured allowed for the researcher to engage with the participants in the here and now to further explore answers to prompts and collect more details as needed (Miller, 2018). The semi-structured interview (Appendix C) allowed for more in-depth conversations while also providing more consistency between interviews. During interviews the researcher invited an open dialogue with participants, through acknowledgement of my own identities and experiences, as well as using counseling skills to create an environment in

which participants feel safe to share their lived experiences. Openness in the interview process was created through clear communication with participants, keeping them apprised of the research process and how the data will be collected and used.

Two 45-60-minute interviews were conducted for each participant, to allow for depth of discussion. In depth interviews are the most common format of IPA which allow for rapport to be established with the participants as they share about their particular experiences and the researcher can engage empathically with the participants (Smith et al., 2009). Interviews were conducted and recorded via a secure zoom with participants to allow for review of the data and transcription. Interview recordings and data were stored on a password protected computer, on a secure server. Transcription will be completed by the researcher using software. The researcher will review each interview and the transcription provided by the software for accurateness.

The interview protocol developed follows structures and guidelines for IPA to clearly communicate the data and provide an interpretation of it (Smith et al., 2009). An interview schedule was created prior to interviewing participants. The interview schedule was provided to participants prior to the meeting in order to allow participants time to reflect on their experiences. When communicating with participants about the interview, they were encouraged to bring other artifacts/data with them that may be reflective of their experiences of training and supervision. Artifacts were another way for participants to communicate and share their experiences of training and development as a supervisor. Participants had an opportunity during the interview process to share about their artifacts and what those artifacts meant. Provided are a few sample questions asked during the interview process:

- Tell me about your journey of development as an expert supervisor.
- What skills and dispositions do you possess that make you an effective supervisor?
- What steps do you think you need to take to continue to build your expertise?

Consultation with the dissertation committee was ongoing regarding the interview protocol to determine appropriateness for IPA and for the study content. Consultation with other counseling supervisors regarding their experiences of broaching in supervision was used to help with formulation of the interview protocol. Follow up with participants after transcription allowed them to review their transcript and assess for accuracy of the data as well as provided the opportunity to add corrections or edits. Participants were invited to share what themes they saw within their recorded and transcribed data.

Data Analysis

Data analysis considered the participant's experience of developing their multicultural competencies and expertise in supervision, and how the participants make meaning of their experiences. Data analysis through IPA allowed me to interpret events and experiences of the participants within their social context as well as theoretical understandings (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). Similarities across participant reports as well as where the data is divergent across participant accounts was determined (Miller et. al, 2018).

IPA analysis is broken down into two major components (Miller et. al, 2018). The first round of analysis carefully looked at the participants' individual experiences of training and development and how the data is distinct for individual participants at a more

surface level. This type of analysis is similar to transcendental phenomenological data analysis (Miller et al., 2018). The second round of analysis included interpretation of the data (Smith et al., 2009). IPA takes the analysis experience further by doing more interpretation of the data with consideration of how society, culture, theory, or systems inform the experiences participants report (Miller et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2009). IPA looks at the unique account of each individual participant and then compares across accounts to explore the similarities and differences of each experience.

The first step in analyzing the data was to read through the data several times, as well as listen to the recorded interviews, making initial notes from observations in the data, as well as my own reflections of what I heard. Second, through multiple exposures to the data, I began making notes of linguistic, conceptual, and descriptive comments related to details that appeared central to each individual participant's experience of supervision to understand their world, word choices, and how the participant makes sense of their development as a supervisor (Smith et al., 2009). Analysis of the data was initially case by case reviewing the participant's idiosyncratic experiences. Third, after each case was evaluated, analysis moved back and forth between the individual interviews and the whole of the data from all participants. Notes were made regarding client language, context, units of meaning, as well as details that stood out or were similar or contradictory, generally falling into the same categories of descriptive, linguistic, or conceptual details for all the transcripts (Smith et al., 2009). Through the review of the data, quotes and specific words from the participants were used to attempt to capture the essence of the participants' lived experience as a supervisor (Alase, 2017). Direct quotes and words from participants were used to shape themes and summarize experiences.

Fourth, after ongoing note taking, patterns in the transcripts were assessed, themes were developed from each individual participant account and then compared across all participants. Themes were developed from individual interviews as well as the overall collection of interviews, and based on repeating words, experiences, and similarities amongst the data. Themes were built keeping hermeneutics in mind, as the individual parts were interpreted in relation to the whole data set, and the whole data set also considered the individual participants (Smith et al., 2009). Within an IPA framework and considering critical theory, each participant's unique voice was honored in the creation of themes. Fifth, themes were ordered according to how they appeared in the transcripts and mapped according to how they fit together. Sixth, interpretation of the data looked for larger meanings or connections within systems. Looking at larger systems and processes allowed for the application of interpretation that is a component of IPA as well as uses critical theory to explore the unique and collective experiences of participants. Each participant was a unique data set, just as together the total data set was unique and provided insight at a more generalized level (Smith et al., 2009). Through the process, continued support from the dissertation committee was available to maintain reflexivity.

Reflexivity and Trustworthiness

As a White licensed counselor and counselor educator, I have had many opportunities to provide supervision to students during both practicum and internship, supervising upwards of 40 students over the course of nine school semesters. I have participated in community-based supervisor training provided by local agencies, a university training collective for social work supervisors, and doctoral course work. I have participated as a supervisor in a community mental health setting as well as a

private practice. I have also provided supervision for licensure. My experiences of supervision training have varied in accessibility, depth, and breadth of knowledge, as well as their level of engagement in issues of multicultural competence as a supervisor. I do not yet consider myself an expert in supervision but have a desire to continue to build my skills and knowledge. An awareness of my identity and experience is important as it shapes my interpretation as well as my frames of reference.

To maintain reflexivity and bracket my own experiences and thoughts, I had ongoing conversations with my committee chair. Codes and themes were developed through my own work, in collaboration with a doctoral student also reviewing and coding all the interview transcripts. Through development of the study, faculty members and other research colleagues discussed my emotional reactions to the data and my response through reading and reflecting on participant's reports. Outside perspectives from other supervision researchers and practitioners in the field, chosen based on their research or expertise on supervision, created further opportunity to process the data and the accuracy of analysis. Two opportunities to meet with participants created rich and detailed accounts of their lived experience. Note taking was an important part of the reflexivity process as I made notes and reflected on any personal assumptions (Miller et al., 2018). Note taking was implemented after interviews, to reflect on thoughts, feelings, and themes. Note taking was also used throughout as interview recordings were watched and transcribed. Triangulation of the data was used to assess the accuracy of themes and of participants' similarities between data and the unique experiences of the same phenomenon and reviewed using an external auditor (Hays & Singh, 2012; Larkin & Thompson, 2012). Participants had the option to participate in a transcript review to

provide clarifications or additions, however, none engaged in the opportunity. An audit trail was kept and the research process closely tracked of how data was collected, themes developed and then analyzed.

Results

In this study, the themes of advancement through opportunity or need, the experience of good or bad supervision, the participant desire to learn or be better, as well as characteristics of an expert demonstrated how master's level supervisors developed and view their expertise as a supervisor practicing in the field. In the sections below, each theme is explored further with quotes from participants used to explain the themes.

