



1-2011

African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad

Brandi L. Pritchett-Johnson
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Clinical Psychology Commons, Counseling Psychology Commons, and the Multicultural Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Pritchett-Johnson, Brandi L., "African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad" (2011). *Dissertations*. 452.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/452>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



AFRICAN AMERICAN EXPERIENCES OF RACE RELATIONS IN THE
SUPERVISION DYAD

by

Brandi L. Pritchett-Johnson

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Advisor: Lonnie E. Duncan, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 2011

AFRICAN AMERICAN EXPERIENCES OF RACE RELATIONS IN THE SUPERVISION DYAD

Brandi L. Pritchett-Johnson, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2011

Everything we do is embedded within multiple contexts of collective and individual historical events that culminate in present day encounters. As an increasing number of racial minorities have entered the ranks as mental health practitioners, the configuration of the treatment and the supervision dyad has changed (Owens-Patterson, 2002). The fundamental aim of this study explored, captured, and described the supervision experience from the nuanced perspective of African American supervisors. A qualitative approach was employed using in-depth interviews to capture the complexity of race relations within the supervision dyad through an African Centered framework, aiding in our understanding of supervised training dynamics.

Ten self-identified African American supervisors participated in one audio recorded in-person interview and one audio recorded telephone interview. The data was then analyzed using discourse analysis (Gee, 1999) and traditional phenomenological methods. The data captured the interpersonal dynamics represented between the researcher and participant while also illuminating nuanced themes found within the African American supervision experience. Textual descriptions highlighted each

participant's recollections of race relations during their supervised training, their experiences providing supervision, and their overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad. Three general domains and seven subthemes (Lived Experience – *social, political, historical and cultural context; proving one's competence; entitlement and privilege*), (Training and Multicultural Learning – *training; mentorship; limited exposure*), and (Relationship – *acquiring comfort, trust, and safety*) were derived from this study.

The meaning of these themes and subthemes were discussed in relationship to providing culturally responsive supervision to psychology trainees and the challenges of being an African American supervisor.

UMI Number: 3496364

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3496364

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Copyright by
Brandi L. Pritchett-Johnson
2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you God! Thank you God for the opportunity to shine and to successfully reach a major milestone in my personal and professional life. Thank you God that the doctoral journey is finally over. I also thank you God for bringing champions into my life that have supported me along the way. I'd like to acknowledge those champions. First, my husband, Joe "stud" Johnson. You are my friend and my partner. You truly inspire me. Your sense of humor, smile, encouragement, tough love when I want to slack off, understanding, and affection has helped me to reach my goals. I love you and I feel privileged that I get to experience this life with you.

Gammy and Aunt Cherry, you are the wise women who have listened to me ramble on and on about all things graduate school. Thank you for being my cheerleaders and for being genuinely interested in my world. To my sister, Ashlee who reminds me that I have a job to do. My biggest priority is being a big sister that you can be proud of. I live each day with you in mind. Thank you so much for loving me, believing in me, encouraging me, and reminding me that I have something to offer this world. My youngest sisters, Kyema, Trena, India and all of my godsiblings. Don't you ever forget that you are special and brilliant. Your intellect, talents, gifts, and passions will ultimately make this world a better place. Everyone knows that I do this work for all of the young woman and men who are hungry for a little encouragement. Know that when things got difficult for me, you were MY encouragement. Let's celebrate this victory together.

Acknowledgments – Continued

To my bruncle David, I'd like to say, "that's wassup". Just as you've watched me grow up, I've watched you grow up. You make me proud. I hope you know that I find you to be a man of real integrity and good fun. Your words of praise and positive affirmation are greatly appreciated. To all of my aunts and uncles, you are the core of my being. I feel so blessed to have such an amazing support network. Your sometimes unexpected words of encouragement were always right on time and I thank you. I would not be who I am if it were not for all of you.

