THE COMPLEXITIES OF POWER IN FEMINIST MULTICULTURAL PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISION: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

by

Alexis Victoria Arczynski

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Psychology

The University of Utah

August 2014

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of **Alexis Victoria Arczynski**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Susan L. Morrow	, Chair	**December 6, 2013** Date Approved
Christina E. Gringeri	, Member	**December 6, 2013** Date Approved
Donna M. Hawxhurst	, Member	**December 6, 2013** Date Approved
Janiece L. Pompa	, Member	**December 6, 2013** Date Approved
Lauren M. Weitzman	, Member	**December 6, 2013** Date Approved

and by **Anne E. Cook**, Chair/Dean of

the Department/College/School of **Educational Psychology**

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

Supervision is described as a central method for teaching psychotherapy, wherein licensed psychotherapy clinicians facilitate the development of supervisees' clinical capabilities and skills, transmit the values and ethics inherent in the counseling profession, address issues of client wellbeing, and foster integration of multicultural perspectives into clinical training. Supervisors with a feminist multicultural (FMC) approach to counseling are uniquely positioned to train prospective psychologists about the knowledge, awareness, and skills necessary for clinical work with multiculturally diverse clients, because the basic tenets of FMC are congruent with multicultural competency. Although extensive literature exists on clinical supervision, little scholarship and research has focused specifically on the FMC perspective. In an effort to understand the conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision, the present study explored the experiences of 14 supervisors who utilized FMC principles in their supervision practice. A qualitative grounded theory design employed individual initial interviews, follow-up interviews, and feedback interviews. Via grounded theory analysis procedures, a conceptual model emerged to explain how FMC supervisors conceptualize and practice supervision. Analysis yielded the core category *Dealing with the Complexities of Power*. The FMC supervisors in this study anticipated the consequences of their power-laden supervisory roles and actions by utilizing the remaining conceptual categories in their conceptualization and practice of supervision. The ways in which they conceptualized the

complexities of power included (a) *Having Inordinate Power in the Supervisory Role*; (b) *Complexity of Power Manifesting in Identities and Statuses*; (c) *Having Responsibilities Within and Beyond the Supervision Relationship*; (d) *Managing Tensions Between Responsibility, Power, and Egalitarianism*; (e) *Empowering Supervisees*. The model was illustrated by participants' own words. The conceptual model may be used to teach supervisors-in-training of an empirically derived FMC model of supervision and may be used to augment the practice of supervisors currently in practice.

This dissertation is dedicated to my ancestors. Your time on this earth left indelible impressions on my spirit. From you I was offered tenacity, perseverance, and resilience. To you, Babcia, Wiesiek, William, and Tadeusz, I offer this and all future works.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Tables

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to extend my gratitude to those supervisors who participated in this study. I am deeply thankful that you shared your professional journeys, experiences, and reflections with me. I felt inspired by each of you and your individual approaches to supervision. I feel incredibly privileged to know and learn from each of you. I sincerely hope that your energy, time, experiences, and beliefs are accurately reflected in the results of this study. Each one of you provided your experiences, requesting nothing in return except that I publish these findings to advance FMC supervision. Believe me, this is my goal.

Next, I thank all those individuals who supported me through the dissertation process. From beginning to end, my supervisory committee provided instructive feedback that helped me shape a research design that led me to my desired end: a model of supervision that integrated feminism and multiculturalism. As the chair of my committee, Sue Morrow provided me with support, wisdom, guidance, and challenge. I am grateful for all that I have learned both personally and professionally from you. You inspire my professional dreams and personal visions. Thank you for soothing my early-career researcher anxieties and providing a foundation from which I could grow into the professional I am today. In addition, I want to thank the Qualitative Research Group members who listened to me and pushed my development as a qualitative researcher.

Last, I want to acknowledge the extraordinary support of the many individuals who have surrounded, buttressed, and loved me. Without each of you, I would have surely quit long ago. I want to thank my doctoral cohort: Jim, Megan, Stephanie, Tiffany, and Whitney; we motivated one another to forge our individual journeys, traverse difficult terrain, and arrive at our individual destinations the wiser. I want to thank my Women's Resource Center colleagues and past supervisors in California and Utah who showed me what FMC supervision, consultation, and mentoring looks like in its application. You inspired this study and me. I also want to share my gratitude for the many individuals who provided supportive resources to keep me emotionally, cognitively, and physically "fed" through the journey of this dissertation. Specifically, I want to thank my many families. I thank my mom, dad, and sister as members of my biological family; Brooke, Tiffani, and Stacey as members of my Cali family; the members of my "Living the Promise" family; Halley, Jenny, and Will as members of my SLC family; and my emerging Eugene family. To each of you I am indebted for a lifetime.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As a "fourth force" in psychotherapy (Pedersen, 1991, p. 6), multiculturalism values being able to appreciate, recognize, and work with culturally diverse people. Given the ethical imperatives to develop multicultural knowledge by recognizing and learning about the cultural and sociopolitical experiences in client behavior, needs, and development (American Psychological Association [APA] Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs, 1993); to develop multicultural awareness through understanding the potentially detrimental biases towards culturally different clients; and to integrate culturally appropriate skills into counseling interventions (APA, 2003), it is important that psychologists are trained to be multiculturally sensitive and competent practitioners.

Supervision is described as a central method for teaching psychotherapy; it is a rigorously concentrated, interpersonal, one-on-one relationship wherein licensed psychotherapy clinicians function as supervisors for clinicians-in-training so as to facilitate the development of clinical capabilities and skills in supervisees, transmit the values and ethics inherent in the counseling profession, and address issues of client wellbeing (Hoffman, Hill, & Freitas, 2005; Majcher & Daniluk, 2009). Therefore, in conjunction with the ethical imperative to integrate multicultural perspectives into clinical training, supervision is a key opportunity to foster that integration. Further,

supervisors who identify with a feminist multicultural (FMC) orientation to counseling are uniquely positioned to train prospective psychologists about the knowledge, awareness, and skills necessary for clinical work with multiculturally diverse clients, because the basic tenets of FMC are congruent with multicultural competencies. Counseling psychology and other helping fields have written extensively on clinical supervision, but little has focused specifically on the FMC perspective (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). This paucity of scholarly examination of FMC supervision theory and methods is of concern, given the congruence of focus of FMC theory and counseling psychology on the importance of multiculturalism (Szymanski, 2003). Counseling psychology promotes a contextualized view of human functioning and emphasizes the importance of diversity issues—central tenets of FMC theory and practice. Thus, it is imperative that we understand how FMC theory impacts supervision practices.

FMC supervision offers an important perspective that is otherwise lost in the traditional supervision literature. FMC authors have criticized traditional models of psychotherapy supervision due to (a) an emphasis on superior/subordinate structures rife with abuses of power leading to unsafe supervisory environments wherein supervisees feel uncomfortable engaging in self-exploration, supervisees' individuality is rejected, and supervisees' behavior is pathologized; (b) the promotion of sexist, racist, classist, heterosexist, and intrapsychic behavioral interpretations while sociocultural and contextual interpretations are ignored; and (c) a lack of attention to the political nature of counseling and the importance of social change (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Szymanski 2003). This fundamental analysis of traditional supervision processes suggests that FMC supervisors may have an alternative and valuable view of how to conduct psychotherapy

supervision. Unfortunately, little empirical literature exists regarding the groundbreaking and relevant FMC lens of supervision practice.

Definition of Terms

The terms *social locations, culture, multicultural, intersecting identities, feminist supervision, multicultural supervision,* and *FMC supervision* will be utilized throughout this dissertation. These terms are ambiguous, and the definition of each can vary from person to person and text to text. Thus, these terms are defined here for the purpose of this study. Social locations refer to demographic variables, socio/cultural identities, and reference group categories including, but not limited to, gender (e.g., women, men, transgender, gender queer); ethnicity/race (e.g., Black/African American, white/Caucasian/European American, Latino/a, Asian American/Pacific Islander, East Asian, Native American/American Indian, multiracial); generational/immigration status (e.g., third generation United States citizen, citizen of Mexico, dual citizen of the United States and Mexico); sexual orientation (e.g, lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, questioning, pansexual); religious or spiritual affiliation (e.g., Jewish, Catholic, Hindu, Muslim, pagan, agnostic, atheist); ability status (e.g., able-bodied, physical/orthopedic disability, blind/visually impaired, deaf/hard of hearing); class background (e.g., lower, middle, upper class, working poor, poor); age; and physical appearance (e.g, attractiveness, size) (L. S. Brown, 2010). This study rests on a foundation of an inclusive definition of multiculturalism (D.W. Sue & D. Sue, 2008). In this broad definition of multiculturalism, culture is defined as "the dynamic and active process of constructing shared meaning, as represented by shared ideas, beliefs, attitudes, values, norms, practices, language,

spirituality, and symbols" (Vargas, Porter, & Falender, 2008, p. 122). Therefore, the inclusive definition of multiculturalism used in this study is one in which individuals' experiences with a range of social locations and cultures have an impact on their worldviews, values, biases, and experiences of privilege and/or marginalization and power and/or oppression.

The inclusive definition of multiculturalism used in this study also purports that sociocultural identities are intersecting and intersectional. When describing *intersecting identities*, Greene (2010) suggested that human identity is formed out of a

> Stable but flexible matrix of multiple intersecting identities that may shift in salience depending on the complicated nature of both time, place, historical period and relationship context in interaction with developmental junctures and individual temperamental characteristics. (p. 470)

The term *intersectionality* formed out of Black feminist criticisms of second wave feminists' homogenization of the diversity within the category of gender and emphasis of the centrality of sexism in all forms of oppression (Collins, 1990). Collins defined intersectionality as examining the impact of interactions between social locations on systemic oppression. Collins specified that discrimination based on factors such as race, gender, and/or sexual orientation do not occur independently; rather, they are interrelated.

Porter (2010) described the process of feminist supervision as integrating feminist principles into the supervision process. When describing the components of feminist supervision, she wrote:

> Strives to empower and avoid abuses of power, is informed by social context and social constructivist perspectives, is collaborative and reflexive while maintaining standards of ethics and quality, fits the unique developmental needs of each participant, and promotes organizational advocacy and community activism on behalf of clients and emerging therapists. (Porter, 2010, p. 3)

The definition of multicultural supervision incorporates two dimensions: (a) a quality of

being open, curious, and respectful toward the complex cultural interactions that occur between clients and counselors/supervisees, as well as counselors/supervisees and their supervisors due to each party's cultural identities (e.g., gender, ethnicity/race, immigration status, sexual orientation, ability status, class background, religion/spirituality, age, physical appearance), which impact the process, content, and outcomes of supervision and counseling (M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Constantine, 1997; Garrett et al., 2001; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Westefeld, 2009); and (b) the processes of assessing and enhancing the multicultural competence of supervisors and supervisees (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Westefeld, 2009). Ancis and Marshall (2010) defined multicultural competence in counseling as developing an awareness of our culturally constructed assumptions and biases, enhancing our knowledge of diverse groups, expanding our skills to work most effectively with diverse people, taking on responsibilities outside of traditional counseling roles (e.g., advocacy, activism). Competent multicultural supervisors enhance supervisees' multicultural competence by modeling multicultural conceptualizations in the supervision process and initiating discussions of cultural factors in the supervision process so that trainees can implement discussions of multiculturalism and diversity in their work with clients (Falender, Burnes, & Ellis, 2013; Westefeld, 2009).

FMC supervision entails merging the theory and practice of feminist supervision with the theory and practice of multicultural supervision. Though no formal definition of FMC supervision has been articulated in the literature, FMC supervision involves political analysis of power inequities within supervisory relationships, in clinical relationships, and clients' lives; a collaborative and developmental approach; reflexivity

(e.g., self-reflection on one's biases and assumptions that impact the therapeutic and/or supervisory relationship) for both supervisors and supervisees; a social action framework; attention to the advancement of multicultural competencies for supervisor and supervisee; and attentiveness towards the implications of intersecting cultural identities on the process, content, and outcomes of counseling and supervision (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Kulpinski, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1985, 1995, 2010; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003).

The Current Study

The present study explored the processes of FMC psychotherapy supervision from the perspectives of supervisors in order to elucidate the concepts and processes inherent in FMC supervision practice. In this chapter, I review the literature related to feminist supervision and multicultural supervision to highlight the broad literature pertaining to these fields. I then narrow the focus to FMC supervision. The current FMC supervision literature lacks empirical grounding, as all the models of FMC supervision to date are theoretical in nature. Thus, this study provided an empirical understanding of what FMC supervisors did in psychotherapy supervision. I conducted a grounded theory study of FMC supervision; here, I describe the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the rationale for using qualitative research.

Literature Review

A goal of this study was to extend the literature on the related, yet divergent, fields of feminist supervision, multicultural supervision, and FMC supervision. To

provide the relevant background, I review the conceptual models and empirical literature of these fields, highlighting major themes; explore the limitations of or gaps in the existing literature; and discuss how the study will advance the existing literature.

Feminist Supervision

Feminist supervision practice developed out of a desire to broaden the consciousness of counseling trainees while also enhancing the quality of therapy for women (Porter, 1985). Feminist supervision involves the application of feminist principles to the process of supervision. Multiple feminist supervision conceptual models exist (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Nelson, 1997; Porter, 1985; Porter & Vasquez, 1997), although few empirical studies have been conducted (Burnes, 2013; Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996; 2008; Prouty, Thomas, Johnson, & Long, 2001; Szymanski, 2003). I review major themes of feminist supervision conceptual models, as well as empirical research and information regarding model organization.

Review of the Feminist Supervision Literature

The major themes of feminist supervision conceptual models include *feminist identity development; relationships; power analysis; awareness and examination of diversity and social context;* and *advocacy, social action, and change*. Each theme will be described below.

Feminist Supervisor Identity Development

In their qualitative studies, Kulpinski (2006) and Prouty (1996) examined feminist supervisor identity development. Burnes and colleagues (2013) explored process variables in feminist supervision in their qualitative study. Kulpinski (2006) and Prouty (1996) found that being a feminist supervisor was an expression of feminist values, not training. Prouty and Burns and colleagues found that feminism was a lens that guided feminist supervisors' work with supervisees. Feminist supervision was integral to feminist supervisors' personhood; it was an expression of their worldviews (Kulpinski, 2006; Pouty, 1996). Prouty found that feminist supervisors highlighted feminist identity development as a process and journey that lasts a lifetime.

Kulpinski (2006) found that feminist supervisors developed their feminist identities through informal teaching and mentorship by feminists, whereas Prouty (1996) found that supervisors were better able to employ a feminist supervisory style if they had feminist support. Porter and Vasquez (1997) posited that nonhierarchical, collaborative relationships foster the development of feminist communities. These communities are necessary for neophytes and mentors alike, because communities attenuate "battle fatigue" inherent in feminist practice. Szymanski (2003) found that connection with a community of women was correlated with feminist supervision practice.

Relationships

Several authors have stressed that feminist supervisory relationships are characterized by collaborative, nonauthoritarian relationships (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Szymanski 2003). Kulpinski (2006) found that a major goal of supervision was to teach

and model “a vision of relationship that embraced awareness of, and sensitivity to, the existence of power dynamics, the sharing of one's power with others, and the facilitation of powerfulness in others” (p. 106). According to Prouty (1996), the feminist supervisory relationship was important for safety in training and required the supervisor to be present in and responsible for the relationship. Because the supervisory relationship is power disproportionate due to the evaluative responsibility of the supervisor, the supervisor must take an active role to reduce the power differential and emphasize more egalitarian relationships (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003; Taylor, 1994). Burnes and collegues found that feminist-identified supervisors utilized an inductive approach to supervision, wherein supervisees were encouraged to lead the session (Burnes et al., 2013).

The supervisory relationship is guided by mutual respect of individual opinions, values, and worldviews of the participants. Burnes and colleagues (2013) found that the feminist theoretical variables of promoting self-care, nurturing others, and connecting emotionally pervaded the group supervision process of feminist-identified supervisors. Prouty (1996) and Kulpinski (2006) found that feminist supervisory relationships were based on a foundation of reciprocal and mutual partnership values by challenging, supporting, and respecting one another. Supervisees’ autonomy is encouraged through facilitation of supervisees’ trust and confidence in their authority and competence, mutual feedback, collaborative goal setting, and collaborative negotiation of theoretical orientation to assist empowering the voices of supervisees and increasing their trust in themselves (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Kulpinski, 2006; Porter, 1985; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003). This modeling of feminist relationships assists in

supervisee development, because supervisory relationships are models for counseling relationships.

Though feminist supervisors worked to be collaborative and egalitarian with supervisees, Prouty (1996) and Prouty et al. (2001) found that feminist supervisors would engage in more hierarchical methods of supervision when clients were in danger due to supervisees' lack of experience or negligence. However, supervisors worked to share power in these situations by providing detailed explanations of their behavior to empower supervisees to engage in ethical service to clients.

Along with the responsibility to maintain client safety, Kulpinski (2006) found that feminist supervisors had ethical responsibilities to the supervisory relationship. Feminist supervisors were responsible to maintain ethical boundaries with supervisees so as to maintain an environment of safety, wherein supervisees felt safe to explore their development as therapists; supervisors engaged in supervision with supervisees instead of providing therapy to supervisees; and supervisors self-disclosed only for the purposes of furthering their relationships with supervisees.

Porter and Vasquez (1997) suggested that developing an egalitarian, nonhierarchical, and nonauthoritarian supervisory relationship develops a space of safety and trust in supervision, which assists in the engagement of power analysis and self-examination. Thus, the supervisory relationship is central to the formation of the other hallmarks of feminist supervision. To promote the supervisory relationship, FMC supervisors may self-disclose about their historical experiences or experiences within supervision (Burnes et al., 2013). Within the supervisory relationship, feminist supervisors are open to supervisees' experiences, are authentic with supervisees, and are

reflexive in an effort to build collaborative and nonauthoritarian supervisory relationships while also modeling the processes that supervisees can use in their work with clients (Kulpinski, 2006; Porter & Vaszquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996). In order to build this type of relationship, feminist supervisors engage in power analysis.

Power Analysis

Power is a central topic to feminist theory and practice and, therefore, a focus of feminist supervision (Burnes et al., 2013). Within their theoretical models of feminist supervision, Hipp and Munson (1995) and Porter (1985) emphasized that, though egalitarian relationships are fostered in feminist supervision, one cannot ignore the power differentials both in the lives of clients and in supervisory relationships. As emphasized by Porter and Vasquez (1997), supervisors explore how they use their power and privilege in ways that may lead to supervisees feeling unsafe in supervision. They suggest that supervisors be proactive in analyzing power in supervisory relationships.

Evaluative power can be used as a way to empower supervisees or to exert control over supervisees (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). For example, supervisors can either foster supervisees' self-efficacy in counseling by emphasizing taking risks developed out of their conceptualizations, or they can force supervisees to take certain directions in counseling processes. The latter emphasizes supervisees' dependence on supervisors, whereas the former emphasizes supervisees' autonomy and self-reliance. As described by Porter (1985), "Supervisors can empower the trainee by listening to and working with the trainee's goals and jointly establishing supervisory objectives and criteria for performance" (p. 335). Authors note that supervisors evaluate because of their role as

gatekeepers to the profession, but they can do so in ways that are power-sharing instead of power over. Examples of sharing power include demystifying supervision processes before engaging in supervision, providing feedback to increase supervisee awareness and skill while not shaming the supervisee, and respecting supervisee self-disclosure instead of rooting out psychopathology. Prouty (2008) found that, when environments emphasized challenge combined with guidance and trust, supervisees felt the necessary safety to take risks and grow.

In their feminist ecological model of supervision, Gentile, Ballou, Roffman, and Richie (2010) emphasized the importance of expanding the examination of power and called for supervisors to engage in an "examination of context, multilayered analysis, and underlying power dynamics" (p. 142). Their suggestion was not only to account for the influence of social locations on power in supervisory relationships but also to critically explore how structures marginalize or privilege clients, clinicians, and supervisors as well as how clients, counseling relationships, and supervisory relationships are affected.

Empirical studies have shown that feminist supervisors believed that they bear the responsibility to be proactive and direct when attending to, analyzing, and reconceptualizing power in the supervisory relationship (Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003). Supervisors take action to initiate conversations that deconstruct the power dynamic and explore variables that augment the power imbalance (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Szymanski, 2003). By opening this discussion, power dynamics can be examined and diminished.

By identifying and deconstructing variables that contribute to power differentials in supervision relationships (e.g., proscribed roles in supervisory relationships and larger

culture and privileges embedded in larger social structures), feminist supervisors model techniques that parallel ways that feminist clinicians balance and share power in counseling processes (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Kulpinski, 2006; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996, 2008; Szymanski, 2003, 2005). For example, by demystifying the process of feminist supervisory methods, supervisors can model demystification of counseling processes with clients. Modeling is a central process by which feminist supervisors can impart their knowledge and experience to their supervisees with regard to power analysis, examination of diversity, and advocacy (Gentile et al., 2010; Prouty, 2008).

Awareness and Examination of Diversity and Social Context

Supervisors not only have the responsibility to engage in power analyses with supervisees; they also have a responsibility to engage in conversations that challenge supervisees' racist, heterosexist, and patriarchal assumptions (Taylor, 1994) and develop a recognition of how the voices of oppressed groups are marginalized and trivialized (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). Burnes and colleagues (2013) found that feminist-identified supervisors attended to sociocultural issues that affected supervision and clinical work. Szymanski (2003) found that feminist supervisors developed an understanding of how the context of sociocultural variables affect mental health, and Prouty (2008) found that feminist supervisors allowed supervisees to experiment with new social and clinical identities. Szymanski's (2005) study emphasized that these responsibilities were paramount in feminist theory, counseling, and supervision.

Kulpinski (2006) and Prouty (1996) found that feminist supervisors believed that honing the self as an instrument is central when building awareness of and examining

social contexts and diversity. Kulpinski and Prouty discovered that feminist supervisors worked to become aware of their own attitudes, beliefs, values, biases, judgments, privilege, oppression, and experiences of socialization and to understand the impacts of these factors on their supervisees' experience of supervision. Feminist supervisors then facilitated this process for their supervisees in their work with their clients.

Kulpinski's (2006) results emphasized that feminist supervisors assisted supervisees in understanding the impact of societal and cultural conditions (e.g., power, privilege, and oppression) on client functioning. Prouty (1996) found that feminist supervisors assisted therapists to be more knowledgeable of different clients, to be flexible in therapeutic approaches based on diversity factors, and to be aware of how diversity impacts the therapeutic relationship. By examining contextual impacts on client functioning, feminist supervisors could support supervisees in deconstructing the limitations of diagnostic systems, developing a critical consciousness regarding the process of diagnosis, and enhancing supervisee growth, conceptualizing their clients' symptoms as positive coping versus pathology. In fact, conversations about social locations, diversity, and power had powerfully positive effects on the supervisory working alliance and on supervisee satisfaction and comfort (Prouty, 2008). Thus, it is imperative that supervisors challenge supervisees in an atmosphere of safety and respect.

This consciousness-raising process is modeled by supervisors' explicit examination and monitoring of their language, biases, assumptions, and stereotypes (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 2008) while engaging in supervisory functions. By attuning to the social contextual nature of counseling and supervision, supervisors impart knowledge of feminist practices to their supervisees and lead to larger societal change.

Advocacy, Social Action, and Change

In her research, Szymanski (2005) illuminated the relationship between feminist supervision practice and feminist advocacy. Social action, advocacy, and change were found to be major guiding principles of feminist theory: feminists worked toward enhancing the personal power and lives of all oppressed groups (e.g., women, sexual minorities, disabled individuals, ethnic minorities, and the young and aging) to make a better world (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Kulpinski, 2006; Szymanski, 2003; Taylor, 1994). As described by Gentile et al. (2010), feminist supervisors model social action in their lives and explore options for social action in supervision in efforts to contribute to supervisee development. A social action framework in supervision includes building supervisees' awareness of the needs of marginalized communities.

Social action begins in supervisors' work with supervisees, given their vulnerable position. Within educational, training, and community contexts, feminist supervisors provide advocacy for their supervisees and clients (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). Kulpinski's (2006) research confirmed Porter and Vasquez's assertion in her finding that feminist supervisors advocate for their supervisees. This includes challenging colleagues' behavior when supervisees are targets of sexism, heterosexism, or racism (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). Feminist supervisors advocate for positive and facilitative supervisory practices in their colleagues. They educate their colleagues about fair, appropriate, and ethical treatment of supervisees, while also modeling these qualities in their own work.

Along with modeling social action and advocacy in the workplace, Szymanski (2003) found that supervisors also taught supervisees about feminist perspectives, embodied feminist actions and attitudes, and assisted supervisees in learning feminist

counseling practice. In their work with supervisees, feminist supervisors promote links between therapy practices and social change (Porter & Vasquez, 1997). Supervisors provide their supervisees with opportunities to engage in social change by engaging in their own political activities in the surrounding community. For example, they provide services to disadvantaged groups because few clinicians in the area address these groups; challenge and educate entities that perpetuate damaging stereotypes because they feel they have a responsibility to do so for the public good; and address legislative bodies because they have expert knowledge regarding the negative effects of current systems on the mental health of marginalized groups. These actions allow their supervisees to have first-hand knowledge of the radical change they can create in their communities to raise "the quality of life to its highest level for all" (Hipp & Munson, 1995, p. 26).

Developmental Implications of Feminist Supervision Models

One feminist supervision conceptual model incorporated a developmental trajectory of supervision (Porter, 1985). After describing the principles and goals associated with feminist supervision explicated in the themes described above, Porter provided a four-step progression of feminist supervision. In the first stage, Porter suggested that supervisors introduce a feminist perspective through a didactic focus of comparing feminist and traditional intervention literature and exploring how to use feminist literature to develop treatment plans for clients. This stage affords trainees personal distance while a safe and collaborative supervisory relationship develops, setting the stage for a climate conducive for supervision aimed at personal awareness.

In stage two of her model of feminist supervision, Porter (1985) suggested moving toward exploring the effects of sexism and socialization on women socioculturally. This involves a process in which supervisors assist supervisees to move away from "purely psychological, individualized, or ahistorical analysis of behavior, toward an understanding of the role of cultural, historical, and environmental factors" (p. 337). Supervisors assist supervisees to resist conceptualizing symptoms as pathology, and instead conceptualize symptoms as coping with stress, oppression, and trauma.

The third stage of Porter's (1985) model of feminist supervision involves supervisors assisting supervisees in exploring their own internalized sexism and how supervisees' assumptions impact their expectations, goals, and behavior within the therapeutic relationship. Supervisors work to help supervisees understand where their assumptions developed and how they can negatively influence the therapeutic process.

The final stage of Porter's (1985) model involves assisting supervisees to understand the importance of a collective perspective in which supervisees look for community resources for clients, supervisors support supervisees' social justice activism efforts, and supervisees provide clients with group options. Thus, movement from an individual perspective to a group perspective is emphasized not only for clients but also for the personal lives of supervisees.

Porter (1985) emphasized a stage approach to feminist supervision to support the developmental needs of supervisees while also emphasizing the importance of the development of a collaborative and supportive supervisory relationship. In addition, moving from a sociocultural analysis to a personal analysis makes the process more effective, limiting defensiveness on the part of the supervisee.

Prouty (1996) found developmental implications of feminist supervision practice. Feminist supervisors worked to have collaborative relationships with their supervisees. However, depending on the developmental needs of their supervisees, supervisors would engage in collaboratively hierarchical supervision. Prouty (1996) found that feminist supervisors were more hierarchical and directive with less experienced supervisees. By attending to the developmental needs of supervisees, feminist supervision is made more meaningful for supervisees (Porter &Vasquez, 1997).

Feminist supervision literature has moved into a stage of scholarship wherein researchers have begun to empirically examine feminist principles employed in supervision practice. I have elucidated the major themes of feminist supervision scholarship. Next, I will critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of the feminist supervision literature base.

Critical Analysis of the Feminist Supervision Literature

This study expanded the empirical and conceptual literature pertaining to feminist supervisory practices. Major contributions to the empirical base of feminist supervision included Burnes and colleagues (2013), Kulpinski (2006), and Prouty's (1996) qualitative studies examining feminist psychotherapy supervision process and Szymanski's development of the Feminist Supervision Scale (2003) and quantitative examination of the relationship between feminist identity and feminist supervision practice (2005). Since the publication of these studies, attention to and integration of FMC tenets into feminist supervision has increased (Nelson et al., 2006). The current study adds to existing

knowledge by supplying an explicitly multicultural focus on feminist supervision and participant sampling.

Multicultural Supervision

Due to the increasing diversification of the population of the United States; growing visibility of marginalized persons in struggles for human rights; and a strengthening agenda of multiculturalism in research, practice, and ethics of psychology, multicultural supervision has developed to enhance the competence of counseling professionals to meet the needs of a diverse clientele (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009). Multicultural supervision involves the application of multicultural competency guidelines to enhance the effectiveness of supervisors in meeting the needs of diverse supervisees and clients. Within the field of multicultural supervision, multiple conceptual models exist (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Garrett et al., 2001; Hird et al., 2001). Three empirical studies have been conducted on the conceptual model developed by Ancis and Ladany (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Inman, 2006; Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009), and one model was empirically derived (Constantine, 1997). I will review the major themes of multicultural supervision conceptual models and empirical research, including information regarding model organization, and I will summarize an exemplar model.

Review of the Multicultural Supervision Literature

The major themes of multicultural supervision conceptual models include *multicultural competencies, scope of focus, barriers, working alliance, addressing difference, and enhancing competence*. Each theme will be described below.

Multicultural Competencies

Many authors have provided overviews of multicultural competencies to conceptualize how clinicians and supervisors demonstrate multiculturalism (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). Multicultural competencies for counselors included the following (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Constantine & Ladany, 2001): (a) multicultural awareness (e.g., reflecting on one's multicultural identities; consciousness of the impact of one's cultural identities on one's assumptions, biases, and values; and understanding the dynamic interplay of the above on the counseling relationship); (b) multicultural knowledge (e.g., familiarity with the impact of multicultural group membership on the lives of clients generally, understanding of the culture of specific clients, and awareness of clients' worldviews); and (c) multicultural skills (e.g., counselor self-efficacy and ability in engaging in interventions appropriate for their clients' cultural context and building a culturally appropriate working alliance).

Supervisor multicultural competence involves similar components. However, supervisors are responsible for both their supervisees and their supervisees' clients. Supervisor multicultural competence includes the following components (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Falender et al., 2013; Fouad et al., 2009; Westefeld, 2009): (a) Multicultural awareness (e.g., supervisors' awareness of their own

cultural identities; awareness of culturally bound assumptions, biases, and values; awareness of the impact of their cultural identities on the supervisory relationship and counseling relationship; and awareness of their own cultural identity development); (b) multicultural knowledge (e.g., knowledge of counselor multicultural competencies, understanding of supervisee and client cultural identities, familiarity with the impact of supervisee and client cultural identities on their life experiences, awareness of multiculturally responsive supervision theory, and consciousness of the ethics related to multicultural supervision and counseling); and (c) multicultural skills (e.g., ability to negotiate goals and tasks for supervision that are culturally appropriate and collaboratively developed, capacity to effectively assist supervisees in attaining multicultural counseling skills, capability to assist supervisees in gaining multicultural knowledge, ability to help supervisees in developing advocacy and social action skills, and means to assess supervisee readiness to work with culturally different clients).

Due to the expansiveness of the above guidelines for multicultural competence, Arthur and Collins (2009) proposed that prior training is a necessity for supervisors and counselors. Thus, supervisors and counselors are encouraged to have prior education in multiculturalism by taking coursework in multicultural counseling. Additionally, supervisors are implored to have prior training in supervision. Still, it is the case that many supervisors have not yet received formal training in supervision (Falender et al., 2013). Falender and colleagues, therefore, emphasize competency-focused supervision. Therefore, supervisors should explore the boundaries of their own competence so they are better able to assess the multicultural competence of their supervisees.

Scope of Focus

Conceptual models of multicultural supervision appear to have either a more limited or broader scope of focus. Some authors focused their models on the effect of multicultural competence on the supervision dyad (i.e., supervisors and supervisees only). Other authors expanded their focus to include the impact of multicultural competence on the supervision/counseling triad (i.e., supervisors, supervisee/counselors, and clients).

Those models that focused on the supervision dyad only (Constantine, 1997; Garrett et al., 2001; Hird et al., 2001) suggested that not discussing and exploring identity variables in the supervision dyad might affect the quality, process, and outcomes of supervisory relationships (Constantine, 1997). On the other hand, models that incorporated the client into their scope of focus (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995) suggested that cultures of the clinician/supervisee, supervisor, and client impact the triadic relationships (Arthur & Collins, 2009) and have an influence on the content, process, and outcomes of supervision and counseling (M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). Barriers can block the integration of multiculturalism within the supervisory relationship.

Barriers to Integrating a Multicultural Perspective into Supervision

The authors of multicultural supervision models have suggested that multiple barriers challenge the infusion of diversity into supervision. Arthur and Collins (2009) theorized that disparities between the supervisor and supervisee with regard to interest and expertise in multicultural competence could be a roadblock to multicultural supervision. For example, Constantine (1997) found that 70% of supervisees in her study

had prior formal training in multiculturalism in counseling, while 70% of supervisors had not. She asserted that not having the requisite training for working with diverse populations might have diminished the effectiveness of supervisors when working with diverse supervisees. Unfortunately, Arthur and Collins and Constantine theorized and Hird and colleagues (2001) found that there were implications for supervisors' effectiveness; ineffective supervisors may harm both their supervisees and clients.

A second obstacle to multicultural supervision occurs when time is not taken to explore cultural differences in the supervisory relationship. Constantine (1997) found that supervisees felt that their supervisory experience might have been better had their supervisors spent more time exploring cultural differences. Indeed, a subset of the participants in her study felt that their supervisors were reluctant to introduce topics regarding diversity in supervision sessions. In fact, supervisor participants in Constantine's study reported that multicultural issues were not important. Other participants indicated that they had not personally explored issues of multiculturalism. By not finding multicultural issues germane to supervision and by not taking the initiative to conduct self-exploration, supervisors may have neglected to take time to explore issues relevant to the experience of their supervisees.

A third obstacle involved the structural power of supervisors. Because of supervisors' experience, education, and responsibility for the welfare of their supervisees' clients, as well as their evaluative position (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Hird et al., 2001; Zapata, 2010), a power imbalance exists in supervisory relationships. Therefore, supervisors can exert control over the process and content of supervisory sessions. Due to

this structural power, supervisors may neglect the needs of supervisees to explore multicultural issues in supervision relationships or in counseling relationships.

Scholars have also discussed a fourth obstacle: supervisors' unawareness of their own biases and assumptions based on culture (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Garrett et al., 2001). By having unconscious or unexamined biases, supervisors may judge their supervisees' clinical behavior and conceptualization inappropriately. Arthur and Collins and Garrett et al. theorized that multicultural issues in the supervision or counseling relationships may be due to incongruence between supervisors' and supervisees' cultures, values, or identity development statuses.

Incongruence

M. T. Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) and Garrett and colleagues (2001) suggested that values or worldviews reflect different ways in which individuals interpret their relationships to their environment. Therefore, it is important for supervisors and supervisee/counselors to be aware of and understand the impacts of value incongruities prior to launching supervisory and counseling relationships in order to attenuate counseling or supervision disruption. M. T. Brown and Landrum Brown (1995) and Garrett and colleagues (2001) have provided theoretical values dimensions to assist in understanding congruence or incongruence in supervisory and counseling relationships. Values incongruence may relate to activity modality (e.g., being, doing, becoming); social relationships (e.g., individual, collateral, hierarchical); relationships between humans and nature (e.g., mastery over, subjugation to, harmony with); ways of knowing (e.g., via cognitive, affective, or cognitive affective); ways of reasoning (e.g., either/or

thinking, both/and thinking, circular thinking); nature of reality (e.g., objective versus subjective); nature of people (e.g., good, bad); concepts of time (e.g., present, future, past); and self-concepts (e.g., individual versus extended self). Garrett et al. (2001), M. T. Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995), and Zapata (2010) indicated that it is important that supervisors assist supervisees in understanding how values can impact therapy, and they suggested that supervisors facilitate exploration of the relative match between their own cultural values and the cultural values of supervisees.

Beyond values discrepancies, theorists have postulated that cultural differences from the general population of European Americans due to such factors as language, class, worldviews, experiences of oppression, ethnicity/race, education, and occupational experience (M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Zapata; 2010) may lead to values differences and biases. Theories of supervision and counseling are often based on values assumptions of the general population and may obstruct counseling and supervision. This may be because supervision has most often taken an etic approach, in which supervision is assumed to apply to the general population of clients, supervisees/counselors, and supervisors. Within cultural groups, differences can also lead to difficulties in the triadic relationship (due to language, cultural values, mental ability, nationality, migration history, urbanicity, reservation residential status, tribal identification, and occupational/educational history).

In an effort to examine the complexity of multicultural encounters in supervision, a subset of the models explored the value of looking at identity development as an indicator of cultural incongruence (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Hird et al., 2001). Instead of considering

demographic variables as a mode of understanding difference in the supervisory relationship, Hird and colleagues (2001) hypothesized that it is more explanatory to use identity development to facilitate articulation of relational difficulties. Authors of multicultural supervision models utilize identity development models to predict triadic relationships based on interactions of identity and the development attainment of supervisor, supervisee/counselor, and client (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). Arthur and Collins (2009) theorized that supervisors' level of identity development would have a direct effect on their ability to facilitate supervisee cultural identity development. Thus, it is important that supervisors work to develop their own identities to assist in working with their supervisees' clients.

Ancis and Ladany's (2001, 2010) Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Identity Development (HMNID) theorized supervisees and supervisors can be one of four types: (a) *progressive*, where the supervisor is at a higher level of identity development than the supervisee; (b) *parallel-advanced*, in which both the supervisor and supervisee are at similarly advanced levels identity development; (c) *parallel-delayed*, where both the supervisor and supervisee are at similarly delayed levels of identity development; and (d) *regressive*, in which the supervisee is at a higher level of identity development than the supervisor. For example, if supervisor and supervisee exhibit a regressive interpersonal interaction, there would likely be difficulty developing a supervisory working alliance, the supervisee's multicultural competence might be impaired, and the supervisee's advanced identity development would buffer his or her supervisor's ineffective supervision and provide stronger client outcome.

A Collaborative and Reciprocal Supervisory Working Alliance

Some authors have suggested that the working alliance is important in the supervisory relationship; a strong working alliance creates an atmosphere of safety and trust when developing multicultural competence (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Hird et al., 2001; Ladany, 2005). Arthur and Collins (2009) and Hird and colleagues (2001) suggested creating an environment of reciprocal learning wherein a collaborative process is engendered to support supervisee safety. Though the therapeutic relationship is distinct from the supervision relationship, similar processes take place (e.g., goal orientation, participant personal and professional development, increased awareness). Psychotherapy outcome research has demonstrated that the quality of the therapeutic relationship was related to positive psychotherapy outcomes. (Norcross, 2002; Wampold, 2001). Further, Tyron and Winograd (2011) found that goal consensus and collaboration in the therapeutic relationship were related to better treatment outcomes. Thus, it can be extrapolated that the supervisory working relationship is relevant to the outcome and process of multicultural supervision.

Arthur and Collins (2009) and Garrett and colleagues (2001) recommended that supervisors should facilitate dialogues about expectations in supervision as a valuable component of building strong supervisory working alliances. This includes discussions on cultural expectations regarding the role of supervisors, supervisees, and the process of supervision. Supervisors and supervisees can collaboratively determine the roles they take in supervision. Further, Garrett and colleagues (2001) suggested that supervisors work to understand the supervisees' values and collaboratively clarify the supervisory environment surrounding such topics as confidentiality in supervisory relationships,

supervision goals, behaviors of supervisors and supervisees, communication style of supervisors and supervisees, and intervention strategies in supervision. By exploring these topics, Garrett et al. (2001) suggested that supervisory relationships would better reflect supervisees' cultural values.

Arthur and Collins (2009) and Hird et al. (2001) recommended that supervisors model how to engage in multicultural supervision through self-disclosure and by being genuine and authentic with supervisees. Arthur and Collins suggested that supervisors share their multicultural competency journey, including uncovered biases and assumptions, challenges, struggles, and learning experiences. By sharing their stories, it authors suggested that supervisees would feel validated, their experience normalized, and their competence enhanced. As found by Zapata (2010), supervision that incorporated multicultural discussions became intensely personal and involved self-disclosure by supervisors. Further, self-disclosure involved sharing new information and processing disclosures to enhance supervisees' learning of how to employ self-disclosure with clients. Supervisees in this study reported being thankful for the depth of conversation present in supervision that incorporated multicultural dialogues.

Addressing Cultural Difference in Supervision

Beyond clarifying expectations and sharing multicultural competence stories, Arthur and Collins (2009) and Constantine (1997) posited that supervisors should address cultural differences early in the relationship, instead of avoiding addressing cultural differences or waiting for supervisees to bring up cultural differences. Inman (2006) and Mori, Inman, and Caskie (2009) found that supervisees were more satisfied with

supervision, and the working alliance strengthened, when supervisors were more multiculturally competent. Gatmon et al. (2001) and Zapata (2010) found that the supervisory working alliance was stronger when discussions about difference took place.

The working alliances between supervisor and supervisee as well as supervisee and client can be negatively impacted when discussions of difference do not take place. Arthur and Collins (2009) suggested that supervisees' case conceptualization skills can be stymied, and individuals with marginalized status can feel oppressed. M. T. Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) and Hird et al. (2001) hypothesized that, in this situation, clients may become frustrated, feel marginalized, and become resistant, whereas counselors may become defensive or over identify with their clients. Further, supervisees may become frustrated and resistant to supervision, may self-silence, and may not develop appropriately as clinicians, and supervisors may experience countertransference and may patronize supervisees. By exploring differences, supervisors can more effectively enhance their supervisees' multicultural competence.

Role of Supervision in Enhancing Multicultural Competence

Ladany (2005) recommended that supervisors be on the lookout for either overt or covert indications of supervisees' stumbling blocks to multicultural competence. Overt indicators include supervisees stating that a client's cultural identity is an obstacle to effective counseling, supervisees indicating a struggle to connect with a culturally different client, or supervisees taking an overgeneralizing perspective (e.g., all clients can benefit from nondirective counseling). Covert indicators can be illuminated from

discussion and may include omitting culturally relevant information or dismissing the importance of culture in an intervention.

Supervisors need to explore supervisees' affect when they experience multicultural learning experiences (e.g., supervisees experience guilt when made aware of unintentionally abusing their privilege in session; Ladany, 2005). Supervisors can normalize supervisees' experiences and then assess supervisees' level of knowledge. Supervisors should explore their own cultural identities; worldviews associated with cultural identities; value systems associated with cultural identities that impact supervisory approach and strategies; knowledge of supervisees' world views based on cultural identities; challenges to working with culturally different supervisees; and ways to resolve lack of awareness, knowledge, and skills (Constantine, 1997).

Constantine (1997), Hird and colleagues (2001), Garrett and colleagues (2001) recommended and Zapata (2010) found that supervisors facilitate supervisee exploration of multiculturalism to assist supervisees in: (a) understanding how culture impacts how they perceive culturally different clients and, conversely, how culture impacts how clients see them; (b) understanding how culture impacts implementation of theoretical orientation, conceptualization of clients, and planning for treatment; (c) exploring salient parts of supervisees' cultural identity to enhance identity development; and (d) exploring with supervisees their interpretation of what happens in their counseling experiences, their perceptions of the client's responses in session, and their rationale for interventions.