Advancement Through Opportunity Or Need

All six participants started their career in a community mental health setting. Two participants remain in a community mental health setting, another participant works for the military, the remaining three are in private practice. Participants in the study who worked in agency/government settings all had side businesses as supervisors. Each participant shared experiences of moving up through the ranks within a community mental health setting, taking on more leadership or supervising individuals without any training or experience. Two participants shared their experiences of moving up in respective agencies as young professionals and, once being licensed, they were quickly placed in supervision roles. Both participants had no clinical supervision training though were expected to provide supervision to individuals in their agency. Participant 1 pursued the step towards being a supervisor due to him having met the qualifications and the agency where he worked had an open position. However, in this role, he found little support or direction when it came to providing clinical supervision and support to the

staff below him. This experience was shocking and overwhelming as he worked to find his footing with the new role expectations;

> I started working for a nonprofit that was a bigger nonprofit. They had an opportunity for a supervisor position and I had done supervisory stuff in my previous careers before getting my master's degree. I'd been a team leader, those kind of things. I was excited to try it and I had my independent license and not many of the providers there did. So [the agency] gave me a supervisor position. I had no idea what I had gotten myself into. I had zero training. They did no on the job training. It was literally like here is your new office, here are the people you are supervising. They said at some point this year you just need to get the CEU that you need to be a supervisor. (Participant 1)

Participant 3 was placed in a supervisory position in an agency setting as a bachelor's-level clinician. She made the decision to pursue more learning to improve her clinical skills and be better equipped to support her staff. Once she had completed the necessary things, her state at the time had very few requirements for supervision so was very quickly placed in a clinical supervisor position. For this participant, there was a very steep learning curve with little support:

> I've been in the counseling mental health field for 25 years. I started in community mental health and was very quickly put into a management role. I still had my bachelor's degree so I hadn't even gotten my master's yet, but within a couple years was put into a management/supervisory role and I had no idea what I was doing at all and eventually decided to go back and get my master's degree. I got my clinical degree and then I got licensed. Maybe not the day I was licensed,

> but a few months after I was in a supervisory role where I was providing clinical supervision because this was back in 2008 where they just didn't have any requirements. (Participant 3)

These participant experiences of becoming supervisors early in their careers were similar for five of the six participants. All of the participants were promoted during their time in agency settings, taking on leadership roles and providing clinical supervision. Participants who took these leadership positions and became clinical supervisors experienced opportunities for growth and development that may not have been planned or expected, but they took those opportunities to learn and grow their skills. In ways that were similar to other participants, participant 4 entered into her role as a clinical supervisor and clinical director to support her friends who were running the agency:

> Of course, with no training or anything, just hey, here is your office and we don't even know what we're doing as an organization, but you're the clinic director and the clinical supervisor. Figure it out. So I would say that too shaped me, believe it or not, in a positive way when you look at it because being forced into this position, I don't think I would have taken it because I'd have been terrified. (Participant 4)

Participant 4 felt that the push into a leadership role and clinical supervisor shaped her career path in a positive way. As a young professional, at 27 she did not have the confidence in her skills and abilities in the ways that she does now. She had to learn to supervise individuals who were older and had more experience than her. Individuals in this study experienced a “trial by fire” type of learning. The necessity of their agencies or work environments placed them in a path that challenged them to be clinical supervisors

whether they were ready or not. Once thrown into those roles, participants made the best of it and pursued learning to grow in those roles, build their skills, and make themselves into stronger clinicians and supervisors.

Desire For Growth, Learning Or More

All of the participants in this study expressed a desire to improve as a supervisor and to gain the knowledge necessary to excel as a supervisor. All of the participants pursued their own learning regarding clinical supervision and worked to develop the skills necessary to the position. Learning varied amongst participants as they sought training through SAMHSA, state approved trainers, national cohorts for supervision, agency leadership training, university professors or workshops, and business or leadership books. When working at an agency, some participants' trainings were covered by agency funding while others had to pay out of pocket to participate in supervision training. All six participants have completed over 45 hours of training and would be able to qualify for the Approved Clinical Supervisor credential. However, only one individual had completed the certification process to hold the credential. Participant 6 decided to pursue supervision training after taking a break from her role as a counselor. When she returned to her role as a therapist she decided she was ready to use her experiences in the field to help train new clinicians. Her identity as a Black woman also drove her desire to learn and grow so she could mentor other Black counselors:

> About 2016 is when I started the training and it was a 40 hour training over a weekend. As in half of it was done individually [on your own time] and the other half was in vivo a very long, long weekend. We learned a lot and that trainer had a lot of different theories that they showed us a lot of different techniques using

> case studies…And it just kind of reiterated what I already felt as an intern was like, yeah, I have not had a lot of people that look like me, train me to do this. (Participant 6)

Participant 5 received training through her agency setting as she was in a leadership role. The TIP-52 program was one of the most influential for her learning and shaped her supervision practice to be competency based. They then pursued their own learning for a competency-based supervision model that did not include substance use so that they would be able to better support supervisees not working in a substance treatment setting. After being thrown into a leadership role, Participant 1 decided to seek out more training to grow his skills as a supervisor:

> But for me, I needed to seek out more. So, I started searching and found they had just started a program here in the state for people that are working towards a national supervisory certification and I got set up with their program. I had to pay for it out of pocket. It was a year-long leadership and clinical supervision program. It was really extensive, we looked at all the different modalities and how to apply different approaches to different supervisees and different situations. We did a lot of discussion groups because it was a small cohort that went through the class together. We problem solved current situations we were having and addressed ethical issues. (Participant 1)

Participant 1 recognized the need to support his staff of trauma therapists as they navigated helping clients with their own trauma stories. Through his year-long training, he was able to learn about modalities and support supervisees with different needs and skill sets.

During her 16 years as a supervisor, Participant 6 has received many formal and informal opportunities for training: “I'm a person that likes to learn and develop and get better and so not having a lot in the clinical world, there was some under social work but not under ours. I started searching out other things” (Participant 6). Some of her learning was through reading leadership books, articles on management and leadership, as well as social work. She took what she learned and applied it to supervision:

> I was given the opportunity to be trained by some of the professors that were clinical supervisors and some colleagues in the field that were obviously quite a bit more advanced and older than me, which gave me a lot different insight into clinical supervision as it was developing and evolving…I think too, with me wanting to grow personally so that I could help the ones that I was responsible for, they really had nobody else. So feeling that burden of helping them grow and develop because we had nobody else knowing what I had to go through to learn kind of gave me the passion and desire to better myself, learn more. And so I was already ahead of the curve. (Participant 4)

Participant 3 engaged in a lot of training for supervision over her 16 years practicing as a supervisor, with a unique entry into the field approaching through leadership before pursuing a clinical degree.

> I've done a lot of formalized training. I did the 45 hour training to obtain the ACS, Approved Clinical Supervisor credential. I would say that was actually only a few years ago, but before that I had done several separate supervisor trainings, again that I paid for because I was interested in it and wanted to learn more. And then I always had my own clinical supervisor that really supported me and provided

> clinical supervision. One of the most impactful trainings I had was a 3D training. It was actually geared towards addictions counselors because I was getting my addiction counselor license at that time and it was fantastic. It was a three day experiential kind of training on providing clinical supervision. (Participant 3)

Half of the participants found their supervision training for substance use to be the most impactful and helpful in building their supervision skills. Participants found little direction or support from their state guidelines or ACA regulations regarding supervision. Their development was shaped by the number of hours required by the state, but the actual growth and development was through their individual pursuit and desire to learn and grow. ACA's ethical codes (ACA, 2014) provided a framework for supervisors to protect clients and give standards for behavior expectations of supervisees. State regulations dictated the number of hours of training, but for some participants who have been supervising for a while, there were no guidelines when they initially became a supervisor.

> [My licensure state] is very, I think lax, just in the last two years, they implemented that supervisors who are providing licensure supervision to counselors have to have six hours of supervision training, which is not a lot, I mean not a lot at all. And that's just two years ago that they implemented that. So I don't think they have [shaped my supervision practice] at all. Yeah, I wish they were a lot more strict. (Participant 3)

Participant 4 had a similar experience that they were licensed and supervising prior to any real state guidelines being in place. They had pursued their own learning and growth

without much direction from state and ACA guidelines, but more out of their own desire to support their clinicians.