I must recognize my Dad, Reginald Hartsfield (Go Bronco's). Thank you for being the best Dad a girl could ever have. Thank you for setting an example of humility, generosity, poise, and elegant professionalism. It is largely because of you that I know HOW to give back. Shout out to my dear friend and business partner Cheyla Milo and the entire Future 4 Teens family (Joe, Walter, Terence, and Trenae). I admire and appreciate your passion and your commitment to social justice, anti-racism, and the youth population in general. You are truly amazing friends and colleagues. Thank you Bunk for being my best friend for over 20 years. Our paths couldn't be more different but you have always been loyal to me. True friends are hard to find. Thank you for loving me.

I must also acknowledge my amazing dissertation committee. Dr. Lonnie Duncan, you always believed in me and had my back. You challenged me and called me out when appropriate. It is because of people like you that students like me are able to shine. When the world gives up on us or says we are not good enough, you advocate, mentor, and equip us with the tools to prove the world wrong. You are without a doubt the best thing

Acknowledgements – Continued

to ever happen to the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department. Words can't express the depth of my gratitude. I'd also like to say thank you to those individuals at the Graduate College, particularly Linda Comrie and Tony Dennis that are the nicest most genuine Broncos at WMU. Too often your support goes unrecognized.

Finally, I dedicate this accomplishment to my mother – Shawn Diane Pritchett, God-Mother - Yvette Morgan, grandfather – Juston “Jerry” Threets, and uncle – Scott Derek Pritchett. Please know that while you rest in the heavens above I rejoice in the fact that I was blessed to know you in the first place. Your spirit lives on in me and in all that I do. Thank you so much for impacting my life in such a magnificent way. Through me, others will know just how phenomenal you were and are.

Brandi L. Pritchett-Johnson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Method	3
Results	7
Discussion	11
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Race and Racism.....	17
Counseling Supervision.....	21
Racial Identity Development.....	23
Supervision Relationship and Working Alliance.....	30
Communication and Power.....	39
III. METHODOLOGY	55
African Centered Approach to Qualitative Inquiry.....	56
Phenomenological Methodology.....	61
Research Design.....	69
Data Analysis.....	77
Validity and Reliability.....	80
Ethical Considerations.....	82

Table of Contents – Continued

CHAPTER	
Researcher as Instrument.....	84
Epoch.....	85
IV. RESULTS	91
Descriptive Statistics.....	91
Study Findings: Discourse Analysis.....	92
Study Findings: Textual Descriptions.....	95
Study Findings: Essence Themes.....	107
V. DISCUSSION	126
Summary of Findings.....	126
Strengths and Limitations.....	143
Implications for the Future.....	145
REFERENCES.....	149
APPENDICES.....	157
A. Informed Consent Agreement.....	157
B. Demographic/Background Questionnaire.....	162
C. Call for Participation.....	164
D. Interview Protocol (Researcher Copy).....	166
E. Transcription Coding Guide.....	168
F. HSIRB Approval Letter	170

LIST OF TABLES

1. Descriptive Data from Background Questionnaire.....	91
2. Discourse Analysis Coding Guide.....	93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The process of clinical supervision has been understood as a primary means of disseminating useful clinical information and providing a venue that allows supportive hands-on learning for beginning and developing clinicians (Bernard & Goodyear, 1997,2004). Beyond the traditional didactic classroom learning, supervision serves as the primary means of applying learned theoretical knowledge. Clinical supervision is a core and essential component of clinical and professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 1997,2004; Majcher & Daniluk, 2009.). The Supervision literature has broadly examined the following areas: the working alliance (Banks-Johnson, 2002; Buckard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999; Lui & Pope-Davis, 2004; Wood, 2005), competencies and skill development (Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997; Sue & Sue, 1999), identity development (Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Gushue & Constantine, 2007; Helms, 1995; Hays & Chang, 2003) , and various cross-cultural issues (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006; Carter & Pieterse, 2004; Casas, 2002; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005; Sue, et. al. 2011).