Exemplar Model

Many of the models explored provide a fragmented perspective of multicultural supervision. The model developed by Ancis and Ladany (2001, 2010) provides a more fully articulated framework for multiculturally competent supervision, integrating the fragmented literature into a synthesized whole. To provide an exemplar of the multicultural supervision literature, I will provide an overview of this theory. Thus, I will describe the following aspects of the supervisor multicultural competence model: (a) multicultural knowledge, (b) multicultural awareness, and (c) multicultural skills.

Supervisor Multicultural Knowledge

Supervisors need to gain an intellectual understanding of three areas of practicing multiculturally competent supervision. Ancis and Ladany (2001, 2010) suggested that supervisors need to: (a) develop knowledge about components of counselor multicultural competence; (b) review literature pertaining to traditional models of supervision and literature relevant to supervision that integrates multiculturalism; (c) and be familiar with the ethical principles, guidelines, and standards relevant to multicultural supervision and multicultural counseling.

Supervisor Multicultural Awareness

As briefly described above, Ancis and Ladany (2001, 2010) developed a conceptual model for developing self-awareness of one's cultural identities and how they can impact interpersonal relations. HMNID provides a heuristic model for understanding supervisors', supervisees', and clients' emotions, behaviors, and thoughts associated with

different levels of identity development. First, Ancis and Ladany (2010) articulated that any cultural identity could either be a socially privileged group (SPG; e.g., man, straight, White, able-bodied, upper class) or socially oppressed group (SOG; e.g., woman, gay, person of color, disabled, working class).

Second, for each cultural identity, individuals progress through similar stages of identity development, called Means of Interpersonal Functioning (MIF), that are exemplified in behaviors that arise out of thoughts and feelings about self and others. The four stages of MIF are based on Helm's (1995) model of racial identity development but have been expanded to be inclusive of all demographic variables. The first stage, *adaptation,* is exemplified by complacency and indifference to oppressive contexts and a shallow appreciation of differences based on cultural identities. The second stage, *incongruence,* is illustrated by experiencing uncertainty and minimal awareness of marginalization and oppression due to personal experiences. The third stage, *exploration,* is typified by anger directed at oppressive environments and enhanced awareness of cultural issues. The fourth stage, *integration,* is characterized by advanced awareness and ability to interpersonally interact with SOGs and SPGs. MIF provides a conceptual model for multiple cultural identities, to articulate how individuals can have different levels of development for different cultural identities.

Ancis and Landany (2010) suggested that supervisees and supervisors at different MIF stages exhibit differing behaviors relevant to supervision and counseling. Below I provide sample behaviors for each stage. In the incongruence stage, supervisors and supervisees are not likely to consider cultural identities important to clinical work or supervision and are likely to take an individual pathology view versus accounting for

contextual variables influencing clients' presenting concerns. Supervisors and supervisees in the incongruence phase are unlikely to bring multicultural issues into supervision; supervisors may be dismissive of multiculturalism and supervisees may collude with supervisors, and both may explore their identities in private. In the exploration stage, supervisors and supervisees may overemphasize multicultural issues in supervision and counseling, supervisors may excitedly begin to facilitate supervisee self-awareness without the skills to follow through, and both may struggle to integrate multicultural and personal issues in client conceptualization. Finally, in the integration stage, supervisors develop skills in advocacy and social change and sharing power in supervision, supervisors and supervisees spend more time building multicultural self-awareness, supervisors and supervisees are able to discuss cultural differences in supervision and counseling, and supervisees and supervisors are aware of how personal cultural development can impact counseling and supervision.

Supervisor multicultural awareness also encompasses an understanding of how MIF can impact the supervisor-supervisee-client triad (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). The four supervisor-supervisee relationship types were outlined above under *Incongruence*. These relationships include progressive, parallel-advanced, parallel-delayed, and regressive. Ancis and Ladany (2010) suggested that each of these supervision relationship types predicts the supervisory relationship, supervisee development of multicultural competence, and clinical outcomes. As supervisors enhance their multicultural awareness and knowledge, supervisors can move toward advancing multicultural skills they implement in supervision.

Supervisor Multicultural Skills

Ancis and Ladany (2010) conceptualized supervisor multicultural skills as pertaining to five domains: (a) supervisor-focused development, (b) supervisee-focused development, (c) conceptualization, (d) interventions, (e) process, and (f) outcomes. Ancis and Marshall (2010) conducted a qualitative analysis of these multicultural skills. Their findings are integrated with Ancis and Ladany's (2010) descriptions. The supervisor-focused development dimension pertained to supervisors' ability to self-reflect on their identities, values, biases, competence boundaries, assumptions, and participation in continuing growth and education. Ancis and Marshall (2010) found that supervisors proactively discussed issues of multiculturalism in supervision; showed awareness of the clinical impact of marginalization; and self-disclosed their biases, identities, and experiences in supervision. The supervisee-focused development dimension referred to facilitating supervisee development of self-reflection, knowledge, and skills. Ancis and Marshall found that supervisors were able to facilitate dialogue on the influence of the supervisee's cultural identities on clients and were able to aid supervisees in enhancing awareness through experience and dialogue. The conceptualization dimension concerned integrating the impact of individual pathology, contextual elements, and oppression on case conceptualizations. Ancis and Marshall found that supervisors were able to assist supervisees in exploring their assumptions and biases and were able to assist supervisees in taking the client's perspective. The interventions dimension pertained to increasing supervisee flexibility in intervention application and use of multiculturally appropriate interventions. Ancis and Marshall found that supervisors were able to help supervisees in engaging in collaborative goal setting and enhancing clients' awareness of social impacts

on their functioning. The process dimension referred to a supervisory relationship epitomized by respect, collaboration, and open-mindedness. Ancis and Marshall found that supervisors were accepting, created a safe supervisory relationship, and initiated discussions about power in supervision. Finally, the outcome dimension involved evaluating the multicultural competence of supervisees and evaluating the outcomes of therapy for the client. Ancis and Marshall found that supervisors were able to identify supervisees' areas of growth and areas of strength and that supervision improved client outcome.

Multicultural supervision, as found in empirical and theoretical literature, is developing into a strong literature base. Engaging in multiculturally competent supervision has been described above. Next, I will critically examine the existing multicultural supervision literature.

Critical Analysis of the Multicultural Supervision Literature

Currently, the multicultural supervision literature has a large empirical base that has explored such topics as the value of providing multicultural supervision (Constantine, 2001); the preparation of supervisors to provide multicultural supervision (Constantine, 1997); the resulting low frequency of conversations about culture (Gatmon et al., 2001), which is linked to microaggressions perpetrated by unaware supervisors (Constantine & Sue, 2007); the effects of supervisors' multicultural competence (e.g., Inman, 2006); the examination of supervisees' experiences in multicultural supervision (e.g., impacts of supervisor unresponsiveness to cultural concerns; Burkard, 2006); and the exploration of

discrete aspects of cultural identities and their development, including sexual identity, racial/ethnic identity, spiritual identity, and gender identity (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Though there is a significant empirical foundation in multicultural supervision, few authors have pieced together the empirical knowledge into an integrated conceptual framework. Only two models have an empirical basis, those developed by Ancis and Ladany (2001, 2010) and Constantine (1997). The current study added to the multicultural supervision literature base by providing empirical data that extends the current multicultural literature by integrating the evidence into a larger conceptual framework. A conceptual framework provides supervisors with a lens through which to view and understand the complexity of supervision practice (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Feminist Multicultural Supervision

FMC supervision practice developed out of the critiques of women of color, identified feminists, and womanists who argued that feminist scholarship has historically marginalized the experiences of women of color, elevating gendered oppression as "the worst oppression" (Nelson et al., 2006), and neglecting intersections of identity (L. S. Brown, 1990; Porter, 1995). Due to these concerns, Nelson and 16 members of the American Psychological Association's Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) Section for the Advancement of Woman conference (2006) worked to articulate themes pertinent to an FMC conceptualization of supervision, and Porter (1995) developed her own theoretical model for integrating feminist, antiracist, and multicultural elements into supervision. To date, no empirical literature has evaluated the FMC literature, nor have empirically derived models been developed. In the following section, I will review the

major themes of the FMC supervision models, highlighting and focusing on elements that go beyond separate feminist and multicultural models of supervision. I will then provide a critical analysis of the literature to sum up the findings of FMC supervision literature.

Review of the Feminist Multicultural Supervision Literature

The major themes of feminist supervision conceptual models include *developmental FMC supervision, using caution when engaging in FMC supervision,* and *power inequities in the supervisory relationship*. Each theme will be described below.

Developmental Feminist Multicultural Supervision

Porter (1995) suggested that FMC supervision brings together feminist critical analysis and cultural analysis to the process of supervision practice, thereby integrating a multilayered analysis of oppression in the lives of clients. In her theoretical model, Porter valued a developmental approach, wherein supervision moved through sequential stages to anticipate the needs of supervisees. This process emulates Porter's (1985) model presented in the review of feminist supervision but incorporates ethnicity, race, and culture into the process. This is no easy task. Therefore, FMC supervisors work to prepare supervisees to expand their perceptions of therapy.

Nelson et al. (2006) suggested that incorporating FMC theory into supervision is anxiety-provoking for both supervisees and supervisors, because discussions incorporating feminism and multiculturalism elicit feelings of guilt for historical oppression and fears of alienating supervisors or supervisees (Nelson et al., 2006). Porter's (1995) model incorporates the possibility that supervisee guilt, anxiety, and

defensiveness will occur. The model begins with a didactic process of teaching supervisees about a conceptual framework for integrating multiculturalism and feminism into their understanding of clients so as to assist supervisees in being intellectually prepared for deconstructing the sociocultural aspects of marginalization and oppression. Porter emphasized that supervisor enhancement of supervisee knowledge of feminist and multicultural perspectives of counseling are adjunctive to formal training; supervision is not a replacement for coursework in multiculturalism and feminism.

Porter (1995) and Nelson and colleagues (2006) theorized that the next step after enhancing supervisees' knowledge about feminism and multiculturalism would be a process wherein supervisors challenge supervisees to see the impact of socialization, acculturation, environment, and culture in clients' presenting issues versus having an individual pathology perspective. Then, supervisors can begin to assist supervisees in deconstructing their own internalized racism and sexism.

Nelson and colleagues (2006) suggested that self-disclosure can go a long way in de-escalating supervisee anxiety when exploring biases and assumptions. For example, it might be helpful for supervisors to discuss their own process in unearthing their internalized racism or sexism, how this impacted their clinical work, and how they managed such situations with their own supervisors and clients. Therefore, Nelson and colleagues (2006) recommended that it is important for supervisors to engage in thorough self-examination and self-evaluation of biases, assumptions, and limits of knowledge throughout their professional lives. Additionally, Nelson et al. (2006) emphasized that relationships are paramount to the development of both supervisees and supervisors.

Beyond the supervisory relationship, supervisors benefit from connection with other like-minded professionals. Nelson et al. (2006) speculated that feminist communities provide social support, limit professional isolation, and enhance development of appropriate supervision practice by changing the environments in which feminist supervisors reside (Nelson et al., 2006). Finally, Porter (1995) emphasized that, after supervisees have developed knowledge about feminism and multiculturalism, expanded their vision of clinical work to incorporate a sociocultural lens, and learned how to incorporate self-awareness of internalized sexism and racism, supervisees would begin to move from individual change to group change for their clients, as well as engagement in social change themselves. As an FMC perspective is integrated into supervision processes, supervisors prepare to engage in multicultural and feminist analysis so as not to distance themselves from their supervisees.

Using Caution When Engaging in FMC Supervision

Though it is the job of FMC supervisors to foster supervisees' development, Nelson and colleagues (2006) reasoned that there are potential risks for supervisors when integrating an FMC perspective into supervision. When discussing issues related to social locations in supervision, supervisors risk distancing supervisees when, for example, supervisors have minimal experience engaging in multicultural and feminist dialogues. Thus, it is important that supervisors foster their personal awareness of the limits of their professional knowledge when engaging in feminist political analysis and multicultural dialogues. Supervisors must assess their level of multicultural competence and facility with feminist theory and practice. Supervisors may make errors in their analysis of

gender or cultural issues in supervisory relationships (Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1995). Therefore, it is important for supervisors to seek support and consultation when beginning to engage in FMC supervision practice (Nelson et al., 2006).

As emphasized by Porter (1995), by initially engaging in a didactic and directive process of applying feminist and multicultural perspectives to clinical work with clients, in which supervisors provide alternative conceptualizations to traditional viewpoints, supervisors can avoid overwhelming supervisees by beginning to deconstruct supervisees' biases and assumptions before supervisees are prepared. Further, by providing information unknown to supervisees in an objective manner, supervisors can prevent supervisees from feeling judged or blamed. Later, when supervisors begin to challenge supervisees to take cultural, historical, and environmental perspectives on clients' presenting concerns, supervisors may expand supervisees' application of learned material. By staying in a sociopolitical perspective versus the personal (e.g., challenging supervisees' biases), supervisors prevent alienating supervisees.

Additionally, Nelson and colleagues (2006) recommended that supervisors attend to the relational dynamics of exploring social locations in supervision or risk alienating their supervisees. Supervisors evaluate their adeptness in using the communication skills necessary to process cultural differences between themselves and supervisees. Supervisors work to provide adequate preparation to their supervisees before carrying out multicultural dialogues. If not emotionally and cognitively prepared to engage in multicultural dialogues, supervisees may experience anxiety. Further, authors suggest that supervisors become equipped to manage and process emotions related to discussing culture, gender, race/ethnicity, and class backgrounds in supervision. Having evaluated

one's own preparedness to engage in multicultural and feminist analysis can assist supervisors in balancing power inequities between themselves and their supervisees.

Power Inequities in the Supervision Relationship

It is the role of FMC supervisors to work to deal with the power inequities in supervisory relationships while also working to support the empowerment of supervisees (Nelson et al., 2006). As suggested by Nelson and colleagues, the Eurocentric, masculinist basis of supervision that emphasizes a hierarchical relationship between supervisors and supervisees is an underlying cause of power inequities in the supervisory relationship. Power imbalance may be due to (a) the role characteristics of supervisor and supervisee, including the evaluative power of supervisors, the responsibility of supervisors for the care of supervisees' clients, and the responsibility of supervisors for supervisees' training; (b) the structural power of supervisors in the training site; and (c) the power and privilege differences between supervisors and supervisees due to race/ethnicity, culture, gender, and other statuses or identities.

Due to the traditional model of supervision, supervisors are expected to provide evaluation of supervisees' skills and gatekeeping to the profession. Thus, supervisors have the power to positively or negatively change supervisees' professional futures. (Nelson et al., 2006). Supervisors can, without self-examination and self-awareness, wield significant power in the lives of those they supervise. This is because of their privilege of knowledge, education, authority, and status.

Thus, to manage the power imbalances inherent in the relationship between supervisors and supervisees, Nelson and colleagues (2006) suggest that supervisors

engage in transparent discussion of their roles and responsibilities as supervisors, the roles an responsibilities of supervisees, and the expectations of the training site for what occurs in supervision. Supervisors demystify the power aspect of supervision by openly analyzing the Eurocentric, masculinist underpinnings to traditional supervision practice and explaining supervisors' responsibilities to supervisees and supervisees' clients. Further, Nelson and colleagues emphasized, it is the responsibility of supervisors to initiate discussions of power imbalances between supervisors and supervisees based upon cultural identities because of the inherent power inequities in the supervisory relationship.

Steward and Phelps (2004) examined the negative implications of hierarchy and power imbalance salient to the traditional definition of supervision as addressed by Nelson and colleagues (2006). Steward and Phelps (2004) indicated that hierarchy in the supervisory relationship is necessary because "Those having higher status (most experienced) have an implicit responsibility to transfer knowledge and guidance to those of lower status (less experienced)" (p. 361). The authors qualified this statement by noting that this "necessary" hierarchy in the supervisory relationship should not be the result of cultural factors (e.g., gender, race, class), but instead due to supervisors' age and length of experience.

Additionally, Steward and Phelps (2004) discussed the assumptions made by Nelson and colleagues (2006). Nelson and colleagues emphasized that the power differentials between supervisors and supervisees will always present with a "higher power base of the supervisor" (Steward & Phelps, 2004, p. 362). Nelson and colleagues (2006) did not discuss the possibility of situations when the usual power structure of a supervision dyad may become inverted due to social locations or systemic alliances

between the supervisee and the training system. Steward and Phelps (2004) provided an example to illuminate this situation:

> For example, senior and well-published faculty and supervisors who do not personally or professionally acknowledge the powerful and very real influence of race, culture, and gender within any relationship can certainly provide a wellspring of support for like-minded students. Consequently, when issues directly related to any of these points of diversity arise in terms of students' annual evaluations and grades in practicum, it is the culturally-sensitive faculty or supervisor who may feel powerless in settings wherein they are outnumbered. Supervisees' resistance to supervisors' feedback and attempts to process issues regarding race and gender and the resulting negative evaluations may be sometimes dismissed, discounted, and/or attributed to bias and incompetence on the part of the culturally-sensitive supervisor. In such cases, students may have the support of like-minded senior members of the profession who also hold in their hands the professional future of faculty having less status and experience within the academic setting and the profession. (p. 362)

Further, Steward and Phelps indicated that supervisees may already be empowered due to factors such as gender and/or racial privilege and/or the status of their educational and clinical mentors. Therefore, there may be times when the supervisor, not the supervisee, needs structural empowerment.

The scholarship reviewed herein evidences the burgeoning nature of FMC supervision. As compared to feminist and multicultural supervision literatures, FMC supervision literature is the last to venture into the domain of empiricism and is in the earliest stages of scholarly development. Next, I will examine the FMC literature base critically to expose its positive elements and areas for growth.

Critical Analysis of the Feminist Multicultural Supervision Literature

The literature pertaining to feminist and multicultural supervision has provided a meaningful and rich theoretical conceptualization of supervisory practice. However, FMC supervision, presumably the merging of feminism and multiculturalism, lacks the

depth of integration of the strong conceptual and empirical literature of the two fields. As an emerging field, FMC supervision literature does not incorporate cultural identities beyond gender and ethnicity or race, nor does it supply a way of conceptualizing intersecting cultural identities, feminist theory, or multicultural competencies.

Women of color, lesbian and queer feminists, transnational and postcolonial feminists, and third wave feminists have written extensively regarding the Eurocentric, racist, classist, heterosexist, and colonialist biases implicit in the assumed common or universal struggles of women made by White, liberal, second wave feminists (Garner & Enns, 2006; hooks, 2000; Sinacore & Enns, 2005). Espín (1993) highlighted the irony of the exclusive focus of second wave feminists on gender oppression and the lack of awareness of the implications of exclusivity. By assuming that gender oppression is preeminent and central to all other forms of oppression, women who experience other forms of injustice due to social locations of, for example, racial/ethic identity, sexual orientation, and/or social class are forced to choose among or prioritize their identities (Sinacore & Enns, 2005). Further, persons who experience multiple forms of oppression are alienated or made invisible in feminist circles because their personal experiences are not present in feminist discourse.

Focusing on the liberation of women while making invisible other forms of oppression, as highlighted by Lorde (1987), is reminiscent of the "divide and conquer" (p. 100) tool of patriarchy. By excluding the heterogeneity of feminists and feminisms and ignoring differences based on intersecting identities, persons with less access to privilege and power are marginalized within feminism (Espín, 1993; Lorde, 1987; Sinacore & Enns, 2005). White feminists have replicated the power struggles inherent in

the dominant culture by emphasizing a false universalism of gendered oppression and have reduced the strength of feminist agendas by creating an environment of suspicion and separation (Lorde, 1987). Women of color have criticized the lack of integration of the perspectives and needs of diverse women and the overwhelming focus on the perspectives and needs of White, heterosexual, middle class, English speaking, able-bodied, United States citizens (e.g., Cole, 1986; Espín, 1993; Green, 1994).

Brown (1990) discussed the slow pace of feminism to incorporate a race/ethnicity and class perspective. She intimated that many feminists are easily able to notice masculine biases, and many are also able to be aware of homonegative and heterosexist biases. However, "the subtle aspects of racist and classist assumptions have been less visible and less salient to the many white feminist therapists who have benefitted from privilege of race and class" (p. 4). This is especially salient to the practice of supervision, wherein supervisors are in the role of mentoring students in their multicultural sensitivity and competence. Therefore, multiculturalism should be integrated throughout developing models of supervision practice instead of "mere references to some side point not central to their writing" (Espín, 1993, p. 104) as has been done by many of the authors of feminist and FMC models of supervision.

Calls for an integration of diversity, multicultural, and feminist perspectives have been vague (Williams & Barber, 2004). Resulting theories of how to provide FMC supervision have lacked depth of integration. For example, Steward and Phelps (2004) demonstrated that the FMC literature lacks complexity when discussing the hierarchical and power-discrepant supervisory relationship (Steward & Phelps, 2004). Further, FMC supervision literature has lacked specificity in how to enact FMC supervision. For

example, although Porter (1995) provides a rich developmental perspective to FMC supervision, she does not provide direction regarding what supervisors can do to be prepared to provide FMC supervision.

The current study aimed to reduce this notable gap in the FMC literature by qualitatively examining the principles and theoretical underpinnings of FMC psychotherapy supervision practice through the use of qualitative data from interviews with supervisors who practiced using an FMC lens. Additionally, given that an important element of feminist discussions on supervisor practices is a critique of traditional models of supervision (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Szymanski 2003), this study sought to uncover aspects of supervision that are unique to FMC-oriented supervisors. For example, this study examined how FMC supervisors integrated analysis of power, analysis of privilege and oppression, and multiculturally sensitive clinical interventions, all hallmarks of FMC theory (Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Szymanski, 2003).

Further, this study illuminated how FMC supervisors manage tensions between and within feminism and multiculturalism in their role as a supervisor and work to integrate feminism and multiculturalism. Thereby, a more complex, varied, and contextualized model of supervision has developed as a result of this study that more directly reflects the lived realities of diverse clients, supervisees/trainees, and supervisors due to a focus on the intersections and interactions among the mutual relationships of gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, class, ability or disability (Garner & Enns, 2006). A more distal goal of this study was to contribute knowledge to improve supervision and training practices, thereby benefiting clients from marginalized

communities by providing them with multiculturally appropriate clinical services, taking into account their sociopolitical histories, contexts, and experiences.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to expand the counseling supervision literature pertaining to feminist, multicultural, and FMC supervision. This was done by developing a conceptual model of FMC supervision grounded in the data of supervisors who engaged in FMC supervision. A further purpose of this study was to explore the ways that supervisors integrated FMC principles and values into their work with counselors in training by understanding how they conceptualized and conducted FMC supervision.

Research Question

The aim of this study was to answer the following question: How do self-identified FMC psychotherapy supervisors conceptualize and practice feminist supervision that is explicitly multicultural?

Rationale for Qualitative Methods

Qualitative methods were appropriate for developing an understanding of how FMC supervisors engage in supervisory practices because of the complex nature of FMC theory (Creswell, 1998; Morrow, 2007). Quantitative methods were insufficient to provide a multifaceted picture of what happens in FMC supervision. Additionally, given the limited empirical support for FMC supervision, qualitative methods served a function to explain the concepts and processes associated with FMC supervision (Marshall &

Rossman, 1999). Further, an emergent qualitative design allowed for the collection of rich, in-depth data, supplied by participants who engaged in multiculturally focused feminist supervision practice, which resulted in a full description of FMC supervision. Lastly, because little research has examined FMC supervision practices, the results of this study provided an inductive theory, developed out of the voices of participants. An inductive process is a hallmark of qualitative methods (Morrow & Smith, 2000) and provided a complete and meaningful understanding of FMC psychotherapy supervision.

Summary

In an effort to understand the conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision, the present study explored the experiences of supervisors who utilized FMC principles in their supervision practice. In this chapter, I introduced the topic of supervision, generally, and the importance of an empirically-grounded model of FMC supervision, specifically. I reviewed the literature related to feminist, multicultural, and FMC supervision approaches. Notably, there is a major gap in supervision literature in which feminist and multicultural approaches are integrated and empirically substantiated. Thus, I presented the purpose of the present study, the research question, and the rationale for the use of qualitative methods. In the next chapter, I will define and expound upon the methods used in this study to arrive at a grounded theory conceptual model of FMC supervision.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

In this study of FMC supervision, my goal was to obtain a complete understanding of how FMC supervisors conceptualize and carry out their supervision work. The research design was guided by a critical/ideological feminist paradigm (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). In the following sections, I will explain the research paradigm, the research design used in this study, my role as researcher, the participants of this study, the sources of data and the data analysis procedures used in this study, and the presentation of results. Then, I will substantiate the trustworthiness of these methods and describe relevant ethical considerations.

Paradigm Underpinning the Research

In qualitative research, the research paradigm guides the research process and is often informed by the everyday life of the researcher (Morrow & Smith, 2000). Thus, it is important to discuss the paradigm underpinning the research to provide a contextual understanding of the study that follows (Ponterotto, 2005). Critical/ideological feminist theory was the paradigm guiding this study; and, because critical/ideological feminist theory centralizes the researcher's values as important in guiding the research methods and outcome, I will disclose my assumptions and values related to the research process.

I followed an idiosyncratic, subjective, and broad description of critical/ideological theory, while integrating third wave and locational feminist values and principles (Enns, 2010; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). In this approach, I centralized a basic tenet of a critical/ideological stance that "oppression has many faces and that focusing on only one at the expense of others (e.g., class oppression versus racism) often elides the interconnections among them" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 304). Further, I invited the "messy" aspects of third wave feminisms to the table by "embracing individuality, uncertainties, conflicts, and ambiguities" of third wave feminisms (Enns, 2010, p. 335). Critical/ideological feminist theory provided answers to the nature of reality (ontology), how we know (epistemology), what is valued in the study (axiology), how knowledge is gained (methodology), and the language used to present the study (rhetorical structure).

Ontology

Critical/ideological feminist research theory incorporates a critical analysis of traditional positivist and postpositivist research methods modeled after the natural sciences (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Critical/ideological feminist theory takes a critical realist perspective on the nature of reality (Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005). A critical realist perspective recognizes the constructed and subjective nature of reality and holds that there is a reality rife with oppression and power imbalance that is socially and historically constructed (Harrison, MacGibbon, & Morton, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000). In this study, I was interested in the subjective meanings that FMC supervisors made of their work in order to gain an

understanding of how they provided clinical supervision that emphasized multicultural and feminist values.

Because social constructions of power are ingrained in the ontological assumptions of critical/ideological feminist research, the examination of power is a hallmark of critical/ideological feminist theory and research (Fine, 1994; Gottfried, 1996; Morrow; 2006). Decisions about whose subjective truth will be given voice are decisions based in the power of the researcher. Researchers from the mainstream often unintentionally replicate systems of oppression in their research (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Thus, critical/ideological feminist researchers work to give voice to marginalized groups who are often silenced in a majority community (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow, 2006; Morrow & Smith, 2000). I worked to centralize historically marginalized voices in feminist supervision theory and research: I endeavored to include participants in this study that exhibited, for example, gender, racial/ethnic, cultural, sexual identity, class, and generational/citizenship diversity. Also, by studying the work of FMC supervisors, I gave voice to a theoretical orientation that is marginalized in the applied psychological community as evidenced by a notable hole in the academic literature: there was little empirical support for FMC supervision despite a growing literature base of FMC theoretical formulations. Given the emphasis in applied psychology on evidence-based practice, it was important that empirical research be conducted on FMC clinical and supervisory practice.

Obtaining an evidence base for FMC supervision was a difficult premise, given the criticisms of research-as-usual practices by critical/ideological feminist theorists (Acker, Barry, & Essveld, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Criticisms include a

focus on the individual differences between participants versus the political realities between participants, the power imbalances inherent in research leading to objectification of participants, and the focus on unearthing universal laws versus enacting social change (Fine, 1992; Morrow, 2006). This project arose out of my desire to provide empirical support for and recognition of the practice of FMC supervision through the voices of diverse participants. I achieved this by creating a written product that was valuable for both researcher and participant, cultivating a participatory relationship between researcher and participant, and incorporating a social justice process (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow, 2006).

Epistemology

The epistemology of a critical/ideological feminist research paradigm comes out of the transactional, subjective, and dialectic relationship between the researcher and participant, resulting in a joint construction of meaning. Further, as a critical/ideological framework to research practice, power in the research relationship is examined; and an explicit goal of research is emancipation and social change (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005). Critical/ideological feminist researchers seek to examine the effects of privileged identities in research relationships to decrease the likelihood of researchers dominating, oppressing, and devaluing research participants (Gottfried, 1996; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Olesen, 2005). I worked to be explicit about my power as a researcher, but I also invited participants to collaborate with me throughout the research process in an effort to decrease the differences of power between us and to co-construct knowledge. Additionally, I collaborated with participants in data

analysis by asking participants to evaluate the results derived from my analysis of our co-constructed knowledge and incorporating their feedback.

The relational nature of critical/ideological feminist methods brings into question the objectification and exploitation of research participants (Gottfried, 1996; Harrison et al., 2001; Morrow; 2006). In traditional methods, there exists a hierarchical separation of the roles of researcher and participant, and critical/ideological feminist theorists criticize the assumption that researchers can maintain a neutral and objective stance in research (Acker et al., 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). Relationships found in the traditional model lead to a gathering of data from the subjects of study with little or no effort made toward reciprocity or egalitarianism. This fundamental assumption of traditional research methods is replaced with a transactional, co-constructive, and relationship-oriented epistemology (Morrow, 2006). This is a process of acknowledging, holding, and valuing the realities of the researcher and participant to create joint knowledge and meaning. Further, critical/ideological feminist methods create a research environment that allow for both the researcher and the researched to be active participants in the creation of knowledge and empowerment of marginalized groups (Heshusius, 1994; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005).

For example, in an effort to deobjectify participants, critical/ideological feminist researchers work to build egalitarian relationships with participants and work to benefit not only themselves but also participants (Gottfried, 1996; Morrow, 2006). To accomplish this, the current project not only benefitted me as the researcher, but also my participants, by providing them opportunities to articulate their perspectives and contribute to an empirical basis for FMC supervision practices. In fact, this meant I

listened when my participants stated that their participation would only occur if I promised future publication of my findings. Further, by providing a complex, articulated, and functioning conceptual model for carrying out FMC supervision, this study benefits the training of future therapists and supervisors. Lastly, I hope to influence the multicultural competence of clinicians so that clients will receive treatment fitting their contexts and histories.

Critical/ideological feminist methods are emancipatory, working to end oppression manufactured by larger social structures in the lives of marginalized groups (Gottfried, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow; 2007; Ponterotto, 2005). By moving beyond the central focus on women characteristic of prior feminist supervision studies (Burnes, 2013; Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996; Syzmanski, 2003, 2005), this study provided a framework for working with the multiple and intersecting identities of diverse client populations (e.g., different races/ethnicities, socioeconomic classes, abilities, sexual orientations, religious/spiritual orientations, and others). Inherent in FMC theory is the value of liberating oppressed groups (L. S. Brown, 2010). By providing an empirical foundation for FMC supervision practice, I illuminated an emerging foundation of scientific legitimacy within the psychological community with the ultimate goal of benefiting diverse clients.

Axiology

Axiology is concerned with the role the researcher's values play in the research process (Morrow, 2007; Ponterotto, 2005). In critical/ideological feminist research methods, the researcher's values, beliefs, and biases are expected to play a role in the

process and outcome of research (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). In the context of this study, I have worked to be transparent about my values as they pertain to FMC supervision practice by presenting them explicitly both to the reader and to participants (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). Given the shared FMC theoretical orientation between participants and myself, I was explicit about my values and biases related to FMC supervision. I was, therefore, active in the creation of knowledge with participants and was engaged in the interview process. A further goal of the critical/ideological feminist axiological stance is that of transforming the status quo (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005). By providing an explanatory model of FMC supervision, this research provided an empirical formulation that challenged traditional supervision practices and may serve to disrupt and alter the current supervisory status quo.

Method and Rhetorical Structure

The method of this study will honor the "mutual engagement" quality of the researcher/participant relationship (Gottfried, 1996, p. 56). By engaging in a transactional and interactive process of co-constructing meaning with participants, I was immersed in the participants' worlds, using in-depth individual interviews (Ponterotto, 2005). The rhetorical structure of the written product of this study incorporated a transparent perspective, preserving my role as an interactive and subjective researcher by detailing my own "experience, expectations, biases, and values" (Ponterotto, 2005, p. 132) and by utilizing the first person (Acker et al., 1996). Further, I used language that exemplified my active participation in the research process and acknowledged my power in the

researcher/participant relationship. No matter what actions I took to limit power imbalances, I still had the power of interpreting the voices of others and synthesizing those interpretations into the output of writing (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). I, therefore, used the voices of participants to illuminate our co-constructed and contextualized meaning-making process.

The paradigm underlying the research provided a context for my research process from data gathering and analysis to presentation of the results (Morrow & Smith, 2000). Defining my underlying critical/ideological feminist theory paradigm provided guidelines for how I viewed the nature of reality, how I knew, what I valued, how I gained knowledge, and how I presented the results. The values of the critical/ideological feminist paradigm are related inextricably to the research approach used in this study, that of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006).

Research Design

The research design utilized in this study was grounded theory. Sociologists Glaser and Strauss (1967) originally developed this approach for qualitative research, with the purpose of opposing traditional research methods of deducing knowledge from existing theory by developing a method of building theory from qualitative data (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Thus, the process of grounded theory is one in which the researcher inductively develops a theory from data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Grounded theory originally emerged as a research design from the theoretical orientation of symbolic interactionism, wherein meaning is created through social interaction primarily grounded in communication (Charmaz, 2006;

Fassinger, 2005). Thus, the grounded conceptual model developed in this study was gleaned through the complex, lived experiences of the participants to gain theoretical understanding of FMC supervision.

Grounded theory has gone through shifts and changes from its original, more postpositivist formulation to include a constructivist perspective (Charmaz, 2006), wherein theory is constructed through "past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives, and research practices" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 10). It is assumed in this constructivist view of grounded theory that researcher neutrality is a myth. Thus, researcher reflexivity is necessary in the research process.

As an inductive process of developing theory, the grounded theory design involves flexible procedures for interpreting data, often described as emergent design (Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Throughout the investigative process, the researcher is involved in a simultaneous process of data acquisition and analysis (Haverkamp & Young, 2005). Further, the researcher engages in a constant comparative method of continuously comparing the data, codes, and developing theory to be sure that interpretations reflect the meaning provided by the participants. Incidents of data are compared to one another to aid in understanding their similarities and differences, with the goal of grouping conceptually similar incidents into categories or codes. Constant comparison allows for differentiation of categories. Additionally, incidents of data are compared to provide evidence for a category. *Memoing* is utilized in grounded theory methods to assist in tracking data immersion and pulling back to find meaning. Memos consist of the researcher's analytic assumptions, hunches, insights, and emerging analytic statements (Yeh & Inman, 2007).

Sensitivity is an important concept in grounded theory and refers to both *researcher sensitivity* and *theoretical sensitivity*. Researcher sensitivity is a more appropriate qualitative construct than the traditional notion of objectivity (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In this concept, the researcher cannot force the self out of analysis. Instead, the researcher needs to be aware of her or his own subjectivity so she or he can see how subjectivity influences interpretation. Sensitivity develops when the researcher immerses her- or himself in the data, allowing the researcher to understand the significance of a piece of data and connections between concepts, and achieving theoretical sensitivity.

Theoretical sensitivity occurs through "stopping, pondering, and rethinking anew. To gain theoretical sensitivity, we look at studied life from multiple vantage points, make comparisons, follow leads, and build on ideas" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 135). As the researcher becomes more sensitive, she or he increases the likelihood of becoming aware of the theoretical concepts in the data. Further, this process will deepen the research questions initially developed, creating a more targeted and defined search for knowledge. Theoretical sensitivity grows throughout the process of research and allows the researcher to discern which concepts are of importance to the study and to find indicators of relevant concepts in the data (Corbin & Strauss, 1998). Theoretical sensitivity can be developed through reading about the concepts and phenomena in disciplines outside one's own (Holton, 2007).

Grounded theory design was utilized in this study to build a conceptual model grounded in the complex and lived experiences of participants, which provided an understanding of how FMC supervisors practice clinical supervision. This was different

from providing a description of the data through organizing the data around themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990); in this study, I went further in the interpretive process to provide a conceptual scheme that relates categories or themes together. To assist in this process, *theoretical sampling*, a cornerstone of grounded theory, was used to enhance the research. This involved the process of collecting data that had the highest probability to provide richness and depth and supply maximal opportunity for developing concepts, links between concepts, and variations among concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

The research design of grounded theory as articulated by Charmaz (2006) was used in this study. Following their early work, Glaser and Strauss parted company both professionally and theoretically/methodologically. Charmaz, having studied with both Glaser and Strauss, brought together the best of both divergent approaches. Where Glaser and Strauss (1967) began in explicating the use of grounded theory design to build substantive and formal theory, Morse and colleagues (2009) furthered the clarification of the theory-building components of grounded theory.

Thus, I developed a *substantive* conceptual model versus a substantive theory. A conceptual model is an initial empirical understanding of a substantive area that requires additional data collection to push analysis to theory. In brief, a substantive theory is focused on the specific substantive area, such as FMC clinical supervision, versus a more general *formal* theory, such as applied FMC theory (Glaser, 2007; Glaser & Strauss, 1965; 1967). As such, I generated a substantive conceptual model on FMC supervision, grounded in the lived experiences of participants. I became engaged and immersed in data collection and analysis, and enhanced my awareness of my subjectivity through reflexive action. Next, I will describe the methods I employed to hone my subjectivity.

Researcher as Instrument

Qualitative researchers and methodologists have challenged the idea of objectivity by encouraging ownership and acknowledgement of one's standpoint and subjectivity (Morrow, 2005). This ownership values that the subjective is present from the development of a study through data collection, data analysis, and writing up of the results (Gottfried, 1996; Morrow, 2005). Critical/ideological feminist qualitative methods demand a reflexive process, wherein subjectivity is embraced, owned, and valued throughout all levels of the research process (Harrison, et al., 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow, 2005, 2007; Olesen, 2005).

In this study, I, as the researcher, engaged in a reflexive process to examine my biases and assumptions to use myself as an instrument in the research process (Olesen, 2005). For example, I examined the influences of my social locations on the research process to reveal my potential to unintentionally oppress participants. This reflexivity allowed for the mutually constructed meanings derived from interpersonal transactions between participants and myself to be reflected in the project. By owning my experience as data, my role in the co-construction of knowledge, creating a "participatory mode of consciousness" was made explicit (Heshusius, 1994, p. 15; Morrow, 2005, 2007).

Further, it was important to explore my role in the research process as an insider to the group of exploration and given my FMC identity as a clinician, supervisor in training, and researcher. As discussed by Morrow and Smith (2000), the researcher's role as either an insider or outsider has implications for the research, including what research questions are asked, accessibility to participants and data, how the data are interpreted, and the results of the study. As an insider to the group studied, I had an easier time

accessing participants and creating a sense of safety in the process of co-constructing knowledge. However, because of a sense of a shared cultural experience, I was attentive to the possibility that participants and I could easily make assumptions based upon mutual understanding of experience, leading to insufficient depth of knowledge. For example, before starting interviews, I indicated the likelihood that participants and I would have a shared vocabulary and tacit knowledge of supervisory practice. I then indicated that I would want to make that shared information explicit in the interview situation. Then, as the interview progressed I reflected back the participants' language and meaning and asked participants to "tell me more about that" or "I think I may know what you mean, but I wonder if you could define that term for me or provide an example?" in efforts to avoid collapsing the meaning-making process.

Morrow (2006) emphasized the importance of self-reflection, or the self-examination of one's assumptions and biases about the area of study, to accurately represent participants' meanings. Therefore, I brought my biases and assumptions into the meaning-making process, which facilitated knowledge development. At times, those biases and assumptions were challenged by participants, which enhanced the results of the study. For example, I believed, through reviewing the literature and through interviews with participants, that feminist communities; peer supervision; and/or relationships with student, intern, or colleague groups enhanced participants' development as FMC supervisors. I shared this insight with Ava, one of my participants, and she indicated that, though she did experience positive benefits from groups and communities along her FMC supervision journey, she also experienced being tokenized when she was asked to speak for her cultural groups. A goal of self-reflection in this

study was to prevent my biases and assumptions from unintentionally impacting my interpretation of participants' meanings, thereby making the results of the study a reflection of my own conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision versus a reflection of the participants' experiences.

In efforts to make my subjective experience explicit as a critical/ideological feminist qualitative researcher, I found it important to disclose three key elements. First, I discussed my social locations that had an influence on the current research due to power differences in my relationships with participants. Second, I shared my personal history and experiences related to qualitative research. Third, I explained my subjective experience of FMC supervision, including my biases, assumptions, and values. Additionally, I will discuss how I engaged in a reflexive process in this study through a critical/ideological feminist paradigm to embrace and use my subjectivity in the present study.

Horizons of Understanding

I used the term *horizons of understanding*, first developed by David Rennie (1994), to shape my disclosure of my personal background, my research experiences, and my subjective understanding of FMC supervision. First, I describe my social locations, or identities, which may have interacted with the social locations of participants, in order to begin to manage my power as a researcher. My worldview was inextricably linked to my lived experiences and owned (as well as unowned) identities; these were the filters through which I saw the world. In brief, I was born into an upper middle class, White, highly-educated family in Orange County, California. At the time of the study, I

identified as a White, lesbian, able-bodied, first generation United States citizen, Polish American, gluten-intolerant, multicultural feminist, goddess-worshiping, androgynous woman. Further, I was a doctoral candidate, versed in the language of research and counseling, who was highly educated. These identities wove together to form lenses through which I saw the world and thus were a part of my worldview. As I an able-bodied, White, educated, middle class, clinically trained citizen of the United States, I held power as a researcher, because those identities were privileged in the current sociopolitical context. These power-holding identities intersected with others that held less power (e.g., lesbian, feminist, goddess-worshiping, student), which served to provide balance when interacting with participants.

My background and experiences pertaining to qualitative research were also relevant as influences on my subjectivities, values, and assumptions. My formal education history has involved an explicit interest in the study of psychology, counseling, and now counseling psychology. Throughout my graduate education, I have focused on the use of qualitative methods of inquiry. I valued qualitative methods because of the opportunity to develop knowledge through a collaborative process, thereby providing an optimal chance to understand the complexity of meaning (Morrow & Smith, 2000). I have found the process meaningful in my prior qualitative research experiences as both a master's and doctoral student.

My prior qualitative research experiences included a grounded theory study investigating clinicians' experiences of integrating spirituality into their work with children. This study employed an interpretivist paradigm and occurred prior to my identification as a multicultural feminist. While this study was underway, I worked on a

postpositivist modified consensual qualitative research study exploring effective psychotherapy for male clients.. Concurrently while completing the current study, I conducted a constructivist phenomenological study examining undergraduate students' experience of feminist activism. These qualitative research experiences provided me with knowledge regarding navigating the Institutional Review Board (IRB), ethical considerations for qualitative research (e.g., informed consent and confidentiality of qualitative investigations), recruitment of participants, conducting one-on-one interviews, developing rapport with participants, gathering interview data, conducting qualitative data analysis, and constructing a final written product.

As I considered my biases and values surrounding FMC supervision and my expectations for the outcome of this study, I was aware that my valuing of FMC supervisory practice emerged out of my feminist identity development. Through exposure to the ideological and philosophical beliefs of multicultural feminism, specifically related to FMC counseling, I developed a theoretical orientation that supplied a vocabulary for how I see the world, counseling, and clients. Through this identity development process, I received supervision from similarly identified supervisors. I began to review the literature pertaining to FMC supervision practice, which informed my interactions with supervisors. For example, I felt increased empowerment to advocate for discussions of power dynamics in supervision. Through this increased ownership of my clinical supervision, I grew as an FMC-identified clinician.