> I mean I don't want to say they didn't offer any type of conferences and trainings as things evolved. But again, they were so far back. I think too, with me wanting to grow personally so that I could help the ones that I was responsible for, they really had nobody else. So feeling that burden of helping them grow and develop because we had nobody else. Knowing what I had to go through to learn kind of gave me the passion and desire to better myself, learn more. And so I was already ahead of the curve. So their [trainings] were kind of just refreshers at the time. (Participant 4)

Participant 2 lived in a state with more strict requirements and supervisor trainings have to be approved by the licensing board. This participant spoke highly of her approved trainer and that they continue to seek CEUs and participate in consultation groups through this provider. Taking their learning above and beyond that required of the state.

> When I became a supervisor, you know, obviously as part of the training they require you to, we went through the ethics with a fine tooth comb. The training that I went to was when I had my aha moment of like oh wait a minute, maybe I should change some things. So I think that's when I kind of realized I need to be aware of these ethics. (Participant 2)

This participant's experience however is not reflective of all states and the regulations. Some states do not require supervisors or counselors to have specific ethics training to maintain their counseling license or their supervisor credentials.

Good Versus Bad Supervision Experiences

All participants shared examples of mentors and supervisors who were supportive or not supportive during their time as a counselor and also as a new supervisor. For all of the participants, they were shaped by their own experiences of supervision and mentorship. Those experiences led participants to want to be a better supervisor and provide good supervision experiences to those coming up behind them. Participant 6's experiences led them to want to be a diverse voice in the field so that others could see someone like them in a supervision relationship. Their experiences of supervision were good, just not diverse:

> I knew I wanted to be [a supervisor] as soon as, you know, before I got my licensing because it was hard to find a diverse supervisor, someone that just wasn't a white male. I loved my supervisors. They were wonderful, wonderful men, very self aware. Allowed me to challenge them as far as stereotypes and things like that. (Participant 6)

Participant 3 was shaped by both positive and negative experiences of supervision, so much so that they had to take a step away from the field due to burnout under a bad supervisor. This experience coupled with ongoing supervision of supervision has shaped their growth and development as a supervisor:

> So I was lucky that I had some really good clinical supervisors that I learned a lot from. And then I also had the opposite that I had a really bad clinical supervisor that I also learned a lot from. For me, it was really impactful because the difference I felt having a good supervisor versus a bad supervisor was like night

> and day. You know, I ended up becoming burnt out under one of those bad supervisors. (Participant 3)

Another participant shared about the mentorship and guidance they received in their journey of becoming a supervisor, believing some of the characteristics that make an expert supervisor, like understanding your own identity and who you are as a leader, can not be learned in a classroom. This participant had support and guidance in their early career as they were establishing their supervisor identity:

> I had at least one very good supervisor. And again, this was years ago, they taught me about supervision, about mentoring, and really helped me a lot. He probably doesn't even know, but more with personal growth, because I think that's a big thing, is like learning to develop patience, empathy, all those things that are critical to be in my opinion, to being a good supervisor that at a young age coming into supervision I did not have and taught me in a way that was not judgmental but more of coaching and mentoring I would say. (Participant 4)

This experience of non-judgmental support from a mentor or supervisor is one of the ways that helped this participant build their skills and expertise as a supervisor. They were supported as they leaned into a new role and practiced new skills. Another participant shared about their experience of mentorship and supervision of supervision. Through these experiences, coupled with the supervisor training they pursued, they built their skills to become an expert supervisor. This participant experienced support as they learned skills and practices of supervision.

> I took this clinical supervisor position and we had our clinical directors that were above us and she is this amazing provider, great leader, and good teacher. She had

> all of these great skills and every one-on-one that we had, she was really teaching me how to be a supervisor. Every week we did weekly one-on-ones and it was just like mind blowing, like oh I've never even heard about this. I've never even thought about these things. I was really fortunate to have that. And I had this model of what a really good clinical director, clinical supervisor looks like and all of those pieces to supervision. (Participant 1)

Finally, this participant had several negative experiences of supervision that drove her to want to offer a different experience to others in the future. Looking back she recognized that one of her supervisors was burned out and unable to offer her the support she needed as a new clinician. The experience mentioned below led her to feelings of resentment as she took on more responsibility than necessary as the supervisee. Her negative experiences drove her to want to be better and build her skills, even if she wasn't supported during the supervision process.

> So supervision was not really supervision with him. He'd be like, let's go have lunch and count that as supervision. And at that time I was just trying to get my hours, just sign my hours logs. I don't care. But you know, you're just trying to make it right and survive. I think, after that is when I really recognized, ooh, I need to do something different because I'm not going to be good at what I do and I want to be good at what I do. (Participant 2)

Characteristics of an Expert Supervisor

Participants in this study shared experiences of the skills that they have developed over time as expert supervisors as well as specific skills or dispositions they possess that they believed make them experts. Participants in the study identified the necessity of

being ethical in their practice and decisions, as well as teaching ethics to their supervisees.

> I think being a type A [personality] in some ways is helpful because I am a rule follower. I think ethics are important. And so I always revert back to like okay, what does our ethics say? How do we make this decision right based on our ethics. (Participant 2)

This participant's state guidelines required ethics training which has shaped some of their practices as a supervisor.

> I think that [ethics] was sort of ingrained in me at that moment [of training]. That's something I've always referred to. It's like, what does our ethics say? And then I became aware that there was an ethical decision-making model. Like there's a what? I've used that multiple times with my associates, but nobody ever taught me that. And so, I think my supervisor training was probably the best training I ever had. (Participant 2)

Not all participants in the study were required to have ethics training or to have ongoing ethics training, however all participants acknowledged that ethical practices are essential to their skills as an expert supervisor. The ability to be flexible with supervisees and the approaches they take in supervision is a necessity as supervisee and client needs shift week to week.

> I'm pretty flexible, even if not initially. I don't like change sometimes, but I can see the benefit of change [even if I] might not agree. I'm willing to go with it and

> try it and make the best of it. I think being willing to change and adapt that you have to [as a supervisor]. (Participant 4)

Supervisors ability to be empathetic and responsive was a part of building relationships with supervisees as well as contributed to their flexibility with supervisees. In building relationships with supervisees, participants shared the importance of confrontation or directly addressing the issues they were seeing or experiencing with supervisees.

> I'm more comfortable with [confrontation of supervisees] because I know the potential consequences if I'm not. Not just for me, but for the individual that's receiving the services, that could be the person that's in the middle of that issue. Mental health care, all of the things that we do, have such a stigma already and then to put a not prepared provider in front of somebody and have it be damaging makes things so much worse for a future provider [and client]. (Participant 1)

Lastly, the knowledge that these participants held from their experiences as both a counselor and a supervisor, shaped their work in supervision. They held practical and theoretical knowledge from their experiences and training that could be used to support supervisees in their own growth and learning.

> I like to be laid back and collaborative, but I can also jump in if I know a yellow or a red flag is being waved. I can jump in and say, hey, let's do this instead. What about this? So I feel like I have the knowledge to back things up and then I can be, I can be very present with my supervisees. I think the biggest thing that I have seen for an effective supervisor, you have to have the knowledge, not just providing that unconditional support. (Participant 3)

Participant 1 felt his supervision journey has been shaped by necessity. However, his desire for people to experience good clinical care and feel supported also drove his work. Through knowledge gained from training and experience he was able to support his supervisees.