While the literature has acknowledged multiculturalism within clinical supervision, much of the research has looked at supervision from the perspective of majority white supervisors. There have been two primary perspectives of exploration in the multicultural supervision literature. Initially supervision research focused primarily

on the dynamics between White supervisors and White supervisees when working with clientele of color (Constantine, 2009). Scholarly contributions have also included the experience of White supervisors working with supervisees of color (Constantine & Sue, 2007; McNeill, Hom, & Perez, 1995; Nilsson & Duan, 2007). Literary focus has been sparse in relationship to examining these issues from the African American supervisors perspective nor has the methodological approach been intentionally based upon culturally grounded principles. Because an increasing number of racial minorities are assuming the role of supervisor, it may be useful to explore the African American supervisors nuanced experience. It is expected that by doing so, the literature will (1) embody greater and more adequate representation of this small population of supervisors, (2) identify common themes amongst African American supervisors, (3) illuminate the often subtle racialized or culturally charged dynamics between supervisor and supervisee.

This study is especially unique in that it employs a research model that supports within group exploration while also capturing between group data. Much of the cross-cultural and cross-racial literature emphasizes the natural and socially constructed power dynamic between supervisor and supervisee (Cook, 1994, Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Yi, 1998) communication patterns (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Garrett, Borders, Crutchfield, Torres-Rivera, Brotherton, & Curtis, 2001), and factors related to racial identity development (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Hays & Chang, 2003; Ladany, Iman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997). The proposed study allows for broad exploration of power dynamics not

only when African American supervisors are engaged in supervision with a majority White individual, but also another African American, whether supervisor or supervisee. Furthermore, this study allows for the two-fold investigation of communication style and captures the general African American supervisory experience.

Method

This study utilized an adapted phenomenological method to explore the range of supervision interactions throughout the tenure of self-identified African American supervisors. Phenomenological studies aim to illuminate a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Race relations can be understood as the phenomenon worthy of exploration within this study. This study was driven by asking participants to reflect on and share three things: (1) their experiences receiving supervision from White American and African American supervisors, (2) their experiences providing supervision to White American and African American supervisees, and (3) their general understanding of race relations over the course of their careers. Only recently has the literature begun to look at minority supervisor experiences in the supervision relationship (Banks-Johnson; 2002; Goode-Cross, 2011). This study can be considered a significant contribution for a number of reasons. First, its aim was to discover and give voice to the nuanced experiences of African American supervisors. Second, a hope was to intentionally look at within group supervision dynamics verses solely comparison in cross-cultural/racial supervision, which is most commonly explored. Third, rather than focusing primarily on demographic

variables, this researcher was most interested in giving voice to the subtleties of racialized interaction rather than specific competencies.

Participant Selection

The targeted participant pool included any mental health provider who has experienced standardized clinical training. Because interviews were conducted in-person it was also required they reside within the Midwest or Eastern region of the United States of America within traveling distance for this researcher. In order to participate, each participant had to (a) self-identify as African American, (b) have received supervision during his/her training as a masters and/or doctoral student, (c) have provided clinical supervision to an African American supervisee, and (d) have provided clinical supervision to a White American supervisee. Criterion sampling (Creswell, 2007) was used for this study. Due to the narrow target population, snowball sampling was also used as a secondary measure to increase the participant pool. The researcher developed a generic email that was sent to academic departments and counseling centers. This researcher also recruited individuals from the American Psychological Association (APA) and Association of Black Psychologist (ABPsi) website. Participants varied in their years of experience, allowing for advanced doctoral students to be a part of the participant pool as well as seasoned veterans. This allowed for greater representation of African American supervisor developmental levels and history of experiences.

Procedures

Once potential participants responded to researcher solicitation, they were provided with a copy of the informed consent, demographic questionnaire, and the interview questions. Participants were then asked if they were still interested in study participation and asked to provide a date, time, and desired location for their first interview. Participants were asked to engage in the following:

Question 1: Take a few moments to reflect on your supervision relationships during your clinical training when you received supervision. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisors and African American supervisors.