Interwoven with this process of developing as a multicultural feminist, an FMC clinician, and an FMC consumer of supervision, I began to develop my own identity as an FMC-identified supervisor. My perceptions of FMC supervision were as follows. I

believed that FMC supervisors are mindful of their power in supervision as related to evaluatory power, institutional power, hierarchical power, and social location power. FMC supervisors therefore take action to manage and not abuse their power. FMC supervisors work to heighten their supervisees' awareness of the impact of marginalization, oppression, privilege, and power in the presentation of their clients; to de-pathologize clients' behaviors by placing behavior into a lens of coping; and to institute a contextualized conceptualization of supervisees' clients through a layering of the biological, intrapsychic, interpersonal, socio/political, individual, familial, and cultural aspects of clients' lives, presenting concerns, and therapeutic process.

Further, I posited that these lenses are utilized in the supervisor's conceptualization of the supervisee and the supervisee's conceptualization of self. FMC supervisors utilize a collaborative means of increasing supervisee awareness, knowledge, and skill as multiculturally competent clinicians. FMC supervisors utilize clinical best practices, while also engaging in a political analysis of the tools used in psychological practice, so as to prevent the unintentional inclusion of monoculturalist assumptions, sexism, racism, heterosexism, ablism, and classism into the clinical work of supervisees.

In this section, I have highlighted the relevant personal constructs, historical experiences, and perceptual biases I brought into the study, which are major elements of my worldview. Given my prior qualitative research experience, beliefs about FMC supervision practice, and social locations, it is important to delineate how I monitored my subjectivity throughout this study.

Monitoring Subjectivity

In an effort to manage these experiences, biases, assumptions, and worldviews in a systematic fashion, I employed several strategies to privilege the collaborative constructions of meaning formed out of this study above my own preconceived notions. First, I employed a self-reflective journal in which I wrote about my thoughts, feelings, biases, assumptions, and reactions throughout data acquisition, data analysis, and writing (Morrow, 2006). In this medium, I made explicit my implicit assumptions and biases and monitored my thoughts and actions (Morrow, 2005; Olesen, 2005). This process also helped me assure that I worked towards depth in my meaning-making with participants so as to not make assumptions about participants' meanings (Morrow & Smith, 2000). I shared my emerging self-awareness with my advisor or my peer research team to get feedback to help me determine if I wanted to incorporate this into my interactions with participants or into data analysis (Morrow, 2005) to allow for a participatory consciousness between participants and myself (Heshusius, 1994).

The second process of managing my subjectivity came in the form of regular contact with my peer research team (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). My peer research team consisted of graduate students engaging in qualitative research. My peer research team met on average biweekly and provided several key functions in my research process. My peer research team (a) reflected back their experiences of my work throughout the research process; (b) provided me with alternative points of view; (c) provided me with a critical analysis of my developing research project; (d) made me aware when my assumptions were limiting my acquisition of co-constructed meaning with participants;

and (e) helped me to see when my assumptions were helpful when interacting with participants, conducting data analysis, and writing up the findings.

A third strategy for working with my subjectivity was accomplished through participant checks by corroborating my understanding of the participants' meaning-making within the interview situation and through verification of my grounded conceptual model with participants to make sure it fit their views of FMC supervision practice. Participant checks also included a power analysis within the interview. Given my development of strong skills in feminist political analysis, I recognized my potential to be inadvertently oppressive of individuals who hold social locations with less power than my own (in this case, as participants in research). Thus, I believed it was important to dialogue, deconstruct, and work to manage power differentials in the interview situation. A final strategy for managing my subjectivity was through searching for disconfirming evidence. This process was attained by rigorously examining the data for participants' meanings that conflicted with my conjectures; by seeking disconfirming evidence in follow-up and feedback interviews; and by utilizing my peer research team, who provided me with alternative points of view of the emerging conceptual model.

As qualitative researchers challenge the positivist assumption of objectivity, and qualitative and critical/ideological feminist researchers value the importance of reflexivity of presupposed biases and assumptions, critical/ideological feminist qualitative researchers work to take ownership of subjectivity. By being honest with my beliefs, values, assumptions, and experiences, I worked to meaningfully create mutual knowledge with participants through a self-reflexive journal, contact with my peer research team, and participant checks. The participants in this study were FMC-identified

supervisors who were able to provide their knowledge of the conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision.

Participants

In this section, I discuss the setting of the research, the participants, participant selection and recruitment, and procedures for taking leave of participants.

Context

The setting of this investigation is simultaneously broad and restrictive. Within the United States, few training sites explicitly identify a feminist or FMC supervision focus. These cites include Chrysalis Community Counseling Services (CCCS) located in Santa Rosa, California; Seattle Therapy Alliance (STA) located in Seattle, Washington; the Fremont Community Therapy Project (FCTP) located in Seattle, Washington; and the Women's Resource Center (WRC) located at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah. Below, I provide information about these training obtained from their websites as an overview of the larger, national context.

CCCS was established in 1982 to provide affordable feminist counseling to women, men, couples, children, and families (CCCS, 2011). The CCCS training program provides training to postmasters and registered marriage and family therapist interns, social work interns, and psychology assistants. CCCS works to enact feminist theory and ideals in clinical practice and agency policy. Interns provide supervised individual and group therapy to community members. CCCS is an explicitly feminist training site that does not address multicultural issues on its website.

STA was founded in 2009 (STA, 2011). The goal of this training center is to provide feminist-oriented training for master's level clinicians interested in women's issues and to provide low-cost counseling services to women and adolescent girls. Trainees engage in long-term psychotherapy with women from the Seattle area and advocate for clients within mental health and business. Like CCCS, this explicitly feminist site does not explicitly address multicultural issues in its publicity materials.

Established in 2005, FCTP provides low-cost psychological services to individuals whose income normally prohibits access to mental health services (FCTP, 2011). The FCTP training program offers training for social work trainees, doctoral practicum students, predoctoral internship trainees, and post-doctoral fellows. FCTP is oriented towards a multicultural, feminist, queer-friendly site in which trainees receive supervision. The training mission of FCTP is to make trainees successful, independent practitioners who engage in empirically-supported individual treatment modalities; conduct psychological evaluations for FCTP, community, and court referrals; provide group counseling; offer workshops to the community; and consult with allied mental health providers in the training program and broader community.

The WRC was established in 1971 and began providing graduate-level practicum training to clinical psychology, counseling psychology, professional counseling, and social work students in 1994 (WRC, 2010). The WRC's training mission is to immerse practicum counselors in a training experience that weaves together FMC theory and practice in a framework that analyzes and includes issues relevant to marginalized communities, power, and privilege. Trainees' responsibilities include providing individual counseling, co-facilitating support groups, and engaging in social justice

advocacy and outreach, both within the university and in the broader community.

In addition to these formal training sites, which accounted for a limited number of feminist and FMC supervisors around the United States, many FMC supervisors have emerged either from their origins as grass-roots feminist therapists whose activist feminism informed their work as counselors and therapists, or academically nurtured feminist therapists who had the good fortune to be mentored by feminist, multicultural, and/or FMC teachers and supervisors during their undergraduate and graduate work. Other FMC therapists and supervisors have emerged via the influence of feminist organizations such as the Association for Women in Psychology (AWP), the Society for the Psychology of Women (SPW; Division 35 of the American Psychological Association), and the Section for the Advancement of Women (SAW; a section of the Society of Counseling Psychology [Division 17] of the APA. Thus, training for FMC counselors and therapists, and subsequently for supervisors, is incredibly variable.

Engaging in a national search for variability in participants allowed for a greater understanding of FMC supervision perspectives. I recruited from sites like those above, pursued leads via web searches, and used snowball sampling to identify as diverse a participant pool as possible throughout the United States. By engaging in a national search, I increased the demographic, geographic, and experience diversity of the participant pool, thereby increasing the diversity of the FMC perspectives articulated in the results of this study.

Participants

I recruited participants for this study via a national search of FMC supervisors from the above training institutions and supervisors not connected to FMC training institutions. Fourteen total participants engaged in this study. A majority of participants were counseling psychologists (*n*=12, 86%), 1 was a clinical psychologist, and 1 reported a master's level clinical psychology and social work background. I included this master's level participant because of the minimal access to doctoral level training in her country in Central America. While 5 participants (35%) reported no formal training in supervision, the remaining participants reported diverse geographical locations of supervisory training within their doctoral training and/or predoctoral internship, including the Midwest (*n*=3), Southeast (*n*=1), Northeast (*n*=2), Northwest (*n*=2), South (*n*=1) and Southwest (*n*=2) United States; 11 states were represented. Further, participants reported variability in locations of supervisory experience, including the South (*n*=4), Southeast (*n*=1), East (*n*=1), Midwest (*n*=4), Northwest (*n*=2), Northeast (*n*=4), and Southwest (*n*=5) United States (18 states represented), Taiwan (*n*=1), and Central America (*n*=1).

Participants endorsed a wide range of theoretical orientations or philosophical approaches to supervision. Most participants indicated an integrative approach (*n*=11, 92%)' further, many participants identified their approach as integrating multicultural (*n*=9, 64%), feminist (*n*=9, 64%), relational-cultural (*n*=4, 29%), and/or gender-aware (*n*=1, 7%) approaches into their conceptualization and practice of supervision. Participants also reported the use of developmental (*n*=4), interpersonal/relational (*n*=3), humanist/client-centered (*n*=2), solution-focused (*n*=2), emotion-focused (*n*=1), narrative (*n*=1), conflict (*n*=1), humanitarian (*n*=1), psychodynamic (*n*=1), Adlerian (*n*=1),

Psychodrama (*n*=1), Adlerian (*n*=1), Interpersonal Process Recall (*n*=1), Chaos Theory (*n*=1), and/or constructivist (*n*=2) approaches into their work as clinical supervisors. Most participants indicated that they had provided supervision in university counseling centers (*n*=11), as practicum instructors in academic departments (*n*=6), and/or in community mental health settings (*n*=3). Six participants reported providing supervision in departmental clinics or university counseling centers as doctoral students.

I obtained demographic information from participants at the conclusion of their initial individual interviews. Two men- and 12 women-identified individuals made up this sample. Participants' ethnic/racial background included White (*n*=6 43%), Mexican American (*n*=2, 14%), Taiwanese American (*n*=1, 7%), South Asian (*n*=1, 7%), American Indian/First Nation (*n*=1, 7%), Biracial (*n*=1, 7%), Mestizas (defined as multiracial including White, Native, and non-White backgrounds; *n*=1, 7%), and Creole (defined as multiracial including Black racial background; *n*=1, 7%). In terms of citizenship/nationality, participants identified as United States citizens or United States born (*n*=4, 29%), while the remaining participants identified as third generation (*n*=3, 21%), second generation (*n*=2, 14%), first generation (*n*=2, 14%), dual citizen of the United States and Canada (*n*=1, 7%), citizen of a South Asian country (*n*=1, 7%), and citizen of a Central American country (*n*=1, 7%). Participants reported that their language preferences included English (*n*=14), Spanish (*n*=3), and Creole French (*n*=1). All data were gathered in English.

Participants' religious and spiritual orientations included Agnostic (*n*=4), Catholic (*n*=3), spiritual (*n*=3), Jewish (*n*=2), Secular/Atheist (*n*=2), Buddhist (*n*=1), Christian (*n*=1), and no answer (*n*=1). Participants' self-identified sexual orientations included

Heterosexual (*n*=7, 50%), Queer (*n*=2, 14%); Bisexual/Fluid (*n*=2, 14%), Lesbian (*n*=1, 7%), Pansexual (*n*=1, 1%), and Two Spirit (*n*=1, 7%). Participants' ages ranged from 29-66 years with a mean of 41 years, and they reported providing supervision from 3 to 42 years, with a mean of approximately 12 years. The sample's ability/disability status was largely Able-Bodied (*n*=11, 78%). Three participants (25%) self-identified disability statuses, including having a chronic disease, hearing impairment, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, McArdle's Disease, and a congenital visual disability.

Of the 14 original participants, 6 participants engaged in follow-up interviews. Of the participants involved in follow-up interviews, 4 identified as women (67%), 3 identified as persons of color (50%; i.e., South Asian, Mestizas, Mexican American), 2 were international (33%), three identified as having a disability (50%), 2 identified as sexual minorities (33%; i.e., lesbian, queer), with a mean of 9 years of supervision experience (range of three to 42 years), and a mean age of 44.5 years (range of 31 to 66 years). Participation in follow-up interviews was voluntary, and I interviewed all those who responded to follow-up interview recruitment emails. As compared to the overall sample, the follow-up interview sample included a higher representation of men, international citizens, and those with a disability status as well as a lower representation of sexual minorities. The follow-up interview sample had a slightly older mean age and had slightly fewer mean years of supervisory experience. Thus, the follow-up interviews may have emphasized the perspectives of participants with experiences historically marginalized in feminist discourse.

Of the 14 original participants, 6 participants took part in feedback interviews, two of whom previously participated in follow-up interviews. Of the participants

involved in feedback interviews, 4 identified as women (67%), 2 identified as persons of color (33%; i.e., Mestizas, Mexican American), 1 was international (17%), 1 identified as having a disability (17%), 3 identified as sexual minorities (50%; i.e., queer, bisexual, queer), with a mean of 9 years of supervision experience (range of three to 24 years), and a mean age of 38 years (range of 30 to 47 years). As compared to the overall sample, the feedback interview sample included a higher representation of men. The feedback interview sample had a slightly younger mean age and had slightly fewer mean years of supervisory experience. Individuals newer to an FMC approach to supervision may have guided the revision of results to supervision.

Generally, sample sizes in qualitative investigations are considerably smaller than those of quantitative studies (Morrow, 2007). This is especially true if the sources of data are varied and extensive to obtain depth of co-constructed knowledge. What matters more than numbers in qualitative research is that the sample is obtained purposefully, by incorporating a rationale for the type of information needed and the purpose of the study, as well as taking into account what is possible given the number of researchers and availability of financial resources (Patton, 2002; Sandelowski, 1995). Thus, the number of participants in this study was appropriate given the need for diverse participants and the extensiveness of data collected. Data collection stopped when data became redundant and when the theory was fully saturated, to prevent an unnecessarily large sample. *Theoretical saturation* occurred when "fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights nor reveals new properties of these core theoretical categories" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 113).

Selection Procedures

In an effort to improve upon the sampling procedures of Kulpinski's (2006) study, I focused on recruiting supervisors with diverse social locations and supervisory history and experience. This study therefore incorporated a maximum variation type of purposeful sampling procedure (Sandelowski, 1995). Maximum variation sampling requires the largest sample size when compared to other purposeful sampling procedures. This study utilized demographic variation to obtain participants with maximum variation specifically related to diversity of cultural variables, theoretical approaches, regional location of supervisory training and experience, and years providing supervision.

In addition to maximum variation sampling, selection procedures for this study included purposeful and criterion-based sampling (Patton, 2002; Polkinghorne, 2005). Purposeful sampling was used to procure a sample that was information-rich. Therefore, participants of this study were selected because they self-identified as supervisors who integrated feminist, womanist, and/or multicultural perspectives into their supervision practice and had experience providing clinical supervision. I restricted recruitment to participants who had provided clinical supervision for no less than 2 years (Kulpinski, 2006) and provided supervisory service at the time recruitment. I recruited FMC supervisors from among licensed psychologists. Initially, I sought out participants with diverse licensure domains (e.g., social workers, marriage and family therapists, professional counselors, psychologists). However, after utilizing gatekeepers in master's level clinical fields, contacting training facilities, and submitting emails to appropriate listserves, I was unable to recruit master's level clinicians. To aid in the data analysis process and to streamline recruitment, I focused on a more homogeneous sample of

psychologists with degrees in counseling or clinical psychology. Homogeneity of licensure domain reduced the variation related to training experiences and educational paths, resulting in a need for a smaller sample size. Restricting recruitment to psychologists allowed me to focus recruitment efforts on variation related to social location, theoretical approach, region, and experience.

Theoretical sampling was also utilized in this study (Charmaz, 2006). This involved a process of continually gathering purposeful data to "elaborate and refine" emerging categories of the theory (p. 96). I sought out individuals who were not accounted for in the sample to obtain a diversified data set. To create a focused and theoretically saturated analysis, I searched for individuals who could provide information that disconfirmed my emerging conclusions. For example, after interviewing and analyzing the first five participant interviews, I developed initial concepts to follow in the next wave of data collection. I noticed that 3 of the participants in the first wave of data collection were early-career psychologists and 2 were women of color. Their experiences contrasted with the 2 participants entering their 2nd decade as practicing supervisors, who were, at minimum, 10 years older than the remaining 3 participants. In this early wave of data collection, I noticed that power dynamics and management of power were important concepts to FMC supervision. However, participants of color and early career psychologists described increased complexity in the power relationships they experienced between themselves and their supervisees.

I noticed that 1 of the first 5 participants had not been exposed to formal training in supervision at any point in her career. Another participant had received supervised supervision provision on her predoctoral internship, but she had not received formal

training during her doctoral education. When compared to the 3 participants with formal supervision training in the first wave of data collection, the 2 participants without formal training in supervision emphasized the role of modeling in their supervisory evolution and described their supervision theoretical orientation largely by comparing it to their theoretical orientation to counseling.

Further, 3 of the first 5 participants provided indirect supervision as faculty members and the other 2 participants historically provided direct supervision in agency contexts. I noticed that participants spoke of advocating for their supervisees, but that advocacy took different forms if supervisors provided direct or indirect supervision. Further, group supervision provision dominated the stories of participants in departmental contexts. However, participants providing individual or group supervision talked about using collaboration. Lastly, I noticed that the women of color and the man in this first wave of data collection spoke to experiencing noninclusivity in feminist psychology and their historical challenges in feminist communities and/or adopting a feminist identity. Thus, I looked for participants who had been in the field longer than 10 years, were supervisors in agency or community settings, and were members of social location groups historically on the margins of feminism (e.g., men, women of color) to clarify initial themes embedded in the data.

Further, theoretical sampling involved iterative sampling (Polkinghorne, 2005), wherein sampling continued until the data analysis was saturated and when the findings were no longer "challenged or deepened" by new participant experiences (p. 140). Further, I also employed purposeful snowball sampling in this study (Patton 2002). In an effort to find applicable and information-rich sources of information, I asked participants

to provide participant referrals. This became especially important when I sought out diverse participants and participants with different points of view.

Recruitment

After attaining approval from the University of Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB), I accessed potential participants through a variety of means. I utilized my dissertation chair, Dr. Susan L. Morrow, who is an FMC supervisor, as a gatekeeper into the field. Given her longstanding established relationships with FMC-oriented clinicians, researchers, and supervisors, she was able introduce me to participants and to assist me in establishing initial rapport. Further, her assistance provided legitimacy and credibility to my study on the outset, allowing for easier entrance to the field (Patton, 1990).

After securing Morrow's contribution to participant recruitment, I brainstormed with my peer research team to locate appropriate supervisors from their prior practicum and graduate education experiences. Given their prior relationships with potential participants, my peer research team members served as gatekeepers to establish connection and initial rapport. In addition, I contacted and brainstormed with my past supervisors and obtained their assistance as gatekeepers in the field. Then, I followed the process described by Kulpinski (2006). I recruited participants through FMC-centered email distribution lists using e-mail announcements. I utilized distribution lists associated with the following organizations: Association for Women in Psychology (both the local and national chapters), the Society for the Psychology of Women (Division 35 of the American Psychological Association [APA]), the Section for the Advancement of Women of the Society of Counseling Psychology (Division 17 of APA). Lastly, I utilized

the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) online directory search to locate internship and postdoctoral training sites reported a feminist and/or multicultural focus in their training. After finding appropriate sites, I reviewed their clinical staff information and individually contacted appropriate supervisors.

When individuals contacted me in response to e-mail announcements, contact from gatekeepers, and/or my requests for participation, I forwarded them a copy of my recruitment flyer, recruitment letter, and informed consent documents for review (see Appendices A, B, and C, respectively). After screening these individuals for interest in and appropriateness for this study, I secured their involvement by obtaining verbal consent before conducting initial interviews.

Researcher Roles and Relationships with Participants

As a critical/ideological feminist identified researcher, my goal was to create a mutually participatory, collaborative, and transparent research process. Thus, I was a participant-observer in this study. I, therefore, not only observed the participants, but I also participated in the co-production of meaning with participants (Morrow & Smith, 2000). I actively collaborated during our interactions and utilized active listening skills throughout data acquisition to make sure I understood participants' meanings. I was transparent about my interest in the study; my goals in performing this study; and my experiences, assumptions, biases, and beliefs about FMC supervision. That said, the primary story that emerged from this investigation was that of the participants; my own experiences and subsequent story were tools of the research, not a source of data.

I also pursued active participation from the participants by working to manage

power differentials during interviews. I did so by opening dialogue about our power differences early in the interview and by requesting feedback from participants throughout the interview regarding their feelings of safety and perceptions of how the interview was going (Goudie-Nice, 2010). Because supervisors were more advanced in the field than I was, I found their social and professional locations to offset the researcher-participant power differences. However, as a critical researcher I was mindful of these dynamics throughout the study. Throughout our interactions together, I asked for feedback about their experiences in the research process so as to modify my interactions to create a positive research atmosphere.

Taking Leave

In an effort to engage in respectful research with the participants in this study, I ended the research project in a way that honored their participation. To do so, I valued their expertise on FMC supervision by engaging them in feedback sessions regarding the theory and the research process itself. I showed my gratitude for their assistance throughout the process. Additionally, I provided them with a copy of their transcribed interview and will provide them with the final dissertation, as a token of my appreciation.

The participants in this study provided meaning to the construct of FMC supervision. These participants were recruited from a national search, wherein I sought participants who provided maximum variation of demographic variables, theoretical perspectives, and experiences. In an effort to develop a rich, meaningful, and informative theory of FMC supervision, I collected multiple sources of data.

Sources of Data

The use of multiple data sources, also known as *triangulation,* elevates the rigor of a study and enhances the richness and depth of the data (Morrow, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000). In this study, triangulation of sources of data (Denzin, 1978) included obtaining multiple perspectives of FMC supervision from different individual interview participants and through multiple kinds of data. I utilized triangulation to provide a stronger snapshot of what happened in FMC supervision by viewing the phenomenon from multiple vantage points. Additionally, to be consistent with the concept of emergent design in grounded theory, I utilized data sources that could be shaped in response to emerging analyses through concurrent data collection and data analysis (Charmaz, 2006). Therefore, it was not only important that I have a variety of sources, it was also important that I utilized the sources of data flexibly. In this study, a combination of individual interviews, participant observation, follow-up interviews/participant checks, analytic memos, and reflexive journals were utilized as data sources.

Individual Interviews

Consistent with grounded theory methods, I utilized intensive interviewing as the primary data source in this study. Because this was a national study, it was beyond my financial means to interview each participant in person. Therefore, I conducted individual interviews through Internet video conferencing (n=8) or by phone (n=6). By providing options for distance interviewing, I was able to obtain a wider variety of respondents from more diverse regions of the United States and internationally (Sturges & Hanrahan, 2004). Telephone and video conferencing interviews produced data similar to in person

interviews, because the present study had a narrow scope of focus and being immersed in the participants' environments was not necessary. Given that I asked participants about their FMC supervision practice, distance interviews were sufficient. However, due to the loss of nonverbal information when conducting phone interviews, I preferred video conferencing interviews.

I began individual interviews by engaging in brief, informal conversation to assist in the development of rapport and safety in the interview situation (Spradley, 1979). Following this informal conversation, I employed the process of *briefing* participants to the interview by discussing the purpose of the study, explaining the informed consent document, and obtaining verbally recorded consent to engage in my study (Kvale, 1996). Following the semistructured interview, I utilized *debriefing,* an informal conversation to answer questions participants had about the study and how their information would be used. Consistent with Kvale, I provided participants with the main points I had taken from the interview to allow the participants to correct or expand on my understanding.

Individual interviews are seen as providing an opportunity for one to explore participants' experiences in depth (Charmaz, 2006). I cultivated environments wherein participants felt listened to, because I sensitively observed participants and encouraged them to share their experiences as fully as possible. I worked to think critically of the meanings made in the individual interviews, to move beyond the surface meanings of participants' words. The goal of this process was to gain intensive depth of knowledge of participants' experiences and meanings. Thus, I actively participated in the interviews by asking for clarification of participants' meanings; asking for more information when participants' meanings could be described more fully; and responding with active

listening, empathic response, and minimal encouragers (Kvale, 1996). For example, participants often used jargon from their theoretical orientations, supervisory scholarship, feminism or multiculturalism, or the broad field of psychology. When such terms were used, I immediately asked participants to expand on their definitions of these terms.

I conducted 14 semistructured individual interviews, ranging from 91 minutes to 170 minutes in length (mean = 117 minutes), with a total of 22 hours and 58 minutes of initial individual interviews. Each interview was digitally audio-recorded for transcription. I worked with a professional transcriber to transcribe my initial and follow-up interviews. I completed accuracy checks of the transcriptions by listening to the recorded interviews and making corrections to the transcripts.

Consistent with grounded theory methods, I utilized a few broad and open-ended questions (Charmaz, 2006). The interview questions detailed below were developed to answer the research question, "How do self-identified FMC psychotherapy supervisors conceptualize and practice feminist supervision that is explicitly multicultural?" These questions were used to guide and structure the interview conversation. Given the emergent nature of this study, questions shifted throughout the research process. In each interview, I asked different clarification questions to obtain depth of meaning (Kvale, 1996). Further, due to concurrent data collection and data analysis, I "look[ed] for ideas through studying [my] data and then return[ed] to the field and gather[ed] focused data to answer analytic questions and to fill conceptual gaps" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 29). The specific interview questions emerged from the conversations with participants; however, the following questions guided the conversation. I piloted an initial list of questions with an FMC supervisor who was not part of the study and was further revised before

embarking upon data collection to develop clear questions that allowed for extended, information-rich disclosures by participants (Fassinger, 2005).

1. Can you describe your journey or evolution to becoming a supervisor?
    a. What training did you have to become a supervisor?
2. Can you describe your theoretical orientation or conceptual approach to supervision?
    a. If not already described, can you tell me other ways that you do supervision through your theoretical/conceptual approaches?
3. Can you give me some examples from your supervisory work?

Field Notes

As a self-identified FMC supervisor-in-training who invested time in reviewing the literature, I had prior cultural knowledge of the participants' supervisory practices. Further, given my interest in collaborative development of knowledge and meaning in interviews, I played a highly participatory role in the interview situation (Lassiter, 2005; Spradley, 1980). Participant observers can be viewed on a continuum from "more participant" to "more observer" (Spradley, 1980); in this study, I took a position near the middle of that continuum but toward the "more observer" end, where I drew from my own supervisory experiences (both as a supervisee and a supervisor-in-training) and my experiences from prior data collection and data analysis to inform my interactions with participants. I also had a minor role as observer of the interview situation. By attending to my observations in the interview, while also participating in the interview, I decreased the potential distance between the participants and myself.

Observational data augmented my interview data (Spradley, 1980). At the end of each interview, I recorded detailed descriptions of what I observed in the interview. I described what I heard and saw during the interview. I described participants' emotional reactions to and ways of interacting with me and, when available, their behavior and body language. I described my feelings, fears, reactions, mistakes, and breakthroughs during the interviews. These observations were recorded in *field notes,* which were written logs of detail-oriented, nonjudgmental descriptions of the interview. Organized and systematic field notes allowed for identification of patterns of behavior and relationships that enhanced analysis (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Participant Checks and Follow-up Interviews

I engaged in participant checks during individual interviews, during data immersion, and during the later stages of data analysis (Morrow, 2007). Frequently during the individual interviews, I checked in with participants to confirm that I had accurately understood what they said and perceived their meanings. In addition, I checked in with participants to seek additional, clarifying, and or disconfirming evidence when their disclosures related to or were different from other participants.

When engaging in the immersion stage of data analysis, as I reviewed transcripts, I recorded follow-up questions for participants to clarify or deepen meanings and obtained follow-up information through email, Internet video conferencing, or phone calls. After completing all 14 initial individual interviews, I contacted participants via email to offer the option of participating in follow-up interviews or to answer questions via email. I conducted six follow-up interviews lasting 27 minutes to 56 minutes in length

(mean = 47 minutes) with a total of 4 hours and 44 minutes of follow-up interviews. Questions in follow-up interviews were emergent in nature; and, therefore, I did not have a proscribed set of follow-up questions. Instead, I asked questions of participants to fill holes in their initial interviews; to make sense of unclear, thin, or missing aspects of the emerging conceptual categories, their properties, and relationships between conceptual categories; and/or to clarify discrepant or disconfirming evidence.

For example, in my follow-up interviews with Clara and Megan, I wanted to clarify the emerging tensions between supervisors' responsibility for learning opportunities and protection of clients and the focus on transparent and collaborative relationships. I asked, "How do you as a supervisor manage this apparent tension between creating this reflective, connecting, collaborative relationship and times when you're, like, 'I spot something that's problematic for client care, and I need to step in'?" Megan and Clara helped me make sense of seemingly related yet divergent information.

Finally, the purpose of feedback interviews was to engage participants as co-analysts of the data by requesting their feedback on the emerging conceptual model. After I derived an initial theoretical structure of the conceptual categories, subcategories, and relationships between categories and subcategories via completing initial, focused, and axial coding, I invited participants to meet with me via email, Internet video conferencing, or phone to provide feedback on the emerging model. I conducted six feedback interviews ranging from 32 minutes to 70 minutes (mean = 55 minutes) for a total of 5 hours and 31 minutes of feedback interviews. Feedback interviews occurred in two waves. The first wave occurred early after initial conceptual categories emerged from data analysis in order to clarify that I had appropriately formed major conceptual

categories, subcategories, and linkages per participants' lived experiences. After analyzing and integrating the initial feedback from participants, I requested participation from the remaining participants and conducted a final wave of feedback interviews.

In both waves of feedback interviews, I emailed participants a brief electronic narrative of the conceptual categories and subcategories and the questions below. I invited participants to individually review the emerging analytic narrative and offered to talk participants through the emerging analytic narrative during the feedback interview. During the feedback interviews, about half of the participants previously reviewed the narrative, but all participants asked me to talk through the conceptual categories, subcategories, and linkages. After reviewing the narrative, I asked participants the following questions to invite their feedback on the emerging analysis:

1. Is there anything about your experience that is not showing up in the emerging analysis?
2. Are there any conceptual categories that appear to be more important to your experience than others?
3. What relationships do you perceive among the emerging conceptual categories?
4. What central category or categories do you see emerging from the analysis?

By inviting participants into the analytic process, I invited them to challenges my interpretations of meaning; sought out disconfirming evidence; and clarified categories, subcategories, and their relationships. I adjusted the conceptual model to match participants' revisions. Participants' feedback was critical to the emergence of the central category, its relationships to other categories, and the final conceptual model.

Analytic Memos

Using analytic memos, I reflected on the data as I wrote about analytic hunches and interpretations, catalogued my questions that directed data collection, and described connections among the data (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Holton, 2007; Morrow, 2005; 2007). Memos included analytic notes of research team meetings, observations during the interviews, reflections during data immersion, and meetings with my advisor. Additionally, I included developing codes, categories, and themes. I wrote analytic memos after each initial, follow-up, and feedback interviews.

Memo writing ensured that I engaged in data analysis concurrent to data collection. Memo writing helped me to keep track of my analytic hunches to drive my next steps for data collection and analysis. For example, I reviewed prior analytic memos often to ensure that I incorporated prior analysis into later interviews. The process of collecting my analytic thoughts during data collection and analysis supported later efforts when raising data to codes, codes to concepts, and concepts to conceptual categories and their properties (Holton, 2007). Memoing helped me slow down and stick close to the data when adopting a core category and forming the final conceptual (Holton, 2007). I used hand sorting of memos to shape the theoretical structure, elucidate the central theoretical code, and integrate the conceptual model into its final form.

Using theoretical sampling and data triangulation, I developed information-rich data. I collected multiple types of data, including individual interviews, participant observation, follow-up interviews, participant checks, and analytic memos to strengthen the analysis and results of this study. Throughout the process of collecting data, I managed and analyzed the data and reported the results in ways cognizant of a

critical/ideological feminist paradigm and grounded theory research design.

Data Analysis and Writing

Within this section, I describe the processes for managing the data, analyzing the data, and writing up the results of the study.

Data Management

Data management, the process of compiling and organizing incoming data, was an important activity throughout the data collection and analysis process. These data management activities helped to insure that I immersed myself in the data. To manage the data, I used both electronic and hard copies of the data. I assembled the data corpus, or the collection of raw data, by transcribing digitally audiotaped interviews into Word documents. I hired a professional transcriber to do the transcription. To verify the data, I checked the transcription by simultaneously listening to the interviews, reading along in the transcripts, and making corrections as needed. This began the process of initial immersion in the data that is typical of grounded theory analysis. Further, I utilized Atlas.ti (Muhr, 2009) to assist with data management. Atlas.ti provided instantaneous records each time I added new data to the data corpus, which proved priceless in tracking my data collection process and in formulating my audit trail.

Data analysis incorporated computer and hand coding. I utilized Atlas.ti (Muhr, 2009) to conduct initial coding, focused coding, and axial coding. When I began building relationships among codes and categories, I printed out coding families or hypothesized focused codes, hand sorted them, and organized them on a large table. Then, I entered

hypothetical relationships among code families into Word documents. A similar process occurred after memoing focused codes and their relationships and seeking participant feedback on focused codes and, again, after analyzing participant feedback, raising focused codes to conceptual categories, and explicating properties of conceptual categories. I also used diagrams of the code families to assist in analysis.

Data Analysis

As described above, data collection, immersion, writing, and analysis are concurrent and iterative in grounded theory methods. Thus, the processes of collecting interview data, developing analytic memos, immersing myself in the data, and analyzing data occurred in overlapping waves. In grounded theory analysis, analysis is the process of tuning in to the data, asking questions of the data, and using those questions to continue data collection and analysis (Charmaz, 2006). This is congruent with a critical/ideological feminist theory paradigm, in that I used what I learned in the process of closely connecting with the data, or the meaning made between participants and myself, to direct future data gathering efforts. This insured that the voices of participants influenced the emerging design of the study. I also constantly questioned the meanings I made, while also searching for evidence that disconfirmed my understandings. Analysis occurred through processes of substantive and theoretical coding. Substantive coding included immersion, initial coding, focused coding, and axial coding to facilitate the emergence of the core category; and, then, theoretical coding to integrate the substantive theory (Charmaz, 2006; Holton, 2007). The purpose of analysis was to develop a grounded theory of FMC supervision practice.

Initial immersion continued with reading each transcript without annotating in the first read-through (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). This allowed me the opportunity to just listen to what participants told me and to enter into their worlds. Next, I listened to the interviews and made analytic notes of my reflections. These dated notes were the start of my analytic memos. Memos were housed in Atlas.ti (Muhr, 2009) to allow for a chronological cataloging of analytic memos and to assist in data analysis. Before beginning the coding phase of analysis, I reread transcripts and analytic memos multiple times.

I used Charmaz's (2006, 2009) constructivist grounded theory approach as a framework to elucidate a theory of FMC supervision. I augmented Charmaz's constructivist formulation with works from first generation grounded theorists (Glaser, 1965; Glaser & Strauss, 1965, 1967) and writing by second generation grounded theorists (Hernandez, 2009; Holton, 2007; Stern, 1980, 2007) to support my analytic journey. Coding was a process by which I named and summarized large bodies of data (Charmaz, 2006). As artfully described by Charmaz, "Grounded theory coding generates the bones of your analysis. Theoretical integration will assemble these bones into a working skeleton" (p. 45). The first step to coding was *initial coding.* I stayed close to the data during initial coding, partitioning data into small segments of words, lines, or incidents and naming the action happening in each segment of data. I named segments of data using gerunds to help me stay close to the action occurring in each fragment of data. Further, I used *in vivo codes,* or codes that used the words of participants, which kept me connected to the data, versus my preconceived ideas about the data. Throughout this process I employed the *constant comparative method,* wherein I compared data to data,

data to codes, and codes to codes to refine coding and to verify that coding was supported by data (Charmaz, 2006; Holton, 2007). I changed code names to allow codes to reflect more fully the meanings of participants. These codes served as indicators of larger concepts to be determined in later stages of analysis (Holton, 2007).

When I sufficiently confirmed that the initial codes fit the data, I focused attention onto initial codes that were most theoretically salient and frequent, initiating the process of *focused coding* (Charmaz, 2006). Thus, I identified the most frequent and significant codes as categories if they completely categorized smaller initial codes in a theoretically relevant way. Through analytic memos, I wrote about the concepts underlying focused codes, articulating the processes occurring in FMC supervision. I then compared focused codes to the subordinate open codes and verified my analysis as conceptually valid. Thereby, I developed initial themes that I followed in continued data collection.

Following initial and focused coding came *axial coding,* or the process of relating categories to subcategories and specified the properties and dimensions of categories (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In the stage of axial coding, I put the data back together again. Instead of using the approach suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1998), wherein the analyst specifically looks for answers in the data to understand the conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences to organize the data, I followed Charmaz's (2006) interpretation of axial coding. I made sense of the data conceptually by relating the focused codes to one another by creating subcategories, categories, and links between subcategories and categories (Charmaz, 2006). Categories and subcategories needed to be at the conceptual level of abstraction, not just describing the meaning of participants, but instead naming what was happening among open and focused codes

(Holton, 2007). Within this stage of analysis, I compared subcategories to categories and defined their relationships, compared categories to the data, and delineated the characteristics of categories (properties) to deepen category conceptual clarity (Fassinger, 2005). In axial coding, I began developing conceptual structure of the subcategories, categories, and links and reconceptualized the emerging structure when disconfirming elements arose. Throughout the process of analytic coding, I wrote analytic notes to deepen my understanding of the concepts and processes that integrate the categories.

Through the iterative process of initial, focused, and axial coding, I looked for theoretically salient categories and identified a core story that emerged, providing an integrative force to the developing theory. Though Charmaz (2006) rejected the concept of a core category articulated by Strauss and Corbin (1998), I found it to be a valuable method for providing explanatory power to my grounded conceptual model (Holton, 2007). Additionally, given that the core story emerged through the iterative processes of coding, memoing for concepts, and theoretical sampling, and it developed out of the data through increasing layers of abstraction.

Following axial coding, I engaged in *theoretical coding* (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Hernandez, 2009; Holton, 2007). In theoretical coding, I compared higher-order categories to other higher-order categories, defined how categories related, and established a coherent foundation for the grounded theory. It was important at this stage that I let the data speak for themselves, versus forcing the data to fit existing theoretical schemes (Morrow, Castañeda-Sound, & Abrams, 2011). Theoretical codes "conceptualize how the substantive codes may relate to each other as hypotheses to be integrated into the theory. They help the analyst maintain the conceptual level in writing

about concepts and their interrelations" (Holton, 2007, p. 283). As I proceeded through theoretical coding, I fleshed out the theoretical structure into a model. I used theoretical sampling to connect with participants and asked questions about categories that lacked depth to enhance the theoretical value of the category. I used follow-up interviews, gathered new data to check the validity of the theory, and altered the model as necessary to fit the experiences of FMC supervisors.

Throughout the process of data analysis, I engaged in the process of writing analytic memos. Analytic memos forced me to think about coding and categorizing data, thereby enhancing my analysis. Memos were a place where I wrote about and illuminated the emerging model; made document comparisons and identified relationships; explored the implications of disconfirming evidence and gaps in the data; and noted changes in my codes, categories, and the grounded theory. This started early and continued until I developed theoretical saturation. Analytic memos helped me be accountable to the analytic process by chronologically cataloging each session of data analysis. Further, sorting analytic memos was pivotal in theoretically integrating the core category and other conceptual categories to create a parsimonious, fully articulated grounded theory conceptual model. By ordering and reordering analytic memos, I was able to ascertain the relationships among conceptual categories, delimit excess code families, and enhance my theoretical sensitivity of the evolving model (Holton, 2007; Stern, 1980).

A typical element of grounded theory methods is the quest for disconfirming evidence. Disconfirming evidence provides a platform for refining and improving analysis. I sought out disconfirming evidence by requesting it in initial and follow-up interviews, through discussion of my unfolding analysis with my advisor and peer

research team, and through memo writing. These were efforts to find discrepancies, holes, and flaws in the explanatory model (Charmaz, 2006).

Writing

The result of data analysis was a written narrative explicating the theory of FMC supervision. Although users of grounded theory often employ the use of visual models or diagrams to visually represent their analyses; despite employing my participants, brainstorming with my peer research team, and spending hours alone drawing and memoing on countless diagrams, I was unable to facilitate the emergence of a visual model to represent the results of the study. As described by Bryant and Charmaz (2007), a defined split exists amongst grounded theorists regarding the value of diagrams and visual models. For me, diagrams served a useful purpose when examining categories, subcategories, their properties, and their linkages, yet diagrams never served to express the conceptual model better than words. Thus, I chose to use a narrative to express the grounded theory that resulted from my analytic process.

The narrative included representative quotations of the participants' own words to supply validity to the model and to provide context to the model (Ponterotto, 2005). To provide equity among the voices of participants, I examined the frequency of quotations used in each section of the narrative to avoid the possibility of a few voices outweighing many. As I developed an initial model of FMC supervision practice, I returned to participants to elicit their feedback on the model to find evidence that disconfirmed the model, thereby refining the developing model.

To summarize, once sufficiently immersed in the data, I utilized a grounded theory approach to analyzing the data. Once the analysis was sufficiently saturated and

verified by participants, I wrote the results to centralize the voices of participants to provide trustworthiness to the model. Beyond valuing the voices of participants, I engaged in multiple methods to enhance trustworthiness of this study.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness for a study using a critical/ideological feminist theory paradigm can be best understood through authenticity criteria as developed by Guba and Lincoln (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln, 1995). Authenticity criteria include fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, and catalytic authenticity. *Fairness* involved the process of obtaining and privileging multiple and diverse perspectives and meaning through the entirety of the research process. In the data collection process, I worked to recruit participants who had diverse perspectives through a variety of training and work experiences, disciplines, and lengths of time as supervisors. I recruited participants who had different experiences with privilege and marginalization because of diverse social locations. Additionally, I recruited participants nationally, providing variability in regional experiences. To provide accountability for having multiple perspectives, I used participant checks so that participants provided discrepant and disconfirming evidence to my conclusions. In the written product, I attended to fairness by providing equitability of participants' voices. This meant that I attended to the frequency in which I quoted participants to avoid privileging some voices above others.

Ontological authenticity involved fully developing and expanding participants' perspectives and meaning. As described in the section on "Horizons of Understanding," it was important to manage power discrepancies in the collection of data to diminish the

potential of inadvertently oppressing participants, thereby creating an unsafe environment and silencing their perspectives. Thus, I engaged in explicit power analysis to manage power discrepancies and create safety in the interview situation. Additionally, as described in the section on "Sources of Data," I worked from an "unknowing" perspective: I resisted the urge to think that I knew participants' meaning due to our shared culture, reflected participants' meanings, and probed for additional information. Bu doing so, I encouraged clarity and depth of meaning while in the interview (Charmaz, 2006). Thus, I sought meaning from participants, even when I thought I knew what they meant, to fully elaborate participant meaning. Additionally, in the data analysis and writing process, I sought participants' involvement by asking them to provide feedback on the emerging model and narrative, thereby adding to the analysis and results.