> I've always felt if this is the role that I'm going to be in, I need to be good at it. I need to make sure that the people that I am sending out into the world to help people have the right skills to do that. I don't want it to come back to me that they did damage to somebody because they weren't prepared, you know? Or they didn't know how to handle a situation. Or that they didn't feel supported enough to come to someone and say, I don't know what to do with this, please help me. (Participant 1)

Discussion

The purpose of the interpretative phenomenological analysis study was to understand the lived experiences of master's level supervisors in the field building their expertise as a supervisor and learning as they grow their multicultural competence. This research uncovered the need to better understand the experiences of supervisors practicing in the field. Counseling training centers, doctoral students, and internship sites create easy access for researchers to learn about practices and experiences of individuals providing or receiving supervision. By ignoring the work of supervisors practicing in the field, crucial data is missed and the experiences of those supervisors is lost. The pressure for a large output of research and published material may limit some researchers from pursuing community members. Participants in this study pursued their own growth and

development, based on need or opportunity. Supervisors in the field may experience having little direction when it comes to learning about supervision.

Participants in this study often advanced into supervisor roles with expectations of starting supervision immediately without having training or experience. They met their state requirements for training but continued to pursue more learning to perform at a higher level and out of a sense of professional responsibility to ensure they were providing necessary support to supervisees and clients. Through state requirements, supervisors are mandated a specific number of hours of training that vary greatly across the United States (Henricksen et al., 2019). Some states may require ethics trainings, some states do not. Some require ongoing supervision CEUs, other states only require the initial training. Supervision is a key form of training within the counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Yet, the structures set in place for supervisors across the United States are inconsistent (Henricksen et al., 2019). This study points to the various ways in which master's-level supervisors pursue learning about supervision and the characteristics that are exhibited by expert supervisors. Based on participants' frustrations with needing to seek out training and resources to grow as supervisors, this research speaks to the need for state guidelines and supervisor expectations to be more aligned in order to better support supervisors and create consistency across the field.

Best practices in supervision were established in 2011 (ACES, 2011), however, this document is not easily accessible on the ACA or ACES website. There are competencies for many different counseling topics available on the website, but not for supervision (American Counseling Association, n.d.). Learning from supervisors practicing in the field is important to better understand how their skills are developed and

expertise is built (Falender et al., 2013). Gaining insight into the experiences of those in the field can help to shape the training of future counselors and supervisors as well as provide better supports to those in the field, closing the research-practice gap (Hays et al., 2019). Previous research has explored the cognitions of and practices of expert supervisors (Kemer et al., 2014; Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020; Nelson et al., 2008). However, understanding the journey to building expertise has not been explored in counseling supervision. Understanding the experiences of training and learning for supervisors can lead to more intentional training requirements and expectations, as well as creating consistency across states. The themes from this study are: (a) advancement through opportunity or need, (b) the experience of good or bad supervision, (c) the participant's desire to learn or be better, and (d) characteristics of an expert.

Participants in this study all began their careers in a community mental health agency setting. During that time, various participants were placed in leadership roles even if they were not prepared to provide clinical or administrative supervision. Participants' were often placed into leadership roles, prior to having any supervision training. Once placed in a clinical supervision role, they were asked to pursue training within the year. In a recent workforce study, the ACA (2024) found that 11% of respondents worked in a community mental health setting and 38% were in private practice. However, the response rate was only 3.1% for the ACA study. It is possible that individuals who work in community mental health settings were less likely to respond to the survey. According to the report (ACA, 2024), those in community mental health settings have the highest debt, so participating in ACA membership may be less accessible, therefore they may have been less likely to participate in the survey. The lack of data from community

mental health settings is problematic because supervisors in agency settings may have support from other supervisors via consultation, but may lack training or direction for clinical supervision. All participants in the study started in community mental health and through much of that experience grew their expertise. There is little research that explores supervisors in community settings, more specifically community mental health settings (Hutman et al., 2021). Yet, these large agencies employ many new graduates seeking licensure supervision. For those in community health settings, trainings for supervision may be inaccessible due to time or financial constraints.

This research is a step in the direction of understanding experiences of those in community mental health, but also those in private practice. Hutman et al. (2021) worked to develop a competency based training program for public sector supervisors that fits the constraints and needs of a larger agency. In this study, none of the participants had access to that type of training. All participants had to pursue their own learning for supervision. Not all supervisor trainings are created equal and individuals who are only seeking to meet the requirements of their state supervision guidelines may miss out on important learning opportunities to grow their skills and gain the needed knowledge to support supervisees. Participants in the study pursued learning based on their interests and their identities, not to meet professional requirements. Some states represented in the study required supervision training to be state approved or NBCC eligible trainings. Participants were intentional in choosing their supervision training. Some even stayed in contact with trainers and training cohorts due to their positive learning experiences and the support they received.

Of the six participants in this study, two were licensed in more than one state and approved to supervise in more than one state. Participants in this study expressed the importance of maintaining ethical practices and the challenges of tracking the various requirements of multiple states for both themselves and their supervisees. Some participants found online supervisor communities to be useful when pursuing information about state requirements or supervisee issues. Supervisors who are approved to supervise in a state they are not currently residing in have to keep straight the various requirements for the counselor as well as the requirements for their own training as a supervisor for each state. Sixty nine percent of individuals who responded to a recent ACA Workforce survey were interested in multi-state licensing (ACA, 2024). As the field continues to move towards pursuing a compact for counselors for consistency in licensure requirements across states, further considerations need to be made regarding supervisors. Henricksen et al. (2019) found that across states there were similarities between states and jurisdictions but no consistency in supervisor licensure requirements. Consistency is needed to ensure that counselors are trained sufficiently and are receiving the supports from supervisors to help build their skills and advance the field.

Participants in this study shared various experiences of supervision and mentorship they received that shaped their current practices as a supervisor. Those positive experiences of supervision created a safe environment for participants to build and explore their skills as a clinician. As a supervisor, if they had positive mentorship experiences, they learned supervisor skills and felt more prepared. Ongoing support or mentorship is one way in which individuals can build expertise (Elvira et al., 2017; Wallin et al., 2019). Being supported by others as you learn a new role and new skills

leads to growth and testing of those skills and abilities, honing the theoretical knowledge in to practice. For those who experienced little support or negative supervision realized, they needed to seek out their own trainings, build their own networks, and create their own supervision narrative. The participants in this study all began their supervision career while in a community mental health setting. A white paper by the company Motivo, found that "geography, supervision fees, and finding supervisors with the right credentials are huge obstacles for new therapists looking to fulfill supervision requirements" (McCrickard, n.d.). Those in community mental health settings are most likely to experience burnout (ACA, 2024) and having a supportive and skilled supervisor has potential to change experiences of burnout if new clinicians are supported in their roles (Byeolbee & Sojeong, 2024; McCarty et al., 2023).

The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) outlined that, "counseling supervisors are aware of and address the role of multiculturalism/diversity in the supervisory relationship". However, it does not provide specific guidelines for supervisors to use in their practice. The MSJCC (Ratts et al., 2016; Fickling et al., 2019) or the broaching continuum (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2019) are frameworks that supervisors can use to infuse their work with multicultural practices. Most participants in the study had never heard of the MSJCC or the broaching continuum. However, the work they reported doing with their supervisees reflected these frameworks. Having knowledge of these academic articles or the ability to access them, may be limited for individuals practicing in the field, but it does not mean they are not practicing in a way that aligns with the research. Having clearer structure for supervisors in the field can help to create more consistency in the training and expectations of supervisors. It provides clearer guidelines for how to

train supervisees as well as provide more support to supervisors as they work to adhere to the ACA code of ethics.

Participants in this study made a commitment to their training which was evidenced by their willingness to pay for some of the training they received. Those working in agencies may have had financial support for CEUs, but much of the training costs were paid for by participants. The current costs of training to pursue an Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) designation ranges in cost from $500 - $1,200 for various courses (cce-global.org), not considering the various ranges of tuition to enroll in a doctoral level supervision course. To receive a year of training and group supervision and pay fees on the top end of this range may not be accessible to all individuals in the field. Some participants, despite receiving some supervision training that was paid for while working in an agency setting, still chose to pursue more supervision training because of their interest and desire to learn more. For individuals to be equipped to supervise, as well as meet state credentialing, trainings needs to be accessible. The ongoing need for mental health professionals means there is also a need for supervision and training of those new clinicians. Hutman et al. (2021) found that through competency training offered to mental health professionals (licensed marriage and family therapists, social workers, and psychologists), multicultural competence was one of the largest increases in self-efficacy. Through intentional training, supervisors can practice with more competence to address multicultural issues in supervision. Participants in this study valued multicultural competence, and worked to grow their skills. This study stands out in that all participants valued this, and may not be common in other research. Understanding that personal drive shaped the expertise development and growth

accessible materials or support from counselor educators or supervisor mentors can be more specific in the guidance they provide.