Question 2: Take a few moments to reflect on your current/recent supervisor/supervisee relationships as a supervisor. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisees and African American supervisees.

Question 3: Take a few moments to think about your full range of experiences as an African American supervisee and now as an African American supervisor. How have you have come to understand race relations over the course of your clinical training? What will this mean as you continue to provide supervision to African American supervisees in the future?

Participants engaged in an extended interview process, adapted from Seidman's (1998) three-interview model. The adapted version comprised of an initial in-person interview in a location of the participants choosing and a second follow-up phone interview. Each participant was offered the option to interview a third time in an effort to

further validate the accuracy of their disclosures. None of the participants opted to participate in the third interview. Initial interview ranged from 45-90 minutes while the second follow up interviews ranged from 30-60 minutes in duration. Each interview was audio recorded and transcribed totaling twenty interview transcriptions. Identifying information was deleted from all transcriptions and denoted by a number and pseudonym. Participation was voluntary and uncompensated.

Data Analysis

A two-fold analysis framework was employed for this study which included traditional phenomenological methods (Moustakas, 1994) and discourse analysis (Gee, 1999). The full data analysis process first included transcription of each interview verbatim; including verbal utterances (e.g. sigh, laughter, etc.) and nonverbal expressions (e.g. shaking head, hitting table, etc.) through the use of memo-writing and then provided to each interview participant to cross check accuracy. The transcription process was considered a core component of the full data analysis and was then coded using common Discourse Analysis coding methods (Cameron, 2001; Gee, 1999) in an effort to capture discourse patterns between researcher and each participant. In accordance with traditional phenomenological analysis, clusters of meaning (Moustakas, 1994) were identified based on repetition, commonalities, and common utterances discovered through discourse analysis (Cameron, 2001; Gee, 1999).

To further validate this study a data rater process was then employed. Three demographically diverse graduate students familiar with qualitative statistics individually

matched themes with direct participant quotes. Quotations that matched to any theme for two of the three inter raters was denoted as a “match”. Inter raters were directed to include suggestions for themes if they felt that none of the researcher identified themes adequately represented any one quotation. Those quotations that did not match to any researcher derived theme nor an inter rater derived theme was thrown out.

Results

A wealth of data was derived by utilizing discourse coding. This form of analysis illuminated discourse themes between researcher and participant. In accordance with previous literature (Kochman, 1981; Orbe & Harris, 2008; Parham, White, & Ajamau, 2000; Seidman, 1998), this study found that assumptions attributed to racial similarity contributed to greater comfortability and common lived experience. Comfortability and common lived experience were demonstrated by the use and understanding of cultural vernacular, nonverbal expressions of agreement, as well as instances where the participant directly acknowledged comfort or similarity.

Beyond the analysis of researcher/participant discourse, three general ideas best reflected participant experiences in supervision both during their supervision and while supervising others. The three general ideas have been identified by the following themes: (1) Lived Experience, (2) Training and Multicultural Learning, and (3) Relationships. Each of the general ideas were further separated out into subthemes to better highlight the similarities and variation within participant reflections. It is imperative to understand the themes listed below as interrelated in nature.

Lived Experience

For the purpose of this study, *lived experience* refers to first-person reflective stories of interactions within the supervision dyad or interpretations that shape supervisory experiences. Within the scope of lived experience participants alluded to the following subthemes; (1) political, historical, racial, and cultural context, (2) proving one's competence, and (3) entitlement and privileged power.

Political, Historical, Racial, and Cultural Context

All participants disclosed instances when political, historical, racial, and/or cultural variables made an impact on their experiences prior to the supervisory experience. They elaborated on how such experiences would show up in their supervision practices and how they impacted the supervisory relationship. This theme supports the notion that supervision does not occur in a vacuum but rather the larger psycho-social macrocosm.