Educative authenticity involved participants learning from the perspectives of other participants. Educative authenticity occurred in the interview situation and through participant checks. In the interview situation, I shared my developing perspectives on FMC supervision with participants, thereby enhancing their appreciation and understanding of other participants' perspectives. In participant checks, I shared the emerging model and narrative, created from the integrated perspectives of all participants, and enhanced their conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision. In feedback interviews, participants remarked that they valued the opportunity to learn from other participants' employment of FMC supervision and desired to use the results of this study to inform future generations of supervisor-trainees in their supervision courses.

Finally, *catalytic authenticity* involved the process of creating change through research. I plan to promote change by using the final grounded theory model to provide

presentations at trainings, conferences, and classes to introduce or enhance the awareness, knowledge, and skills of FMC supervision to training staff, professors, and supervisors. Additionally, I plan to submit the final written product to scholarly journals for publication to provide a wider disbursement of the findings of this study.

I improved the trustworthiness of this study by using multiple components of rigor, including immersion in the data, participant checks, explicit attention to disconfirming evidence, the peer research team, and the audit trail. I strengthened the trustworthiness of this study by using multiple data sources, including individual interviews, participant checks, and analytic memos and journals. I engaged in researcher reflexivity in an effort to manage my subjectivity, by using my self-reflective journal, peer research team, and participant checks.

By engaging in the above processes, the rigor of the study was enhanced, thereby increasing the trustworthiness of the results of data analysis. In an effort to monitor my completion of the above tasks, I used an audit trail. An audit trail is a "detailed chronology of research activities and processes; influences on the data, collection and analysis; emerging themes, categories, or models; and analytic memos" (Morrow, 2005, p. 252). The audit trail increased my accountability to the research process and included records of my use of a self-reflective journal, analytic written memos, and record of support sought from research team members (Guba & Linclon, 1989; Morrow & Smith, 2000). Further, in the audit trail, I catalogued research activities such as data collection (e.g., interviews, field notes, contacts with participants, and participant checks) as well as data analysis (e.g., emergent codes and themes, emergent grounded theory models, changes in the model, and changes in the research method). To increase my

accountability, I removed confidential information from the audit trail and submitted the edited audit trail to my advisor, Dr. Susan Morrow, to provide feedback on the research method, research process, and analysis. Finally, I included a copy of a condensed audit trail (see Appendix D).

Through the lens of a critical/ideological feminist theory paradigm, trustworthiness is best explicated through the authenticity criteria of fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, and catalytic authenticity. To enhance rigor, I engaged in multiple actions throughout this study. Beyond enhancing the rigor of this study, I was also mindful of ethical considerations that relate to welfare of participants.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical principles of psychologists and the code of conduct of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2002) guided the research in this study. I obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Utah to conduct my research and followed the accepted procedures. Due to the emerging design of qualitative research, I amended the procedures of the study's design (Morrow & Smith, 2000). When I wished to amend the procedures, I submitted said changes to the IRB. Due to the extensive interviews I had with the participants, it was possible that they may have experienced heightened emotions. To attend to this vulnerability, I enumerated potential risks to the participants in the informed consent documents (see Appendix C), so that they would be made aware of this in advance.

Contact with participants for the purposes of recruitment and scheduling interviews occurred via email correspondence. Email is not necessarily a private platform

for data collection, although participants may have felt that it was private due to the lack of face-to-face contact (Sixsmith & Murray, 2001). It was important to examine the public versus private nature of email communication and supply provisions to maintain participant confidentiality and privacy. In the case of this research, all communication was contained within the individual participant/researcher dyad. I copied and pasted all emailed communication to a Word document, and all identifying information was removed and replaced with pseudonyms. Emails were then deleted from my account. However, participants may have elected to keep email in their inboxes, and this was within the participants' control to maintain confidentiality of participation. The analytic narrative and conceptual model model was attached to the email correspondence for the participant to review, make comments, and provide criticism.

Confidentiality of interview transcriptions and participant checks was maintained by stripping all data of identifying information and utilization of pseudonyms in place of the individuals' names. All computer data were held within a password-protected computer. With respect to the analytic narrative and theoretical model, only pseudonyms were utilized, and identifying information was not employed in illustrative quotes to protect the privacy of the participants.

Summary

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore and understand the FMC supervision. In explicating the underlying research design, my role as researcher, the participants in this study, and the analytic procedure I used in this study, I provided the reader with an inside view of how this study was conducted. I defined the sources of rigor

and explicated how I set out to maintain trustworthiness when carrying out the methods of this study. In the following chapter, I describe the results of a grounded theory analysis of FMC supervisors' conceptualization and practice of supervision.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to expand the literature pertaining to feminist multicultural supervision in the discipline of psychology. Therefore, this study was explorative, and I sought to understand how supervisors apply feminist and multicultural principles into their supervisory practice with counselors in training. This was accomplished by inductively developing a conceptual model from the experiences of supervisors who practice feminist multicultural supervision.

In this chapter, I provide the results of a grounded theory analysis from individual, follow-up, and feedback interviews with counseling and clinical psychologists. Participants described their evolution toward becoming supervisors, their conceptual approach to supervision, and their methods of supervision. From these data, I define the conceptual categories by describing their analytic properties, the conditions from which they arise, and their consequences. I also discuss the social processes underlying conceptual categories. Further, I describe how the conceptual categories relate to one another and relate to the core category.

One core conceptual category and six related conceptual categories emerged from this grounded theory analysis. These categories explain the conceptualization and practice of FMC counseling supervision and exist as an interlocking system. That is, each

distinct category requires every other in order for supervision to exist as a feminist and multicultural framework. The core category is *Dealing with the Complexities of Power*. The FMC supervisors in this study anticipated the consequences of their power-laden supervisory roles and actions by utilizing the remaining conceptual categories in their conceptualization and practice of supervision. The ways in which they conceptualized the complexities of power included (a) *Having Inordinate Power in the Supervisory Role*; (b) *Complexity of Power Manifesting in Identities and Statuses*; (c) *Having Responsibilities Within and Beyond the Supervision Relationship*; (d) *Managing Tensions Between Responsibility, Power, and Egalitarianism*; (e) *Empowering Supervisees*.

Further, these FMC supervisors modeled or explicitly facilitated supervisees' processes of anticipating the consequences of power in clinical relationships and managing power with clients. The strategies participant supervisors used to anticipate and manage power included (a) *Bringing History into the Room*; (b) *Creating Trust Through Openness and Honesty*; (c) *Collaborating*; (d) *Meeting People Where They Are*; (e) *Knowing Self to Know Others*; and (f) *Looking at the Impact of Context.* I use participants' words as illustrative examples of the conceptual model. Brackets (i.e., []) are used to indicate that changes were made to the quote to enhance readability.

Core Category: Dealing with the Complexities of Power

Dealing with the complexities of power was the core conceptual category and central issue of FMC supervision. Actively dealing with the complexities of power was how participants explained how they conceptualized supervision and why they behaved as they did in their supervisory roles. FMC supervisors dealt with the complexities of

power by acknowledging that supervision relationships were power unequal. Supervisors always had more power than supervisees did due to their roles as evaluator and gatekeeper to the professional field. Power was a complex variable in participants' supervision relationships. Although supervisors always had more power relative to supervisees, their social locations and statuses in their agencies or departments could alter the power dynamics between supervisors and supervisees. Dealing with the complexity of power emerged from the conditions of responsibility to provide learning opportunities for supervisees and, at the same time, to protect clients. These responsibilities guided the decisions made in supervisory processes. Participants dealt with power by creating relationships that aspired to be egalitarian, on the one hand, and admitting to their supervisees that power equality was not possible, on the other. FMC supervisors acknowledged tensions between their values and their evaluative and gatekeeping responsibilities. When dealing with the complexities of power in this way, participants aimed to empower their supervisees. The core category is illustrated below in Table 1; then, each property of the core category is explained using the words of participants.

Table 1

Core Category: Dealing With the Complexities of Power

Properties of Dealing with the Complexities of Power
• Having Inordinate Power in the Supervisory Role • Complexity of Power Manifesting in Identities and Statuses • Having Responsibilities Within and Beyond the Supervision Relationship • Managing Tensions Between Responsibility, Power, and Egalitarianism • Empowering Supervisees

Having Inordinate Power in the Supervisory Role

To the FMC supervisors in the current study, dealing with the complexities of power meant knowing that the role of supervisor involved having a higher social status in the professional and academic context from the supervisee. The power that was specific to the supervisor's status and privilege set the tone for how supervision relationships played out; and, by virtue of their privileged and power-laden status, supervisors did not have to consider supervisees' preferences. Luna spoke to the potential of having unidirectional power as a supervisor and her resistance to traditional use of power in supervision, "[A] supervisee comes in with a client, 'What do I do?' 'Oh, you need to do x, y, and z. Ok, let's role-play how you're gonna do x, y, and z.' That's not what I do."

Because of their status, supervisors had more influence over supervisees than supervisees had over supervisors. Thus, supervisors had the potential to change supervisees' professional journeys, their experience of training, and their level of distress. Arby provided a keen illustration of the influence of supervisors and its impact on supervisees:

> Clients can walk out on you. Supervisees can't. Well, I mean they can; but the consequences are usually pretty dire. So, I can understand, at times, why supervisees are so anxious about wanting to be in sync with the supervisor.

Amisha identified the potential for abusing power:

> How I see power being abused is when you have the ability to change someone's life or to impact someone's life and you do it in a hurtful or in a disempowering or in a cruel way, essentially you have power.

The supervisor's status and power emerged from the evaluative and gatekeeping roles assigned to psychologists in academia. That is, supervisors were required to evaluate

supervisees' performance and progress in their clinical training. The supervisory power influenced supervisees, as described by Ava:

> Recognizing that, just naturally because of the way it's set up, I am considered the authority in the room. So, with supervisees, I have the license. I know with that comes some change of self; nobody acts the same way with their friends as they act with their [supervisor].

Participants acknowledged that their power vis-à-vis their supervisees influenced the dynamics in the counseling supervision room. They also recognized more broadly that power was complex and extended beyond the dynamic created from the social statuses of the supervisor, the supervisee, and the context.

Complexity of Power Manifesting in Identities and Statuses

A supervisor's power was not merely defined by her or his location within an agency, department, and/or professional field. Instead, the complexity of power manifested in statuses and social locations. Jenny noted that her power due to her status as director had deep implications for her status as a supervisor, "As a director, it's hard to remove that from people's awareness; and, sometimes, I'm not that conscious of it even though I get reminded." The interaction between supervisors and supervisees shifted depending on supervisors' and supervisees' social locations, including how aware they were of the power difference generated by their social locations.

If supervisors' social locations were oppressed, marginalized, or privileged within the larger socio-political contexts of the institution, community, state, and/or country, supervisors' power in the supervisory relationship was potentially augmented or possibly diminished. In addition, supervisors' ability to influence their supervisees shifted depending on the degree to which their supervisees accepted or rejected beliefs and

values learned from greater culture, that pertained to, for example, ability, age, gender, race, and/or sexual orientation. Megan, a young White woman supervisor, provided an example: "[When I'm] working with a really forceful male supervisee who wants to kind of take all the time and . . . doesn't want any feedback from me or . . . when I bring up things around gender or race, it's me pushing an agenda." Megan experienced her influence with some male supervisees as reduced and negated because of her social locations with regard to age and gender.

Supervisors in this study experienced their power differently depending on their social locations and the saliency of these social locations in a given supervisory relationship. Depending on their relative access to resources and power in larger socio-political systems, some supervisors experienced more distaste, discomfort, and fear of the power granted to them by educational attainment, licensure, and status. For example, Clara, a Latina, wondered with some discomfort about her relationships with her supervisees: "Have I kind of drank the juice . . . and kinda got off on the power a little bit?" Women and women of color supervisors with histories of experiencing abuses of power in supervision, in particular, appeared to feel suspicious or fear supervisory power and were concerned with unintentionally abusing their power in supervision. Amisha, an East Asian woman, illustrated her concern,

> I belong to so many different minority populations, that when I have this power, like, what does it mean to be a faculty member at [a prestigious university], right? I mean it has this kind of intoxication about it. And, there's a part of me that's disgusted by it, but I sort of fall into that trap.

In dominant social norms, individuals gained influence by having power over others and dominating them. FMC supervisors in this study worked to have a positive influence and did what their responsibilities demanded in a power-sharing process.

Having Responsibilities Within and Beyond the Supervision Relationship

FMC supervisors in this study admonished that to effectively deal with the complexities of power, supervisors must honor their responsibilities as supervisors. The power imbalance in supervision relationships emerged from two responsibilities: provision of supervisees' learning opportunities and protection of clients. Evaluative power and gatekeeping power emerged from these responsibilities.

Supervisors had the responsibility to provide learning opportunities for the supervisee within supervision. Based on supervisors' experience in the field, training, and status as a supervisor, they had a great deal to offer supervisees' clinical training journeys. This was especially true when helping supervisees to develop awareness of their behavior and attitudes, enhance knowledge of clinical work and client populations, and build new clinical skills. Thus, supervisors provided direct feedback to supervisees on their growth edges and simultaneously helped supervisees access information to fill their gaps in knowledge, self-awareness, and skills. Jenny explained, "The responsibility of a supervisor is to give very direct feedback on where they would like to work with trainees and where they see the trainees as needing more development." If supervisees were unable to meet the standards of a given institution, the supervisor was responsible to remediate deficiencies and sometimes prevented supervisees from moving forward in their clinical training. This was how the power imbalance in supervision relationships emerged when providing supervisees with FMC learning opportunities.

H defined her understanding of supervisory power as follows: "I'm grading students, typically, and I also have power because they are dependent on me and my

advice. I mean their development is dependent on me. I want them to develop, and I don't want them to feel manipulated." H believed that, even if supervisees felt uncomfortable providing personal information to supervisors that was irrelevant to the development of their professional skills, they would likely provide it upon request because of supervisors' power and authority. Thus, H wanted supervisees to make their own disclosure decisions about personal information.

In the supervisory triads, clients possessed the smallest amount of power. Supervisors, then, were ultimately responsible for the wellbeing of supervisees' clients. However, they avoided engaging in a dominating process to accomplish this goal. When clients exhibited self-harming behaviors or were a danger to themselves or others, supervisors would step in and provide directive assistance and support to both supervisees and their clients. Mo emphasized her responsibility to clients: "There's this administrative side to it where you have to be able to tell people what to do to keep the best interest of the client above the supervisee." Therefore, supervisors were responsible to ensure that supervisees were working within the boundaries set forth by the ethical and legal standards of the profession. Arby indicated the importance of responsibility: "If a supervisee does something unethical, for example, which is pretty clear, then I can't back off that, as uncomfortable as I might be." For FMC supervisors, being directive could feel uncomfortable because it signaled and exacerbated the power imbalance between supervisor and supervisee, as well as supervisee/therapist and client.

Managing Tensions Between Responsibility, Power, and Egalitarianism

When dealing with the complexities of power, these FMC supervisors experienced tensions between responsibility and power and aspirations for egalitarianism. Kevin gave voice to this tension: "I don't see myself as, nor do I want them to see me or expect them to see me, as somebody who is critical, evaluative." FMC supervisors worked to equalize power in the supervisory relationship, but they recognized that true egalitarianism in the supervisory role was only an aspiration that could not be fully realized. Clara clearly demonstrated her awareness of the limits of equalizing power:

> I still struggle with egalitarianism and how that relates to power, because with so many of the clients I've worked with there's no power in their lives. So, I just try to work with it in a responsible manner . . . and just realize that [power] shifts constantly. It's not static. So, with students, I'm just constantly aware of that.

When reflecting on the experience of recommending a supervisee retake a prepracticum in counseling, Lilly stated:

> From that experience [I've] learned how to balance that you wanna be collaborative; that you wanna make room for the other person, of course, in the relationship; but that there are times that you may need to direct them in a certain way or to say, 'This isn't good enough.' That was, I think, tricky through that whole experience.

Evaluating supervisees, gatekeeping the profession, protecting clients, and offering learning opportunities were conducted by participants via collaborative and transparent action. This was an attempt to reduce the gap of power in the FMC supervision relationship to protect and/or benefit the client first, supervisee second, and supervisor third. Katie acknowledged that discussing client harm and ethical dilemmas were difficult for supervisees. Therefore, she worked to create a supervisory context that was conducive to disclosure. Katie described, "[I try] to make the supervision room just safe enough for

them to talk to me about whatever's going on, so I'm just aware." Jason highlighted that attending to client welfare emerged from supervisees working under supervisors' licenses. His response to licensure resonated with other participants:

> As someone who's licensed, I know how hard it is to get it, right? Like you fuckin' work your ass off for that little piece of paper. It's hard, right, you wanna make sure that your shit's tight, and you wanna make sure that everything is okay. And, I think that's really important. At the same time, I think when you're working with [supervisees], helping them to understand or actually using them as a consultant for the clinical process: . . . "I understand what you're saying, and here's why I'm concerned. How do we work with my fear?"

An FMC reaction to power was sharing power in such a way that these supervisors responded to their responsibilities but brought supervisees into the process of caring for clients' needs. This involved supervisors holding their awareness of the licensing process in mind and their personal struggles to attain professional status. Sharing power restores supervisees' power.

Empowering Supervisees

Dealing with the complexities of power meant creating a process that was empowering to supervisees. Supervisors talked about power dynamics in relationships, worked to decrease power differentials, and shared power with those who had less status. Megan emphasized that talking explicitly about power dynamics in supervision could have far-reaching effects: "Having dialogues with students [about power] allows them to, then, do that with their clients, allows them to then do that in agencies, to deconstruct and make agencies less hierarchical and less oppressive and make change there." For some participants, empowering supervisees was a byproduct of assisting supervisees to learn how to empower their clients. For others, it was an overt goal of supervision.

When a supervisor worked with a supervisee to facilitate her or his finding her or his own voice, both parties were empowered, as was the supervisory relationship. For participants, empowering supervisees involved creating supervision relationships wherein supervisees trusted that they would not be shamed and believed that their voices were important. Empowering supervisees meant that supervisors honored supervisees' strengths, growth edges, great work, effort, and mistakes. It meant supervisors drew on the knowledge and intuition of all parties involved. It also meant mutual growth and naming how supervisors grew from their supervisees. Participant supervisors empowered supervisees by respecting their supervisees' opinions when there was disagreement, and supervisors acknowledged when they were wrong. Renee emphasized that empowering supervisees meant supporting supervisees in adopting an identity as a professional: "For the student who came in as a student, when he leaves the practicum he is a professional. For him to be able to visualize himself as a professional, that is empowerment. That is our intention."

Empowering supervisees meant knowing oneself and being committed to furthering self-learning, which was a byproduct of furthering the learning of supervisees. It also meant explicating the roles of power, privilege, and context. Therefore, participants managed the complexities of power through a complex process by which supervisors' and supervisees' were invited into supervision. FMC supervisors intentionally addressed transparency, collaboration, meeting people where they were, self-reflection, and attention to context, in order to empower supervisees.

Summary

Participants had a great deal of power attributed to their role as supervisors due to the conditions of evaluation, gatekeeping, responsibilities to provide learning, and responsibilities to protect clients. Power in the supervision role was not simple. Instead, it was complex, due to the intersection of supervisory power and social locations of supervisors and supervisees. FMC supervisors modeled anticipating and managing the consequences of their power-laden behavior for their supervisees and supervisees' clients, and these FMC supervisors facilitated supervisees' similar learning. Supervisors recognized tensions between traditional supervision practice (e.g., being directive, power-over) and their use of collaboration and transparency as primary means of managing supervisory power. Thus, the FMC supervisors in this study worked to anticipate and manage the consequences of their power in ways that were empowering to supervisees and used supervisory relationships as a model for supervisees' conduct with clients.

Related Conceptual Categories: Anticipating and Managing Power

Given the complexity of power identified by the supervisors in this study, all expressed the need to anticipate and manage this power. Table 2 illustrates the ways that participants achieved this goal. Each of these strategies is explained below. In the first strategy, participants constructed an approach to supervision that managed supervisory power using their lived experiences.

Table 2

Related Conceptual Categories: Anticipating and Managing Power

Properties of Anticipating and Managing Power

• Bringing History into the Room
  o Recognize that History Influences Approach
  o Earlier Experiences Prime Later Directions
  o Ways of Learning to Be a Supervisor
  o Refining Approaches From Experiences
  o Practicing in a Feminist, Multicultural Social Justice Way
• Creating Trust Through Openness and Honesty
  o Laying Things Out on the Table
  o Talking About Expectations
  o Being Who I Am Moment-to-Moment
  o Being Real and Authentic with Clients
• Collaborating
  o What Do You Need to Get There?
  o Valuing Different Approaches
  o Helping Supervisees to See Their Competence
  o Creating Mutually Growth Fostering Relationships
  o Talking Through Relationship Boundaries
  o Processing the Supervision Process
  o Collaborating on Feedback
  o Seeing Clients as Necessary Partners
• Meeting People Where They Are
  o Figuring Out What Supervises Bring into the Room
  o Respecting that People Are in Different Places
  o Meeting Supervisees on a Developmental Continuum
• Knowing Self to Know Others
  o Needing to be Consciously Aware
  o Exploring How Bias Creeps in
  o Getting at the Heart of Reactions
  o Processing the Impact of Identities on Relationships
• Looking at the Impact of Context
  o Exploring External Influences
  o Making Systems and Ecological Change

Bringing History into the Room

To the participants, bringing history into the room was the historical backdrop of their approaches to supervision. This FMC approach traced the role of oppression, power, and privilege on individuals' historical narratives and current lenses and acknowledged that these experiences primed individuals for later directions. More recent histories (e.g., work, education, and extracurricular activities) shaped participants' journeys towards their current approaches. Along an individual's personal and professional journey, other people, who enacted their own histories, affected the individual. Participants modeled themselves after attractive examples and distanced themselves from unattractive examples.

Participants looked at how training experiences and practical experiences refined a person's current style and approach. The FMC supervisors in this study grappled with personal worldviews and sociopolitical forces and constructed an approach that integrated feminism, multiculturalism, and social justice. Bringing history into the room meant that the histories of supervisors and supervisees influenced FMC supervision experiences. The ways that supervisors brought history into the room included (a) *Recognizing that History Influences Approach;* (b) *Earlier Experiences Primed Later Directions;* (c) *Ways of Learning to Be a Supervisor; (d) Refining Approaches from Experiences;* and (e) *Practicing in a Feminist, Multicultural, Social Justice Way*.

Recognizing that History Influences Approach

These FMC supervisors' histories influenced their supervisory approaches. The supervisors in this study experienced privilege, oppression, and power due to their social

locations. They appreciated how experiences of power, privilege, and oppression formed the lenses through which they viewed the world, which normalized feeling of anger, fear, insecurity, guilt, and detachment in response to such experiences. Kevin, a White, middle class supervisor from a rural farm town, experienced moments where he was the "other" while growing up in a Middle Eastern neighborhood, attending a Jewish high school, and living in African American neighborhoods. During his interview, he recalled:

> I had a lot of experiences as a minority in some way or another. Yet, all through that, I didn't think of it in [those] terms necessarily. Reflecting back, I remember what it was like to be the other in this group, and what that felt like and, gosh, how great it would have been had somebody said, "Hey, how are you doin' with this?"

With hindsight, Kevin recognized the value of being able to make sense of his social displacement. Like Kevin, participants in this study acknowledged these experiences as extraordinary or mundane, but later reflection led them to see the impact of experiences with power, privilege, and oppression on their worldviews and self-concepts. Jenny reflected on her junior high school experience and its impact on her interpersonal style:

> I remember when we moved into a brand new house. At the time, down the hill from our house, there was a tree. Some kids in the neighborhood had built a tree house. When we bought our house, we were told that it was part of our property now. When we moved in—I'm Chinese American; back then I identified as Chinese—some kids in the neighborhood put up a sign that said, "Jap go home." [I thought,] "I'm in my own backyard, and you're telling me to go back home? I'm not even Japanese". . . . I [had] people make fun of me, they kung fu, they pull their eyes back, and make these "ching chong" noises at me in school. I always downplayed that and thought, "They're just ignorant. They don't know what they're talking about." Those incidences added up to my hesitancy interacting with people in undergrad.

Jenny coped by distancing herself from the experience and continued to downplay her and others experiences with oppression until graduate school. However, she understood, in a matter of degrees, the importance of these key moments littering the landscapes of

her life in relationship with herself and others. Luna recalled visiting home during a break while working towards her doctoral degree. During her visit, she looked around and noticed that she had privilege not granted to her friends and family that were working class, Latina women. Her voice mattered more. “Everyone else was just as smart, but because I was book smart, people [would] listen to me versus listen to them and not value them or not value their insight.” Personal experiences of discrimination based on social locations taught some people that life was not fair or equitable.

Not all participants emphasized the role of power, privilege, and oppression in their personal journey. In particular, 2 participants did not talk about how their experience with power, privilege, and oppression shaped their supervision approaches. A White, lesbian-identified woman participant and a White, heterosexual man participant did not address this issue in initial or follow-up interviews. I asked myself, “What was different about these individuals?” I looked to participants to help me answer my question. When examining the relationship between oppression, privilege, and power on his supervisory evolution, Jason, a queer-identified White man described, “I think there was a period of my development before I went into psychology, where I focused a lot on my identities that were oppressed. I really negated the [impact of my] identities in which I held privilege.” Lilly, a White queer-identified woman, commented, “People aren’t always comfortable looking at where they’re oppressed and where they have privilege. You have to look at both.” I noted that participants who did not speak to the influence of oppression and privilege were older, had longer histories as supervisors, and were White-identified. Thus, they held more power in their supervisory roles. Participants who did not speak to the influence of power, privilege, and oppression on the formation of their

supervisory approaches could represent cohort effects intersecting with racial privilege effects on an evolving FMC approach.

Earlier Experiences Primed Later Directions

FMC supervisors noticed that historical experiences primed them for later career interests. This meant having pivotal experiences that changed them because they were exposed to individuals making positive change in their communities. Through others, they learned a language for understanding collaboration, power, and culture. They found later professional passions through exposure to FMC-oriented individuals and places. While in graduate school, H sought out peers to form a discussion group for issues pertinent to feminism and multiculturalism, "[We] got together and formed a multicultural discussion group—a feminist multicultural discussion group among us. So, we, as grad students, would meet weekly. . . and talked about feminist multicultural issues." In this way, H filled in a gap in her graduate experiences that lacked training on FMC principles and excluded a feminist sense of community. Having experiences that primed them for later directions provided participants with a language to make sense of their lived experiences and a taste for their professional objectives.

While engaging in punk activist communities, Megan began to unravel the role of sexism in relationship to her gender: "I had a very reactionary approach, like, 'I hate being a girl,' like, 'fuck this!' . . . I started to learn, 'Oh, this is just me internalizing all of these messages,' and [I began] actually reclaiming [my] power as [a] woman." These "aha" moments helped these FMC supervisors to understand their experiences with privilege, power, and oppression and ways that they could create change. Priming

experiences led these FMC supervisors to actively construct their journey to psychology generally or to FMC psychology specifically. Renee shared her experience of developing a women's center in her community in Central America. She co-developed a multidisciplinary group, and they discussed their vision for the center.

> I clearly remember one of the times we got together and somebody said, "Okay, let's talk about—forget about theory, forget about today—let's talk about the first time we experienced violence." The shock of each one of us mentioning living through violence because we were women opened up our eyes completely. . . . We began seeing the need of talking about ourselves and talking about our experience in a context which was safe, and where we felt supported and understood by others.

Renee understood the value of breaking silence around violence against women. This fed her passion to stop violence in her community and formed her approach to supervision that incorporated understanding the links between self-knowledge and other-knowledge. Historical narratives became a part of present practice as the participants in this study learned to be supervisors.

Ways of Learning to Be a Supervisor

The personal histories and educational journeys of the FMC participant supervisors in this study came into their present practices through their experiences as they learned to be supervisors. These FMC supervisors observed the styles of their peers, advisors, mentors, teachers, supervisors, and training contexts. Further, they noticed the approaches they felt drawn to and those that they found unsatisfying or ineffective. They reflected on positive and negative experiences.

The supervisor participants noticed their visceral reactions when they were trainees and wanted to emulate individuals to whom they were drawn, who had elicited

their intellectual and emotional enthusiasm, and had engaged in actions congruent to their worldviews. Katie discussed how she learned from individuals who were not formal supervisors but who modeled that being a professional was congruent with being human:

> I've had mentors [that were involved in a national association] who I learned a lot from them being transparent about themselves. I felt like that was really powerful 'cause there was so much pressure, especially on internship, to do everything right, to . . . not show flaws, not show weaknesses, and not show if you don't know what you're doing and wingin' it. It was really refreshing to have other people going, "Sometimes we're just wingin' it and we're tryin' to see what works."

These mentors gave Katie permission to accept herself as she learned and grew as a professional-in-training.

Supervisor participants actively avoided replicating supervision experiences that they had experienced as negative, that prompted feelings of discomfort, or that were incongruent with their worldviews. Jason explained how negative experiences helped him develop his approach, "I had mentors that really challenged [my approach] in a way that helped me solidify it. Things would happen; and I'd be like, 'Oh, my gosh, that was jacked-up, . . . I don't believe that' or 'That's kinda weird.'" Mo reflected on her experience of noncollaborative supervision: "I would say the subcontext of that is . . . your supervisors in dominant culture are seen as authority figures who are sometimes intimidating and scary. You need to please them, and you have to let go of yourself in order to please them."

Ava, a multiracial, pansexual-identified woman, explained the impact of supervision with a White woman supervisor who utilized an interpersonal approach:

> I don't think I knew this at the time, but there was very little reflection or introspection into who I was as a psychologist, how I was building that. I didn't realize that I was missing that at the time. . . . My experience with her was good, I

> guess. . . . I don't know if I didn't think that that was allowed in the room or that that was part of supervision.

Participants described how they used negative supervisory relationships as examples of professionals they wished not to be. They compared negative experiences to their developing professional identities and projected ways they could be different as supervisors in the future.

These FMC supervisors learned to be supervisors by seeking out literature that spoke to approaches that were attractive to them and channeled those approaches in their own supervision practice. Clara described how feminist literature inspired her:

> I was drawn most to the feminist supervision, Melba Vasquez's article, and the work by Morrow and Hawxhurst—I love their, their piece and [it] really lays out the power analysis with the different boxes and case studies. All that made it really real to me of what feminist therapy looks like and also what feminist supervision looks like . . . that was kind of my learning introduction to it.

Literature provided an additional layer of information from which participants built their own supervisory approaches. Literature was especially important to participants that did not have access to formal training.

Those who had had access to supervision training learned about many different theoretical approaches to supervision, practiced supervision, and received supervision of their supervision. Katie described how group supervision of her supervision had helped her to grow early in her career as a staff psychologist:

> I think one of the things that was important early on was that we had a lot of support as supervisors, as well. We did meet weekly. We had colleagues in the room to really do some supervision on supervision and just sort of normalize some of those experiences that we had. . . . I got mentoring in the room with some of the supervisors who had been there years before I had been there, too. To actually see them ask some of the questions and [to have] some of the struggles with their supervisees and thinking about the different things that can come up with that. What if you have a difference of opinion in terms of where to go with a client, for example, and how to manage that? What trumps what?

Formal training and supervision of supervision helped supervisor participants as they stepped into the role of a supervisor, to obtain support, to have the chance to ask questions, and to receive guidance. However, formal training was not accessible to all. Arby spoke of his struggles with the "learning by watching" model of his 1970s training:

> It was . . . if you got taught then you could supervise. The assumption essentially was to remember what people did when they supervised you and, then, do it down the line. Do it with someone else, which actually was not very good. . . . I was much more focused on what I needed to do to become a better therapist than I ever thought I was gonna need to do supervision.

Experiences providing supervision helped participants refine their supervision styles, challenge growth edges, and feel comfortable with new supervisory approaches. In their early supervision experiences, participants struggled to adjust being responsible for their trainees and to believe they had something to give to their trainees. Lilly's experience providing supervision for the first time resonated with many other participants, "I don't know what I'm doing. How am I supposed to help these folks?" In a manner that mirrored other participants, continued practice and reflecting on her existing clinical skills helped Lilly realize she had a great deal of experience from which to work. Bringing history into the room meant supervisor participants learned something new with each supervision experience and continuously refined their supervisory approaches.

Refining Approaches From Experiences

Bringing history into the room was essentially an articulated framework shaped by experience and reflection. The framework was actively constructed rather than passively replicated. FMC supervisor participants recognized that feminism and multiculturalism were often pitted against one another in the literature like fighting

siblings. Instead, they valued an approach in which feminism and multiculturalism were integrated, casting "oppression Olympics" out as too simple for a complex society. Amisha described how she had to work to construct her own feminist and multicultural approach that diverged from what she had seen in the actions of feminist practitioners and read about in feminist therapy literature:

> I think my journey with feminism has been confusing, for lack of a better word. I identify as a feminist, right. . . . I don't know, maybe like meeting professionals who tout themselves as feminists, but then behave in varying nonfeminist or oppressive ways, has made me reluctant to embrace that title of being a feminist. I think, as I said earlier, I have been saddened by the fact that feminism has really sort of ignored the women of color experience, the womanism piece of it, and that has also sort of kept me at bay.

For other FMC supervisors in this study, like Amisha, constructing an identity meant defining multiculturalism broadly and defining feminism as incorporating an analysis of diversity intersected with gender. H emphasized that feminism and multiculturalism were not oppositional: "Because they are both based on power, of being aware of power, of being aware of, you know, how power can be systematized and oppressive and structured." Therefore, constructing an identity meant attending to the intersections, as well as the independent features of power, privilege, and oppression.

Male-identified supervisors described constructing an identity in the context of the women-centered history of feminism. Kevin described constructing an identity as an ally of feminism by using a profeminist label to describe his approach:

> There's a part of some people's experiences I will never have, but I work to understand those and work as an ally in that area. . . . Literally, if you would have asked me a year ago, I would have said, "[I am a] feminist psychotherapist." But, it's me as a male-identified [person] saying, supporting, and working with that theory, the feminist lens.

Not all male FMC-oriented supervisors identified as profeminist. Jason described his experience of talking with women-identified peers and mentors who facilitated his construction of a feminist identity:

> People [were] like, "Okay, so, [Jason] was assigned male at birth, but he is male. Does that mean that there are individuals who were not assigned male at birth but now are male who are now feminists?" So, it brought up a bunch of stuff around gender. So, the long story of that is that I have not always felt like I could use that term [feminist]. But, I've had a really colorful history where . . . after a long road I feel really comfortable with it.

Unlike Kevin and Jason, Arby did not adopt a feminist or profeminist identity. Instead, he stated, "I value the approach mostly because I—well, I don't know whether I believe in it; so, therefore, I value it. Or, I value it; and, therefore, I believe in it. Probably both." FMC supervisors saw the value of feminist and multicultural principles and may have needed to contextualize them to fit personal, interpersonal, and socio-cultural needs.

For the FMC supervisors in the current study, constructing an identity was about having a desire before, during, or after their education to apply the power and knowledge granted by education, and the privilege associated with their social locations, for the benefit of society. Renee emphasized her revolutionary motives for higher education. After obtaining her master's degree in clinical psychology and social work, Renee worked with an interdisciplinary team to develop a community clinic with a practicum component. She created her practicum program to change the status quo:

> So, we as a group are very clear that our function is not to have practicum students, and we're getting our work done. It's not . . . creating the theory. It's really giving back to our community. . . . Okay, our little grain of salt, but we're gonna make sure that this grain that we're gonna give to the community is something that we think will benefit our society as a whole.

Jenny, like Renee, entered the psychology profession because she wanted to help her community. After volunteering at hospitals during the 1992 Los Angeles riots, "I started

to recognize that I wanted to work more with the underprivileged and underserved populations because of their inability to access the services. I recognized that I didn't have the skills to do that." She sought a doctoral degree in counseling psychology to provide services to underserved populations.

The FMC supervisors in this study had intentions to use their education and privilege to make the word a better place. They sought to make change because doing so was congruent with taking an active approach to bringing history into the room, and they experienced social justice as consistent with their worldviews and prior experiences. Thus, bringing history into the room involved identifying the individual's social justice approach within the larger FMC framework.

Practicing in a Feminist, Multicultural, Social Justice Way

Participants engaged in iterative processes of integrating experiences with practice and feminist multicultural practice with experience. This way of seeing and understanding the world became an all-encompassing identity: FMC principles and practices influenced participants' thinking and actions on what was sometimes an unconscious level. However, feminism and multiculturalism were omnipresent forces for participants: Their FMC-oriented identities or approaches pervaded all their actions and were integrated into their personhood. Participants developed reputations for practicing in FMC and social justice ways because they lived in states of congruence across roles and identities. Luna emphasized role congruence: "It's because the way I am as a supervisor is the way I am as a therapist is the way I am as a professor is the way I am in my life." An FMC and social justice approach was deeply personal yet formed participants'

political schemes: it was an identity and a way of understanding the surrounding world. Megan described the importance of her FMC experiences:

> That's why the journey is so relevant because it is this way of being, right. I can't speak for all of the participants. But, for most of us, we can't talk about who we are as feminist multicultural supervisors as a series of, "Well, here's how I integrate this and that" because it is about making the personal political. It is about ourselves in a very deep way.

Further, because FMC and social justice approaches were core to their humanity, participants spoke of integrating FMC and social justice principles into their overall supervisory approaches. Thus, participants brought feminism and multiculturalism into their integrative approaches, folded other theoretical orientations into their existing FMC and social justice frameworks, or developed ways to communicate their integrative supervisory approach with nonoppressive and nonpathologizing language. Mo expressed her supervisory approach similarly: "I will call myself a multico. I will call myself feminist. But, I probably wouldn't fight over it because for me it's the deeper issue of social justice and constructivism." For the participants in the current study, practicing in a feminist, multicultural, social justice way was about recognizing that FMC was too big for one cookie cutter approach, one identity, and one way of being.

For the participants in the current study, their FMC-oriented approaches challenged the status quo and sought equity. H described the importance of activism in her identities: "My activism has been really important in terms of shaping my sense of self as a feminist multicultural person, which, then, influences my feeling in terms of how I see myself as a supervisor." This resonated with the connections many participants drew between activism, therapy, and supervisor roles. Ava emphasized that her worldview valued every being on the planet and drives her actions as a psychologist: "I see that

we're hugely impacted by the people around us. So, I definitely want all people to feel important, all people to feel as though they matter. . . . [Social justice is] central to who and how I am in the world." In participants' supervision relationships, practicing in an FMC and social justice manner involved, for example, pointing out power dynamics, exploring self, examining the role of bias and assumptions, depathologizing normal behavior, looking for when advocacy or activism is a better approach than talk therapy, and challenging the status quo.

Summary

The participants indicated that a supervisor's collective historical experiences served as a context to his or her current supervision approach. These FMC supervisors appreciated the importance of history in the formation of, for example, worldviews, ways of thinking, and action. Thus, the relationship between history and FMC supervision was bidirectional: History informed FMC practice and FMC practice appreciated history. Thus, participants' personal and educational histories exposed them to elements of FMC approaches, involved experiences that allowed them to practice using FMC approaches, and resulted in supervisory approaches that integrated FMC and social justice principles. The following sections expand on the underlying processes paramount to an FMC approach that manages power in supervision relationships.

Creating Trust Through Openness and Honesty

Two superordinate and closely interrelated strategies for dealing with the complexities of power emerged from the data: creating trust through openness and

honesty and continuously using a collaborative process. The first, creating trust through openness and honesty, or transparency, helped participant supervisors to balance power inequality in the supervisory relationship. Due to the status and power given to supervisors, they were not traditionally expected to share personal information about themselves with their supervisees. Instead, participants provided information and opinions at the start of and throughout supervisory relationships, as appropriate, to demystify the process so supervisees did not have to fear the unknown. Participants assumed that supervisees' discomfort around those in authority resulted from experiencing abuses of power in their pasts. Supervisors worked hard to earn a supervisee's trust by providing frank, straightforward, and honest disclosures about themselves. Feedback was provided in a manner that shared power with supervisees. The ways that participants created trust through openness and honesty included (a) *Laying Things Out on the Table;* (b) *Talking about Expectations;* (c) *Being Who I am Moment-to-Moment; and (d) Being Real and Authentic with Clients.*

Laying Things Out on the Table

For participants, if not explicitly discussed, power could be easily taken for granted by supervisors in supervisory relationship. Renee clearly described the ease of falling into traditional power hierarchies in supervision,

> I mean, knowing you're the supervisor and knowing that the institution you're working with or that you're representing in that moment is giving you the authority and the power and by not naming it, by not openly talking about [power], it's very easy to fall into the role of, "I know everything and you are here to learn from me."

Initially, these supervisors began fostering transparency by providing information about the sources of power in supervision relationships. In the first few supervision sessions, participants acknowledged that they had more power than their supervisees did because of evaluation and gatekeeping. They were clear about their approaches to evaluation, shared evaluative tools, and discussed their struggles with evaluative power. Mo, for example, described how she made her evaluation process transparent and available to trainees even before beginning supervision:

> I think that's my responsibility to own my power. . . . I think informed consent is part of it. Our evaluation form is on our website. Anybody even applying to us has had the opportunity to see what our evaluation form looks like. It's not a surprise. . . . I talk about due process and . . . not getting blindsided. You get formative and summative feedback on a regular basis, so there's no way it would come as a surprise to any trainee here, because that's part of the culture here.

Supervisors discussed worst case scenarios such as their responsibility to provide accurate feedback regarding supervisees' clinical skills, which might result in academic failure if, after attempts to prevent or remediate were unsuccessful, supervisees' clinical work resulted in client harm or if supervisees did not demonstrate adequate skill development. Supervisor participants explicated their responsibilities in supervision in order to provide an environment where supervisees could develop as clinicians and to protect supervisees' clients. Further, they described other roles and responsibilities that might impact the supervisory relationship.

For example, Luna described how she stepped in and out of directive supervision, "I let them know ahead of time. I say, 'There are gonna be times when I need to put on my supervisor hat, my faculty hat, whatever it is, and I'll need to tell you what to do, but I'll let you know.'" Luna wanted to prevent discomfort in her supervisees when she moved from her usual collaborative approach to more directive approaches. These FMC

participant supervisors acknowledged their intentions to equalize power in supervisory relationships and recognized that they would not always do this perfectly.

Creating trust through openness and honesty meant supervisors brought their histories into the supervision space and discussed what they were like personally and professionally. They did so because they were aware that they were not traditionally expected to share anything about themselves, while supervisees were expected to be vulnerable and open to feedback in supervision, which exacerbated the power differential. Lilly stated, "I'll talk about who I am and . . . put myself in the room so that a conversation can happen around that." Therefore, these FMC supervisors disclosed their identity statuses, their professional journeys and backgrounds, their theoretical frameworks for supervision, their supervision styles, and the impact of this information on their worldviews and supervision relationships. H discussed the importance of sharing her statuses and cultures and how they informed her approach to supervision:

> I always talk about my partner. I always make clear I'm a lesbian. I always talk about being Jewish. I also try to model talking about culture comfortably, and that feels important to me, too. The thing is, I'm also Canadian; the cultural context is so different. . . . I noticed that here people are often really uncomfortable talking about culture; it's very threatening, and people are often very suspicious . . . which isn't my cultural background. So, I to try and model ways of being able to do that comfortably, and that can be a big deal. You know, hearing someone talk about being lesbian, using the word, and it's not such a big deal here.