The expertise developed by the individuals in this study aligns with expertise development within the counseling profession and other adjacent fields. The integrated development model (IDM) described expert supervisors as individuals who want to improve their skills and were able to adjust supervision to the developmental needs of the individual supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Expertise is developed over time and all participants fall within a range in which they have had time to develop and build their expertise. The present study explores more about development of their supervision expertise and less about their cognitions (Kemer, 2020). Through the building of their expertise, this study furthers research that the development journey is ongoing and unique to each individual (Alexander, 2003), yet outcomes still reflect expertise. Understanding expertise development and ways to support new and seasoned supervisors in building their expertise is important for building and maintaining a strong field of counselors (Elvira et al., 2017). Participants in this study are distinctive in that they pursue their own learning, above and beyond what might have been expected of them.

Limitations and Future Research

IPA illuminates an individual's idiosyncratic lived experience, emotions, and thoughts utilizing participants from a homogeneous group (Larkin & Thompson, 2012). This can make broader generalization more challenging. However, it can help counselor educators understand others' experiences and take those into account when it comes to teaching, training, research, and policy. Eligibility of participants and those who responded to the study may have been limited due to much of the communication being

through word of mouth or social media. This might limit the individuals who were aware of the study, therefore potentially missing out on important expert supervisor reports.

Additionally, despite attempts to define expertise broadly in the eligibility criteria, the term expert may be hard for some individuals to embrace and therefore limit those that responded to the call for participation. Multicultural growth and development may be a newer concept for some expert supervisors and therefore a knowledge gap for those who attended school many years ago.

As a White female, my identities may present a barrier to some participants and their willingness to fully share some of their experiences in supervision skill development. Future research of other homogenous groups would allow for exploring the unique experiences of various groups on broaching and how it shapes the supervision relationship. A case study of a supervision dyad would also be beneficial research to explore both the supervisor and the supervisee's experiences of broaching in the relationship. Further exploration is needed to understand supervisor requirements across states as the licensure compact continues to move forward and change the field of counseling and supervision.

Implications

Once practitioners have graduated from their master's programs, they may have little connection to the universities. Similarly, individuals in the field may be less aware of current research or practice trends, limiting the work they are doing supporting supervisees as they become less informed of current research and practices. Accessibility of research and training for supervisors is often hidden behind steep costs of major publishing companies or other organizations.

Training

Participants in the study often had to pay out of pocket to pursue training that built their skills as a supervisor, despite those trainings being a requirement of the state licensure boards. Agencies can sometimes provide supervisors with funding for CEUs but those in private practice have to intentionally set aside money to pursue training. Most participants in the study were not actively looking at current research, but relying on business leadership material and consultation with peers to learn. Creating access to information for supervisors better equips individuals to provide training, modeling, and mentorship to new practitioners. Creators of trainings need to be compensated for their work but creating accessible learning opportunities for all is necessary to build more equity in the field. Individuals can continue to learn about current data by looking for open access journals, such as *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, the *Journal of Counselor Preparation & Supervision*, and *The Professional Counselor*, to learn about supervision as well as using their ACA membership to access the *Journal of Counseling & Development* which is included with membership. Using the local library, alumni status from your university, or a guest membership to a local college library are other ways to access recent research publications. Additionally, scholarships for supervision training are available through NBCC to pursue their ACS credential (cce-global.org).

Trainings for current and future supervisors need to include frameworks and theories of supervision as well as an application of skills to allow individuals to apply and practice what they have learned. Those receiving instruction would benefit from training that takes place over a longer period of time, therefore allowing them to practice and receive feedback. However, this is not always feasible due to time and financial

constraints. Training needs to reflect not only the expectations for supervisors from the ACA Code of Ethics (2014) but also the best practices in supervision (Borders et al., 2014). Developing expertise includes practical learning, as well as reflective knowledge. Supervisor trainings need to allow time and space for supervisors to reflect on their own identities and the impact that can have on supervision relationships as well as how they support supervisees in addressing client needs.

Practice

For new and developing supervisors, building expertise is a personal journey, in which they continue to pursue learning and development, but also experience support (Wallin et al., 2019). Within a private practice setting, seeking out supervision of supervision or a consultation group for supervisors is a way to experience support and pursue ongoing growth. Multiple participants in the study used social media groups (e.g., Missouri Clinical Supervisors or Oklahoma Counseling Supervisors) to seek support from other supervisors. Engaging in local (e.g., Texas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision) or national supervision (e.g., Association for Counselor Education and Supervision) conferences can lead to ongoing learning as well as exposure to current research. Regional conferences for counselor educators and supervisors, such as North Central Association for Counselor Education & Supervision, may help make travel costs more manageable. ACES and regional ACES could work to promote their conferences to more practitioners, and not just academics. In community mental health settings, supervisors can seek out other supervisors or administrators who are open to supporting growing professionals. Networking with peers, seeking out leadership cohorts, or using local social media groups are ways to connect with those locally or within an

agency. Participants in the study continued to connect with internship or licensure supervisors, as well as trainers and learning cohorts, for ongoing support. Individuals can leverage the resources of agencies to their benefit by using training hours or training dollars to grow supervision skills and seek out consultation with peer supervisors.

Supervisors who view themselves as experts should consider ways in which they can give back to the field by supporting newer supervisors. They might host consultation groups for supervisors to build community and encourage skill development. One participant who still actively worked in community mental health discussed the cost of supervision for supervisees and making supervision costs more accessible. They viewed their work as a supervisor as a way to give back. They were able to offer lower cost supervision services as a part of their side business while working full time for an agency. Additionally, counselor educators and counseling programs may be able to support supervisors by offering accessible trainings or scholarships for trainings. Access to knowledge can help to create equity and advance skills across the profession. Community engaged research and advocacy can lead to more reflective research that supports the needs of counselors and supervisors (Barrio Minton et al., 2021).

Research

Counselor educators have a unique role as they are training current/future supervisors as well as continuing to research supervision and its many facets. For those individuals with tenure, privilege, and power, they can begin to push back against the expectations of academia in order to decrease the researcher-practitioner gap, making knowledge more accessible to people that have need of it in the field, and not just those in the academy (Murray, 2009). This could look like challenging systems and structures of

tenure, allowing for researchers and practitioners to be more involved in the community, building longer term relationships with community partners, and focusing on participant populations that will not turn out quick publications (Chan et al., 2019). Universities and the counseling field can continue to create open access journals that encourage practitioners to engage and learn about best practices and the field as it evolves. Counselor educators have an opportunity to mentor and provide supervision of supervision to new supervisors in the field. Finally, grant funding to support these ventures and those of other community-based endeavors would benefit not only counselor educators but those leaders who are practicing in the field as well.

Conclusion

The two studies in this dissertation explored the lived experiences of supervisors practicing in the field. The participants in these studies self-identified as experts in their practice as supervisors. Participants in both studies had a range of counseling experience from 13-34 years (M = 18.3) and had practiced as a supervisor for 6 to 16 years (M = 11.6). Only one participant held the Approved Clinical Supervisor credential, though all participants had completed enough supervision training hours to earn it. The participants in the two studies shared their experiences of training and of broaching in supervision. Article one explored:

> RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience the supervisor-supervisee relationship when addressing multicultural issues?
>
> RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors develop skills in broaching and addressing intersectional identities in the supervisory relationship?