I guess as I think about it I wanted and want to not perpetuate the stuff that has happened before because sometimes inadvertently we can. Our training as psychologist frequently does not take our history into consideration. Freud didn't take you and me into consideration...Maslow didn't...so you have to think and question. You have to read Asa Hilliard...you need to read...you need to read Naim Akbar (*Rico*)

Proving One's Competence

Participants offered their reflections upon the dynamic between supervisor and supervisee with respect to the challenging and/or questioning of their competence and intellectual capabilities. This subtheme offers some illustration on the ways in which

racialized stereotypes often accounted for supervisors and/or supervisees having limited expectations for the study participants. Participants further described how other, often marginalized characteristics (e.g. age, gender, etc.) served as a barrier.

I think sometimes when you are working with White supervisees you have to maybe prove your expertise a little bit more because the supervisee may come in with their own biases and expectations. There is also the age issue being kind of a young professional they may challenge you or may not be so quick to take your feedback. They may put you on the same...I guess level where as a supervisor is not the same level. (*Stacey A.*)

Entitlement and Privileged Power

The subtheme, Entitlement and Privileged Power best describes dynamics within the supervision relationship that reflected larger Eurocentric norms, white supremacy, white privilege, or gender power hierarchy.

Don't get out of this box...you're behind me...I control what you can do and what you can't do. The White [supervisors] weren't even dealing with my perspective. They were determining my box and then in a way using power or influence to remind me not to get out of it (*Gpsych*)

While all participants experienced the stated subthemes in varying degrees, they were open in their disclosure regarding differences and similarities with white and black supervisors and/or supervisees.

Training and Multicultural Learning

For the purpose of this study, training and multicultural learning refers to the structured and unstructured practices of clinical supervision and departmental instruction. Within the scope of training and multicultural learning three subthemes were illuminated;

(1) development, (2) mentorship, and (3) limited exposure. Participants reflected upon their multicultural development as well as distinctions among their supervisees and supervisors. Mentorship appeared to be either a strongly desired and/or provided element within supervision practices for all participants. Finally, participants acknowledged the breadth of limited exposure both of African American supervisors and vehicles of multicultural learning.

Development

Beginning supervisors may have some concerns about their own competency and so now you have a supervisee who [has] some cultural issues coming up and they may not feel competent. That's why I say these things have to be discussed among us as supervisors so that you do feel more comfortable addressing cultural issues. Part of the problem with supervisors [is they] haven't looked at their own issues so when something comes up they don't feel confident (*Little Snake*)

Mentorship

In my early years it sometimes was painful but as I talked to more seasoned minority clinicians they talked about how they dealt with those issues and how they coped and they would give me mentoring advice on how to navigate those treacherous waters. (*Connie*)

Limited Exposure

I just think that people just aren't use to it. They are not use to seeing an ethnic minority in the role of supervisor and boss and that kind of thing so I think it's an adjustment for them. I don't think they are consciously like "I'm gonna revolt or rebel" but it's unconscious (*Dr. Mom*)

Relationship

For the purposes of this study the supervisory relationship will refer to the quality of the working alliance between supervisor and supervisee. Each participant acknowledged the role of the supervisory relationship as key in understanding their experience as positive, negative, or useful with respect to their training specifically around issues of race and culture. There was only one subtheme identified as most salient, which included acquiring comfort, trust, and safety. Participants elaborated on the specific verbal and/or nonverbal occurrences that contributed to a safe and trusting relationship with their supervisors.

Acquiring Comfort, Trust, and Safety

If you don't address cultural issues you're not providing an environment of safety. I can't talk to you about what I really think or what I really feel (*Little Snake*)

Discussion

This study was intended to explore the full range of African American supervisory experiences utilizing a multifaceted analysis method. It was discovered that researcher complementarity and the utilization of elaborate interview procedures (e.g. two interviews, in-person interviews, etc.) in accordance with the primary African Centered tenets were useful in gaining greater depth of information. Few researchers have investigated the supervision experiences of African American supervisees or supervisors specifically (Goode-Cross, 2011; Jernigan, et al. 2010). This study supports previous research (Goode-Cross, 2011) in that participants disclosed that they had closer

relationships with their supervisees of color and that issues of race and culture were more likely to be discussed with their supervisees of color.