For H, self-disclosure helped her to be known to her supervisees, was congruent to her cultural context, and provided modeling that talking about identity was not something to fear. Katie also shared information that tied her personal history to her supervision lenses:

> Being able to articulate my worldview, my biases, what my framework is, [and] how I am looking at things; and to really be able to say, "This may be my bias, or this is where I'm coming from." . . . Being able to say, "This is how I'm looking at this," and being very clear about that. I also help people understand where my lenses come from. I talk about being biracial a lot; because I feel like I can see the

> world through the eyes of people of color, but I can also see the world through the eyes of White folks.

Thus, the FMC supervisors who participated in this study saw a transparent approach as creating and modeling equity between the requirements of supervisees and supervisors. They respected supervisees' needs to assess them as supervisors.

Creating trust through openness and honesty meant supervisors expressed a personal interest in the wellbeing of their supervisees, so supervisees were comfortable sharing personal information. Supervisors acknowledged that individuals with less power have more to gain or lose when being vulnerable with people with more power, depending upon how people with more power used their power. In addition, participants acknowledged that supervisees might feel pressured to disclose information to supervisors when they felt uncomfortable to share about themselves. Ava explained, "If I know you, and I know where you're powerful, I can, then, encourage you. Then, I can create warmth, and I can create trust." Ava asked supervisees to share information about their professional backgrounds and histories to ascertain how they got to their particular training experiences and where their passions came from. Jason also asked supervisees to bring their educational history and informal learning experiences into the room:

> I would say, "Okay, talk to me about your history. You say that you're a feminist; what does that mean? Where did you learn about that? What are the messages that you have [about feminism]?" Also, "So, you come across as someone wanting to work with clients of color. . . . What has been your experience doing that? What are you bringing into the room?" I think even naming things like, "What are you ashamed of about the way that you do this work?"

Creating trust through openness and honesty involved bringing history into the room to demonstrate how it informed the personal and professional lenses of supervisors and supervisees. Participants provided information to their supervisees, as well as sought

information from them, to provide appropriate learning opportunities in the contexts of one another's histories.

Talking About Expectations

According to the participants, sharing expectations early in the formation of supervision relationships furthered their goal of creating trust. Unarticulated expectations represented a lack of transparency, which they believed might lead to frustration and resentment for both parties and may emphasize the power gap. These supervisors requested information regarding supervisees' past positive and negative supervision experiences, and their needs and wants in the current supervision relationship. Arby provided a synopsis of how he discussed expectations for the supervision process:

> As a matter of fact, the first thing I do in supervision is I negotiate our supervision relationship. . . . I go in with [a matrix illustrating different foci for supervision sessions related to therapy and supervision systems], and I say, "Hey, we're gonna wander all over this matrix. Let's talk about what that means in terms of your responsibility and my responsibility and where we are willing to go."

Arby negotiated supervisory meeting agendas with supervisees to demystify the supervision process and his expectations.

The supervisors involved in this study talked about sharing the expectations of the agencies or departments where supervisory relationships took place. They discussed similarities and differences between their expectations and those of their agencies or departments and how the expectations of their agencies or departments would likely impact the supervisory relationship. Supervisors disclosed what they could and could not provide to supervisees based on personal and systemic realities.

There was a diversity of opinions among participants regarding their willingness to personalize their supervisory approaches to the needs of supervisees. Some, like Kevin, describe their theoretical orientations and expectations for supervisees:

> In my first meeting with a supervisee, I say, . . . "I will be whomever you need me to be. So, if you say, 'Out of supervision, I need somebody to be directive, and I need somebody to really say, 'Go try this,' and 'Let's explore this.'". . . So, from the outset, I say, "This should work for you in whatever way works for you, and I will adapt to that."

Others, like Jason, shared that they may not be able to meet a supervisee's needs. He provided an example when a supervisee responded to his use of collaboration in supervision, "That would really freak me out. I need to know who's in charge." Jason responded, "Well then, you know, this is not gonna be the best relationship for you." Although participants expressed different perspectives with regard to personalizing their supervisory approach, they shared desires to approach supervision with transparency to allow for honest discussion of preferences and to aid in collaboratively constructing relationships with supervisees that effectively meet supervisees' developmental needs.

These FMC supervisors told their supervisees that a focus on culture, context, identity, and difference would be a part of the supervision process. Megan said

> I emphasized the supervisee's goals for the time; and, then, how I could use that to help bring in other issues around race, gender, culture, etcetera. . . . I would definitely bring it in if they didn't, but I think that's one of the great things about our field moving towards [multiculturalism], because it's on their evaluations. It's there now. So, maybe it's one item of the seventy items on someone's evaluation, but I can over-emphasize it. Having that helps me say, "Okay, here we go. This is the key piece 'cause obviously you can't have counseling competence without multicultural competency."

Participants linked their expectation of focusing on diversity and multiculturalism to ethical codes, evaluation forms, supervisees' goals, and agency/department requirements.

Being Who I Am Moment-to-Moment

Participant supervisors maintained openness and honesty throughout the supervision relationship by being transparent, forthcoming, and authentic. These supervisors shared their thought processes, questions, reactions, and struggles to keep communication open and to share power. Jenny honed her use of intentional transparency, "That means being transparent about my own struggles and my own thought process and my own questions; and I lay it all on the table and, then, have a dialogue." Participants were transparent about their subversive efforts to reject supervisory power hierarchies and related to their supervisees in egalitarian ways by sharing information and engaging in collaborative processes. After sharing information with supervisees, participants often engaged in collaborative discussion to share power.

For the participants, creating trust through openness and honesty included working to create a human interaction through honest and vulnerable self-disclosure. Amisha shared that her supervisory approach evolved to incorporate vulnerable self-disclosure and transparent authenticity: "I've become very forthright with my emotions with my supervisees." By being congruent and true to herself across professional contexts (e.g., in the supervision room, in meetings, in the break room), she modeled FMC transparency. Amisha added, "What does transparency provide to a student, right? It provides relief. It provides reduction of anxiety." Participants believed that transparency allowed supervisees to have a better sense of their supervisors.

Being Real and Authentic with Clients

Supervisors in this study provided a model of how egalitarian transparency could be accomplished in the supervisory context. In turn, they supported supervisees in learning how to utilize a transparent approach with their clients. They discussed how to use self-disclosure in the counseling relationships by exploring with their supervisees the differences between the boundary expectations of supervisory relationships versus boundary expectations of counseling relationships. In addition, they supported supervisees in being authentic with their clients. Clara emphasized:

> When I'm watching them, and I see that they're not being real with their clients—they don't have to do it the way I do it but just being connected—they're so in their head with a theory that they forget about connecting to this person. I go, "Forget everything you've learned in your classes and just have a conversation with them.". . . Where do they seem most intuitive in a room with a client?

Supervisors aided supervisees in employing styles that were true to their personalities, fit with the expectations of supervision, and were intuitive.

Summary

The FMC-oriented supervisor participants in this study conceptualized and practiced supervision in a manner in which they anticipated and managed supervisory power. Two superordinate strategies for minimizing the impact of power on the supervisory relationship were transparency and collaboration. First, these supervisors earned the trust of supervisees by creating open and honest lines of communication. By demystifying themselves, expectations, supervision processes, and evaluation, these FMC supervisors created a transparent foundation to power-modulating supervision experiences. A second major strategy for managing power was collaboration.

Using a Collaborative Process

The second of two superordinate strategies for managing power was using a collaborative process. Supervisors kept pace with their supervisees' training needs by asking supervisees what they needed from supervision and working with their supervisees to meet supervisees' needs in their time together. Using a collaborative process meant that the FMC supervisors in this study assisted supervisees to see where they had competence instead of only noting where they had limitations. Further, supervisors worked to create and sustain supervisory relationships that incorporated the voices of all the partners involved, including silent partners (e.g., agency expectations, client needs). Supervisors worked with supervisees to form ongoing feedback loops and formal evaluation, rather than holding this power over their supervisees until the end of the supervision time. Participants modeled a collaborative process that helped supervisees employ the same with their clients. The ways that FMC supervisors used a collaborative process included (a) *What Do You Need to Get There?;* (b) *Valuing Different Approaches;* (c) *Helping Supervisees to See Their Competence; (d) Creating Mutually Growth Fostering Relationships;* (e) *Talking Through Relationship Boundaries;* (f) *Processing the Supervision Process;* (g) *Collaborating on Feedback;* and (h) *Seeing Clients as Necessary Partners*.

What Do You Need to Get There?

First, for the FMC supervisors in this study, collaborating with supervisees meant both parties determined what they needed to reach their individual and common goals. Initially, this meant setting goals for the supervisory space. FMC supervisor participants

listened to supervisees as they discussed where they wanted to be at the end of supervisory relationships to discern what goals supervisees had for themselves. Arby emphasized, “I really do believe in supervision, of tracking this overall sense of your becoming a good therapist.” Using a collaborative process meant working together to set well-defined goals for supervision that were within the supervisee's range given her or his current developmental level and breadth of experience.

FMC supervisors in this study asked supervisees at the beginning of a session what they needed and what supervisors could do to get them to where they wanted to go. Participants remarked that supervision could have an overwhelming number of options to pursue in a given session. Thus, H stated:

> So, if your goal is to become a good therapist and there’s something getting in the way with that, you need to deal with that before the person can become a good therapist. So, then, that takes priority because they’re not gonna be one until they get the skill or they get this idea.

Participants speculated that inviting supervisees to navigate supervision sessions provided supervisees with a sense of ownership over their training experiences and control over what they learned. Supervisees may have needed information/knowledge, encouragement, skill building, direct suggestion, venting, or assistance with client conceptualization. Mo likened supervision to midwifery: “Ninety-five percent of my trainees give birth to themselves, and I’m there as the midwife: sometimes you’re encouraging, sometimes you’re directing, and sometimes you’re making sure that there’s no fatality.”

Using a collaborative process meant providing supervisees with what they needed over the course of supervision relationships, via goals, and session-by-session, via session

agenda setting. This was done with the implicit or explicit goal to empower supervisees. Renee stated:

> Something really important based on our program is that, once again, it's not the supervisor who creates the program, it's the supervisee. This, also, goes with empowerment. I mean, it's like, "I'm having trouble with the university. Can you guys help me?" It's not, "We're gonna help because we want to be your advocate." The the supervisee has to learn to speak out about his or her needs in the specific moment.

Managing power in the supervision relationship via collaborating on long range and immediate goals and session agendas emerged from supervisors who encouraged supervisees to ask for what they needed to feel empowered. Supervisees learned that these FMC supervisors honored their needs and began to feel empowered in the supervision context and in their clinical work.

Valuing Different Approaches

Co-constructing an experience through a collaborative process meant acknowledging that supervisors and supervisees were in supervision together. Supervisors valued different approaches, supervisees' and their own, and were keen to learn more. FMC supervisors were aware (through personal experience and/or vicarious learning) that some supervisors abused their power and status by invalidating theoretical orientations and techniques. Participants generally did not require a particular therapeutic approach and honored a trainee's natural proclivities toward counseling.

Luna helped supervisees learn about different conceptual approaches to help them stretch and grow, while honoring supervisees' preferred conceptual approaches:

> I say, "Okay, here's a particular client. Based on your theoretical orientation, how do you conceptualize this client?" Then, I'll go around the room and ask each student, based on their theoretical orientation, how are they conceptualizing this

> client? What would they suggest be the next steps? So, by the time we're done, each student is learning different theoretical orientations.

Lilly respected the theoretical approaches of her supervisees and asked them to expound on the language of their theoretical approaches, while helping them stretch and grow:

> I'll even say, "Well, this is how I'm thinking about it. How are you thinking about it? What are similarities? What are the differences?" I actually see that as a way to help them flesh out the way they see things and to deepen what they're doing using their own language.

FMC supervisor participants respected the theoretical orientations of their supervisees and were responsible to help supervisees grow within their theoretical orientations.

Supervisors who participated in this study helped supervisees identify salient therapeutic moments they might have missed in order to meet the needs of diverse clients and helped supervisees refine their theoretical approaches to counseling. Megan noted, "Part of my approach to the world is valuing other people's perspectives, unless it's discriminatory. So, finding that line of respect versus challenge has been really tricky." This meant holding back initially to draw out a supervisee's thinking and then engaging in a discussion that attempted to fill a gap the supervisor noticed.

Sometimes valuing different approaches meant participants self-reflected before speaking. Ava clarified the connection between self-reflection and collaboration:

> I am always willin' to check in with the person and see, "Am I tryin' to push you into something?" particularly if our theoretical orientations are different. I think I can be more aware of it even when we're very similar. I get so excited about the similarity and the synergy, that I need to check myself and go, "Okay, are we considering the client, as we're both agreeing and wanting to move in this direction?"

Valuing different approaches required a delicate balance of assisting supervisees in acquiring their own voices, finding their own answers, or providing suggestions.

Acquiring Their Own Voices

For participants in this study, using a collaborative process meant supervisors and supervisees shared the space of supervision. Both had voices that were valuable and of equal importance. While providing feedback on my initial in vivo code of "giving voice," Jason emphasized that it was a given for him that supervisees arrived to supervision with their own voices and that he provided implicit permission for them to use their voice:

> I would read "giving voice" and think the supervisor is basically creating a space for the [supervisee's] voice. Maybe not even that it's the supervisor that lets them but it's that, "Hey, we all have an equal voice. So, I'm not even going to give you permission to have the voice. In this space, I'm just gonna say that this space is everybody's space."

Thus, these supervisors assisted supervisees in voicing themselves during supervision.

For participants, some trainees perceived academic, clinical, and counseling training as experiences that invalidated their knowledge and decisions. FMC supervisor participants attended to the voices of those with less power and ensured they received equal time and space in the supervision room. Amisha drew the connection between helping supervisees acquire their own voices and dealing with the complexities of power:

> A lot of times, supervisees are in the space of, "Am I doing this right? Is this correct? Tell me what to do." I think [this] is a result of our education system, which keeps telling students . . . (a) that they're wrong or (b) that they don't know anything. So, I think feeling empowered is to trust your instincts and to find your voice . . . feeling willing to share it, trusting that you know that your voice won't be shamed, and that your voice is important. . . . A lot of times we sort of silence ourselves because we've been told that our voice is not important.

FMC supervisors found that helping supervisees to acquire their own voices caused role discomfort initially. Participants asked supervisees to struggle first when they asked for directives and professional opinions from their supervisor. The tables of relative power turned quickly for supervisees, within the contexts of supervision and therapy, because

they were in the room with clients and were the relative experts between themselves and supervisors. Clara described how she helped supervisees to find their own answers. She said, "I think some of these students have skills already that they just don't know are counseling skills or skills that can be useful. So, helping them figure out, 'What have I already brought to the table that I didn't even know was really useful?'" Clara assumed that many supervisees had their own voices but had not yet been invited to exercise them. Other participants challenged supervisees to find what they already knew to prevent dependence and disempowerment in the supervision relationship.

Assisting supervisees to acquire their own voices meant that participants did not react with retaliation, anger, or rejection when supervisees disagreed with them. Instead, when supervisees disagreed with their supervisors' feedback or suggestions made based on the partial information gained from tapes and conversations with supervisees, participants encouraged supervisees to disagree with them. Luna described how she managed her personal reaction in light of disagreement by a supervisee:

> Once was when I gave a suggestion, and she disagreed with my suggestion. She felt empowered to disagree. . . . first, it takes you back, you disagree, but then I'm like, "Okay, wait a minute. I was encouraging her to be doing this. So, I came back, and I said, "Okay, let's talk about this some more." At the end, we were able to come to a consensus of how she could continue working with a client, and she felt empowered to disagree with me, which was a great thing.

Helping supervisees acquire their own voices further developed independence of thought and a sense of competence as a developing professional.

Suggesting Tentatively

According to participant supervisors, a collaborative process utilized the trainer and the trainee equally. Because both voices mattered, the supervisor's and the

supervisee's approaches were valued. Supervisors were responsible for providing learning opportunities, and there were times when supervisees had genuine needs for direct feedback or suggestion. In these cases, participants found that being instructive was the most helpful and empowering for supervisees. After exploring whether supervisees could find their own answers and checking in on how supervisors could best help supervisees, participants suggested tentatively by hedging suggestions based on their own experience versus the "Truth." Katie described her approach to offering supervisees options:

> Just the way I frame it is sort of like, "I've got maybe a couple more years [of experience]. I can highlight some things, lay out options, and have you think about what you wanna do." It's really their process. . . . I let myself off the hook for "being the expert."

For these FMC supervisors, offering suggestions facilitated collaboration with supervisees rather than assuming the expert role. FMC supervisor participants made clear with their supervisees that they would not always have the answers, that they would offer helpful suggestions, or that they would brainstorm ideas with the supervisees.

These FMC supervisors acknowledged to their supervisees that they would not have all the answers but would help supervisees seek out helpful resources. By offering to work together to gain knowledge, supervisors in this study modeled humility, collaboration, and perseverance. Furthermore, participants demonstrated that learning was a never-ending process. By naming when they did not have the needed answer, FMC supervisors managed the complexity of power in the supervision relationship. Kevin asserted, "I don't want them to see me or expect them to see me as somebody . . . that knows the answers, and I know the right way. For me, that's a power differential, right?"

Giving Supervisees Needed Information

To the FMC supervisors in this study, collaborating meant giving people the information they needed to be empowered. Jenny described her approach when supervisees were at a loss for information:

> The feminist approach is asking them what they want. If they're then asking, "Yes, I want specific ideas, I really have no idea." Then, I will either role-play with them, or I give them specific information, like, "Research blah, blah, blah. Here's what's helpful and here's what I'd try."

Participants helped their supervisees access resources to fill in skill and knowledge gaps through didactics, role playing, or training on a given approach or intervention. Listening when supervisees needed help filling in skills deficits allowed supervisors to invite supervisees to work towards taking risks with new knowledge and skills. Further, supervisor participants provided initial guidance and skill guidelines along with encouragement to try out new skills with a spirit of collaborative experimentation.

Helping Supervisees See Their Competence

FMC supervisors in the current study used a collaborative approach when helping supervisees appreciate their competence as clinicians. Participants normalized professional growth through self-disclosure. They told stories of being in similar predicaments or learning similar lessons to normalize learning, growing pains, erroneous assumptions, and mistakes and to reduce anxiety. Mo shared a story she often shared with her supervisees on the topic of perfectionism:

> There was a rabbit in the woods. Rabbit went to Nannabush. Nannabush is the teacher. Rabbit said, "I need to find the perfect circle." Nannabush said to rabbit, "It's in the woods. If you look hard enough and if you look close to the ground, close to Mother Earth, you will find the perfect circle." Rabbit searched and searched and searched and asked other animals, "Where is the perfect circle? I

> can't find the perfect circle." Rabbit went back to Nannabush and said, "Do you have any more hints for me 'cause I am not finding the perfect circle." Nannabush said, "Yes, look behind you." One day rabbit did look behind him, and what rabbit saw was the perfect brown circle. What is the story to teach you? The story, the metaphor, what it is supposed to teach, what I hope my trainees or my students get from it is perfection is shit.

Participants indicated that striving for perfection hindered supervisees' progress and learning and prevented them from seeing their growth. Knowing that a supervisor had made similar blunders helped supervisee feel encouraged during times of disappointment.

Participants helped supervisees to challenge self-doubt and encourage self-trust by providing information that was discrepant from supervisees' self-perceptions and reminded them of their strengths. Jason reflected on his approach with supervisees who were disappointed with their counseling work:

> "When you told me you didn't feel good about that, why did you not feel good about that? Because I felt great about that intervention. I watched it and loved it. So, what's that about? Is it that you didn't like the intervention, or you're just feeling unsure? Where did you get those messages that you should feel unsure about these skills?"

Focusing on supervisees' strengths meant that participants reminded supervisees what they had done well, fostered awareness of supervisees' efforts rather than their outcomes, and supported supervisees in seeing potential strengths of growth edges.

Supervisor participants honored all aspects of their supervisees' growth as counselors-in-training by cultivating an environment replete with unconditional positive regard. No matter the therapeutic outcome, supervisor participants' responses were exploratory and demonstrated a goal of facilitating supervisees' trust in the safe supervision space. Ava, a woman of color, explained how she approached a young White woman supervisee from a predominantly White community working with persons of color for the first time, "I do need to challenge you; and no matter how you stumble or no

matter how this ends up, I'm still here, and I'm still your supervisor." Ava wanted her supervisee to trust that she would not be shamed if she fell into racist socialization. Participants found that the consequence of helping supervisees see their competence was a sense of relief, increased openness, and trust in supervision processes.

Creating Mutually Growth-Fostering Relationships

Supervisors who participated in this study co-constructed the supervisory experience by acknowledging mutual benefit from the supervisory interactions. Renee expressed her certainty that supervision was a two way street:

> I believe that I grow with every supervisee I have. I believe that I change with every experience. Every time, I learn something new, and I'm willing to learn that something new. I'm not going in as the expert. I'm going in as someone who has worked in this field but is capable of learning something new.

Participants deconstructed traditional supervision and stated that learning processes tended to unidirectional in traditional supervision practice: The supervisee learned from the supervisor. Participants countered that top-down process with the understanding that, by allowing space for vulnerability and self-examination, the supervisee and supervisor benefited in terms of learning about themselves via the healing powers collaborative supervision. Further, the process of an FMC approach was powerful for the supervisors in this study, because it was a part of participants' personal and professional identities. At times, it was exhausting for participants to challenge the status quo, yet it was a philosophy and value system akin to a calling.

Talking Through Relationship Boundaries

Building a collaborative process meant that participants in this study discussed rather than dictated relational boundaries at the outset of the supervision relationship. Supervisor participants considered both the purposes of supervision relationships and the power differentials embedded in the relationship. These supervisors and supervisees examined their multiple relationships due to community and context overlaps. Participants questioned the legitimacy of traditional supervisory boundaries in which supervisors limited outside interactions, and supervisors maintained their power over supervisees. Katie emphasized the problems with traditional supervision boundaries:

> I find that as more of our identities kind of cross—and it's hard especially with LGBT-identified supervisees—it's harder to have those lines in the traditional way. I don't know that it's healthy because I think that there's something to be said—again it's an extension of the supervisory relationship that we've already set up, where you know who I am, I know who you are, and [we know] each other as people. . . . So, you have that respect for each other and you have that friendly rapport with each other, that's good. As long as you can still be honest in your communication, I think that's good.

Participants developed collaborative boundaries with supervisees by considering the relational preferences of supervisors and supervisees, supervisors' responsibilities to provide learning opportunities and to protect clients, supervisors' evaluation and gatekeeping power, and the developmental levels of supervisees. Participants were adamant that supervision relational boundaries in FMC supervision maintained their collaborative process. However, relational boundaries ranged from being supervisor-directed to supervisee-directed depending on decisions made by both parties.

When requesting supervisees' personal disclosures, these FMC supervisors attended to power differentials in the supervision relationship. According to participants in this study, FMC supervision tended to blend professional and personal relationship

qualities. Therefore, supervisor participants needed to check their power during these occasions. Clara discussed her concerns about modeling self-disclosure before a supervisee self-disclosed to her. She stated:

> I feel like there's a lot of power around [modeling], because I could have done it first, and they thought they had to live up to what I did. I think it is a misuse of power [to implicitly suggest that supervisees] need to divulge as much as I do. I wanted it to be more organic where they felt like, "This is what I want to do."

Collaboratively developing informational boundaries meant that participants acknowledged that their requests for information and modeling self-disclosure could set supervisees up to disclose when they were not yet ready because of supervisors' evaluative and gatekeeping power. Thus, a collaborative process meant respecting different personal and cultural informational boundaries, being careful when asking for personal information, giving supervisees permission to not self-disclose, and reminding supervisees that their evaluations were not contingent on self-disclosure.

Participants' co-constructed supervisory experiences at the conclusion of formal supervision relationships in a manner similar to co-constructing relational boundaries at the start of the supervision relationship. Supervisors who participated in the current study maintained awareness that the supervisory power may never totally diminish, even at the conclusion of supervision relationships. There were different methods for managing changing relational dynamics. For example, Lilly was explicit about options for shifting relationship boundaries after the end of formal supervision:

> You're always their mentor in a way. That could evolve. You become more of a colleague, but that's there to some degree. You should respect that, take care of that, and even expect it. . . . I always tried to make that explicit with my supervisees when we were ending and offer [a different relationship] up to them for folks who are a little bit more shy. I don't take it personally if they don't take me up on it.

Given the different paradigms of privacy in different FMC supervision relationships, the small FMC communities in the field of psychology, and potential minority community overlaps, participants' supervision relationships took on new roles as mentors or friends.

Processing the Supervision Process

For participants, FMC supervision involved ongoing examination and adjustment of supervision relationships and processes to avoid assumptions and predictions. For example, supervisors sometimes assumed that the relationship was going well even when it was not. Supervisors regularly reviewed the dimensions and conditions of empowerment, applied it to supervision, and acknowledged that it could be difficult for supervisees to overcome fears of evaluation and gatekeeping to provide negative feedback, leading to silencing supervisees when they were uncomfortable or unhappy with supervision processes. Amisha discussed the intersections of feedback and power:

> It's only happened a couple of times where the supervisee will give me feedback spontaneously. I think it is my responsibility to check in. I mean, how can I expect a person without power to tell the person in power, "Hey, I don't like this." It's not gonna happen, in my opinion. It is my prerogative to ask. So, I always ask.

Thus, at the start of the supervision relationship or when participants noticed process difficulties, participants gave supervisees explicit permission to provide feedback on what was working and not working, supervisors' growth edges, and elements supervisors had missed. To give permission, these supervisors might have asked for feedback at the close of each session or at fixed intervals such as mid-semester and end of year reviews. Kevin provided an example of how he asked for feedback:

> When things slow down at the semester break, then, I go back and revisit. I say, "So, here's, here's the approach that I've been doing and we've been doing together. Let's talk about what works and what doesn't work. Is there something

> we need to change for the next seven or eight months?" . . . It does build an opportunity to reflect on our own supervision process, what's working and what's not, and then changing if necessary.

These FMC supervisors revised and fine-tuned supervision collaboratively with their supervisees by implementing supervisees' feedback.

Maintaining a collaborative process meant that supervisor participants noticed and took action when their intention did not match their impact, when disconnections or ruptures cropped up in the supervisory process, and when miscommunications occurred. Participants noted relational distress when they experienced anxiety, frustration, and feeling off kilter or when supervisees reacted in unexpected or resistant ways. Arby managed collaborative process difficulties head on, "I'll assume that everything's going well until it's not going well. And, if it's not going well, then, I'll start to interact with my supervisee about, 'Why is it not going well?'" These supervisors explicitly addressed process problems by, first, checking with supervisees if they noticed similar issues and by, second, getting permission to address it openly. Then, participants and supervisees examined what was said and its impact, and they worked to construct a more satisfactory process together. Megan provided her approach to navigating supervisory conflict:

> If there's some sort of conflict, what's going on there? Then, thinking about all of the different aspects of my identity and my supervisee's identity. What's happening? What the needs are of the client and the site that are all influencing here so that I know how to navigate conflict? . . . How might I be able to do something different in order to help shift our relationship in a way that leads to more growth?

At times, engaging in collaborative processes to repair fractured communication was successful in rebuilding satisfactory working alliances. At other times, engaging in a collaborative process did not address supervisees' distress. Then, participants explored if distress came from stylistic differences or mistrust based on power or social locations.

Collaborating on Feedback

The FMC supervisors that participated in the current study co-constructed an experience through a collaborative process by creating a collaborative feedback process. Because of supervisors' responsibility to provide opportunities for supervisee learning and, simultaneously, to ensure client welfare, participants provided direct, straightforward, and constructive feedback. At times, this was difficult to offer as well as difficult to hear. Thus, these supervisors worked to provide feedback in a way that that could be well received. Amisha reflected on her experience dialoguing with supervisees prior to beginning formative feedback. She said:

> "How does it feel to receive feedback? What has happened historically for you when people have given you feedback? Tell me, how do you like to receive it? What works? What doesn't work?" Almost all of my supervisees say, "Oh, I like it direct. Just tell me what I'm doing wrong." I will be like, "Okay, you say that now, but tell me, what does that bring up for you? When someone had scolded you? 'Cause that's how I think of being scolded, 'Tell me what I'm doing wrong,' like, you know, has this feeling of being chastised in there."

Providing feedback was preceded with a discussion of the supervisor's style for providing feedback, the supervisee's preferences for hearing feedback, and constructing an ongoing feedback process that worked for the supervisor's responsibilities, the supervisee's preferences, and the maintenance of positive supervisory rapport. Supervisors were concerned about taking for granted supervisees' disagreement with their supervisors' perspectives; thus, a collaborative supervision process meant that supervisors' critiques were not the only perspective. Further, participants were also concerned with supervisees experiencing a shift in supervisory processes, especially if supervisees were not aware of their growth edges. Thus, participant supervisors prepared their supervisees for

potentially difficult information. After feedback was provided and discussed, participants processed supervisees' experiences of hearing feedback.

Having a collaborative process meant being thorough and consistent in formative feedback. Thus, supervisors conducted ongoing feedback loops for the purposes of preparing supervisees for their formal evaluations. For example, Megan discussed why ongoing feedback was pivotal in managing power:

> I've seen supervisors from other approaches do the thing that people who practice counseling from other approaches do. It's like getting really excited about these conceptualizations they have of the supervisee . . . but not sharing that information with the supervisee as they're going through. So, kind of getting off on engaging in this discussion in what feels an exploitive way, to me, about the problems that [the supervisee] has, but, then, being silent in the supervision, not bringing it up unless the supervisee does or avoiding giving the feedback until the end so that the supervisee has no idea that is how they're coming across or that they have struggles in these areas.

Furthermore, ongoing feedback loops decreased surprises at the end-of-term evaluation, allowed supervisees opportunities to provide their thoughts on their own performance, and gave supervisees time to improve their counseling skills.

By making supervisees a part of the formal evaluation process, participants collaborated on evaluating supervisees' performance. Jenny provided an example of her style of evaluation:

> It's always been that I had the supervisee fill out the forms that I'm evaluating them on so that they evaluate themselves. I, also, separately filled it out myself in pencil. We would come back together and compare our notes, how we came to the same evaluation, and how we fill out the same form. I recognize that that's pretty difficult for a lot of supervisees to do. It's very difficult for me, as a supervisor, when I have different ideas than what they come with. So, talking through that has been challenging, at times, depending on where the supervisees are.

Bringing supervisees into the process of formal evaluation involved both supervisors and supervisees completing evaluation forms and discussing similarities and differences in

their perspectives. To prevent a power struggle and to prevent supervisees from feeling as if they have to prove their ratings, supervisors participants acknowledged the difficulty of having rating disagreements, reminded supervisees that evaluation is revisable, and acknowledged the responsibility to provide learning.

Seeing Clients as Necessary Partners

The supervisors in this study modeled a collaborative process in supervision as a way to balance power in the supervision relationship. Likewise, they taught their supervisees how to see clients as necessary partners in the therapeutic relationship. These supervisors helped supervisees remain attuned to their clients' reactions, especially when there was a rupture in the therapeutic alliance (e.g., when the client disconnected or pulled away, projected on to the counselor, or struggled in their counseling). Supervisees, in turn, modeled ways to explore therapeutic process difficulties with their clients. They developed a collaborative process in clinical relationships by seeing the clients as experts of themselves and counting on clients' feedback while honoring their own expertise and perspectives. Thus, supervisors supported supervisees to maintain focus on clients' goals while offering their thoughts and insights. For example, H encouraged supervisees to constantly monitor the wellbeing of their clients:

> I encourage therapists to say to their clients in the first session, "I really need your feedback through this whole process. There will be times when I will get it wrong because I am not in your shoes or I do not know what you are experiencing. We have differences between us. I will really need to hear from you, want to hear from you, and am interested in hearing from you whenever I am off in any kind of way, because those will be the times when we can fine tune and make things fit for you. If I don't know them, it's going to be much harder for me to do that. So, I'm going to be depending on you and counting on you to keep giving me feedback letting me know whenever I am off."

Similar to how the supervisors in this study acknowledged the importance of supervisees' feedback on the supervision relationship, these supervisors supported supervisees in acknowledging the importance of client's insights in what was working and not working in the therapeutic alliance and their progress towards goals.

Summary

In conjunction with transparency, the FMC supervisors in this study utilized a collaborative process to manage power in their work with supervisees to co-construct the supervisory relationship, structure, and process. In order to have a collaborative process, these supervisors facilitated supervisees' development of a voice in supervision, awareness of strengths and competencies, and on-going formative evaluation. These FMC supervisors modeled a collaborative process and supported supervisees to utilize collaboration as appropriate with their clients. As two superordinate strategies to manage power in the supervisory relationship, the FMC supervisors in this study enacted transparency and collaboration as they employed the concepts of developmentalism, self-reflection, and contextual-analysis.

Meeting People Where They Are

Supervisors in this study met their supervisees where they were based on their supervisees' level of clinical experience. Participants inquired about their trainees' clinical experiences and provided supervision to match trainees' development needs. According to these supervisors, regardless of natural and/or historical proclivities, innate abilities, experience levels, developmental levels, and growth edges, FMC supervisors

respected and honored their supervisees. Supervisees' training needs influenced the ways supervisor participants met supervisees developmentally: developmentalism was a vector across FMC supervision conceptual categories. Therefore, the manner in which participants managed power; integrated transparency, collaboration, and self-reflection; and attended to context was based on supervisees' levels of development. The ways that participant supervisors implemented developmental supervision included (a) *Figuring Out What Supervisees Bring into the Room;* (b) *Respecting that People are in Different Places;* and (c) *Meeting Supervisees on a Developmental Continuum*.

Figuring Out What Supervisees Bring into the Room

Meeting people where they are meant participants figured out what trainees brought in to supervision. According to participants, taking for granted supervisory power when assessing supervisees' developmental levels might have led to an educated guess based on supervisees' prior experience with clinical work and might have led supervisors to miss a great deal of information from supervisees' histories. Clara discussed the consequences of assuming counseling proficiency while observing a live therapy session:

> I was really surprised of the direction one of the students took. At the break and halfway through the session, she came back, and I asked her questions about what happened, "Can you tell me more about this? And, why did you choose that way and that way?" And, she got visibly upset. I stepped back, and I said, "What semester of practicum is this for you?" 'Cause I assumed she was in her second or third semester. She said, "This is my first session." I just said, "Oh crap."

Participants learned to check in collaboratively with supervisees to discern supervisees' developmental levels early in supervision relationships to avoid overwhelming supervisees. Supervisors' use of uninformed opinion without working in collaboration

with supervisees led to not meeting supervisees' needs: either pushing beyond supervisees' developmental levels or not pushing supervisees enough to promote growth.

Meeting people where they are meant that participants asked their supervisees what they needed early and throughout supervision relationships. Jason stated:

> The first steps for me in working with the trainee are to figure out who this person is not only in the context of their professional development, but who they are in the context of their life. Because inevitably who they are as a person is gonna influence how they see clients.

Thus, these supervisors asked questions to ascertain trainees' aptitudes and growth edges. Specific questions depended on the individual supervisor's history, theoretical approach, and institutional context. Further, supervisors assessed for supervisees' conceptual approaches, aptitudes, multicultural competencies, and therapy skills. Mo described how she assessed supervisees' developmental level early on in supervision relationships, "I'm specifically looking for research aptitudes. Do they have a natural curiosity? Do they have a natural openness? Is their aptitude either supported by or constricted by the theoretical orientations they've been taught?" Further, supervisors discussed supervisees' comfort sharing personal experiences and histories to assess privacy preferences and supervisees' readiness to examine the self to improve clinical skill via self-reflection.

Meeting people where they are meant participants assessed supervisees' awareness, knowledge, and skills, including their multicultural sensitivity and competence. Therefore, these supervisors talked with their supervisees about their understanding of terminology commonly used in an FMC approach (e.g., privilege, oppression, power). Supervisors explored supervisees' exposure and experience working with diverse groups. Megan emphasized, "[I] help them engage in these explorations around their own knowledge or growth areas with multicultural issues or gender issues."

By collaboratively exploring supervisees' level of counseling development with multiculturalism, supervisors in this study better knew where to meet supervisees with regard to challenging bias, exploring identity and context in supervision, and broaching identity issues in therapy. For example, Ava described a session with a young woman supervisee who espoused survivor-blaming biases when working with young women survivors of violence because of her socialization in a sexist culture:

> I really had to challenge myself as a supervisor to meet her where she was, because my first instinct was to be this angry womanist and just go, "What do you mean? Why are you even going there?" Then, I really had to sit back and ask her some questions about her background.

By asking questions about her supervisee's background, Ava was able to understand that her supervisee's survivor-blaming statements protected her from feeling like a potential victim of sexual assault. Ava, then, was able to meet the supervisee where she was and challenge biased thinking built to help the supervisee cope without shaming her supervisee. Engaging in collaborative and ongoing assessment of supervisees' developmental needs helped these FMC supervisors to respect that trainees were at different places regardless of what year in their training they were in.

Respecting that People are in Different Places

Meeting people where they are meant that participants respected that people were in different places. According to participants, an FMC approach was flexible and depended on where a given supervisee was in his or her training. Collaboration and transparency were always a part of this flexible approach, regardless of where supervisees were in their clinical training. Luna contrasted her developmental FMC

approach with a developmental, yet direct, cognitive behavioral approach at a Veterans Administration Hospital (VA) when providing supervision to an advanced trainee:

> I asked the student trainee, "What did your supervisor at the VA say?" Ok, it's a totally different approach. They gave them things, specific things they should do for the client. . . . So, what the VA supervisor did with this advanced student was something that I would have done with a newbie trainee—newbie, like, wet behind the ears and this is their first client. . . . I think there're components in here that developmentally we do, all supervisors do, pay attention to, but it's within the context of your theoretical orientation. If your supervision theoretical orientation is telling you to be directive, then, you're still gonna be directive regardless of [the supervisee's] developmental level.

Thus, for the supervisors in this study, transparency and collaboration held up across the developmental continuum.

Participants attended to supervisees' level of experience, while they noticed that different skill sets and competencies might not match up with trainees' prior training experiences. Thus, for participants in this study, meeting people where they are was highly individualized and attentive to variability. Hence, participants delicately balanced challenge and support to keep anxiety at a level that facilitated growth but did not shut down or overwhelm supervisees. Kevin explained his process of learning how to meet the developmental needs of supervisees while facilitating supervisees' knowledge of self:

> So, once I started supervising, I realized I needed to relearn, I needed to put myself back into developmentally appropriate expectations. Here I was all excited about supervising, where I was in my growth, and forgetting that these were second semester prac students . . . [I was] totally forgetting that they're just starting this. I had to definitely learn—just like I do with my clients—I had to kind of titrate the intensity, because my colleagues used to joke that I should have a pit cam in my supervision experiences because I had this one supervisee who you could just see his armpits starting to sweat.

For participants, balancing challenge and support was a process of setting appropriate expectations and responding appropriately (e.g., empathizing, normalizing, validating), to

maintain strong learning environments and to prevent shaming or "jumping on" supervisees when they did not measure up to high expectations.

Engaging in FMC supervision meant that participant supervisors understood that clinician development intersected with personal and cultural development. That is, supervisees' individual and cultural backgrounds contributed to their counseling development. H provided an example of how feminist and multicultural identity development influenced supervisees' development, which emerged for beginning to advanced supervisees:

> There may be people who are at different stages in their own feminist and multicultural development who think about what they're doing differently. Then, I can respond to them in different ways. . . . I think there are different stages of our own development and that, then, meet requirements of supervision. Like, if you are feeling angry about a certain kind of oppression, you're going into your sessions with that anger. That's something that you would need to talk about. Or, if you're a therapist who's more integrated . . . or who's just more dealt with that, or less constitutionally angry, then, the concerns might be different.

Therefore, for participants, supervisees' identity development intersected with how they approached work with clients and intersected with their skill level. Different levels of identity development demanded different supervision approaches to adequately meet supervisees' developmental needs. For example, Lilly explored the role of class and professional development:

> Sometimes people are irresponsible, but sometimes it's actually cultural issues. I'm thinking about [an individual]. His parents are farmers. He grew up very blue collar and very rural. The things that people know about clothes you're supposed to wear to work, he didn't know at first. I think he had to have some hard lessons.

Thus, when needed, participants provided trainees information about professionalism within the context of their training site. These FMC supervisors worked to depathologize divergent developmental needs that were related to context, culture, and socialization.

Meeting on a Developmental Continuum

Meeting people where they are meant participants worked with supervisees to understand where they were from the beginning to the end of training, because supervisees early in training might have needed a substantially different approach than supervisees later in training. For example, Arby shared a typical area of focus with early trainees:

> When you're early on, it's like, "Oh, no, this person thinks that I am somehow their savior. I have to be perfect, and anytime I show any vulnerability they're gonna think I'm a bad therapist, and they're gonna run away, and they're never gonna come back again." The truth of the matter is, it really works most of the time the opposite way.

Participants often worked to reduce early trainees' fears of making mistakes and appearing vulnerable in sessions with clients. Jenny shared her experience with middle level trainees and a typical developmental struggle:

> So, they may focus on the content, but they can't get to the deeper level with the clients. They would be aware of that, but they don't know how to get there. They may be at the middle level. . . . They may even have an idea of what they think they could do, but they're not quite sure how exactly it would look.

Participants described the middle level as a period of transition: Supervisees had largely mastered basic skills, were learning to transfer existing skills to more advanced situations, and have struggled with skill or knowledge growth edges.

Katie discussed her center's work with advanced-level trainees and their focus on transitioning trainees to colleagues. "Especially as we moved into post doc mode, and even as we were supervising more interns, by the end of the year, the expectation is that people are really moving into that collegial space." Katie described a shift in approach that reflected the trainees' changing status. Table 3 provides a synopsis of the process of

Table 3

Developmental Foci in FMC Supervision

Meeting Beginning Trainees' Needs	Meeting Middle Trainee's Needs	Meeting Advanced Trainees' Needs
Processing development of counselor identity and role (process anxiety)	Evaluating if anxieties or struggles are skill or knowledge based	Processing anxiety when using advanced skills and working with more complex clients
Enhance use of microskills (extensive use of role-play and watching tape)	Provide role-play to develop skill. Provide didactics or reading to expand knowledge.	Refinement of current clinical skills and conceptualization skills by finessing, tweaking, validating, and adjusting current skill
Reduce taking counseling too seriously, taking on too much responsibility, or feeling unable to make mistakes	If they have both skill and knowledge, process what stands in the way of following through on intervention	Taking risks with new approaches, presenting concerns, and with client populations
Building sensitivity to difference and diversity; introducing self-reflection	Stretching multicultural lenses and self-reflection	Deepening multicultural lenses and self-reflection
Having a more directive and supervisor-structured supervision relationship	Increasingly collaborative and supervisee-directed relationship	More collegial and consultative relationship

meeting supervisees where they are in their counseling development, through an FMC supervision developmental lens articulated by the supervisors in this study.

Meeting supervisees' developmental needs meant that participants approached supervisees on the continuum of their learning curves. For participants, across FMC supervision, the intensity of clinical focus and manner of therapeutic approaches varied based on a supervisee's counseling improvement needs. Renee stated, "You have to be able to be flexible in the strength of the different elements and the different moments of each supervisory process." Participants worked on the continua of supervisees' learning curves to develop awareness, knowledge, and skills: (a) from trainee-trainer relationships to collegial relationships; (b) directive approaches to collaborative approaches; (c) more structure to less structure; and (d) supervisor-directed to trainee-directed.