Participants in the study found that discussing multicultural identities and their intersections was important from the very beginning of the relationship, as well as discussing their own identities as supervisors and their approach to the supervision relationship. This initial approach allowed participants to be direct in their supervision approach to address issues or concerns that may arise as well as exploring the relationship with the supervisee. Participants in the study expressed a desire to understand their supervisees experiences and support them in navigating how their identities might impact the work they do with their clients. Individual participants' approach to supervision was shaped by their identities and their experiences as supervisors and as counselors. Participants often had to be self-motivated to grow their skills as a supervisor, pursuing on going learning, even if their state did not require it.

Article two explored participants' journey of learning that brought them to the place of being an expert in supervision. Article two explored the following questions:

RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience building expertise?

RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors experience learning as they build their own multicultural competence?

Participants in the study shared characteristics and examples of their practices that make them experts in supervision. Participants spoke to the flexibility and ethics required of being a supervisor. The supervisors in this study were placed in leadership roles out of necessity or through a desire for growth. Their advancement in the field helped to shape their skills and created a need for ongoing learning. Participants in this study are unique in that they pursued further learning out of their own desires to excel in their role as a

supervisor. Their expertise was also shaped by experiences of supervision. Participants often had both good and bad examples that shaped how they chose to supervise.

Collectively, these studies speak to the need to understand more about the experiences of professionals in the field and the challenges and success that they have. Most of the current research focuses on individuals affiliated with a master's or doctoral program in counseling (i.e., students or faculty). Individuals who are a part of a master's or doctoral program are easily accessible participants. However, they make up a very small percentage of supervisors in the field. Those practicing in community mental health, although often a mix of social work, psychology, and counseling backgrounds,are rarely studied. The experiences of those practicing in the field are necessary to understand as they are supervising new practitioners and therefore shaping the practices of the counseling profession. The current studies take an important step in addressing the gap in the research.

Expertise has been previously studied in counseling (Kemer et al., 2017; Kemer, 2020) however those participants were mostly doctoral students or individuals who held a PhD. In these study, participants were required to hold only a master's degrees and not be enrolled in a doctoral program. Expertise should not be limited to those pursuing or holding doctoral degrees. In assuming a degree makes an expert based on the participants in expertise studies, much of the practical and procedural knowledge that has been built over decades of experience in the field is left out of the research literature. These studies speak to the skills and development of individuals who worked hard to gain knowledge and grow their skills. Expertise comes with ongoing lifelong learning (citation) and these

participants expressed their individual next steps for growth and development to continue their journey as supervision experts.

Based on the findings of these two studies, future researchers should be more community focused in learning about experiences of supervisors, regulations that shape their practice, and what makes their supervision effective. Possible ideas for future studies include dyads of supervisor/supervisee who practice in the field, pre/post tests for supervisors who participate in training to gauge their learning and growth, or longitudinal studies on supervisors continued learning.

Creating accessible knowledge for those in the field is something I desire to continue to do to make training and growth for supervisors more equitable. As a field, we need to continue to find ways to close the research-practice gap make research more accessible to those outside academia (Murray, 2009). Counselor educators can consider strategies for supporting supervisors at a local level through trainings or certificates. Finding ways to change the tenure expectations and narrative is an important step forward for the field to help supervision research permeate more widely. Expectations to crank out publications often means choosing research that is quicker and easier, and may be less impactful. Building community partnerships and pursuing populations that are harder to reach takes more time and possibly publications, but more wide reaching publications. Supervision is an important part of counselor development and should continue to be explored to better support supervisor development and the needs of new counselors.

References

Alabama Board of Examiners in Counseling. (2022). Alabama board of examiners in counseling administrative code. Author. https://abec.alabama.gov/about/law/administrative-rules/

Alase, A. (2017). The Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Guide to a Good Qualitative Research Approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(2), 9–19.

Alexander, P. A. (2003). The development of expertise: The journey from acclimation to proficiency. *Educational Researcher, 32*(8), 10–14.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision. (2011, April). Best practices in clinical supervision. https://acesonline.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ACES-Best-Practices-in-Clinical-Supervision-2011.pdf

American Counseling Association. (2014). ACA code of ethics. Author.

American Counseling Association (2023). ACA media kit. Author.

American Counseling Association, (n.d.). Competencies. https://www.counseling.org/resources/competencies

Arkansas Board of Examiners in Counseling and Marriage & Family Therapy. (2021). *Rules*. https://abec.statesolutions.us/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/2021-Rules-Clean-with-TOC-2-9-22.pdf

Attri, R. (2019). *The Models of Skill Acquisition and Expertise Development: A Quick Reference of Summaries*. Speed to Proficiency Research

Bautista-Biddle, M. M., Pereira, L. M., & Williams, S. N. (2021). The fallacy of "good training experiences": The need to protect psychology trainees from harassment and the imperative of multiculturally competent supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 15*(4), 323-330. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000353

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). Fundamentals of clinical supervision (6th ed.). Pearson Education.

Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 68*(2), 151–162.

Borders, L.D., Dianna, L.J., & McKibben, B. (2023). Clinical supervisor training: a ten-year scoping review across counseling, psychology, and social work. *The Clinical Supervisor, 42*(1), 164-212. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2023.2188624

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor, 33*(1), 26–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07325223.2014.905225

Byeolbee U., & Sojeong N. (2024). Social resources and professional identity: Predicting counselors-in-training's burnout and engagement. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 63*(1), 26–40. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12289

Chan, C. D., Henesy, R. K., & Erby, A. N. (2019). Toward praxis, promise, and futures of intersectionality in multimethod counseling research. *Counseling Outcome*

Research and Evaluation, *10*(1), 12–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2018.1562845

Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Farr, M. J. (Eds.). (1988). *The nature of expertise.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Chi, M. (2006). Two Approaches to the Study of Experts' Characteristics. In K. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. Feltovich, & R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp. 21-30). Cambridge University Press. https://doi:10.1017/CBO9780511816796.002

Chopra, T. (2013). All supervision is multicultural: A review of literature on the need for multicultural supervision in counseling. *Psychological Study*, *58*(3), 335–338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-013-0206-x

Code of State Regulations. Title 20- Department of Commerce and Insurance, Division 2095 (2023). https://www.sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/adrules/csr/current/20csr/20c2095-2.pdf

Committee for Professional Counselors (n.d.) *Thinking about supervising for licensure?* https://pr.mo.gov/boards/counselors/supervisioninfowebsite.pdf

Constantine, M. G., & Sue, D. W. (2007). Perceptions of racial microaggressions among Black supervisees in cross-racial dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(2), 142–153. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.142

Cook, R. M., Jones, C. T., & Welfare, L. E. (2020). Supervisor cultural humility predicts intentional nondisclosure by post-master's counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *59*(2), 160–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12173

Cook, R. M., & Welfare, L. E. (2018). Examining predictors of counselor-in-training intentional nondisclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(3), 211–226. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12111

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). 2016 CACREP standards. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2018). CACREP vital statistics 2017: Results from a national survey of accredited programs. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2019). CACREP Annual Report 2018. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum 1989*(1), 138–167.

Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Sage Publications Inc.