Research, Training, and Supervision

The findings discovered in this study add to the multicultural supervision literature and serve to give voice to the gaps within the supervision dyad. By further investigating the phenomena of race relations, the field will be better positioned to eradicate the gaps in literature that impede the acquisition of multicultural competence and facilitate greater multicultural development. As denoted in Goode-Gross's (2011) most recent contribution, race appears to be a salient facet of African American supervisor identities and should be acknowledged and may be useful within supervisory training.

A considerable strength of this dissertation was the use of a research design that fit exploration of a socially constructed phenomena as well as the use of a framework that fit most appropriately with the study population. The phenomenological qualitative approach supported by an African Centered framework and intentional two-fold analysis, adequately and appropriately addressed the proposed research inquiries. By interviewing the participants' in-person and on multiple occasions, this researcher was able to develop a deeper rapport and compile a wealth of sensitive information. Due to the sensitivity of the phenomena in question, developing a safe relationship was critical in gaining access to authentic and uncensored participant recollections. The primary limitation of this study was that it did not account for the developmental status of the supervisor participants.

Because racial identity development often shapes the filter through which an individual interprets his/her experiences, it is likely that varied developmental status played a large role in what the participants disclosed throughout the interview process.

Greater exploration of racial identity development statuses within the scope of a within group research model may be useful in terms of continued research. Because supervision relationships do not occur in a vacuum, it would be imperative to further investigate how contextual variables such as political, historical, cultural, and racial phenomena impact the supervision relationship. Findings from this study speak to the tendency for training to focus and cease at theoretical knowledge verses emphasize and practice experiential understanding. This common place dilemma is manifest in the supervision relationship by the difficulty for supervisors and/or supervisees to apply their multicultural learning in practice. Future researchers may wish to investigate what specific multicultural interventions were/are effective within supervision and how so. Finally, fear, discomfort and awareness serve as a barrier to multicultural learning and the likelihood for supervisors to broach multicultural topics. For this reason it may be useful to more deeply explore what barriers prevent supervisors from modeling their multicultural competencies and providing multiculturally responsive supervision.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Everything we do is embedded within multiple contexts of collective and individual historical events that culminate in present day encounters. Due to the events of our past and the social connotations applied to constructs such as race; racial and cultural templates have tremendous salience in what may appear to be simple routine encounters (Lee, 2005). As an increasing number of people of color have entered the ranks of mental health practitioners, the configuration of treatment dyads (including supervision) has changed, thus the potential for a variety of dynamic interactions and unconscious responses will develop in response to this experience of difference (Michele Owens-Patterson, 2000).

Contemporary research has explored minimally the ways in which multiculturalism, diversity, culture, ethnicity, and race have influenced the counseling or therapeutic process, training, and supervision. Many studies exploring the implications of race related issues seek to address the broader issue of multiculturalism and diversity, which often includes ethnicity, sex, religion, sexual orientation, and disabilities (Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, Pate, & Rodolfa, 2001; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004). There has been a strong charge for addressing and exploring multicultural therapy and more recently supervision (Pope & Vasquez, 1998; Vasquez, 1992; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho; 2001) as well as to move beyond a monocultural or

ethnocentric application of supervision (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kyung Kim, 1999). As a result multicultural supervision has received increased empirical and theoretical attention over the last decade (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). However, it has been observed that racially specific issues in supervision still receive scant empirical attention (Bhat & Davis, 2007).