Meeting supervisees where they are also related to the complexities of power. For participants in this study, tension between collaboration, transparency, and power arose in supervisory relationships. In supervision relationships with beginning trainees, participants felt tensions between collaboration, transparency, and power most deeply. Strategies to meet early stage trainees might, for example, emphasize the power differential in supervision relationships because supervisees with these developmental needs were more dependent on supervisors for providing opportunities for learning. Thus, taken for granted power with early stage trainees was potentially most problematic for these FMC supervisors.

Regardless of how power was addressed in the supervisory relationship, FMC supervisors attended to collaboration and strived to maintain transparency with supervisees from the beginning to the end of their formal training. Meeting people where

they are fostered a learning environment that honored, respected, and empowered supervisees. As illustrated by Amisha, “I think empowering is a way of meeting people where they are, right? Instead of dragging them along, you walk with them.”

Summary

The FMC supervisors in this study acknowledged that supervisees have different needs depending on their level of development. Further, power differentials within supervisory relationships were largest with new trainees and smallest with near professionals. First, participants collaboratively assessed a supervisee’s developmental levels and negotiated how to best meet a supervisee’s developmental needs. Therefore, developmentalism served as a vector by attenuating how supervisors engaged in collaboration, transparency, reflexivity, and contextual analysis. The next two sections explore the concepts of self-reflection and examination of context.

Knowing Ourselves to Know Others

For participants, knowing ourselves to know others was a process of anticipating the consequences of their power by cultivating self-awareness and promoting self-reflection for their supervisees. FMC supervisors emphasized being consciously aware at all times for the potential for personal bias, assumptions, and growth edges to insinuate themselves into clinical and supervisory intentions or result in boundary violations. They attended to supervisees’ reactions to clients and built awareness of multicultural dynamics that occurred in supervisory and clinical relationships. Participants cultivated reflexivity for themselves and their supervisees in the following ways (a) *Needing to be*

Consciously Aware; (b) *Exploring How Bias Creeps in;* and (c) *Getting at the Heart of Reactions; (d) Processing the Impact of Identities on Relationships.*

Needing to be Consciously Aware

Participants learned as trainees that self-examination positively influenced their work, be it clinical practice or supervision. Participants viewed harmful supervisory interactions to be borne out of supervisors' lack of awareness. According to participants, the power of supervisors in relation to supervisees amplified supervisees' potential experience of harm, and potential for harm increased when supervisors were not accountable for the harm they caused. FMC supervisors acknowledged the intentional and unintentional potential they had to harm supervisees by being consciously aware.

Maintaining Conscious Awareness

These FMC supervisors believed that they needed to be consciously aware of themselves as much as possible in their supervision work. They evidenced that they were practiced at self-reflection and drew many connections between their histories and their present work. Following an initial interview with a participant, my reflection read:

> She held a lot of self-knowledge, which helped in translating the meaning she made from her experiences. She quickly accessed the meaning she made of her experiences. She was also quite thoughtful about her practice and that of others' practices along her journey. She thought a lot about what her practice meant and what the intent of her practice meant for her supervisees]. (Analytic memo; September 15, 2012)

All participants evidenced ease in reflecting on their supervision history and contemporary practice. Regarding the need to be consciously aware, Katie, too, demonstrated that her approach to supervision had emerged from years of self-reflection:

> I think in more recent years I've been a lot more comfortable talking about myself, who I am as a therapist, who I am as a person, how those things interplay in the work that I do. . . . [That] comes out of the years of knowing who I am as a person, who I am as a therapist, my strengths, and my weaknesses.

These FMC supervisors examined the roles that personal growth edges, life events and stressors, biases and assumptions, identity development, and historical experiences had on their perspectives, motives for action, and reactions to supervisees and clients.

When considering transparency as a means to managing power, FMC supervisors reflected on their motives for sharing their personal and historical information to determine if self-disclosures would provide learning opportunities for their supervisees and/or serve supervisees' clients' welfare. Luna described her process for deciding when to self-disclose: "I decided to self-disclose as much as possible, and it's always done within the context of, 'Is this a teaching moment, a training moment?'"

These FMC supervisors also maintained awareness that their personal and stylistic growth edges or identity statuses could cloud supervisory processes with supervisees. Ava described her approach to self-reflection:

> I'm aware of what my growth edges are because if I have that growth edge with my friends, I'm probably gonna meet a [supervisee] who's like my friend. I need to be aware of how that then will interact in the room. I realize that's a lot of brain work but being able to first challenge myself, because I don't want to bring a challenge in to a [supervisee] when that may not be their thing.

Self-reflection about power differentials in supervision relationships helped supervisors grow in their capacity to meet the needs of diverse supervisees. Arby relayed that he struggled from time to time with stylistic differences with supervisees:

> Part of my approach to supervision, too, is that I'm willing to get down there and do it, and I'm also willing to be embarrassed that I didn't do it right, or I didn't do it as well as I could have. Should I have responded to you more quickly? I looked back at it and I said, "Well, yeah, it probably would have saved a lot of hassle and

> a lot of anxiety on both our parts if I'd have said 'Hey, wait a second, you know, give me an extra week,' or something like that."

Participants attended to their privilege in the supervision context. If they did not successfully manage power, personal struggles, and/or address the role of identity statuses in supervisory processes, they directly acknowledged these imperfections with their supervisees.

Participants reflected on in-the-moment reactions they had toward their supervisees and/or supervisees' clients to examine the meaning of their reactions with their supervisees. Lilly, an FMC supervisor with interpersonal and psychodynamic theoretical approaches, described her reflective process during supervision:

> If I'm feeling something—whether it's that I feel like I'm frustrated or angry or feel like they're the perfect supervisee—how much of that is countertransference, and what does that mean? How much of that is about my own history, and how much about that is about the supervisee? And, if it's about the supervisee, are they trying to tell me something about the work they're doing with their client?

Participants explored reactions to uncover their biases, whether they came from the supervisors' unfinished self-work (e.g., biases or growth edges) or insights that could be used to support supervisees' growth. Examining in-the-moment reactions with supervisees allowed supervisors to be timely and intentional. At times, supervisors in this study shared when they felt that they needed to work on something personally, discovered that their reaction fell outside of supervisees' scope of practice, or noticed that their intention contrasted with the impact (e.g., sharing something potentially beneficial in a way that may cause great discomfort). For participants, discussing in-the-moment reactions mitigated the potential for harming supervisees when supervisors' reactions were more about supervisors than supervisees. These FMC supervisors understood that personal worldviews and professional theoretical orientations worked in tandem.

Personal Is Professional

Supervisors in this study facilitated a self-reflective process in their work with supervisees to increase their intentionality in their clinical work and decrease unintentional harm to clients. According to participants, supervisees' personal growth edges, beliefs systems, identities, and values necessarily affected the ways that they saw their clients and/or counseling processes. For example, Katie guided supervisees' understanding of how their personal experiences influenced their professional work:

> [I ask], "Who are you as a person, what is your context, what are the things that impact your lens, and how are you seeing your clients? And, again, who are you in the room with the client, and what's going on there? Are you seeing your clients in that way, as well?"

Participant supervisors' privacy/boundary preferences affected their modes of facilitating self-reflection in supervision on a continuum. On one end of the continuum, these FMC supervisors provided assignments for supervisees to complete outside of supervision to enhance supervisees' self-awareness. For example, H sought to enhance supervisees' awareness of the personal as political as follows:

> Sometimes, I give supervisees assignments, "Think about your self-criticism, or notice how you're using emotional words in your language through the week." Then, I won't ask them when they get back, "Now tell me how that was." It's something that you can do that I think would be helpful for you, but I feel that that's a private kind of process involved.

H asked supervisees to reflect outside of supervision and offered supervision space for follow-up dialogue, should supervisees choose to share that information. Participants similar to H witnessed supervisors abuse their power by not recognizing that supervisees felt pressured to disclose when asked to do so by a person in power. Therefore, they remained conservative when requesting information from supervisees.

A more moderate approach involved supervisor participants creating space during supervision for self-reflection by encouraging supervisees to self-disclose as they drew connections between their personal lives and their clinical work. On the other end of the spectrum, some supervisors asked supervisees personal questions related to their clinical work. Renee described her methods for increasing supervisees' self-awareness:

> One of the things we tell supervisees as supervisors is that they cannot ignore their own history. I would really like to emphasize that. I think our own personal experience has to come into supervision. That's something that we tell them constantly: "You can't ignore your own personal history when you're working. You have to be aware of your own personal history." [After describing how a supervisee used her history to empower clients] So, you're [showing supervisees] that your own personal history can be used as a way of empowering other women and empowering yourself.

For, Renee, self-reflection and self-disclosure in supervision opened conversations surrounding women's issues typically silenced by dominant social norms, promoted improved service delivery, and empowered supervisees and clients. Participants like Renee felt no qualms asking for personal information that informed supervisees' interactions with clients.

Sometimes a supervisee's personal growth edge seemed to intrude on her or his ability to provide effective counseling. If personal issues went beyond the scope of supervision responsibilities, participants referred supervisees to get their own personal counseling. Jenny reflected on an experience in which her supervisee's personal struggles took space in supervision:

> She had wished that I had provided more space for her to explore what was going on for her personally in our supervision sessions. I remember, she was struggling quite a bit that year with some personal stuff. There were times that she was just so tearful, that I asked her a couple of times if she had her own therapist that she was working with through some of this stuff. I guess, she felt offended that I couldn't sit there with her to work through that with her.

Jenny wondered if she had handled this situation appropriately. She continued to ask herself if she respected her role as a supervisor and if she respected the supervisee during a difficult period. Participants attended to what was happening in supervision relationships to facilitate addressing power dynamics in supervisory and clinical relationship and with the goal of empowering members of supervisory triads.

Exploring How Bias Creeps In

In the context of this study, FMC supervisors referred to bias as a process of making assumptions based on examined or unexamined beliefs and values. Biases affected both supervisors and supervisees. Bias left participants and their supervisees entrenched in their personal, historical, and cultural vantage points pulled them away from what was personally, historically, and culturally appropriate for supervisees or clients, respectively. According to participants, when supervisors or supervisees acted out of biases, they tended to feel judgmental and/or frustrated with supervisees and clients, respectively. By focusing on the ways that biases creeps into psychotherapy, participants helped clinicians to better align their interventions with their clients' needs.

Catching Ourselves

As trainees, FMC supervisors learned how bias affected how they conceptualized clients and selected interventions. Clara described a supervision session where she realized that what she had been taught about ethical behavior was biased:

> I said, "Well I returned a gift a client gave me," and I go, "We're not allowed to take gifts, right?" He said, "Who told you that?" And I go, "Well, I thought that's what we were to do. Our teacher told us that." He's like, "Do you do everything your teacher says?" I was like, "Shit! What are you saying to me?" The more we

> talked about it—and he writes about ethics; he's like Mr. Ethics guru. And, um, and I thought I was doing what he would want me to do. So again, my client's interests weren't at heart. It was my supervisor's interests. I was doing what I thought my supervisor would want me to do by returning the gift and he said, "How did she react?" I said, "She was crying."

Participants had many experiences when others challenged their biases. Thus, they learned the importance of evaluating the role of bias in their own thinking and action.

According to participants, because bias was an ordinary and mundane aspect of humanity and was built into the dominant culture, it was important for FMC supervisors to notice when bias began to influence their work. As described by H:

> I think that we all have biases, we are all in heterosexist, sexist, racist, "ist" kinds of cultures, and we are inevitably gonna be hitting up against those things if we interact with people who are different from us. . . . I feel like I'm learning all the time about my own biases, even when I'm not doing therapy, just by living.

Supervisors worked to catch themselves enacting biases to stop the negative influence of bias on their interactions. Bias was thought to limit empathy and connection with another person or group of people, which was disempowering. Furthermore, when perpetrated by a privileged person, bias was easily mislabeled or went unnoticed and led to judgment, anger, frustration, and/or irritation. FMC supervisors cultivated conscious awareness of their historical biases and current reactions as a means to prevent bias from intruding on supervision or counseling relationships. Because of their self-awareness, participants examined the construct of bias with their supervisees and facilitated awareness of the role that bias played in therapeutic and supervisory interactions.

Not Putting Expectations on Clients

To explore the role of bias in counseling, these FMC supervisors generally subscribed to a constructivist epistemology. They saw multiple truths and realities that

were tied to personal, historical, and cultural contexts. Because it had been so impactful in her professional development, Mo described an assignment she used to introduce trainees to the concept that human nature and history are constructed truths:

> One of the things that all my trainees do is they get to peruse the copy of *Lies My Teacher Told Me* [Loewen, 2007] so that they understand that their K-12 education system did not intentionally do them wrong, but the impact of the available resources (i.e., their textbook) is they have learned incomplete information. That's part of the massaging that happens to get somebody to open up and to really learn that there are multiple perspectives.

FMC supervisors were aware that some narratives were more valued in the dominant society based on the power and privilege of those who espoused them. FMC supervisors questioned societal standards of morality (i.e., normal/abnormal, right/wrong, or good/bad) in order to uncover the constructed nature of truth in a power-laden world.

Megan described how her involvement in punk activist communities exposed her to the nature of power in truth, which helped her facilitate her supervisees' understandings of the power of constructed truth in psychology:

> I just feel very comfortable with thinking, "Are there other ways to look at this? Why is that what's considered normal and why is that not adaptive?. . ." [Supervisees do not know] that there isn't just normal psychology and then political psychology, but that every statement that has ever been written in psychology has a stance.

Thus, participants' histories of being challenged and challenging others' biases facilitated their ability to spot their supervisees' biases.

FMC supervisors discouraged their supervisees from placing expectations on their clients. Jason provided an example of how he helped supervisees understand bias, even in their multicultural training:

> Often, because in the beginning, a lot of it is this, "Well, on feminist day we learned that like women are blah, blah, and blah. Then, on gay day, we learned that lesbian women are blah, blah, or blah" or things like that. A lot of it is well,

> "What are messages that we are getting from this client where that might not be true?" right? So, I feel like the identity centered conceptualization for me is a lot of gentle collaborative inquiry where it's like, "Let's talk about how, how you're thinking and what you're hearing and seeing that could match, but may not match." That for me feels a little bit like, "Let's actually not put your idea of identity in the center but let's put the client's idea of identity in the center." For me, it's a recalibration that happens, and it can be really difficult.

Supervisors noticed when supervisees espoused politically correct and culture-bound assumptions of their clients. They, then, helped supervisees question their lived experiences and training experiences to better attend to their clients' perspective. Kevin described a characteristic growth edge for postdoctoral trainees at his center:

> A lot of us, and I'll throw myself in there, have moved around the country, and are used to having some distance from family. A lot of these clients will go home on the weekends, and it irritates some clinicians. It's saying, "Here you are complaining about feeling disconnected from school, but you're going home every weekend?" Well, there are reasons. Sometimes they're going home to work on the farm. Sometimes they're going to help with siblings. . . . Even if we think that's a problem because they're having issues with school, we need to figure out a way to make it work in both ways.

Kevin examined where supervisees' assumption or bias of valuing higher education above family of origin came from or was learned. He determined that, in his circles, postdoctoral trainees were accustomed to cultural norms that valued graduate education above family. Many graduate students and professionals he knew had moved great distances to pursue their doctoral degrees and were providing services to a local population that did not share their experiences and values. Thus, they needed to understand that access to family of origin was the norm of their client population

FMC supervisors fostered empathetic connections that replaced emotional detachment caused by biased thinking. Helping supervisees avoid placing expectations on clients involved "affective moments" that meant sitting in some amount of discomfort during supervision. According to participants, this was analogous to what clients felt

during therapy. Ava described how she assisted her supervisee to connect emotionally to sexual assault survivors instead of protecting herself by using rape mythology:

> [We spent time] really exploring both the facts as well as her own ideas about that and talkin' about how that affected her. We even explored with her being more traditional, thinkin' about wantin' kids, "What would this mean if your daughter went to college? Um, you know, what would you want in place for her?" And, sort of, challenging her to connect with the pain that the person who had been victimized felt, rather than kind of re-victimizing them by making it their fault.

By helping trainees experience the emotions of clients, supervisors, like Ava, were able to assist supervisees to empathize with the experience of their clients.

Getting to the Heart of Reactions

Supervisors deepened their own and supervisees' self-reflection in order to understand from where reactions arose. Because reactions were embedded in the context of a counseling session, FMC supervisors first developed a narrative of the counseling session. Kevin described his approach to augmenting progress notes in supervision:

> Step one would just be to say to them, and say, "Hey, I noticed this in the notes. Can you tell me how this came up? What did you say? What did he or she say?" Then, expound on it a little bit.

Supervisors and supervisees developed a narrative of the session by reviewing the session (i.e., watching video recording, listening to audio tape, reading progress notes) and by asking questions to understand what therapists said, what therapists felt, and what therapists observed in their clients.

Supervisors, then, asked questions to explore supervisees' thought processes at key points in the session, especially, when supervisees seemed to react to their clients. Supervisors revisited how supervisees felt in response to their clients and their interactions. Last, they processed the experience of talking about therapeutic interactions

in supervision. Lilly used psychodynamic psychology to guide supervisees in exploring their reactions in counseling:

> I say, "What are your reactions to this client? What do you think that's about?" . . . and I'll talk about that, "This can be on several levels. It can be that this client is having transference with you and is treating you as if you had different intentions than you do. . . behaving as though you were a member of their family, for example. How much of it is that? How much of it is what they're drawing from you? How much of it is your own stuff?" I am tentative, 'cause I don't want them to feel like they have to talk about their stuff. But, "How much of this is about you, and how are you gonna find a way to manage that?"

FMC supervisors helped their supervisees reflect on the influence of supervisees' experiences on current reactions to clients, explored options for managing reactions in session, and examined ways to use reactions to enhance treatment effectiveness.

For participants, via self-reflection in supervision, clinicians were better able to articulate their therapeutic intentions and appreciate all of their motives for employing therapeutic interventions. Amisha used videotape in supervision to examine the reason for the use of a particular intervention strategy during a given session:

> The other thing that I like to do is actually watch tape with the supervisee in the room. We watch tape together. I just pause the tape and say, "Okay, now tell me what happened. You had these many roads to go down, and it's not that you didn't go down the right one, but why did you choose this one?" It really helps break it down.

Thereby, clinicians learned what prompted them to move in one direction or another in their clinical work and what stymied supervisees in carrying out their intentions.

Processing the Impact of Identities on Relationships

For participants, knowing ourselves to know others included processing the impact of identities on supervisory and clinical relationships. FMC supervisors paid attention to the multicultural relationship dynamics enacted in supervisory and clinical

relationships and when broaching issues of diversity. Cultural identities, social locations, and/or statuses played roles in multicultural relational dynamics. Further, when ignored, multicultural relational dynamics maintained hierarchies of power in relationships. According to participant supervisors, historical power narratives between social groups had the potential to echo in current relational dynamics if they were not acknowledged nor addressed. This might lead to therapeutic derailment and communication impasse.

Thinking About How Diversity Is Playing Out in the Room

According to participants, processing the impact of identities on relationships involved recognizing the role of diverse social locations, cultural contexts, and personal meanings on an interpersonal exchange. Arby, a supervisor with 46 years' experience, discussed the contrast of social locations:

> I think every relationship has these levels of dynamics. Some of them are more obvious than others. I mean, if it's clear that I have a female supervisee, and I'm a male supervisor. If I have a younger supervisee—which these days is almost guaranteed—and I'm older. I mean, some of them are gonna be more obvious than others, but they're all coming into play.

Participants noticed that multicultural sensitivity positively influenced the processes and outcomes of counseling and supervision, from their perspectives, their superviseess perspectives, and clients' perspectives. FMC supervisors reflected on how multicultural identities, whether obvious (e.g., race) or subtle (e.g., religious affiliation), interacted with that of supervisees' multicultural identities and affected the supervision relationship.

Enhancing Sensitivity of Diversity

Processing the impact of identities on relationships was a way to acknowledge diversity and the role of diversity in the therapeutic process. Supervisors initially enhanced supervisees' sensitivity around differences and similarities in clinical relationships. For participants, building supervisees' sensitivity to diversity intersected with a developmental approach. Supervisees new to a focus on multicultural issues required different approaches as they became aware of the role of diversity in the therapeutic relationship and the world at large. For example, Clara described a group supervision session in which she saw gender dynamics playing out between a male supervisee and his male client:

> [I began by] asking, "How is gender playing out in this situation?" . . . a male student just looks at me like, "What do you mean?" He's another guy. "What do you mean, 'How is gender playing out?'" thinking that gender only is an issue between opposite genders, right? . . . It was just something that never crossed his radar. . . . . He couldn't move in that moment. He just was really surprised. Then, just turning it to the group, "What could be happening?" and just creating hypotheses. There was a lot there, and finally he saw it. I think he came out of the supervision session numb, kind of just taking it all in. The next week, he just was like, "I got it. I see it now."

According to participant supervisors, supervisees new to multicultural sensitivity struggled to acknowledge even obvious diversity dynamics between themselves and their clients, believed that diversity played no role in the therapeutic dynamic, or saw diversity as related to gender or race only. Therefore, enhancing supervisees' sensitivity to differences between clients and themselves meant that supervisors demonstrated openness to hearing supervisees' perspectives and provided opportunities for gentle and collaborative exploration of the role of difference on client conceptualization, the therapeutic relationship, and selected interventions.

Later in supervisees' development, supervisors pointed out perceived real differences and asked supervisees about the influences of diversity on their conceptualization of the client and the therapeutic process. Supervisors spoke more broadly about multiculturalism in psychotherapy with supervisees more practiced at exploring multicultural dynamics. Eventually, supervisees routinely examined multicultural dynamics without prompting.

Processing the impact of identities on relationships meant going beyond merely helping supervisees notice that differences existed in their clinical relationships to exploring how identities impacted therapeutic processes. Renee discussed the process of including indigenous women at her practicum training site in Central America. She and her supervisees examined the role of culture on the therapeutic dynamics in the context of a culturally divided community:

> We noticed that nobody had talked to them about being [indigenous] women. During the first supervision, when I said, "Ok, how do you feel when others look at you in your native dress, and think, 'You're a professional?'". . . One of them said it was like a slap in the face because she said, "Nobody had actually never asked me about that, and it was one of my fears." So, for us, the person in charge of the practicum and myself, it was an eye opener to really notice that there are things that are not talked about but are on the plate.

FMC supervisors started the dialogue of how our identities affected the content and process of disclosures in supervision. This assisted supervisees in building awareness of how they experienced diverse clients and how diverse clients experienced supervisees.

Broaching Issues of Diversity

To facilitate supervisees' abilities to broach topics of diversity and process the impact of identities on relationships, supervisors helped supervisees notice that

differences existed and collaboratively examined their impact on relational dynamics in supervision and counseling relationships. Supervisors sought opportunities to bring up the role of diversity in the supervision relationship. They discussed diversity proactively, early in the relationship, and when identities played a role in supervisory processes. Luna, a middle-aged Latina supervisor, shared an experience of working with a young, White, woman-identified supervisee in an area highly populated with Latino/a populations:

> So, when we had our first session, I was giving her my information, she was giving me hers. . . . We were talkin' about our racial/ ethnic differences, and she gave me the story of how she was worried about me. This was towards the end of the session where she felt free now to tell me that she was worried about me at the beginning, having me as a supervisor, because I reminded her of a basketball coach, who was you know, a female basketball coach, who was kind of mean, and she thought that I was gonna be like that, too. . . . We put our things on the table so that we can kind of clear the air, and talking about how race and ethnicity and all the cultural issues are important in supervision.

Supervisors in this study asked supervisees directly how difference might have affected the supervisory relationship.

At times, supervisors noted that their social locations influenced their stimulus value in the eyes of supervisees. Jason shared an example of being valued because he did not fit his supervisee's expectations as a gay-identified man:

> Trainees are like, "Who is this crazy, women-loving gay male supervisor?" right? I have trainees that are very specific about saying, "I know a lot of really misogynist gay men, right? The fact that you are telling me to 'love myself,' to create these spaces for my clients and to 'fuck the patriarchy' can be really intense coming from you. Because I see you, and I read you as part of that process."

Processing the dynamics of gender and sexual orientation in supervision relationships was important for Jason to develop positively functioning supervision relationships. Supervisees sometimes held assumptions about their supervisors that discredited or overvalued their supervisor's power, esteem, or knowledge. In these situations,

supervisors first normalized biased thinking, and then they explored with supervisees the role their biases played in the supervisory relationship. The outcome of processing the role of identity and bias in the supervisory relationship varied with the supervisor's skill in processing difference and the supervisee's identity development.

Processing the impact of identities on relationships meant that supervisors modeled how they managed difference in supervision relationships and assisted supervisees in naming these identity differences in therapy. Megan shared:

> When our trainees would bring up issues around wanting to broach issues of race and ethnicity with their. . . clients, we would say, "that's appropriate. That's what we do.". . . And, "What is it about . . . gender issues or race issues where you avoid that topic? You're not moving towards that, whereas you might move towards it with other people."

Supervisor participants supported supervisees when they brought up difference in their therapeutic relationships. They helped supervisees develop skills to talk about difference with clients through psychoeducational discussions and role-plays. Supervisors pointed out when supervisees neglected to bring up difference and then processed what stopped them from doing so in supervision and/or in clinical work. At times through processing difference in therapeutic relationships, supervisors and supervisees developed testable cultural hypotheses that integrated multiculturalism into their client conceptualization and therapeutic interventions of therapy.

Summary

FMC supervisors in this study utilized the practice of self-reflection to enhance self-knowledge in efforts to anticipate the power-laden consequences of their actions on supervisees and help supervisees to adopt a similar practice in their work with clients.

Thus, through a process of examining their own biases, growth edges, mistaken assumptions; thoughts, reactions, and actions; and the influence of multicultural dynamics on a given clinical or supervisory interaction was a hallmark of FMC supervisors in this study and was, therefore, promoted as a cornerstone of trainees' clinical work. For participants and their supervisees, developing skill at self-reflection facilitated understanding the similarities and differences between the self and other. To further understand the self and others, FMC supervisors employed an analysis of the contexts of the supervisor, supervisee, and client. A contextual analysis is detailed below.

Looking at the Way Context Impacts People

Participants engaged in two processes to examine the influence of context. The first was analytic and the second was activism. FMC supervisors explored external influences on their own practice, their supervisees' experiences, and clients' presenting concerns. Participants attended to the influence of external events and contexts on self-concepts, thoughts, moods, behaviors, and distress. According to participants, access or lack of access to power and resources (i.e., having influence on self and others), influenced how people experienced the world and how other people in the world experienced them. Participants held that many, but not all, psychiatric symptoms were coping methods for managing distress.

Participants also made systemic and ecological improvements. FMC supervisors developed, implemented, and facilitated supervisees' engagement in interventions that change distressing, oppressive, or problematic contexts. FMC supervisors anticipated the consequences of their actions through the strategies of managing the effects of contexts

on themselves, supervisees, and clients and supporting supervisees in developing similar strategic skills for their clients and themselves. The ways that participant supervisors examined the role of context in the supervisor triad included (a) *Exploring External Influences* and (b) *Making Systems and Ecological Change.*

Exploring External Influences

FMC supervisors in this study examined the impact of their professional contexts on their supervisory practices. In supervisory relationships, FMC supervisors opened dialogue for the implications of the supervisees' contexts on their supervisory and clinical relationships. Participants also explored the ways that clients' contexts affected their presenting concerns and interactions in therapy.

Valuing or Devaluing FMC Approaches in Contexts

Looking at the way context impacts a person meant that participants examined the fit between their professional contexts and their supervision approaches. FMC supervisors tended to experience isolation and felt challenged in professional environments that typically, at minimum, were unaware of FMC approaches or, at most, delegitimized FMC approaches. They felt their power reduced. By contrast, FMC supervisors tended to flourish and felt most congruent in systems that celebrated FMC approaches. They were empowered. As described by Jason, at times FMC supervisors felt like "the only feminist supervisor in a sea of folks who are not."

Participants acknowledged that the field of psychology, as well as most institutions and systems, historically underrated the importance of feminism and multiculturalism. H identified that FMC approaches exist on the margins of psychology:

> I think that, just as a field of psychology, we have [a] very medicalized perspective on mental health, and I think that we channel our resources in a way that supports certain psychotherapy orientations and certain conceptions of clients and that doesn't always fit with being a feminist or a multiculturalist. . . . We grant available money to people who have [a medicalized] perspective and different resources and prestige and opportunities to further the evidence on those approaches, and we don't have that, really, as feminist multiculturalists. . . . You're in a more challenging position, I think, as a supervisor.

FMC supervisors were not accustomed to seeing their approaches to supervision presented in scholarly literature. Instead, their supervision approach was segmented in the literature: they were able to find literature on feminism or multiculturalism. At the time of data collection, there was no empirical literature that integrated feminist and multicultural supervision. The marginalized professional status of FMC gave way to strong reactions to the emerging results of the present study. During a feedback interview, Luna described her relief after hearing the results of this study:

> This project is picking up on exactly what I've been teaching in my course, but I'm teaching it in a vacuum. It's only my experience. I don't know how other "feminist multicultural supervisors" do it. [She went on to echo what other participants shared as they provided feedback on the initial results of the current study.] By seeing this and knowing it cuts across other professionals who consider themselves multicultural feminist, and it fits. I'm just like, that's awesome.

Having a body of literature that resonated with their supervision approach affirmed and validated the participants in this study.

Even if they were marginalized within their profession, they learned that there were others like them. I wrote the following memo in response to Luna's feedback:

> To Luna, this analysis spoke to her in a way that previous literature and research has not yet spoken to her. She seemed enlivened by hearing the analysis, and she

> seemed to have energy behind her initial reaction. Seeing a structure, grounded in her experience and the experiences of others like her, seemed to leave her feeling validated. Luna indicated that seeing her experience match others' experiences made her feel "good." What does "good" mean under the surface? I think this screams of stuff that H has stated in the past: FMC approaches are not yet in the center; they are still on the margins. To have one's approach be validated in the form of ink on the page of a manuscript—or in this case on a feedback handout—feels "good" regardless of the approach. To have a marginalized approach validated by written language means more than good. I think Luna undersells her reaction. I think it feels legitimizing. She indicated, when she taught FMC supervision, she does so "in a vacuum." She told the story through her own voice and experience and, I would guess, through extrapolation of FMC therapy and theory. This seems important, too, because Luna is a voice that is on the margins. As a researcher of Latino/a persons, she indicated that her work has been de-legitimized or deemed "a redo" versus a bona fide addition to the literature. She talked of witnessing the voices of those that looked like her (Latina peers and elders) be devalued and silenced. Luna (likely), too, feels the sting of silencing. I am extrapolating, but I wonder if she feels on shaky ground because of the links between a marginal approach tied to a marginal being. Thus, her excitement is relevant, important, and worth honoring. This seems tied to the discussions of participants that had to prove their approaches in professional settings. They seem angry, resentful, frustrated at the prospect of having to defend something that works (and, I would guess, they think works better). To see their work emerge from an empirical foundation must feel better than good—I hear validation. (Analytic Memo; June 18, 2013)

For participants, looking at the way that context impacts people involved self-reflecting on how FMC existed on the margins in the field of psychology. Developing research on FMC brought marginalized practitioners together.

FMC supervisors experienced a dearth of validation from superiors, colleagues, and supervisees when they questioned them and their approaches. Amisha described the implications of individuals devaluing FMC approaches:

> When you talk about this approach to your colleagues who might not be feminist multicultural, they look at you like, "You're crazy." They're like, "Why in the hell are you doing this? It doesn't make any sense. Just tell them what to do!" . . . Not only are your students in some ways oppressing you, but you're also being oppressed with your colleagues who are also doubting your knowledge.

Participants in non-FMC affirming contexts described other staff, faculty, and/or students/trainees as questioning their approach and looking for more directive supervisory approaches. Thus, FMC supervisors had the added responsibility of explaining or defending their approach to supervision.

Some FMC supervisors found the need to go unnoticed in environments that devalued FMC supervision approaches. Katie described how she used an FMC process in her supervision dyad but kept it quiet in the larger environment as a Navy psychologist:

> It was interesting. For a lot of my experience in the Navy, I felt like my multicultural feminist stuff had to go underground, in a way, because that just wasn't what was on the surface. There was all of the evidence-based practice language that was goin' around and all of that at the time. I used [an FMC supervision approach]; that's what got worked out in the room, but that's not necessarily what we talked about on a broader scale.

For participants like H, Amisha, and Katie, using an FMC approach to supervision in nonaffirming contexts resulted in feeling isolated, being questioned, and going underground. Managing incongruent environments left FMC supervisors exhausted.

By contrast, FMC supervisors in contexts that honored an FMC approach felt a sense of congruence with themselves and their colleagues. FMC-affirming contexts welcomed supervision approaches that incorporated transparency, collaboration, awareness of power, and social justice, for example, and incorporated systemic practices that encouraged transparency, collaboration, awareness of power, and social justice. Jenny discussed how her university counseling center context promoted a collaborative environment through policies existing before she became a director:

> I will try to let different people speak. . . . This was already set up before I became a director. I'm not the one that came up with these ideas. For example, in our clinical meeting, I don't facilitate that. In our training committee meeting, I don't facilitate that. Other people do it. So, I let others at the center have a word.

Jenny's approach was not questioned by others and, instead, felt an FMC approach was common practice in her center. Renee described institutional practices that worked to manage the complexities of power throughout her agency. She said, "We work in a model where we don't believe there's a hierarchy. For example, within our offices, nobody uses their professional title. There's no doctorates. There's no lawyers. There's no doctors. We all go on a first name basis." Arby explained that the faculty in his department created a department that affirmed social justice approaches. All faculty and students were expected to engage in social justice, and he felt no need explain to students or colleagues why social justice was important to him. Instead, the surrounding environment supported his passions. He stated, "We . . . are very dedicated to social justice. . . . Our particular kind of counseling psych area is labeled the social justice area. We do ally workshops. We have dialogs all over the place about this." Arby felt supported by his department and colleagues. Participants like Jenny, Renee, and Arby were able to practice FMC supervision openly because of their affirming contexts, and they were aware of the impact that their context has on their professional wellbeing.

Processing the Impact of External Events on Supervisees' Empowerment

Supervisors looked at the ways that context impacted supervisees. They processed the effects of events that were external to clinical training to determine their impact on supervisees' empowerment. FMC supervisors appreciated when people in power examined how educational and professional (and at times personal) experiences caused them distress. They, in turn, explored the ways experiences outside of therapeutic relationships or supervisory relationships affected supervisees' sense of self-efficacy as

counselors, their willingness to speak in supervision, their sense of being powerful, and their effectiveness in the room with clients. Megan provided an example of the impact that an external event had on a supervisee's efficacy as a therapist:

> Supervisees might have been feeling really confident. But, then, oh, their dissertation proposal gets rejected. Then, all of a sudden, they come in and they can't do counseling anymore. They're like, "I can't do anything!" So, I'm really looking at, "What are external things that are going on in your life that might be influencing your work with your client right now?"

Supervisors assessed how supervisees were doing professionally and educationally.

According to supervisors in this study, educational contexts fostered fear of authority, evaluation, and making mistakes for some graduate students. Mo shared that she endeavored to reduce interns' fear of failure resultant from traditional doctoral education practices. "They just walked out of their Ph.D. program where, [in] every single class, they were evaluated. They were evaluated on every paper, on every answer they gave. They're coming in primed for being afraid of failure." FMC supervisors attuned themselves to past professional and educational experiences that influenced the ways supervisees experienced their relationships with current supervisors and agencies.

FMC supervisors offered space to examine the relationship between historical influences and current relationships on supervision and clinical work. Jason talked about the importance of processing past supervision and educational experiences with interns:

> I, also, have come to the understanding that internship is also a place for people to begin to really process the baggage of their graduate experience. Like, "All this shit that has been jacked up that's happening to me, and I need to really have some time to talk about it!" It's almost ideal, because the people that I'm talking about it with are not affiliated with my program, you know?

Participants recognized that events outside of the clinical relationship and supervision relationship impinged on supervisees' sense of empowerment. They made room for

supervisees to express and process those experiences in supervision. FMC supervisors assisted supervisees in applying a contextual analysis to their work with clients.

Using an Ecological Model for Thinking About Clients

Supervisors used an ecological model for thinking about clients. They looked at the ways social locations, such as relational contexts, familial contexts, community contexts, cultural contexts, and access to power and resources influenced clients' presenting concerns and current functioning. FMC supervisors initiated dialogued with supervisees about the role of identity, context, and power statuses on the experiences of diverse clients. Clara described her use of curiosity to help supervisees learn about the influence of culture on their clients' interpersonal styles:

> So, the supervisee will say . . . "Yeah, my client, she's very submissive, and she's not assertive and da, da, da, da, da, da, da." Well, we'll talk about: "Where do you think she learned that?" [We'll] have a talk. Yeah, I asked her, "Where . . . did that come from?" you know, "How do you understand that?" and, "How do other people see you?" you know, doing relative questioning.

Clara examined the role of socialization and social learning with supervisees to enhance multicultural and feminist conceptualizations of clients. In addition, Kevin worked with supervisees to incorporate a profeminist analysis of masculinity:

> The gender aware piece is often presenting other ways to consider things. So, if they have a [man-identified] client who's angry or having some kind of conduct problem related to anger, rather than going after the anger—this traditional "let's manage this thing"—I'd say, "Well, let's figure out what happened right before the anger." Like, "Well, what do you mean?" I say, "Anger is for many people a reaction to some other thing, and let's figure out what that other thing was. Whether it was shame or humiliation or hurt or whatever it might be." That drastically changes therapy sometimes. The overarching principle is just to raise the issue of men as gendered beings [instead of] the default where we don't have to assume that gender's playing a role in their behavior.

Rather than focusing on pathologizing symptoms, FMC supervisors helped supervisees and clients consider the role of identity socialization on presentation.

FMC supervisors restrained themselves from and urged supervisees to avoid making internal, intrapsychic, or biological diagnoses as initial explanations for clients' presentations, diagnoses, and conceptualizations. Instead, FMC supervisors facilitated supervisees listening for the role of context in clients' histories and integrating an ecological perspective into all levels of treatment planning. Ava described her approach for exploring how access to power influenced clients' symptoms: "I think that's where a lot of depression, anxiety, and suicidality comes from, because people are not regarded equitably, fairly, those types of things. It causes all this other stuff to occur." FMC supervisors assisted supervisees in looking at how clients' symptoms were context dependent versus biological, coping versus pathological, adaptive versus nonadaptive, and functional versus dysfunctional.

FMC supervisors helped supervisees depathologize symptoms when symptoms emerged from problematic contexts. Katie provided an example of how she helped supervisees explore the context-driven nature of the presenting concerns of clients of color on her largely White campus:

> [Black students] tell stories about interacting with people in the residence halls who had never had a one-on-one conversation with a black person before, who had all kinds of questions about their hair. Having comments made like, "Oh, yeah, we thought you had tails.". . . Those are the things that students have to hear and have to experience daily, plus all the pressure of being here and knowing that you're representing your whole family or your whole community. What does that look like and what kind of pressure does that place on our students? I want us to talk about that and understand that context that they're operating in. So, it's not just are they depressed and is that it. But are they depressed, and how is their identity impacting that? How is their sense of what resources they have and what support they have here on campus impacting that? Of course you're gonna be depressed when you're the head of the Native Student Alliance and you're also

> Black. You're a Black Native American, and people are starting to question your legitimacy in the Native community because you're also African American.

FMC supervisors remained alert to the role of intrapsychic and biologically related symptoms in clients' presenting concerns. Lilly reminded supervisees to rule out the role of biology in presenting concerns when she said, "Symptoms are a way of coping. When are they coping? When is it biologically influenced? What are all the influences on what you're seeing? Really involving the client in making those distinctions 'cause in the end it's their body." Thus, by using an ecological way of thinking, FMC supervisors encouraged supervisees to consider symptoms as coping strategies.

Making System and Ecological Change

The first step in looking at the role of context was examining its role in the experiences of supervisors, supervisees, and clients. In addition, FMC supervisors also looked for ways to make systemic and ecological changes. They did so in order to benefit supervisees, clients, and themselves.

Reaching Out for Support

FMC supervisors recognized the importance of structural and interpersonal support. Thus, they sought out contexts and individuals that valued an FMC approach. Being connected to like-minded others at work or in other settings reduced FMC supervisors' experiences of isolation and exhaustion. FMC supervisors began cultivating supportive relationships and contexts along their educational journeys and continued to seek support in their work settings. For example, during her practicum training, Jenny, a

Taiwanese American woman, experienced microaggressions from her Latino supervisor. She turned to her peers to gain the support she could not get from the people in power:

> Him making a comment to me about me needing to be more assertive was very much a Western approach and a perspective that I didn't even pick up on myself. Somebody else mentioned that to me in an observation. "Here's a Latino supervisor who should know better," was what the other person was saying. "He is doing all these things wrong with you," that they were appalled by.

Jenny's supportive peers provided her with validation during graduate training to make sense of a negative training experience with a person in power.

Megan shared that she was the only supervisor in her community LGBTQ clinic who urged others to consider the implications of context, power, and identity during their weekly supervisors' meeting. She clarified that she was not always alone:

> I don't feel that way in all of my contexts. The academic department I teach in—totally not a lone wolf. We're great, you know. Yeah, it's awesome. My program chair is amazing. She's even better at deconstructing everything. I have that to help me take care of myself, and I have like [national feminist organization] to help me take care of myself. My [doctoral] cohort is still on call.

Finding individuals, groups, institutions, and communities that valued an FMC approach helped FMC supervisors make sense of being challenged, questioned, or isolated. Amisha described feeling isolated in her professional context: "Paying attention to all these constructs within an environment that has yet to support them or support this process, it just becomes exhausting. I find myself sometimes, as I said earlier, feeling so tired by being feminist. Can I just not be a feminist?" By seeking support from others, FMC supervisors eased the exhaustion of practicing alone and keep their FMC approach intact.

Being in the Supervisee's Corner

FMC supervisors developed ways to change problematic contexts. They allied with people in power who were willing to change contexts and worked on common goals (e.g., to increase the effectiveness of the training contexts). FMC supervisors did not shrink away from being the change they wished to see. Supervisors learned such an approach from prior supervisors. For example, Clara, a first generation Latina college student, described the experience of her first supervisor challenging her to self-advocate:

> I was the first person in my family to go to college, and my grandmother died my first year of grad school. I thought I couldn't miss anything in grad school, so I didn't go to her funeral, and I didn't tell anyone. Later, I talked to [my supervisor], and she said, "You could have gone." I said, "But, we had a final exam, and I thought I never would be able to make it up." She started to talk to me about what was my fear of asking for things and asking for help. We just processed that a little bit, and it really opened my mind to the possibilities within academia and being a student.

FMC supervisors brought their histories of having people in power take action to correct problems and support them along their journeys into supervision with their supervisees.

FMC supervisors channeled their experiences as trainees. They moved beyond understanding and empathizing with their supervisees' struggles to helping supervisees feel empowered in their training journeys. FMC supervisor participants actively helped supervisees access resources and change contexts to fill unfulfilled needs. At times, supporting supervisees' empowerment was as simple as reminding them to employ self-care or adopt a work/life balance. Jason described his approach to facilitating self-care in supervisees during internship:

> So, for me, [it's the] little things like, "Okay, you just passed the EPPP. Why are you staying late to work? Why are you not out getting your drink on, going partying, or just going home and watching bad reality TV? Who told you that you have to keep working? Part of loving oneself is actively confronting messages that to be productive as a clinician means you have to work, work, work, work, and

> never stop. . . . Let's actually confront economic, power hierarchies that say that productivity is equated to how many hours that you spend in the process."