Crockett, S., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The influence of supervisor multicultural competence on the supervisory working alliance, supervisee counseling self-efficacy, and supervisee satisfaction with supervision: A mediation model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *54*(4), 258–273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12025

Day-Vines, N. L., Bryan, J., & Griffin, D. (2013). The broaching attitudes and behavior survey (BABS): An exploratory assessment of its dimensionality. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *41*(4), 210–223. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2013.00037.x

Day‐Vines, N. L., Wood, S. M., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Holman, A., Dotson‐Blake, K., & Douglass, M. J. (2007). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture during the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *85*(4), 401–409. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00608.x

Department of Commerce and Insurance. (2019). Code of state regulations: Committee for professional counselors. https://www.sos.mo.gov/cmsimages/adrules/csr/current/20csr/20c2095-1.pdf

Dollarhide, C. T., Hale, S. C., & Stone-Sabali, S. (2021). A new model for social justice supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *99*(1), 104–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12358

Elvira, Q., Imants, J., Dankbaar, B., & Segers, M. (2017). Designing Education for Professional Expertise Development. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 61*(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2015.1119729

Eklund, K., Aros-O'Malley, M., & Murrieta, I. (2014). Multicultural supervision: What difference does difference make? *Contemporary School Psychology*, *18*(3), 195–204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-014-0024-8

Evans, A., Tyre, Y., Gunther, D., Jenkins, M., McIntosh, K., & Bynum, B., (2021). An evaluation of licensed professional counselor-supervisors in Alabama. *Alabama Counseling Association Journal, 43*(1), 8-23.

Falender, C. A., Burnes, T. R., & Ellis, M. V. (2013). Multicultural clinical supervision and benchmarks: Empirical support informing practice and supervisor training. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 8–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012438417

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2004). Clinical supervision: A competency based approach. American Psychological Association.

Fickling, M. J., Tangen, J. L., Graden, M. W., & Grays, D. (2019). Multicultural and social justice competence in clinical supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *58(4)*. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12159

Goodyear, R. K. (1997). Psychological expertise and the role of individual differences: An exploration of issues. *Educational Psychology Review, 9*(3), 251–265.

Grant, J., Schofield, M. J., & Crawford, S. (2012). Managing difficulties in supervision: Supervisors' perspectives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *59*(4), 528–541. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030000

Hays, D. G., Bolin, T., & Chen, C. (2019). Closing the gap: Fostering successful research‐practice partnerships in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 58*(4), 278–292. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12157

Hays, D.G., & Singh, A. A. (2012) *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings.* The Guilford Press.

Hays, D. G., & Wood, C. (2011). Infusing Qualitative Traditions in Counseling Research Designs. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *89*(3), 288–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00091.x

Heidegger, M. (1962/1927). *Being and Time*. Blackwell.

Henriksen Jr., R. C., Henderson, S. E., Liang, Y.-W. (Melissa), Watts, R. E., & Marks, D. F. (2019). Counselor supervision: A comparison across states and jurisdictions. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *97*(2), 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12247

Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., Owen, J., Wang, K. T., & Thompson, M. N. (2016). Research design in counseling. (4th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hutman, H., Enyedy, K., Ellis, M., Goodyear, R., Falender, C., Campos, A., Bahadur, M., Dickey, Lore, Duan, C., Ferdinand, L., Nolan, S., Tribitt, T., Tsong, Y., Wood, L., & Zetzer, H. (2021). Training public sector clinicians in competency-based clinical supervision: Methods, curriculum, and lessons learned. *Journal of contemporary psychotherapy*, *51*(3), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-021-09499-3

Jones, C. T., & Welfare, L. E. (2017). Broaching behaviors of licensed professional counselors: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, *38*(1), 48–64. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaoc.12028

Jones, C. T., Welfare, L. E., Melchior, S., & Cash, R. M. (2019). Broaching as a strategy for intercultural understanding in clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *38*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1560384

Kemer, G. (2020). A comparison of beginning and expert supervisors' supervision cognitions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *59*(1), 74–92. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12167

Kemer, G., Borders, L. D., & Yel, N. (2017). Expert supervisors' priorities when working with easy and challenging supervisees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *56*(1), 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12059

Kemer, G., Borders, L. D., & Willse, J. (2014). Cognitions of expert supervisors in academe: A concept mapping approach. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *53*(1), 2–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00045.x

King, G., Bartlett, D., Currie, M., Gilpin, M., Baxter, D., Willoughby, C., Tucker, M. A., & Strachan, D. (2008). Measuring the expertise of paediatric rehabilitation therapists. *International Journal of Disability, Development & Education, 55*(1), 5–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120701654522

King, K. M. (2021). "I want to, but how?" Defining counselor broaching in core tenets and debated components. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *49*(2), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12208

King, K. M., Borders, L. D., & Jones, C. T. (2020). Multicultural orientation in clinical supervision: Examining impact through dyadic data. *The Clinical Supervisor, 39*(2), 248-271. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2020.1763223

King, K. M,. & Jones, K. (2019) An autoethnography of broaching in supervision: Joining supervisee and supervisor perspectives on addressing identity, power, and difference, *The Clinical Supervisor*, *(38)*1, 17-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1525597

King, K. M., & Jones, K. (2019). An autoethnography of broaching in supervision: Joining supervisee and supervisor perspectives on addressing identity, power, and difference, *The Clinical Supervisor*, *(38)*1, 17-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1525597

Larkin, M., & Thompson, A. (2012) Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In A. Thompson & D. Harper (Eds.), Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy: A guide for students and practitioners (pp. 99–116). Wiley.

Manley, K., & Garbett, R. (2000). Paying Peter and Paul: reconciling concepts of expertise with competency for a clinical career structure. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 9*(3) 347-359. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2702.2000.00408.x

McCarty, D. L., Christian, D. D., & Stefurak, T. (2023). Adlerian-informed supervision: Protecting counselors from burnout and improving client outcomes in the juvenile justice system. *Psychological Services, 20*(2), 318–325. https://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000641

McCrickard, R. (n.d.). The mental health therapist shortage starts at graduation: How to help the 57% that never attain licensure. Motivo. https://motivohealth.com/whitepaper-the-57-percent-who-never-attain-licensure

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of perception. Trans. C. Smith, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mitchell, M. D., & Butler, S. K. (2021). Acknowledging intersectional identity in supervision: The multicultural integrated supervision model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, *49*(2), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12209

Miller, R. M., Chan, C. D., & Farmer, L. B. (2018). Interpretative phenomenological analysis: A contemporary qualitative approach. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(4), 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12114

Minton, C.A.B., Gibbons, M.M. and Hightower, J.M. (2021), Community-engaged research and evaluation in counseling: Building partnerships and applying program evaluation. *Journal of Counseling & Development, (99*)210-220. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12368

Murray, C. E. (2009). Diffusion of innovation theory: A bridge for the research-practice gap in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 87*(1), 108–116. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00556.x

National Center for Interstate Compacts (2023). https://counselingcompact.org.

Nelson, M. L., Barnes, K. L., Evans, A. L., & Triggiano, P. J. (2008). Working with conflict in clinical supervision: Wise supervisors' perspectives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*(2), 172–184. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.2.172

Neuer Colburn, A. A., Grothaus, T., Hays, D. G., & Milliken, T. (2016). A delphi study and initial validation of counselor supervision competencies. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *55*(1), 2–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12029

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar‐McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *44*(1), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035

Singh, A. A., Appling, B., & Trepal, H. (2020). Using the multicultural and social justice counseling competencies to decolonize counseling practice: The important roles of theory, power, and action. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *98*(3), 261–271. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12321

Smith, J. A. (1996). Beyond the divide between cognition and discourse: using interpretative phenomenological analysis in health psychology. *Psychology and Health, 11*, 261-271.

Smith, J.A., Flower, F., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Sage.

Soldner, J. L., McCarthy, A., Levine, A., & Taylor, A. (2022). Professional disposition considerations in clinical supervision: A social justice and disability perspective. *Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Journal*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.52017/001c.57696

Stewart, D. W., & Johnson, E. A. (2021). The relational-expressive dual-continuum model of clinical supervisor training. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 17(2), 142–148*. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000393

Stoltenberg, C. D. & McNeill, B. W. (2010). *IDM supervision : An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Vandament, M. L., Duan, C., & Li, S. (2021). Relationships among supervisee perceived supervisor cultural humility, working alliance, and supervisee self-efficacy among white supervisor and supervisee of color dyads. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 16(3), 244–252*. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000370

Wallin, A., Nokelainen, P., & Mikkonen, S. (2019). How experienced professionals develop their expertise in work-based higher education: a literature review. *Higher Education, 77*(2), 359–378.