FMC supervisors discussed with their supervisees the pros and cons of learning skills for self-advocacy versus having supervisors resolve the situation by using their status in hierarchical systems. Participants realized that supervisees had less power than the training staff. H discussed power dynamics to enhance supervisee empowerment:

> We're gonna be talking about power, and how do you negotiate power as someone who's an intern or someone who's a practicum student within a system where you have basically no power and you may be the person who actually knows your clients more than anyone does and still has no power?

Lilly described how she encouraged supervisees to advocate for formative feedback in practicum sites to enhance their learning experiences:

> I'll talk about it with them—about how to use supervision. What's the best way to use supervision, "The feedback and the evaluations are part of how you're gonna grow, but it's also a point of vulnerability for you as the supervisee." . . . For their own protection, they might wanna consider asking for that feedback as their duty, as opposed to thinking they're just automatically gonna get it. If they're hearing on a lot of positive feedback that it might not be a bad idea to say, "I'm [hearing] that you're liking what I'm doing. Is there anything that I can improve?" . . . Let's say they get a feedback at the end of each semester. "Find mid-semester, put it in your calendar; the week before, ask, 'Is there any way that I can get some mid-semester feedback, a kind of informal summary of how you think I'm doing?' That way you get the feedback while you still have time to work on it before the written evaluation that will go into your file."

Lilly helped her supervisees access information to help them grow as trainees in their practicum settings. She empowered them to be proactive, to approach their practicum supervisors in a collaborative fashion to prevent potentially harmful evaluation surprises. FMC supervisors processed with their supervisees as to whether they felt comfortable and had the skills to engage in self-advocacy and interact with people in power.

When supervisees reported feeling uncomfortable or unsafe to advocate on their own behalf, FMC supervisors obtained permission from supervisees to help supervisees

get what they need by using their influence. Mo described an example of how she used her power as the training director to meet the needs of a trainee:

> Two years ago, we had a male trainee whose wife delivered a baby. There's this requirement that it's a 2000 internship with 500 direct service hours, blah, blah, blah. He was so stressed that he was not gonna do it. He was gonna take three days off when the baby came. As the training director and as an auntie having a good positive relationship with him, I gave him a special project to do at home to continue doing hours. I literally told him, "You cannot come into the office for two weeks. You absolutely must stay at home and bond with your child." . . . My associate director and director support that kind of behavior.

FMC supervisors challenged the complexities of power by acknowledging that trainees were in a position where they often neglected personal preferences for educational and professional responsibilities. FMC supervisors provided a training atmosphere that did not require that supervisees outweigh tasks of training and over personal needs.

Making Living Better

FMC supervisors in this study used their knowledge and power to make living better. Therefore, they worked to change the status quo. Given that FMC supervisors knew that contexts could make living problematic for people who were marginalized, oppressed, or lacked access to resources and power, FMC supervisors used their understandings of systems and their status to design interventions that changed contexts. For example, Kevin talked about noticing that safe spaces were limited for sexual minority students on his campus and worked to create a place for a safe process:

> I think that sexual orientation has been an issue [in my clinical setting]. That's also because it's been a problem in parts of this campus. That's also why I started a group for GBQQAA men. Because there was no outlet other than the Pride Center for them to have these discussions.

This meant working within communities and institutions to make living safer, to increase equity, and to honor difference and diversity.

FMC supervisors attended to the policies and practices of their agencies or departmental contexts. FMC supervisors made policy and practice changes to meet the needs of diverse individuals and to promote equity. Luna shared the changes she implemented in her department's clinic:

> I remember putting in the evaluation forms for the supervisees to write on their supervisors, which has a whole section on multicultural aspects, talking about religion and GLBT issues and race and ethnicity and things like that: "Did your supervisors do that? What did you learn from that?" So, I'm getting evaluations of my supervision students from my supervisees to make sure that those things are done. Those are things I taught in class, so they should be doing that. So, again, that all goes back to my training from supervisors who did those things on a regular basis. That was a norm. When I came into [a southwestern state] and saw that our clinic was not doing that, that's when I implemented it. I said, "No, you need to be doing this."

FMC supervisors knew that there were better ways to provide clinical services to diverse clients and worked to implement changes. They offered opportunities for supervisees to join in the context-changing interventions. Renee emphasized the goal at her practicum training program in community activism:

> Because it's one of the real objectives—like I told you at the beginning of this work—when we created the idea of a practicum center, it was not only the advocacy we do in here, but, also, that the students, when they come out, they can continue doing that kind of work. So, if we are able to teach them, and they are able to see how this works, they can repeat this kind of model somewhere else. It's not limiting them to, "Okay, I'm a professional in my little ivory tower," but, "I can also do advocacy. I can also work toward change. I can talk about change."

FMC supervisors provided opportunities for interventions at the systemic level and were aware of the consequences of doing this work. Arby emphasized, "I invite supervisees to be part of that. I won't say that you have to do it. I won't say that you have to do it my

way." If supervisees chose to join in, supervisors provided training and supervision to aid supervisees in their journey.

Summary

Looking at the way context impacts people was a method of anticipating and managing the consequences of power-laden contexts on individuals, including supervisors, supervisees, and clients. In an FMC supervisory process, supervisors examined and facilitated supervisees' examination of how access to power and resources influenced affective states, cognitions, and actions within and outside of supervisory and clinical relationships. In efforts to change the negative affect of problematic contexts on clients, supervisees, and themselves, FMC supervisors engaged in and supported supervisees' engagement in activism and advocacy.

In the following section, I will review the relationships between the central conceptual category and the remaining six conceptual categories by explicating the theoretical codes linking them together.

Conclusion

Participants defined power as the ability to influence the lives of others and one's own life. This was the central concern in FMC supervision. These FMC supervisors worked to resolve the complexity of power in supervision by anticipating the consequences of their power-laden roles and actions and by employing power-managing strategies to reduce the negative consequences of power in supervision relationships. Participants recognized that the way they acted toward and thought about supervisees

ranged from sharing (collaborating) to taking (abusing) power. Supervisors supported their supervisees in manifesting a similar process in relationships with their clients.

History served as a context to developing FMC approaches to supervision. FMC supervisors learned about power through the social cognitive process of experiencing power shared with them or taken from them in their personal lives, training experiences, and professional roles. FMC supervisors fleshed out the lessons they learned in their historical narratives and refined an FMC approach of (or striving for) power sharing.

FMC supervisors utilized five strategies to manage their power in the supervision relationship. Two superordinate strategies, collaboration and transparency, emerged from the data and shaped the remaining three strategies. Both collaboration and transparency facilitated approximating power equity and promoting the supervisees' use of power managing strategies in their work with clients. The three remaining conceptual categories served as strategies for managing power in supervisory relationships, building an FMC lens through which they conceptualized supervision practice with supervisees and acted as methods for providing supervision/training with developing clinicians.

FMC supervisors used a developmental framework to carry out supervision. Managing power, collaboration, transparency, self-reflection, and contextual analysis were emphasized to different degrees and with varying approaches depending on the supervisees' developmental needs. Supervisors engaged in self-reflection and supported supervisees' self-reflectivity to reduce actions that promoted power inequity and increase actions that facilitated (aspirational) power equity in supervisory and clinical relationships. Through self-reflection and discussion, FMC supervisors and supervisees examined and processed the influence of social locations on supervision and clinical

relationships. Examining the role of context was another strategy used to manage the role of supervisees' and clients' experiences with power and disempowerment located in environmental and historical contexts. FMC supervisors facilitated conceptualization of the role of context in supervisees' and clients' presentations. Further, the development of interventions to change problematic contexts was a hallmark strategy participants employed in order to manage complexity of power in systems.

Anticipating the power-laden consequences of one's actions was an empowering endeavor. It allowed FMC supervisors to actively engage in supervision and supervisees to experience a supervisory process that facilitated their multicultural-sensitive clinical awareness, knowledge, and skills. The positive impact of anticipating power-laden consequences in the supervision relationship enhanced the supervisee's clinical work in a way that empowered diverse clients.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how supervisors utilized feminist and multicultural principles in their work with counseling trainees. To do so, I employed a grounded theory design and critical/ideological feminist paradigm to construct the methods of this study. Through intensive initial, follow-up, and feedback interviews, participants explored their evolutionary paths to becoming the supervisors they are today, discussed their conceptual approaches or theoretical orientations to clinical supervision, and detailed their methods for conducting clinical supervision. In this chapter, I begin by discussing the findings most pertinent to the research question and relate those findings to the relevant literature. Next, I describe the limitations of the present study and implications for future research. Last, I discuss implications for supervision practice.

Discussion of the Results and Implications for Future Research

In the following section, I link the major findings of this grounded theory study to existing theoretical and empirical literature related to feminist, multicultural, and feminist multicultural supervision; a critical/ideological feminist paradigm; and other relevant literature sources. I describe the relationships between these results and prior scholarly work. I also detail how the conceptual categories that emerged from FMC supervisors'

experiences confirmed, contradicted, and extended prior scholarly works. In addition, as I integrate the results of this study with existing literature, I suggest ways in which the results of this study can enhance future research.

Dealing with the Complexities of Power

The results of this study found that attending to the consequences of power and managing power in supervisory relationships was the central issue of FMC supervision. This finding converges with Kulpinski's (2006) finding that a major goal of feminist supervision was to maintain awareness of and sensitivity to power dynamics, to share power, and to facilitate others' empowerment. By empirically substantiating that FMC supervisors examined the role of power in supervisory relationships and worked to avoid replication of systems of oppression in their supervision provision, this study stayed true to the ontological assumptions of a critical/ideological feminist paradigmatic approach (Fine, 1994; Gottfried, 1996; Morrow; 2006).

Further, the results of this study were aligned with prior scholars' suggestions: Supervisory power, if taken for granted, was a potential obstacle to supervisors engaging in collaborative processes and meeting the needs of diverse supervisees and their clients (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Hird et al., 2001; Zapata, 2010). True to prior hypotheses and findings, this study found that FMC supervisors saw it as their responsibility to manage the impact of power on supervision relationships via power sharing methods (Burnes et al., 2013; Hipp & Munson, 1995; Nelson et al., 2006; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003; Taylor, 1994). Further, the results of this study corroborated past

findings that FMC supervisors model analyzing and balancing power to support supervisees' efforts in managing power in counseling relationships.

The results of this study indicated that FMC supervisors were aware of the complexities of power in supervision. The power of the supervisor was not simply defined by supervisory status and responsibilities. Instead, supervisors' and supervisees' social locations, identity development, and awareness of the power generated by the social locations of supervisors and supervisees served to make power messy. This finding firmly planted the results of this study in the third wave of feminism (Enns, 2010; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Olesen, 2005). Further, this result advanced the basic tenet of critical/ideological feminist theory of the complex interconnections between social locations and experiences of oppression, marginalization, privilege, and power. These findings were consistent with other literature on how supervisory power emerged from supervisory status and social locations (e.g., Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Nelson et al., 2006). In addition, the results of this study found that supervisors who were young, had marginalized statuses, and/or were early in their careers experienced inverted power, which confirmed Steward and Phelps' (2004) lived experiences. FMC supervisors worked to follow the suggestion of Gentile and colleagues (2010) and Nelson and colleagues (2006) to examine the dynamics of power associated with supervisory status and diversity on the supervisor, supervisee, client, and supervisory triad relationships.

As found in the current study, FMC supervisors balanced their responsibilities and power with aspirations for egalitarian relationships. Thus, the findings of this study converged with the findings of Prouty and colleagues (1996, 2001) and Kulpinski (2006). FMC supervisors shifted to a more hierarchical approach, while maintaining

collaboration and transparency, when they managed supervisees' negligence or struggles to maintain ethical services to clients, because supervisors have had more experience and were legally and ethically responsible for client wellbeing (Steward & Phelps, 2004).

Further, this study confirmed the recommendation of Porter (1985) and Porter and Vasquez (1997), the findings of Prouty (2008) that FMC supervisors, while operating as gatekeepers or evaluators, needed to not utilize excessive power. Instead, the results of this study found that FMC supervisors provided constructive feedback that increased awareness and enhanced skill development while, at the same time, did not shame supervisees; collaboratively discussed feedback to clarify supervisors' observations of supervisees' growth edges; and developed plans of action together to support supervisees' growth. The findings of this study extended the work of Arthur and Collins (2009), Hird and colleagues (2009), Kulpinski (2006), Prouty (1996), and Zapata (2010) and confirmed the suggestions of Steward and Phelps (2004) by expanding supervisor's responsibility to include both client welfare and learning opportunities for supervisees.

Congruent with the findings of feminist researchers and hypotheses of feminist theorists, this study found that FMC supervisors encouraged supervisees' empowerment (Hipp & Munson, 1995; Kulpinski, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1985; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003). Participants did so by facilitating supervisees' abilities to trust themselves as clinicians and colleagues, thus encouraging autonomy and emboldening supervisees to have a voice. The findings of this study converged with those of Kulpinski and Prouty that the use of collaborative feedback, goal setting, and honoring of theoretical orientations managed the negative consequences of power. By empowering supervisees, the participants in this study advanced an

emancipatory approach to supervision in line with the critical/idological feminist paradigm underling this study (Gottfried, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow; 2007; Ponterotto, 2005).

Implications for Future Research

Future research should consider the initial findings of the current study and those of Kulpinski (2006) and further examine counseling supervisors' attempts to anticipate and manage the consequences of power in the supervisory triad, especially when the intention of such action is to empower supervisees. As discussed by Kulpinski, Porter (1985, 1995), Porter and Vasquez (1997), and the current study, FMC supervisors exhibited conflicted feelings regarding egalitarianism in the context of clinical and supervisory relationships. It would be interesting for researchers to empirically explore FMC practitioners' relationships to the term "egalitarian" and their awareness of its meaning and implications in order to develop an empirical definition for egalitarianism, to reduce its connection to the word equal, and render it more user-friendly.

Alternatively, future researchers could examine FMC supervisors' relationship with the term "collaboration." Porter and Vasquez (1997) discussed how the concept collaboration was more appropriate than the term egalitarianism because "to portray supervisory relationships as egalitarian denies power where it exists" (p. 164) which increases the risk of exploiting supervisees. Instead, as evidenced in this study, supervisors explicitly examined power differentials in supervisory relationships, took action to empower supervisees, and avoided abusing their power with supervisees. In the context of the boundaries formed via power aware processes, supervisors constructed

collaborative relationships in which supervisees' autonomy and multiplicity of perspectives were fostered and mutual respect was encouraged.

Further, future researchers should consider the role of social locations, identity development, and multicultural awareness on the power dynamics in the supervisory relationship. Too few researchers and scholars have explored the implications of inversions of power on supervision dynamics, process, and outcomes. Future research should consider the complex interaction between supervisory responsibilities for client welfare, evaluator power, and gatekeeping power, while also considering the additional responsibility for providing supervisees with opportunities for learning and growth.

Bringing History into the Room

The current study found that FMC supervisors developed their supervisory approaches via the interplay between personal, educational, and training experiences. Their histories and current contexts were elements of their constructed supervisory approaches. This finding was consistent with and expanded Marable and Mullings's (2009) emphasis that Black individuals "created themselves, but not just as they pleased, not under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past" (p. xxi). Further, this finding emphasized a critical realist perspective on the nature of reality, given participants described their subjective understandings of their FMC approaches to supervision that were socially and historically constructed (Harrison, MacGibbon, & Morton, 2001; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000). Personal and professional histories informed FMC supervisors' approaches to supervision. How FMC supervisors

made meaning of, thought about, and felt in response to their lived experiences influenced how they thought about and interacted with supervisees. Thus, this study moved beyond Prouty (1996) and Kulpinski (2006) to examine not only the role of mentors in a supervisors' journey but also provided clarity of the complex interplay between personal experience and professional modeling.

In agreement with feminist supervision literature, this study found that FMC supervisors constructed their supervision approaches through relationships with feminist, multicultural, womanist, FMC, or social justice supervisors and mentors (Kulpinski (2006) that provided support along their supervisory evolution (Prouty, 1996). These FMC supervisors learned by watching and interacting with other FMC and FMC-allied supervisors. Thus, in line with critical/ideological feminist theory, participants developed their approaches to supervision through transactional, subjective, and dialectic relationships between themselves and others that resulted in collaborative constructions of meaning (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005).

Further, they received direct mentoring on their emerging theoretical approaches: They were able to talk through incongruences between their worldviews and/or the appropriateness of taking on an FMC identity, given their social locations (e.g., men, women of color). In alliance with the writings of Black feminist scholars, participants in this study struggled to adopt a feminist identity because of historical non-inclusivity and centralized needs of White, heterosexual, middle class, English speaking, able-bodied, United States citizen women (e.g., Cole, 1986; Espín, 1993; Green, 1994) within feminist political agendas. For many participants, supervisory approaches emerged from a desire to incorporate the needs of diverse populations. Thereby, participants worked to avoid the

silencing they experienced and systems of oppression they encountered along their own supervisory journeys, and they advanced critical/ideological feminist values (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow, 2006; Morrow & Smith, 2000).

Further, this study substantiated prior findings that supervisors' inattention to multicultural dynamics in supervisory relationships and clinical relationships lead to short-term or lasting harm (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Constantine, 1997; Hird et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2006; Wong, Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013). Supervisors learned how to conduct themselves as FMC supervisors by reflecting on their reactions to past supervisors and noticing the ramifications of multicultural, power-over, and noncollaborative mistakes with their own supervisees. Participants substantiated prior research because they valued supervisory experiences that spent more time focusing on multicultural issues and disliked supervision relationships that ignored or minimized multicultural issues (Constantine, 1997; Wong et al., 2013).

This study confirmed the findings of Burnes and colleagues (2013), Kulpinski (2006), and Prouty (1996) that FMC principles and values guided the approaches of FMC supervisors, as opposed to explicit methods or step-by-step guides. As in the findings of Prouty and Kulpinski, participants held the principles of FMC practice as integral to their personhood. FMC principles served as lenses for how FMC supervisors approached their professional and personal lives. As suggested by Kiselica and Robinson (2001), they found passion for FMC and social justice approaches through their personal and professional experiences with FMC and social justice approaches.

Implications for Future Research

It would be interesting for future researchers of FMC supervision to further investigate the relationships between supervisors' experiences with or observations of power, privilege, and oppression on supervisory identity development and approaches. When paired with the well understood process of learning from positive and negative models (Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996), future research will benefit from understanding the complex interplay between personal history, modeling experiences, and supervision provision experiences in developing a supervisor's approach to supervision. Further, it would be interesting for future researchers to examine and elaborate how FMC supervisors embody FMC principles in all aspects of their lives.

Creating Trust Through Openness and Honesty

The findings of this study indicated that FMC supervisors worked to demystify their power and supervisory processes; provided informed consent of evaluative procedures, evaluative power, gatekeeping power, and responsibilities for client welfare and supervisee learning opportunities; and dialogued about expectations. These findings substantiated previous scholarly works by feminist, multicultural, and FMC scholars suggesting that FMC supervisors shared power by demystifying supervisory power and process (Garrett et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1985; Porter & Vasquez, 1997). Further, these results promote a critical/ideological feminist paradigm by explicitly naming the role of power in the relational dynamics of supervision dyads (Gottfried, 1996; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Olesen, 2005).

Further, the results of this study confirmed extant scholarship from feminist, multicultural, and FMC literature that FMC supervisors self-disclose their histories, share their experiences in supervision, and are authentic and vulnerable in efforts to support supervisees' growth, enhance safety, reduce supervisees' anxiety, normalize supervisees' challenges, and share power (Burnes et al., 2013; Garrett et al., 2001; Kulpinski, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Prouty, 1996; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Zapata, 2010). In addition, the results of this study found that FMC supervisors modeled transparency to support supervisees in using these processes in their work with clients. These findings converged with the feminist supervision scholarship of Kulpinski, Porter and Vasquez, and Prouty.

Implications for Future Research

Future research would benefit from continuing to investigate how FMC supervisors use transparency as a primary means for managing the consequences of power in supervisory triads. Given the complexity of anticipating power differentials; maintaining ethical boundaries; and managing tensions between responsibility, power, and egalitarianism, it would be interesting to further examine how FMC supervisors employ transparency with supervisees and support supervisees in utilizing transparency with clients. In addition, future researchers should consider how supervisees experience transparency and if transparency serves to diminish anxiety, reduce power differentials, and enhance open communication as suggested by the results of this study.

Using a Collaborative Process

FMC supervisors in this study worked in conjunction with supervisees to develop supervisory boundaries that incorporated the preferences of supervisor and supervisee and the ethical imperatives of psychology. This study found that FMC supervisors had the ethical responsibility to maintain safe disclosure boundaries for supervisees, to prevent providing clinical services to supervisees, and to self-disclose to support supervisees' growth, which converged with the results of Kulpinski (2006). However, this study expanded prior research by Kulpinski by emphasizing the complexity of maintaining ethical relationship boundaries given the limitations of traditional ethical guidelines in the context of mutual FMC supervisory relationships.

Having collaborative, nonauthoritative relationships in FMC supervision that worked toward egalitarianism was found to be a major focus of participants in this study. This approach to supervision rests on a transactional, co-constructive, and relationship-oriented epistemology foundational to critical/ideological feminist paradigms (Morrow; 2006). The purpose was to create safety and autonomy for the supervisee. These findings converged with feminist and multicultural scholarship that indicated that strong working alliances enhance trust and safety (Arthur & Collins, 2009; Hird et al., 2001; Ladany, 2005) and emerge from collaborative and trainee-centered relational qualities (Burnes et al., 2103; Kulpinski, 2006; Porter & Vaszquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996).

The results of the current study converged with feminist supervision literature that emphasized the importance of mutuality in the supervision relationship (Burnes et al., 2013; Kulpinski, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Prouty, 1996). Further, the results of this study substantiated Prouty (1996) and Kulpinski's (2006) findings that the use of

collaborative and reciprocal feedback and evaluation combined with mutual challenging of biases in the supervisory relationship advanced feminist relational values and promoted the intention of empowering supervisees. By advancing supervisory processes that advanced reciprocal benefits for both supervisors and supervisees, the FMC supervisors in this study utilized a framework of mutuality that underlies critical/ideological feminist theory (Gottfried, 1996; Morrow, 2006).

FMC supervisors, per the results of this study, engaged in collaborative processes and sought to have supervisees' needs and wants drive the supervision process. FMC supervisors elicited supervisees' needs through initial goal setting, assessments of developmental levels, and negotiation of setting session agendas. Extant literature converged with the above findings. Scholars suggested that multicultural supervision has incorporated collaborative dialogues of expectations and goals (Garrett et al., 2001). The findings of Burnes and collegues (2013) indicated that feminist-identified supervisors encouraged supervisees to lead supervision sessions instead of supervisors leading supervision agendas and confirmed that feminist-identified supervisors modeled collaborative processes to assist supervisees in collaboratively defining goals of therapy and eliciting clients' feedback on the counseling relationship to fine-tune therapeutic relationships (Kulpinski, 2006; Porter & Vaszquez, 1997; Prouty, 1996).

Implications for Future Research

Future researchers would benefit from further examining how FMC supervisors negotiate ethics of the profession and complex FMC supervision relationships. Given that the results of Prouty (1996), Kulpinski (2006), and the current study substantiated that

FMC supervisors believe that the use of collaborative methods empowers supervisees, future researchers should investigate supervisees' experiences of the implications of collaboration on their sense of empowerment as trainees. Lastly, future researchers would benefit from considering that FMC supervisors model collaborative processes to support supervisees in engaging collaboratively with clients. These results beg the question: Do collaborative supervisory relationships result in collaborative clinical relationships?

Meeting People Where They Are

FMC supervisors assessed supervisees' multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills to understand supervisees' growth edges when working with diverse clients. The results of the current study converged with the literature on multicultural competency components in supervision, in which supervisors are urged to examine supervisees' developmental readiness to work with culturally different clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Falender et al., 2013; Fouad et al., 2009; Westefeld, 2009). In addition, participants discussed attending to supervisees' developmental capabilities to more adequately match the developmental needs of supervisees and to avoid overwhelming supervisees. These results corroborate the focus of flexibly introducing multicultural and feminist analysis to reduce supervisees' guilt, shame, and anxiety (Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1995)

The results of this study diverged from Porter's (1985) feminist and (1995) multicultural feminist models of developmental supervision. Participants in this study suggested that stage-like models did not fit with their practice of clinical supervision. Instead of, first, engaging in a sequential process of providing didactic teaching of

feminist and multicultural principles; second, examining sociocultural aspects of marginalization and oppression; third, exploring supervisees' internalized oppression; and, finally, promoting engagement in social change per the suggestions of Porter (1985, 1995) and Nelson and colleagues (2006), the results of this study found that participants flexibly applied each of the aforementioned elements differently, depending on the needs of their supervisees.

The findings of this study substantiated the results of Prouty (1996), in that FMC supervisors engaged in collaborative yet directive approaches with less experienced supervisees. However, the results of this study expanded upon feminist supervision literature, finding that FMC supervisors examined supervisees' clinical experience, identity development, and educational experiences when assessing how to determine a supervisee's developmental needs.

Implications for Future Research

Future researchers would benefit from considering a non-linear or non-stepwise developmental approach to FMC supervision. Instead, future researchers should explore how FMC supervisors make decisions to meet supervisees where they are in the continuum from trainee-trainer to collegial relationships, directive to collaborative approaches, structured to unstructured approaches, and supervisor-directed to supervisee-directed approaches. Further, researchers should examine how FMC supervisors apply a developmental approach as a vector to carrying out FMC principles in supervisory practice. Lastly, it would be interesting to examine how FMC supervisors contextualize

supervisees' development based on supervisees' personal, identity, and therapist development processes.

Knowing Ourselves to Know Others

In agreement with the findings of feminist supervision research (Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996) and a critical/ideological feminist paradigm (Morrow, 2007; Ponterotto, 2005), the current study found that self-reflection was a major conceptual category of FMC supervision, because participant supervisors acknowledged that their values, beliefs, and biases were expected to affect them and supervisory processes. Unlike the recommendations put forth by Nelson and colleagues (2006), participant supervisors did not report explicitly assessing their own multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. However, in line with prior scholarship (M. T. Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Garrett et al., 2001; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Prouty, 2008; Zapata; 2010), FMC supervisors implicitly evidenced their multicultural competence by engaging in three aspects of a self-reflexive process. First, participants reflected on the influence of their historical and contemporary experiences, language use, biases, internalized oppression, socialization, social locations, and reactions on their interactions with supervisees. Second, participants modeled self-reflection transparently for supervisees (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Falender et al., 2013; Fouad et al., 2009; Westefeld, 2009). Third, participants examined the impact of diversity on supervisory relationships.

Further, the findings of this study substantiated prior multicultural supervision scholarship (Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Burnes et al, 20013; Constantine & Landanay, 2001; Fouad et al., 2009), because the current study found that

FMC supervisors deepened their supervisees' multicultural awareness and knowledge by challenging supervisees to become more mindful of their own social locations, biases, and assumptions. In addition, this study found that FMC supervisors helped supervisees to reflect on how their social locations, biases, and assumptions influenced clinical and supervisory relationships.

Further, the results of the current study substantiated the scholarly works of M. T. Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995), Garrett and colleagues (2001), Taylor (1994), Porter and Vasquez (1997), and Zapata (2010), all of which emphasized that feminist and multicultural supervisors challenge supervisees' stereotyped, biased, and oppressive assumptions and helped them examine values incongruities with clients. However, by assisting supervisees to examine the influence of assumptions based on multicultural and feminist values on their interactions with clients, the results of the current study extended prior scholarship. Further, the results of this study suggested that FMC supervisors broached issues of diversity in supervision. By helping supervisees talk with clients about the impact of social locations, worldviews, and cultural experiences on clinical relationships, therapeutic goals, and clinical interventions, FMC supervisors enhanced supervisees' multicultural skills.

Implications for Future Research

Future research would benefit from broadening the conceptualization of bias in supervisory and clinical relationships to include both examined and unexamined assumptions. The results of this study were novel with regard to integrating multicultural and feminist self-reflection on the influence of social locations in supervisory and clinical

relationships. Thus, future research should examine how the social locations of the supervisor interact with the supervisee and how social locations of the supervisor interact with the client and impact the processes and outcomes of supervisory relationships and clinical relationships, respectively.

Looking at the Way Context Impacts the Person

By having a contextualized understanding of all players in the supervisory triad (i.e., supervisor, supervisee, and client) when engaging in FMC supervision, participants provided evidence for a critical realist ontology. This result substantiated that historical, social, and political realities constructed how one sees the self and others (Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005). Consistent with the findings of Prouty (1996), this study found that FMC supervisors were better able to employ FMC principles in their supervisory work when they were supported in their professional contexts. Further clarifying the findings of Prouty (1996), the results of this study found that FMC supervisors employed FMC supervision practice even when isolated from feminist and/or multicultural communities. FMC supervisor participants described two outcomes of professional isolation. First, FMC practice went "underground" if they did not find systemic support. Second, FMC supervisors experienced exhaustion and battle fatigue when they promoted FMC principles and employed FMC practices in unsupportive contexts.

Alternatively, the findings of this study supported Porter and Vasquez's (1997) and Nelson and colleagues' (2006) suggestions that feminist communities supported FMC supervisors by attenuating exhaustion and battle fatigue prominent in unsupportive

structures. The results further clarified prior literature in that FMC supervisors not only had feminist allies within the confines of, or communities external to, their agencies or departments, but FMC supervisors desired connections to feminists that promoted multicultural ideals and practices. FMC supervisors of color, sexual minorities, men, and other groups historically marginalized in feminist communities thrived in relationship to those who honored their differences and promoted inclusivity.

The current study expanded upon prior research and scholarly works because FMC supervisors examined the role of contextual factors on supervisees' self-efficacy and empowerment. This is a new finding in the domain of feminist-oriented supervision. Thus, a new contribution of this study is that a contextual analysis is expanded to incorporate awareness of the supervisees' lived realities, histories, contexts, and environments on their functioning as clinicians and supervisees.

This study found that FMC supervisors examined the role of sociocultural influences (e.g., power, privilege, and oppression) on clients' functioning, presenting concerns, and lived experiences. This finding confirmed prior literature suggesting that FMC supervisors attended to their own multicultural competencies and incorporated attention to enhancing supervisees' multicultural knowledge and skills (e.g., Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Falender et al., 2013; Fouad et al., 2009; Westefeld, 2009). Further, FMC supervisors challenged supervisees to expand diagnosis to look at internal and external, adaptive and maladaptive, and functional and dysfunctional aspects of clients presenting concerns. These findings converged with the results of studies on feminist supervision by Kulpinski (2006), Prouty (2008), and Szymanski (2003).

In agreement with past research on feminist, multicultural, and FMC supervision (Kulpinski, 2006), the results of the current study substantiated Porter and Vasquez's (1997) hypothesis that feminist supervisors advocate for supervisees when colleagues exhibit oppressive, biased, or power-over behavior towards trainees by using modeling for and educating colleagues about ethical treatment of supervisees. The results of this study broadened prior scholarly and empirical works by finding that FMC supervisors provided educative presentations and changed agency or departmental policy to enhance colleagues' awareness and sensitivity to the needs of diverse clientele and supervisees.

The results of this study provided further confirmation that FMC supervisors' use of mezzo- and macrolevel interventions to change problematic contexts, systems, and institutions and empower oppressed groups was a hallmark of FMC practice (Ancis & Landany, 2010; Gentile, 2010; Hipp & Munson, 1995; Kulpinski, 2006; Nelson et al., 2006; Porter, 1985, 1995; Szymanski, 2003, 2005; Taylor, 1994) and a critical/ideological feminist paradigm (Gottfried, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow; 2007; Ponterotto, 2005). This study confirmed the suggestions of Porter and Vasquez (1997) and Hipp and Munson (1995). FMC supervisors engage in and facilitate supervisees' participation in advocacy or activism.

Implications for Future Research

It would be valuable if future researchers examined the implications of nonaffirming contexts on FMC supervision practice. Future research may benefit from considering the importance of having feminist communities that promote multicultural principles for individuals historically excluded from those communities (e.g., persons of

color, sexual minorities, men). Given that this study was the first to find that FMC supervisors examined the implications of supervisees' contexts for supervisee empowerment, future research should continue to explore this phenomenon. Future researchers may benefit from considering a broadened view of advocating for supervisees by including provision of educative presentations and change of agency or departmental policy to better meet the needs of diverse supervisees. Further, it would be interesting if future researchers investigated how supervision that promotes social justice can influences supervisees' social change efforts.

Limitations and Methodological Implications for Future Research

In this section, I review the methodological limitations of the current study. As limitations are put forth, I integrate procedures researchers could employ to improve upon the methodological limits of this study. Many of the methodological limitations of this study pertain to data collection and sampling. Lastly, I consider implementing the considerations of grounded theorists (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Morse et al., 2009) to develop this initial conceptual model into a substantive grounded theory.

First, although I achieved triangulation of data sources by including participant observation, intensive individual interviews, follow-up interviews, and feedback interviews, future research would benefit from including additional data sources. The inclusion of focus groups in future research would allow for the collection of more complex and nuanced data via group process (Montell, 1999) by allowing participants to build on one another's' perspectives (Kulpinski, 2006). Future researchers should consider examining the experience of FMC supervision from the perspective of

supervisees to add additional complexity to a model of FMC supervision and substantiate or disconfirm the conclusions drawn by supervisors. Further, by incorporating the voices of supervisees, future research will more adequately advance a critical/ideological feminist theoretical approach by including the voices of trainees. As described by the results of this research, supervisees have less power in the supervisory dyad and therefore should be allowed to speak for themselves in future research. Thus, the design of the present study recapitulated the silencing of trainees by not incorporating their perspectives and opinions (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow, 2006; Morrow & Smith, 2000). This may be accomplished by conducting individual and dyadic interviews of supervisors and their current or past supervisees.

Second, although I improved upon the sampling limitations of Kulpinski's (2006) study, because I incorporated a more ethnically/racially diverse sample, I maintained a sample with homogenous educational backgrounds, licensure domains, and work settings. Although these similarities among participants concerning training and educational experiences streamlined data collection and analysis, it reduced the transferability of the findings and potentially reduced the complexity of the resultant model. Thus, future research would benefit from recruiting supervisors with both master's and doctoral educational histories as well as from the domains of social work, counseling, marriage and family therapy, clinical psychology, and counseling psychology.

Although this study built upon the sample diversity of Kulpinski (2006) by enhancing the diversity of work/supervisory settings, the participants predominantly described having experience working in higher education settings. All of the participants reported having provided supervision in university settings (e.g., university counseling

centers, practicum instructors), whereas only 4 reported supervising in hospital, community mental health, or armed forces settings. Future research would benefit from including a larger percentage of participants with supervisory experience in community mental health, hospital, armed forces, and rural settings.

Future research focused on articulating a model of the conceptualization and practice of FMC supervision is warranted for three reasons. First, this study was the first empirical investigation of FMC supervision. Second, few empirical models of feminist supervision exist (see Burnes et al., 2013; Kulpinski, 2006; Prouty, 1996; Szymanski, 2003). Third, extant empirical supervision literature evidences only three empirical models of multicultural supervision (see Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Constantine, 1997; Inman, 2006; Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009),

In addition, future research should follow the call of grounded theorists (e.g., Morse et al., 2009) for more sophisticated theory development. This could be accomplished by using theoretical sampling procedures to follow the central conceptual category that emerged from this initial study of FMC supervision, *Dealing with the Complexities of Power,* to develop a substantive grounded theory of FMC supervision (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1965; Glaser & Strauss, 1965, 1967; Hernandez, 2009; Holton, 2007; Stern, 1980, 2007). In addition, further research can follow the remaining six conceptual categories to provide further empirical evidence for FMC supervision.

FMC supervision is a new frontier in the empirical supervision literature. Future research is needed to confirm and extend the present findings to derive a more complex, nuanced, and dense conceptual model and/or substantive theory. Next, I will discuss implications for supervision practice.

Implications for Supervision Training and Practice

An important aim of this study was to understand the implications of empirically grounded supervision training and practice. Based on the results of this grounded theory study, I recommend that individuals providing training for future supervisors consider bringing supervisor trainees' histories into supervision training and presenting the grounded theory conceptual model that emerged from this study in supervision coursework. In addition, based on the results of this grounded theory study, I recommend that practicing supervisors consider: (a) addressing the histories of trainees, (b) presenting the present model of FMC supervision in supervision coursework, (c) dealing with the complexities of power directly, and (d) applying an empirically derived FMC conceptual model of supervision. Each implication is presented below.

Bringing Supervisor Trainees' Histories into Supervision Training

The results of the current research on FMC supervision implied that FMC supervisors' personal and professional histories shaped their supervisory approaches. Participants acknowledged that, prior to their involvement in the current study, self-reflection of their past experiences informed their current approaches and that supervision training and experience allowed them to refine the implementation of FMC principles and values in socially just ways. Further, true to the mutuality inherent in critical/ideological feminist research, participants acknowledged that they gained a great deal from exploring their supervisory evolution. Many articulated newly found insights into the linkages between their personal and professional journeys.

Hence, I propose, in a manner similar to Kulpinski (2006), that supervision coursework, continuing education, and supervision can support the professional development of supervision trainees and professionals by providing space for reflective discussion on the ties that bind supervisors' histories to their conceptualization and practice of supervision. Educators may consider asking supervision trainees and professionals to examine, grapple with, and bring to light the influence of their lifetime experiences of privilege, oppression, and power on their supervision approaches. Further, supervision educators may develop discussion points to explore how supervision professionals and trainees attempt to model themselves after positive mentors and distance themselves from negative mentors when engaged in supervision practice. Lastly, I suggest that supervision education can support supervisors in their construction of a supervision approach by facilitating active reflection on how past and present practical experiences evidenced supervisors' successful and unsuccessful attempts to demonstrate the values and principles that underlie their theoretical orientations to supervision.

Further, I contend that supervisors in practice and training will benefit from conducting a private version of the above reflexive process if continuing education or coursework lacks an opportunity to support a historical exploration. Individuals may desire to seek out peers or current supervisors to engage in reflective dialogue. If such a relational context is unavailable, individuals may benefit from reflective journaling to examine the influences of historical experiences, mentors, and practical experiences on the construction and refinement of a supervision approach.

Presenting the Grounded Theory Conceptual Model in Supervision Coursework

Participants emphasized the importance of presenting the grounded theory conceptual model of FMC supervision that emerged from this study in their supervision coursework. When introducing supervision theory and practice, instructors of supervision coursework may consider presenting the conceptual model articulated herein to expose supervisors-in-training to an FMC approach to supervision. Providing instruction on diverse supervision models will supply opportunities for supervision trainees with varied histories and interests to gain exposure to models that espouse their worldviews, values, and conceptual approaches most congruently. Further, by presenting the present FMC model of supervision practice, those involved in supervision training may facilitate awareness of social justice promoted in the results of the present study via consciousness raising, empowerment, and efforts to change contexts. By doing so, instructors make attractive the critical/ideological feminist epistemological goal of the present study and the present conceptual model to end oppression manufactured by sociopolitical structures surrounding marginalized groups by giving the present model space in course curriculum (Gottfried, 1996; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow; 2007; Ponterotto, 2005).

Dealing with the Complexities of Power Directly

A crux of the results of this study is that supervision is a complex and power-unequal relationship. In alignment with Bernard and Goodyear (2009) and the voices of participants in the current study, I contend that supervision relationships are always power unequal, that supervisors have significant influence to affect their counselor

trainees' present and future careers due to their responsibility and power, and supervisors are "able to remain less consciously aware" of power than their supervisees (p. 185). An awareness of a power inequality in supervisory relationships advances a critical realist perspective core to critical/ideological feminist theoretical assumptions (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005; Morrow & Smith, 2000; Ponterotto, 2005).

Thus, regardless of a supervisor's approach to supervision, I recommend that supervisors anticipate and manage the positive and negative consequences of their supervisory power. To do so responsibly, supervisors can engage in transparent dialogue of the sources of their power related to responsibilities, evaluation, and gatekeeping; locations in the agency, department, and institution; and social locations. Further, supervisors can describe how they anticipate their power will manifest in supervision relationships. Last, supervisors may clearly describe how they plan to use their power in supervision relationships. Doing so will supply supervisees with informed consent and due process.

Application of an Empirically Supported Model of FMC Supervision

The results of the current study provided an innovative approach to supervision that integrated feminist and multiculturalism through an empirically derived central conceptual category and six related conceptual categories. My intention was to create a conceptual model that was both practical and applicable. Supervisors can use all of the resultant conceptual categories in tandem to advance an FMC approach to supervision.

Alternatively, supervisors may decide to employ portions of the conceptual model to enhance their theoretical approaches to supervision.

Further, given that many of the participants of this study exhibited an integrated supervisory approach, I anticipate that many supervisors conceptualize and practice supervision through the integration of two or more approaches. Expanding on Prouty (1996), supervisors may consider using the present conceptual model to transform other theoretical orientations to supervision. To do so would enhance the multicultural competence of the supervisor and supervisee, thus advancing compliance with the ethical imperatives of applied psychology (APA, 1993, 2003).

Conclusion

This critical/ideological feminist grounded theory study provided the first empirical understanding of FMC supervision practice and conceptualization, which served to greatly expand and build upon the existing feminist, multicultural, and FMC supervision literature. As a profession, psychology mandates that ethical practitioners aspire to be muticulturally sensitive and competent. By integrating multiculturalism and feminism, an FMC approach to supervision helps to advance multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (e.g., Ancis & Ladany, 2001, 2010; Arthur & Collins, 2009; Constantine & Landanay, 2001; Falender et al., 2013; Fouad et al., 2009; Westefeld, 2009). Therefore, supervisors, in general; FMC supervisors, specifically; and supervision trainers/educators, in particular, will benefit from incorporating the empirically supported implications of this study.

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT FLYER

Research on the Conceptualization and Practice of Feminist Multicultural Psychotherapy Supervision

Are you:

- A self-identified feminist, multicultural, womanist, or feminist multicultural psychotherapy supervisor?
- Experienced at providing clinical supervision for no less than two years?
- Providing supervisory service currently?
- A licensed psychologist?

If so, I would be very interested in talking with you about your psychotherapy supervision practice.

You will be asked to:

- Take part in an initial individual interview in which you will be asked about your journey to becoming a feminist, multicultural, womanist, or feminist multicultural supervisor, as well as to describe your theoretical identity as a psychotherapy supervisor, how you conceptualize your way of doing supervision, how you do supervision, and for examples of your supervisory work. This interview will last approximately 60-120 minutes and will be audio recorded.
- Take part in a 30-minute follow-up, audio-recorded individual interview in which I will clarify your prior interview and ask for feedback on the emerging theory of feminist multicultural supervision.
- Optional: Take part in a 120-minute in-person or online discussion group with other feminist, multicultural, womanist, or feminist multicultural supervisors. The in-person discussion group will be video recorded.
- Optional: Take part in an additional 30-minute, audio recorded interview to provide feedback to the researcher about the initial data analysis.

If you are interested in this study or have any questions please contact me, Alexis Arczynski, at 714-394-5859 or email me at a.v.arczynski@utah.edu, a graduate student at the University of Utah.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB; 801-581-3655, irb@hasc.utah.edu). My faculty advisor is Dr. Sue Morrow (801-581-7148; sue.morrow@utah.edu).

APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT LETTER

Date

Participant Name
Address
City, State, Zip

Subject: The Conceptualization and Practice of Feminist Multicultural Psychotherapy Supervision: A Qualitative Study

Dear _____

I am writing to inform you of an opportunity to participate in a research study on the practice of feminist multicultural supervision. This study is being conducted by Alexis V. Arczynski at the University of Utah. The purpose of the study is to learn from people who integrate feminist, multicultural, womanist, or feminist multicultural principles into supervision to elucidate the themes, viewpoints, values, experiences, and processes they find inherent to feminist multicultural supervision practice. I hope to use this information to inform the research on psychotherapy supervision and to assist current and future supervisors in understanding a feminist multicultural approach to supervision.