Watkins, C. E. (2021). Rupture and rupture repair in clinical supervision: some thoughts and steps along the way. The Clinical Supervisor, 40(2), 321–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2021.1890657

Watkins, J., Clifton, Hook, J., Mosher, D., & Callahan, J. (2019). Humility in clinical supervision: Fundamental, foundational, and transformational. *The Clinical Supervisor*, (*38)*1, 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1487355

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Ramaeker, J., & Ramos, M. J. (2016). Repairing the ruptured supervisory alliance: Humility as a foundational virtue in clinical supervision. The Clinical Supervisor, 35(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2015.1127190

White-Davis, T., Stein, E., & Karasz, A. (2016). The elephant in the room: Dialogues about race within cross-cultural supervisory relationships. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, *51*(4), 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091217416659271

Wilcox, M. M., Winkeljohn Black, S., Drinane, J. M., Morales-Ramirez, I., Akef, Z., Tao, K. W., DeBlaere, C., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Watkins, C. E., Jr., & Owen, J. (2022, September 5). A brief qualitative examination of multicultural orientation in clinical supervision. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,* 53(6), 585–595. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pro0000477

Wind, S. A., Cook, R. M., & McKibben, W. B. (2021). Supervisees' of differing genders and races perceptions of power in supervision. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 34(2), 275–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2020.1731791

Wong, L. C. J., Wong, P. T. P., & Ishiyama, F. I. (2013). What helps and what hinders in cross-cultural clinical supervision: A critical incident study. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 66–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012442652

Appendix

Appendix A: Informed Consent

University of Missouri–St. Louis

Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Project Title: " Multicultural Competencies and Developing Expertise in Supervision"

Principal Investigator: Mary Martha Abernathy, LPC, NCC

Department Name: Educational Sciences and Professional Programs

Faculty Advisor: Phil Waalkes, PhD, LPC, NCC

IRB Project Number: 2097576

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to explore supervisor's perceptions of how master's level supervisors develop multicultural competencies and expertise as a supervisor.

To participate in this study, you must fit all of the following criteria:

(1) have practiced counseling for a minimum of twelve years, with a minimum of five years' experience as a supervisor.

(2) hold a master's degree in the counseling profession (clinical mental health counseling, marriage and family).

(3) have not completed a doctoral program. Some states use doctoral supervision courses as a requirement to be certified as a supervisor, therefore coursework for supervision will not prohibit interested individuals from participating.

(4) self-identify as holding advanced skills, being wise, experienced, or an expert in supervision.

(5) identify as being flexible in their cognitive thought processes, as well as being skillful with confrontation, conflict and evaluation in supervision.

(6) have knowledge of and practice self-reflection regarding the impact of power and privilege on the supervision and counseling relationships.

Your participation will involve a survey which will ask you questions about your experience in supervision, number of supervisees, and years in supervision, as well as demographic information. The survey will take approximately 7-10 minutes. Following completion of the survey, two 45-60 minute interviews will be conducted over a secure zoom. During the interviews, you will answer questions about your experiences developing multicultural competence and expertise as a supervisor. Interviews will be audio and video recorded and transcribed. In total, your participation will take about 90-120 minutes.

For your time and effort, we will be offering compensation in the amount of $100 after the completion of each interview.

There is a loss of confidentiality risk associated with this research due to a video chat interview. This will be minimized by using a secure zoom, data will be stored on a secure server, and data collected will be coded so as to remove the identity of the participants. In any publications, pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity. Answering questions about your multicultural approaches in supervision practice and your intersectional identities may feel somewhat uncomfortable.

There are no direct benefits for you participating in this study.

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or withdraw your consent at any time. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or withdraw.

We will do everything we can to protect your privacy. As part of this effort, your identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this study. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection) that would lead to disclosure of your data as well as any other information collected by the researcher.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, Mary Martha Abernathy (314-669-1040) or the Faculty Advisor, Dr. Phil Waalkes (314-516-6086). You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the University of Missouri–St. Louis Office of Research Compliance, at 314-516-5972 or irb@umsl.edu.

Appendix B: Demographic and History Survey

Name:

Title:

Credentials you hold:

Years practicing as a counselor:

Years practicing as a supervisor:

Number of supervisees to date:

Number of active supervision relationships:

What state(s) are you licensed in to practice as a counselor/ supervisor?

What interests you about being a supervisor, keeps you practicing as a supervisor?

Most impactful trainings, materials, books you have completed/used for supervision growth/development

Are there theories or models of supervision you use?

Age:

Disability:

Religion:

Race:

Gender:

Education:

Ethnicity:

Sexual orientation:

Other identities that are important to who you are as a supervisor and human?

What types of supervision have you provided: Site supervision for master's internship, practicum supervision for master's student, licensure supervision, other?

Do you primarily provide in person or virtual supervision?

What languages do you speak fluently?

What languages have you provided supervision in?

In what contexts have your provided supervision in: rural, urban, suburban

Do you identify yourself as an expert or holding advanced skills as a supervisor?

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Article 1:

RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience the supervisor-supervisee relationship when addressing multicultural issues?

RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors develop skills in broaching and addressing intersectional identities in the supervisory relationship?

Multicultural issues in supervision may look like:

> "a working knowledge of the factors that affect worldview; . . . self-identity awareness and competence with respect to diversity in the context of self, supervisee, and client or family; competence in multimodal assessment of the multicultural competence of trainees . . . models diversity and multicultural conceptualizations throughout the supervision process; models respect, openness, and curiosity toward all aspects of diversity and its impact on behavior, interaction, and the therapy and supervision processes; initiates discussion of diversity factors in supervision" (Falendar & Shafranske, 2004, p.149).

But multicultural issues can also look different and unique in every relationship. Understanding your view and how you experience multicultural issues in supervision is what is most important.

1. How do you define multicultural issues in supervision?
2. How have you experienced discussing multicultural issues in supervision?
3. Please describe one particular experience of openly discussing multicultural issues in the supervision relationship.
    a. What did it feel like to address multicultural issues? What were some of the thoughts/feelings you had when addressing this in supervision?
4. How do you feel your own identities influenced your broaching behaviors or multicultural practices in supervision?

5. Can you share a time when you had a learning experience/growth moment/lightbulb moment addressing multicultural issues in the supervision relationship?
6. Can you share an experience of a rupture and repair moment?
7. What else that we haven't covered do you think is important to your experiences of addressing multicultural issues in supervision?

Article 2:

RQ1: How do master's-level supervisors experience building expertise?

RQ2: How do master's-level supervisors experience learning as they build their own multicultural competence?

Expertise can be defined in many different ways. It will be important to understand how you experience and view expertise for the purpose of this research. Expertise may result from the number of years practicing in the field as a clinician or supervisor. It may look like your ability to organize and assess knowledge or experiences (Attri, 2019). It may look like a progression of skills and knowledge that leads to more intuitive practices. Expertise may also happen through intentional reflection on your intersectional identities and engagement with communities.

1. Tell me about your journey of development as an expert supervisor.
2. Please describe for me your experience of how training as a supervisor has helped build your multicultural competencies in practice, in as much detail as possible.
3. What influenced your training path for supervision?
    a. What model/framework(s) do you use as a supervisor, if any?

   b. How did state or ACA training guidelines shape your supervision training

4. What skills and dispositions do you possess that make you an effective supervisor?

5. How has your training path been different from other supervisors?

6. What steps do you think you need to take to continue to build your expertise?