You will be asked to:

- Take part in an in-person, telephone, or Skype interview of 60-120 minutes. This interview will be audio recorded.
- Take part in a follow-up in-person, telephone, or Skype interview of 30 minutes. This interview will be audio recorded.
- Take part in an optional in-person or online discussion group with other clinical supervisors, 90-120 minutes. The in-person discussion group will be video recorded.
- Take part in an additional optional in-person, telephone or Skype interview of 30 minutes to provide feedback to the investigator about the results. This interview will be audio recorded.
- Share any documents, media, or websites that relate to your supervision practice.

If you (a) self-identify as a clinical supervisor who integrates feminist, multicultural, womanist, or feminist multicultural principles into your supervision practice; (b) have experience providing clinical supervision for no less than two years; (c) are providing supervisory service currently; (d) are a licensed psychologist; and (e) are willing to talk about your journey to becoming a supervisor, your conceptualization and practice of supervision, and some examples from your work, I would be very interested in talking with you about taking part in this research. If you are interested in this study or have questions, please contact me, Alexis Arczynski, a graduate student at the University of Utah, at 714-394-5859 or email me at a.v.arczynski@utah.edu. By requesting more information about this study, you are not obligated to participate in this or any study. You should be aware that e-mail is not a confidential form of communication.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB; 801-581-3655, irb@hsc.utah.edu). This study is being supervised by my advisor, Dr. Sue Morrow (801-581-7148; sue.morrow@utah.edu).

Thank you again for considering this research opportunity.

Sincerely,

Alexis V. Arczynski
Primary Investigator

APPENDIX C

IRB CONSENT FORM

Consent Document

BACKGROUND

You are being asked to take part in a research study on feminist multicultural supervision practice. Before you decide to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether you want to volunteer to take part in this study.

The purpose of the study is to learn from people who integrate feminist, multicultural, womanist, and/or feminist multicultural perspectives into their clinical supervision practice to elucidate the themes, viewpoints, values, experiences, and processes they find inherent to feminist multicultural supervision practice. I hope to use this information to inform the research on psychotherapy supervision and assist current and future supervisors in understanding a feminist multicultural approach to supervision.

STUDY PROCEDURE

Your participation in this study will take approximately 1½ to 5 hours. You will have the opportunity to participate in the following interviews in person, via phone, or via Skype. You will be asked to:

- Take part in an individual interview of 60-120 minutes in which you will be asked to talk about your journey to becoming a supervisor, how you conceptualize and practice clinical supervision, and examples from your supervision practice. The individual interview will be audiotaped.
- Take part in a follow-up interview of 30 minutes. The follow-up interview will be audiotaped.
- Optional: Take part in 120-minute discussion group with other clinical supervisors to clarify and obtain feedback on the initial data analysis. This discussion group will be videotaped. If you are uncomfortable being videotaped, you may face with your back to the camera.

- Optional: Communicate with the researchers and/or research participants via a confidential discussion forum on the Internet over a period of 6 months, for an approximate total time of 120 minutes
- Optional: individual interview of 30 minutes to clarify and obtain feedback on the initial data analysis. This interview will be audiotaped.
- Share any documents, media, or websites that relate to your supervision practice.

RISKS
The risks of taking part in this study are considered minimal. It is possible that you may feel uncomfortable thinking about or talking about personal information related to your experiences developing your psychotherapy supervision theoretical identity, conceptualization of psychotherapy supervision, and practice of psychotherapy supervision. These risks are similar to those you experience when discussing personal information with others. If you feel upset from this experience, you can tell the researcher, and she will tell you about resources available to help.

BENEFITS
The researcher cannot promise any direct benefit for taking part in this study. However, you may experience the benefit of enhancing your conceptualization and practice of psychotherapy supervision by discussing your own practice and by being exposed to the empirical theory that results from this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information that you share will be kept confidential to the extent afforded by law. Audio recordings, video recordings, and transcripts will be stored in a locked filing cabinet or on a password protected computer located in the researcher's work space. Only the researcher and members of her study team will have access to this information.

Your information will be assigned a code name or pseudonym (which you may choose if you wish), which will be kept with your interview recordings and transcriptions. In future publications, only your code name will be used, and every effort will be made to protect your identity by removing identifying information from quotes, etc. that are used in the publication. If you would like to exclude certain information contained in the interview transcription from being shared in future publications I will accommodate your requests.

Although the investigator can guarantee your confidentially to the extent afforded by the law, it is beyond the control of the investigator to stop participants in the optional discussion group from sharing information. The investigator will explain the importance of confidentiality during the focus group to protect confidentiality. The only other exception to confidentiality is if you choose to disclose actual or suspected abuse, neglect, or exploitation of a child, or disabled or elderly adult, the researcher or any member of the study staff must, and will, report this to Child Protective Services (CPS), Adult Protective Services (APS) or the nearest law enforcement agency. An additional exception to our guarantee of confidentiality is in the case of a suspected ethical violation in accordance with the American Psychological Association Code of Conduct.

PERSON TO CONTACT

If you have questions, complaints, or concerns about this study, or if you feel that taking part in the research has harmed you, you can contact Alexis Arczynski at 714-394-5859. Alexis can normally be reached during normal working hours; however, if she is unavailable when you call, you may leave a message on her confidential voice mail. She will return your call as soon as possible. You may also contact her by e-mail at a.v.arczynski@utah.edu; however, you should be aware that e-mail is not a confidential form of communication. If, for any reason, you wish to discuss this research with Alexis' research advisor, you may contact Dr. Sue Morrow at 801-581-3400 or by e-mail at sue.morrow@utah.edu.

Institutional Review Board: Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions, complaints, or concerns that you do not feel you can discuss with the investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Research Participant Advocate: You may also contact the Research Participant Advocate (RPA) by phone at (801) 581-3803 or by email at participant.advocate@hsc.utah.edu.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

It is up to you to decide whether to take part in this study. Refusal to participate or the decision to withdraw from this research will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. This will not affect your relationship with the investigator. If you decide to stop after you have agreed to participate, just inform the researcher. Your interview tape and any transcripts will be destroyed.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION TO PARTICIPANTS

There should typically not be any costs to you for participating in this study. If you incur any costs (such as transportation, long-distance phone calls, etc.), you will be reimbursed up to a maximum of $20 if you provide the researcher with a record of the costs (e.g., a mileage record for travel, receipt for food, bills for phone calls, receipts for childcare). There will also not be any payment for your participation in this study.

CONSENT

By participating in the interviews, you are giving your consent to participate in this study.

APPENDIX D

ABBREVIATED AUDIT TRAIL

Prior to Entry into the Field

May 15, 2010 – April 17, 2012

Initial development of dissertation topic, "The Conceptualization and Practice of Feminist Multicultural Psychotherapy Supervision: A Qualitative Study." Via discussions with peer qualitative research team members, my advisor, supervisors, and consultation with existing literature, I settled upon expanding Kulpinsky's (2006) study to integrate explicitly a multicultural perspective into feminist supervision. In June 2011, I began self-reflection on my biases, assumptions, and prior understanding of FMC supervision.

My proposal meeting with my committee occurred on December 14, 2011. We refined interview questions to be more open-ended. We expanded paradigm to critical theory, broadly defined. We expanded inclusion criteria to include feminist, multicultural, womanist, and feminist multicultural supervisors.

I sought approval from Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB). Having received approval on April 17, 2012, I commenced initial recruitment emails on June 2, 2012 and briefed gatekeepers on recruitment materials and procedures.

Entry into the Field

June 6, 2012

My entry into the field began with initial email contact by with the first participant who responded to a gatekeeper's email recruitment efforts. Email consisted of securing interest, scheduling interview date, time, and mode of interview contact (e.g., phone).

Individual Interviews

June 14, 2012 - December 31, 2012

conducted one- to three-hour individual interviews with participants. Shortly after each interview, I wrote field notes to prevent forgetting important details. Field notes included details of the interviews, self-reflections, and analytic memos. I wrote for a minimum of one hour.

Follow-up Interviews

May 16, 2013-June 15, 2013

I conducted 30-minute to one-hour individual follow-up interviews. Before each interview, I planned an agenda, devised questions to fill emerging gaps in the emerging data analysis, and wrote notes on my thoughts and self-reflections. After follow-up interviews, I wrote field notes to capture what occurred in the interview, my thoughts and reactions, and analytic memos.

Feedback Interviews

June 14, 2013-June 28, 2013

I conducted 30-minute to one-hour individual feedback interviews. Before each interview, I planned an agenda, devised or revised questions to facilitate feedback on the emerging conceptual category structure, and wrote notes on my thoughts and self-reflections. After feedback interviews, I wrote field notes to capture what occurred in the interview, my thoughts and reactions, and analytic memos.

Transcription

June 25, 2012-July 29, 2013

I had interviews transcribed and usually received them from my transcriptionist from seven days to one month after the date of interviews. I delayed transcription of the last individual interview until after I had an initial conceptual category structure to seek out disconfirming evidence. After receiving transcripts, I listened to the initial, follow-up, or feedback interview, reviewed the transcript for errors while listening to the interview, and re-read the transcript to manage incoming data and re-immersed myself in the interview transaction. During transcript checks and immersion, I wrote analytic memos, self-reflections, and notes to refine the emerging research design and interview process. I examined my thoughts, feelings, and interactions with participants to enhance future data collection and analysis.

Coding

July 14, 2012-May 15, 2013

arly analysis consisted of analytic memos about what I found during initial individual interviews as documented in field notes, transcription checks, and immersion analytic memos. I drew connections between segments of transcript data within and between participant interview transcripts, their external reactions demonstrated in interviews, and my internal reactions demonstrated in self-reflection memos.

I commenced Atlas.ti-supported initial coding procedures on July 14, 2012. All initial coding occurred electronically on Atlas.ti. In this phase of analysis, I coded each transcript line-by-line. I consulted Charmaz (2006) repeatedly to verify that I consistently used effective initial coding strategies. I used the participants' language, gerunds, and short phrases to keep an active, living quality to the initial codes.

Beginning on December 29, 2012 after completing initial coding on the fifth interview, I contrasted assertions I made in my field notes, analytic memos, and self-reflective memos to the initial codes to seek confirming and disconfirming evidence for emerging focused codes. First, I scoured analytic memos, self-reflective memos, and field notes memos. In this process, I wrote memos on patterns I found in memos that elaborated on both explicit and implicit processes in the first phases of research (interviewing, immersion, initial coding) of my first five interviews. I used those patterns as a re-immersion strategy for focused coding. Thus, this process enhanced my theoretical sensitivity and helped me find important patterns/themes in early memos. These are the patterns I found

Being challenged to self-reflect
Being aware of difference
Being given what she needed
Being met where she was at
Describing the role of extra-curricular/curricular experiences on Feminist/social justice/mc identities
Emulating prior supervisors
Engaging in self-reflection
Growing through community
Having explicit training experiences
Having mentors model difficult self-disclosure
Learning by doing
Learning by watching
Learning language to describe experiences of other
Learning supervision through modeling
Not having explicit training experiences
Not receiving formal training in feminism
Relating supervision to therapy
Advocating for supervisees in the agency

Asking supees to provide regular feedback
Assessing supees' baseline
Balancing humility and authority
Balancing multicultural knowledge and the individual
Balancing supervisor and supervisees' perspectives
Balancing multiple roles as supervisor
Being aware of the potential to oppress
Being aware of power as expert
Being flexible
Being responsible for client welfare
Being up to date on literature and research
Being vigilant of the role of assumptions of normalcy
Being vigilant to spot diversity
Breaking down interactions
Breaking down knowledge
Celebrating supervisees' wins
Challenging and supporting supees
Conceptualizing through social locations
Cultivating safety
Deconstructing power dynamics
Deepening, expanding, and making complex supees' mc awareness, knowledge, skills
Developing a voice to self-advocate
Developing goals for supervision
Directly addressing difference/commonality
Disclosing emotions and reactions
Disclosing supervisors' theoretical orientation
Disclosing one's own history, background, assumptions, identities, and perspectives
Doing regular evaluation
Empowering supervisees' sense of self
Encouraging supervisees to engage in social justice
Encouraging supees to find their own voice
Encouraging supees to seek cultural consultants
Engaging in collaborative evaluation
Enhancing supees' self-reflection
Examining the fit of services to population
Examining tapes through IPR
Examining the role of early relationships with current context
Examining why supees react to clients in the ways they do
Expanding supees' awareness of broader social change
Exploring the impact of therapy/supervision on the supee
Exploring the role of social locations on supervision process
Focusing on the mechanics of therapy
Focusing on the therapeutic/supervisory relationships
Fostering vulnerability
Gatekeeping
Generating knowledge through group supervision

Getting to know supees as humans
Grooming supervisees as professionals
Having a license to protect
Having potential to limit supees
Having power
Helping supees to expand clients' awareness of context
Helping supees to expand awareness of their own contexts, biases, and assumptions
Increasing awareness of clients' cultural identities
Learning how supervises' identities impact their experiences
Letting self be known by supervisees
Looking at how culture impacts supervision/counseling process
Making notes of reactions to supees' work
Making thoughts transparent
Managing evaluative power
Managing power differentials via collaboration
Managing power inversion
Modeling humility of experience and knowledge
Navigating multiple relationships
Normalizing supee development
Normalizing challenges
Noticing supervisees' context in self-efficacy
Noticing supees' dissonance between what they want for client and what the client wants
Noticing when disconnections occur
Not knowing all the answers
Paying attention to how the interpersonal dynamics of supervision parallel the interpersonal dynamics of therapy
Personalizing supervision by a person's context
Personalizing supervision by a supee's developmental level
Privileging the expertise of supervisees
Questioning biases and assumptions
Questioning dominant narratives
Recognizing potential to abuse power
Recognizing the impossibility of egalitarianism
Recognizing the inherent growth potential of everyone
Reflecting on experiences
Reviewing supees' case notes/tape
Seeking clarification of knowledge with clients
Seeking literature of cultural groups
Sharing about self
Striving for egalitarianism
Stretching supees' comfort zones
Supporting supees' theoretical orientations
Supporting supees' transitions
Taking a coping skills approach
Taking multiculturalism for granted
Transcribing therapy sessions

Using cultural customs to increase therapeutic efficacy
Valuing intersectionality
Valuing supervisees' expertise of their own clients
Feeling like an outsider
Feeling supported by community
Finding congruence between beliefs and behavior
Challenging hierarchy of oppression in feminism and multiculturalism
Growing from supervisees
Having limited access to literature appropriate for cultural context
Having one's supervision work questioned
Having one's identity as a feminist challenged
Holding dissonance between social locations and feminism
Impact of social locations on supervision
Taking on the role of a supervisor

After examining analytic memos, self-reflective memos, and field notes, I examined the initial codes themselves. I compared codes to codes, data to codes, codes to emerging focused codes, and focused codes to focused codes to develop an initial list of focused codes. In this round of focused coding I followed Charmaz (2006) by making, "decisions about which initial codes make the most analytic sense to categorize your data incisively and completely" (p. 56). I therefore picked initial codes that condensed data across interviews and people into major themes. I used Atlas.ti to support my efforts using the “coding family” tool.

As I explored the initial codes, I renamed initial codes. Because I developed a keener skill in initial coding as I practiced, I was better able to name what happened implicitly and explicitly. As I went, I renamed focused codes after initial codes that more adequately explained participants’ actions, interpretations, and experiences.

Periodically, I combed through the focused codes and collapsed ones that seem to be subsumed by the others. This way I used the most conceptually and analytically valuable initial codes to sift through large numbers of initial codes. At times, I used temporary holders, or focused codes that were not named from initial codes, until I found an initial code that made the most analytic sense to tie underlying initial codes together. These were hunches. If I was unable to find a suitable initial code, I redistributed initial codes into appropriate focused codes.

On January 26, 2013, I noticed that my emerging focused codes were messy and huge. The above outlined process seemed like a helpful process to get me to think conceptually and analytically about the codes. I found it helpful to step back and examine how well the focused codes sifted through initial codes. About half way through, I looked at my focused codes and noticed that some were quite small while others were huge. I began looking at the small ones and the initial codes within them. I noticed that the initial codes could be more adequately explained by some bigger focused codes, so I dropped the tiny focused code and re-did my focused coding.

Once I finished going through focused coding of the first five interviews, I wrote memos on each focused code by briefly reviewing the initial codes within. Again, I redistributed some initial codes into focused codes that more adequately and analytically explained the concept or process that appeared to be happening, and I broke down focused codes into concept-driven focused codes versus thematic focused codes.

My first list of focused codes looked like this:

Addressing the role of diversity in interventions
Advocating
Advocating for clients
Advocating for Supervisees
Becoming a mentor suddenly happened
Being a feminist supervisor in a sea of folks who are not
Being an FMC/MCF
Being aware of my identities
Being mindful of processing the relationship
Being real and vulnerable
Breaking down therapy
Building awareness
Checking in about their global lives
Context of supervision experiences
Context of Supervision training
Context of training
Counting on client's feedback
Creating a safe space
Critiquing feminism and mc
Doing a solid role induction
Exploring MC and Div
Exploring the role of diversity in supervision
Fostering a sense of self-trust
Having connections in a community
Integrating evaluation
Learning from each other
Looking at power differential dynamics
Maintaining client safety and welfare
Meeting people where they are
Not having all the answers
Recapitulating oppression
Self-disclosing
Talking about critical mentors
Talking about where you are and where you want to be
Using collaboration to mediate power imbalance
Working with inverted power
Working with power responsibly

On March 3, 2013, after completing initial and focused coding of interviews one through five, I began axial coding. This process was tentative and subject to change based on disconfirming evidence found in later interviews. I looked at relationships between focused codes and began articulating subcategories and their links to larger conceptual categories. I sought feedback from my peer research team and advisor. This was my resultant axial coding structure:

Diversity in the Supervision Triad

- Addressing the role of diversity in interventions
- Being aware of my identities
- Exploring MC and Div
- Exploring the role of diversity in supervision
- Recapitulating oppression

The Supervisee's Needs

- Checking in about their global lives (Intentionally checking in about and exploring how personal, educational, academic, and professional experiences as well as prior supervision relationships impact their current clinical work and supervision relationship)
- Advocating for Supervisees
- Building awareness
- Fostering a sense of self-trust

The Supervisor

- Becoming a mentor suddenly happened
- Being an FMC/MCF (having a FMC lens that is just how they see the world)
- Being a feminist supervisor in a sea of folks who are not
- Differing ways of looking at the world
- Having connections in a community
- Critiquing feminism and mc

Setting Up and Maintaining the Supervision Relationship

- Doing a solid role induction
- Talking about where you are and where you want to be
- Meeting people where they are
- Creating a safe space

- Being mindful of processing the relationship (Attuning to one's own interpersonal style, intentionally checking in with supervisees about how the supervision is/is not meeting the supervisees' needs)

Mutuality

- Being real and vulnerable
- Self-disclosing
- Not having all the answers
- Learning from each other

Responsibility

- Maintaining client safety and welfare
- Integrating evaluation

Power

- Using collaboration to mediate power imbalance
- Working with inverted power
- Working with power responsibly
- Looking at power differential dynamics

Client Care

- Counting on client's feedback
- Advocating for clients
- Advocating (activism in the community to benefit clients on a community level)
- Breaking down therapy (using tape and other means to break down the practice of psychotherapy so supees can learn how to be effective therapists)

Context

- Context of supervision experiences (what types of institutions and supervisees they had worked with in current and prior supervision practices)
- Context of Supervision training (what their training looked like, of they had any)
- Context of training (experiences prior to graduate school that directed them to interests in social justice, feminism, or mc)

Beginning on March 22, 2013, after completing the first wave of initial, focused, and axial coding, I initiated a second wave of initial and focused coding procedures.

Following initial coding of every two of three transcribed interviews, I re-articulated the focused coding structure as outlined above. After conducting initial and focused coding of the 13th interview, on May 15, 2013, I began the process of formulating the relationships between focused codes or rearticulating the axial coding structure.

In analytic memos, I analyzed focused codes and began conceptualizing some focused codes as subordinate focused codes and others as higher order focused codes of the analysis. At that time, the focused codes were in flux as I still needed to analyze Katie's transcript, and I still had to clean and refine focused codes. I cut out each of the focused codes and piled focused codes together that were related in a meaningful way. These relationships were hypothetical: They were my first attempts of making sense out of the data. My efforts at axial coding the first 13 interviews resulted in a large 15-page document of the superordinate focused codes, subordinate focused codes, and their linkages. I wrote analytic memos on the definitions of focused codes and how focused codes related to one another. I noticed many gaps in the emerging axial coding structure, and, via follow-up interviews, sought participants to fill out conceptual gaps. The first attempt at axial coding structure looked as follows:

The Supervisors' Journeys

Learning How to be the Supervisors They Are Today

- Engaging in allied careers and extra-curricular activities directed me to FMC supervision
- Shaping my supervision approach through modeling
- Forming supervision approach through literature
- Starting my feminist journey
- Having formal supervision training
- Having anxiety supervising for the first time
- Being an FMC/MCF
- Bridging Fem and MC perspectives
- Approaching supervision in a feminist multicultural way
- Having a range of supervision experiences (context)
- Loving supervision

Finding Community

- Experiencing marginalization in unsupportive structures
- Having connections to communities/peer groups

Being a Social Justice Change Agent

- Having a social action identity

- Seeing oppression and difference and experiencing aggressions
- Doing something with my education
- Using power to change contexts for supervisees and clients.

The Supervision Dyad

Power

- Looking at power differential dynamics
- By definition, the supervisor has an inordinate amount of power
- Working with inverted power
- Struggling with authority and power
- Acknowledging authority and power

Evaluation

- Acknowledging evaluation:
- Having evaluative power and gatekeeping responsibility
- Collaborating on integrating feedback
- Avoiding evaluative surprises by integrating feedback
- Collaborating on evaluation

Supervisor's Reflective Transparency

- Attending to what's happening within
- Being real and vulnerable as a supervisor
- Being transparent
- Processing self-disclosure

Using Collaboration and Consensus

- Honoring the good, bad, and the ugly
- Collaborating to mediate power
- Respecting theoretical orientation differences
- Creating an egalitarian space
- Learning from each other:

The Supervision Relationship

- Collaborating on session navigation

- Discussing boundaries
- Asking for feedback on what is working/not working in supervision
- Reflecting on our supervision process
- Remaining mentors to supees

Exploring and Respecting Diversity in the Supervision Relationship

- Working with diverse supees
- Exploring the role of diversity in supervision
- Exploring how identities are a stimulus in supervision
- Respecting differences between sup and supee

Setting the Stage for Supervision

Doing a Solid Role Induction

- Doing a solid role induction
- Putting the supervisor's TO and style into the room
- Putting supervisor's self into the room
- Getting to know supees early on
- Assessing supee skill and dev'l level
- Assessing comfort in sharing personal info

Meeting People Where They Are

- Meeting people where they are
- Avoiding overwhelming supervisees
- Meeting early stage trainees needs
- Meeting middle stage trainees needs:
- Meeting later stage trainees needs:

Building Awareness and Self-Disclosure of Supervisee

- Personal is professional
- Being cautious to ask for supee self-disclosure

Expanding the Focus Beyond Client Care

- Opening up dialogue about professional development
- Opening up discussion for how context affects supervision
- Opening up discussion of how education affects supees

- Having corrective experiences along the way:
- Advocating for supees
- Opening up dialogue for self-care

Client Care and Skill Development

Enhancing Awareness of Supervisee's Clinical Self-reflection

- Building awareness of intention
- Building awareness of difficulty intervening
- Building awareness of experience of the session
- Building awareness of supee rxns in session
- Attending to client reactions
- Tying approach to Person, Context, Time
- Examining parallel process
- Counting on clients' feedback
- Counting on client's expertise

Focusing on Supervisee Skill Development

- Doing role-plays
- Providing resources
- Giving didactics

Focusing on The Journey not the Destination

- Normalizing growth through supervisor self-disclosure
- Challenging self-doubt and encouraging self-trust
- Making mistakes
- Focusing on strengths
- Giving supees space to try stuff out
- Trying out new skills
- Empowering supee

Giving Voice

- Letting supees share their wisdom
- Suggesting tentatively
- Not having all the answers

Flipping into Directive Supervision

- Maintaining client safety and welfare
- Being in the dark is scary
- Sharing ways the supervisor would approach it and why

Building Supervisees' MC Sensitivity and Competence

- Setting the stage
    - Deconstructing truths
    - Exploring privilege and power
- Looking at the role of Diversity in counseling dyad
    - Enhancing sensitivity to differences/similarities
    - Meeting supees MC needs
    - Exploring how identity statuses affect therapy
    - Learning about MC knowledge
- Enhancing MC and F informed conceptualization
    - Looking at how context affects clients
    - Reconsidering diagnosis
    - Reconsidering symptoms
    - Exploring clients' identity statuses
    - Helping supervisees develop an FMC lens
- Challenging bias in conceptualization
    - Not putting expectations on clients
    - Catching yourself
- Bringing MC into therapeutic interaction
    - Supporting/challenging supees to bring culture into therapy
    - Offering opportunities to discuss difference in therapy
    - Brining cultural hypotheses into therapy
    - Bringing cultural practices into therapy

Via participant feedback, peer research team feedback, and my analytic memos, I realized that the above structure was thematic in nature. I had not advanced to a conceptual analysis. I needed to do continued work via memoing and interviewing to raise focused codes into conceptual categories (Charmaz, 2006).

The Emerging Conceptual Category Structure

May 15, 2013-July 18, 2013

From May 15, 2013 to June 11, 2013, I developed several iterations of the first focused code structure, gathered new data from participants in follow-up interviews, and wrote extensive analytic memos on shifts in the emerging conceptual category structure. I

reprinted the first iteration of the code structure, cut out grouped subordinate focused codes, placed them into different piles to try out different focused structures, all of which stimulated conceptual thinking.

From May 18, 2013 to June 9, 2013, while simultaneously conducting follow-up and feedback interviews, I began writing analytic memos on emerging superordinate focused code categories to define further their properties and dimensions and to refine the emerging conceptual category structure. I, again, compared focused codes to focused codes, data to focused codes, and emerging conceptual categories to emerging conceptual categories. Through this process of comparison and memo writing, the conceptual categories gained substance, density, and complexity; I reduced redundancies; and I began raising superordinate focused codes to conceptual categories.

I shared the results I had gradually refined with participants, individual peer-researchers, Sue Morrow, and my peer research team. In these meetings, I received copious feedback about code/category names, relationships amongst codes/categories, my writing style, and the emerging code/category structures. Feedback from others helped me to organize leads in further data collection.

Throughout follow-up and feedback interviews, I asked participants how conceptual categories seemed to be related, which seemed redundant, and which conceptual category defined the central category of their mode of supervision. I also asked them what guided their purpose or intention in supervision. In my follow-up interview with Clara on May 16, 2013, I learned that managing power and empowerment were central guiding themes for her work. In analytic memos following the interview, during initial coding, and during focused coding of her follow-up interview, I compared her conjecture with the data, initial codes, focused codes, and conceptual categories. I found evidence for her hypothesis. I decided to follow my hypothesis that *Dealing with the Complexities of Power* was the central category of the conceptual category structure. I searched for disconfirming evidence in initial, follow-up, and feedback interviews and examined prior memos.

From June 18, 2013 to July 18, 2013, while conducting feedback interviews, I continued to write analytic memos on my emergent conceptual categories, using the feedback supplied by participants, peer researchers, and my peer research team to further conceptual abstraction of the emergent conceptual categories. I used the ideas of Charmaz (2006) as a scaffold to my analysis. She suggested to:

- Define the category
- Explicate the properties of the category
- Specify the conditions under which the category arises, is maintained, and changes
- Describe its consequences
- Show how this category relates to other categories (p. 92).

I used her suggested guidelines and clarified the full conceptual model.

The final conceptual category structure has notable similarities to the first code structure. However, via intensive analytic memo writing, constant comparison, and feedback from participants, I developed the final conceptual category structure on July 18, 2013. Below is the emergent conceptual categorical structure:

Dealing with the Complexities of Power

- Having Inordinate Power in the Supervisory Role
- Complexity of Power Manifesting in Identities and Statuses
- Having Responsibilities within and Beyond the Supervision Relationship
- Managing Tensions between Responsibility, Power, and Egalitarianism
- Empowering Supervisees

Bringing History into the Room

- Recognizing that History Influences Approaches
- Experiences Primed Later Directions
- Ways of Learning to Be a Supervisor
- Refining Approaches From Experiences
- Practicing in A F, MC, SJ way

Creating Trust Through Openness and Honesty

- Laying Things Out on the Table
- Talking about Expectations
- Being Who I am Moment-to-Moment
- Being Real and Authentic with Clients

Using a Collaborative Process

- What Do You Need to Get There?
- Valuing Different Approaches
- Helping Supervisees See Their Competence
- Creating Mutually Growth-Fostering Relationships
- Talking Through Relationship Boundaries
- Processing the Supervision Process
- Collaborating on Feedback
- Seeing Clients as Necessary Partners

Meeting People Where They Are

- Figuring Out What Supervisees Bring into the Room
- Respecting that People are in Different Places
- Meeting on a Developmental Continuum

Knowing Ourselves to Know Others

- Needing to be Consciously Aware
- Exploring How Bias Creeps In
- Getting to the Heart of Reactions
- Processing the Impact of Identities on Relationships

Looking at the Way Context Impacts the Person

- Exploring External Influences
- Making System and Ecological Change

After completing this conceptual category structure, I began writing analytic memos to articulate emerging theoretical codes. I consulted writings by Charmaz (2006), Morse et al. (2009), Holton (2007), Glaser and Straus (1967), Glaser (2006), and Hernandez (2009) to support my endeavor. I more fully conceptualized the relationships between conceptual categories and subcategories and the relationships between conceptual categories and the central category.

Writing the Results

July 18, 2013-August 30, 2013

During the phase of writing and rewriting the results for chapter three, a stronger and denser analysis emerged which resulted in the final conceptual model. Conceptual categories were re-analyzed by comparing conceptual categories, sub-categories, and data to one another. Through using the constant comparative method in the writing phase, I refined the resultant conceptual model. Therefore, the writing phase was an additional layer of analysis.

REFERENCES

Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1996). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. In H. Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and social change: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 60-87). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58* 377-402. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.58.5.377

American Psychological Association Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs (1993). Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations. *American Psychologist, 48*, 45-48. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.48.1.45

Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2001). A multicultural framework for counselor supervision. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 63-90). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2010). A multicultural framework for counselor supervision. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany, L. (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles process, and practice* (4th ed., pp. 53-94). New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Ancis, J. R., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal Of Counseling & Development*, *88*, 277-284. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00023.x

Arthur, N., & Collins, S. (2009). Culture-infused counselling supervision. In N. Pelling, J. Barletta, & P. Armstrong (Eds.), *The practice of clinical supervision* (pp. 267-295). Bowen Hills, QLD Australia: Australian Academic Press.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Brown, L. S. (1990). The meaning of a multicultural perspective for theory-building in feminist therapy. *Women & Therapy*, *9*, 1-21. doi:10.1300/J015v09n01_01

Brown, L. S. (2010). *Feminist therapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brown, M. T., & Landrum-Brown, J. (1995). Counselor supervision: Cross-cultural perspectives. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 263-286). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2007). Introduction: Grounded theory research: Methods and practice. In A. Bryant & K. Charmez (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 1-29). London: Sage.

Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Madson, M. B., Pruitt, N. T., Contreras-Tadych, D. A., Kozlowski, J. M., Hess, S. A., & Knox, S. (2006). Supervisor cultural responsiveness and nonresponsiveness in cross-cultural supervision. *Journal of Counsleing Psychology, 53,* 288-301. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.3.288

Burnes, T. R. Wood, J. M., Inman, J. L., & Welikson, G. (2013). An investigation of process variables in feminist group clinical supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*, 86-109. doi: 10.1177/0011000012442652

Charmez, K. (2006) *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2009). Shifting the grounds: Constructivist grounded theory methods. In J. M. Morse, P. N. Stern, J. Corbin, B. Bowers, K. Charmaz, & A. E. Clarke (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory: The second generation* (pp. 55-85). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Chrysalis Community Counseling Services (2011, October 12). Job opportunities [web site]. Retrieved from: http://www.chrysaliscounseling.org/Jobs.html

Cole, J. (1986). *All American women: Lines that divide, ties that bind.* New York: Free Press.

Collins, P. H. (1990), *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision: Operationalizing a practical framework. In D. B. Poe-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.) *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 310-324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Constantine, M. G. (2001). Multiculturally focused counseling supervision: Its relationship to trainees' multicultural self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20,* 87-98. doi: 10.1300/J001v20n01_07

Constantine, M. G., & Ladany, N. (2001). New visions for defining and assessing multicultural counseling competence. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 482-498). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Espín, O. M. (1993). Feminist therapy: Not for or by white women only. *The Counseling Psychologist,* 21, 103-108. doi: 10.1177/0011000093211005

Enns, C. Z. (2010). Locational feminisms and feminist social identity analysis. *Professional Psychology: Research And Practice*, *41*, 333-339. doi:10.1037/a0020260

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*, 8-27. doi:10.1177/0011000012438417

Fassinger, R. E. (2005). Paradigms, praxis, problems, and promise: Grounded theory in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*, 156-166. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.156

Fine, M. (1992). *Disruptive voices: The possibilities of feminist research*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fouad, N. A., Grus, C. L., Hatcher, R. L., Kaslow, N. J., Hutchings, P., Madson, M. B., & . . . Crossman, R. E. (2009). Competency benchmarks: A model for understanding and measuring competence in professional psychology across training levels. *Training and Education In Professional Psychology*, *3*, S5-S26. doi:10.1037/a0015832

Fremont Community Therapy Project (2011, October 12). Training Programs [website]. Retrieved from: http://www.therapyproject.org/training.php

Garrett, M., Borders, L., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural SuperVISION: A Paradigm of Cultural Responsiveness for Supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*, 147-158. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00511.x

Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*, 102-113.

Gentile, L., Ballou, M., Roffman, E., & Ritchie, J. (2010). Supervision for social change: A feminist ecological perspective. *Women & Therapy, 33*, 140-151. doi:10.1080/02703140903404929

Glaser, B. G. (2007). Doing formal theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmez (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 97-113). London: Sage.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1965). Discovery of substantive theory: A basic strategy underlying qualitative research. *American Behavioral Scientist, 8*, 5-12. doi: 0.1177/000276426500800602

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gottfried, H. (1996). Engaging women's communities: Dilemmas and contradictions in feminist research. In H. Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and social change: Bridging theory and practice* (pp.1-20). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Greene, B. (1994). Diversity and difference: The issue of race in feminist therapy. In M. P. Mirkin (Ed.), *Women in contexts: Toward a feminist reconstruction of psychotherapy* (pp. 333-351). New York: Guilford.

Greene, B. (2010). Intersectionality and the complexity of identities: How the personal shapes the professional psychotherapist. *Women & Therapy*, *33*, 452-471. doi:10.1080/02703141003757547

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Harrison, J., MacGibbon, L., & Morton, M. (2001). Regimes of trustworthiness in qualitative research: The rigors of reciprocity. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*, 323-345. 10.1177/107780040100700305

Havercamp, B. E., & Young, R. A. (2007). Paradigms, purpose, and the role of the literature: Formulating a rationale for qualitative investigations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35,* 265-294. doi:10.1177/0011000006292597

Helm, J. E. (1995). An update of Helm's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hernandez, C. A. (2009). Theoretical coding in grounded theory. *The Grounded Theory Review 8,* 51-59.

Heshusius, L. (1994). Freeing ourselves from objectivity: Managing subjectivity or turning toward a participatory mode of consciousness? *Educational Researcher, 23*, 15–22. 10.3102/0013189X023003015

Hipp, J. L., & Munson, C. E. (1995). The partnership model: A feminist supervision/consultation perspective. *The Clinical Supervisor, 13*, 23-38. 10.1300/J001v13n01_03

Hird, J. S., Cavalieri, C. E., Dulko, J. P., Felice, A. D., & Ho, T. A. (2001). Visions and realities: Supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 29*, 114-130. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00509.x

Hoffman, M. A., Hill, C. E., & Freitas, G. F. (2005). Supervisor perspecitve on the process and outcome of giving easy, difficult, or no feedback to supervisees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 3-13. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.3

Holton, J. A. (2007). The coding process and its challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmez (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 265-291). London: Sage.

hooks, b. (2000). Introduction & Feminist Politics. In *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics* (pp. vii-6). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisiory process and outcome. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 32,* 73-85. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2006.tb01589.x

Kiselica, M. S., & Robinson, M. (2001). Bringing advocacy counseling to life: The history, issues, and human dramas of social justice work in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79,* 387-397. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01985.x

Kulpinski, L. M. (2006). *The conceptualization and practice of feminist psychotherapy supervision: A qualitative study.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3203434)

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladany, N., Friedlander, M. L., & Nelson, M. (2005). Heightening multicultural awareness: It's never been about political correctness. In N. Ladany, M. L. Friedlander, & M. Nelson (Eds.), *Critical events in psychotherapy supervision: An interpersonal approach* (pp. 53-77). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10958-003

Lassiter, L. E. (2005). *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1995, April). *Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research*. Keynote address presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: New Press.

Lorde, A. (1987). Master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In G. Anzaldua & C. Moraga (Eds), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (pp. 98-101). New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press

Majcher, J.-A., & Daniluk, J. C. (2009). The process of becoming a supervisior for students in a doctoral supervision training course. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3*, 63-71. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.18.2.172

Marable, M., & Mullings, L. (2009). *Let nobody turn us around: Voices of resistance, reform, and renewal : An African American anthology* (2nd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Montell, F. (1999). Focus group interviews: A new feminist method. *NWSA Journal, 11*(1), 44-71. Retrieved from: URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316628

Mori, Y., Inman, A. G., & Caski, G. I. L. (2009). Supervising international students: Relationship between acculturation, supervisor multicultural competence, cultural discussions, and supervision satisfaction. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3,* 10-18. doi:10.1037/a0013072

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 250-260. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250

Morrow, S. L. (2006). Honor and respect: Feminist collaborative research with sexually abused women. In C. T. Fischer (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods for psychologists: Introduction through empirical studies* (pp. 143-172). San Diego, CA: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-012088470-4/50009-0

Morrow, S. L. (2007). Qualitative research in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*, 209-235. doi: 10.1177/0011000006286990

Morrow, S. L., Castañeda-Sound, C. L., & Abrams, E. M. (2012). Counseling psychology research methods: Qualitative approaches. In N. A. Fouad, J. A. Carter, & L. M. Subich (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology, Vol. 1: Theories, research, and methods* (pp. 93-117). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/13754-004

Morrow, S. L., & Smith, M. L. (2000). Qualitative research for counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.) *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 199-230). New York: Wiley.

Morse, J. M., Noerager Stern, P., Corbin, J., Bowers, B., Charmaz, K., & Clarke, A. E. (2009). *Developing grounded theory: The second generation.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Nelson, M. (1997). An interactional model for empowering women in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *37*, 125-139. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1997.tb00538.x

Nelson, M. L., Gizara, S., Crombach H. A., Phelps, R., Steward, R., & Weitzman, L. (2006). A feminist multicultural perspective on supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*, 105-115. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2006.tb00031.x

Norcross, J. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Psychotherapy relationships that work*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Olesen, V. L. (2005). Early millennial feminist qualitative research: Challenges and contours. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 235-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. G. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pedersen (1991). Multiculturalism as a generic approach to counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70.* 6-12. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01555.x

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 137–145. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 126–136. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.126

Porter, N. (1985). New perspectives on therapy supervision. In L. B. Rosewater & L. E. A.Walker (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist therapy: Women's issues in psychotherapy* (pp. 332-343). New York: Springer.

Porter, N. (1995). Supervision of psychotherapists: Integrating anti-racist, feminist, and multicultural perspectives. In H. Landrine (Ed.), *Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 163-175). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 10.1037/10501-000

Porter, N. (2010). Feminist and multicultural underpinnings to supervision: An overview. *Women & Therapy, 33*, 1-6. doi:10.1080/02703140903404622

Prouty, A. (1996). *A grounded theory of feminist supervision: A qualitative study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9725608)

Prouty, A. (2008). Experiencing feminist family therapy supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Supervision, 12,* 171-203. doi: 10.1300/J086v12n04_01

Prouty, A., Thomas, V., Johnson, S., & Long, J. (2001). Methods of feminist family therapy supervision. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 27,* 85-97. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2001.tb01141.x

Rennie, D. L. (1994). Clients' deference in therapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 182-203. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.41.4.427

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 18*, 179-183. 10.1002/nur.4770180211

Seattle Therapy Alliance (2011, October 12). Internships and Externships [website]. Retrieved at: http://seattletherapyalliance.com/internships-externships/

Sinacore, A. L., & Enns, C. Z. (2005). Diversity feminisms: Postmodern, women-of-color, antiracist, lesbian, third-wave, and global perspectives. In C. Z. Enns & A. L. Sinacore (Eds.), *Teaching and social justice: Integrating multicultural and feminist theories in the classroom* (pp. 41-68). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Spradley, J. S. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Spradley, J. S. (1980). *Participant observation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stern, P. N. (1980). Grounded theory methodology: Its uses and processes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 12,* 20-23. doi: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.1980.tb01455.x

Stern, P. N. (2009). Glaserian grounded theory. In J. M. Morse, P. N. Stern, J. Corbin, B. Bowers, K. Charmaz, & A. E. Clarke (Eds.), *Developing grounded theory: The second generation* (pp. 55-85). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Steward, R. J., & Phelps, R. E. (2004). Feminist and multicultural collaboration in counseling supervision: Voices from two African American women. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 358-365.

Sturges, J. E., & Hanrahan, K. J. (2004). Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative interviewing: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, *4*, 107-118. doi:10.1177/1468794104041110

Szymanski, D. M. (2003). The feminist supervision scale: A rational/theoretical approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 221-232. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.00102

Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Feminist identity and theories as correlates of feminist supervision practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 33*, 729-747. doi: 10.1177.0011000005278408

Taylor, M. (1994). Gender and power in counselling and supervision. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 22*, 319-326. 10.1080/03069889400760341

Tryon, G., & Winograd, G. (2011). Goal consensus and collaboration. *Psychotherapy, 48*, 50-57. doi:10.1037/a0022061

Vargas, L. A., Porter, N., & Falender, C. A. (2008). Supervision, culture, and context. In C. A. Falender & E. P. Shafranske (Eds.), *Casebook for clinical supervision: A competency-based approach* (pp. 121-136). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/11792-006

Women's Resource Center (2011, October 12). Feminist multicultural counselor training [website]. Retrieved from: http://www.sa.utah.edu/women/counseling/training.htm

Wampold, B. E. (2001). *The great psychotherapy debate. Models, methods, and findings.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Westefeld, J. S. (2009). Supervision of psychotherapy: Models, issues, and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *37*, 296-316. doi:10.1177/0011000008316657

Williams, E. N., & Barber, J. (2004). Power and responsibility in therapy: Integrating feminism and multiculturalism. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 32*(extra)*,* 390-401. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%292161-1912/issues

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*, 66-85. doi: 10.1177/0011000012442652

Yeh, C. J., & Inman, A. G. (2007). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation in counseling psychology: Strategies for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *35*, 369-403. doi:10.1177/0011000006292596

Zapata, A. (2011). *A qualitative study examining discussions of multicultural perspectives in clinical supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3428287)