The concept of multicultural supervision can encompass many differences within the supervision dyad as many argue that all supervision is multicultural. Culture can be described as the belief systems and value orientations, including psychological processes and organizations (Fouad & Arrendondo, 2007). One could be a part of a sorority or fraternity and exhibit all components of their collective culture as displayed by their common behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes. In further illustration one must recognize that this particular culture may not be comprised of the same ethnic background or race. Cross – cultural supervision refers to relationships where the supervisor and supervisee come from different cultural backgrounds (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006). Conversely, race has been defined as the category to which others assign individuals on the basis of physical characteristics (Fouad & Arrendondo, 2007). Therefore, racial identification could be an example of one type of cross-cultural interaction. An individual's stated racial identification is more specific than the more general term of cross-cultural and therefore should be stated explicitly. While much of the literature uses terminology such as cross-cultural and cross-racial interchangeably; researchers have

begun to describe cross-cultural, cross-ethnic, and cross-racial dyads more specifically as they may embody different components.

Literature has used cross-cultural identification to illustrate differences related to race, ethnic socialization, social class, religious orientation, gender, and sexual orientation (Helms & Cook, 1991). All of these factors can influence supervision however when specific cultural or racial differences are not specified explicitly within research, there is the potential for misrepresentation of the individuals studied. For example, ethnicity is unlike race in that it is used to refer to national origin (Carter, 1995). One's racial group membership is observed by others and has been used to define a place within a social hierarchy, whereas, ethnic group membership is seldom recognized or observed by others and doesn't necessarily define a place within a social hierarchy (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). Therefore, individuals from Britain whom physically appear "Black" may be recognized and treated according to American social norms based on his/her skin color and thus placed in an oppressive status within the American social hierarchy. To utilize terms such as race and ethnicity interchangeably could potentially be problematic as it fails to acknowledge their distinct differences and further convolutes our understandings of race and race relations.

While the literature has begun to take significant strides in acknowledging the importance of developing multicultural competencies we have failed to adequately explore the implications of supervision relationships specifically relating to racial dynamics and the impact this has on developing sound supervisory relationships and

productive working alliances. Multicultural literature seems to converge around the theme of the training of White, European American therapists to understand their own racial identity and the ways in which their values may influence the supervision and the therapy process (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005; Kiselica, 1998). However, it appears that multicultural training is experienced uniquely by students of color (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005) and effects supervisors of color as well. This review seeks to provide the reader with a more comprehensive understanding of how race may shape the racial dynamic specifically within supervision relationships, particularly when both the supervisor and supervisee identify as Black or African American. The assumption is that students and supervisors of color may also experience specific supervision experiences differently than their white counterparts, particularly when engaged in the supervision experience with another person of color. This topic is one of interest as the current body of literature largely focuses on the racial dynamic between White supervisors and Black supervisees or from the perspective of educating White supervisors to work more effectively with supervisees of color or White supervisees working competently with clients of color.

Race and Racism

Rapp (2000) proposes that all individuals harbor cultural and political baggage, which leaves us prone to ethnocentric bias. According to Jaynes & Williams (1989), race matters greatly in the United States. Now 20 years later, during the twenty-first century, the meanings, attitudes, and behaviors surrounding race may have changed, yet the fact of

its existence remains significant. Race continues to receive considerable attention in academic, economic, social, psychological, health, and political arenas and has been shaped and deeply influenced by physical and social disciplines (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). The field of psychology has come to understand race as a social construct with little connection to biology and genes (Graves, 2001) yet is used to define non-whites through which physical differences serve as a basis to make inferences about human diversity and advance the interest of those in power (Armino, 2001; Cameron & Wycoff, 1998; Hays & Chang, 2003; Watt, 1999). Crites (1969) observed that the color of an individual's skin defines an aspect of his or her subculture, not so much because of the manifest physical difference which singles him or her out, but because of social reactions to it. Counseling psychologists must have an accurate understanding of the term *race* if they are to effectively work with the so-called racially diverse U.S. population (Casas, 2005). Such understanding is often lacking and race remains one of the most misunderstood and misused words in the English language (Atkinson, 2004).

Race is typically determined on the basis of skin color and physical features and its membership involves knowledge of racism and racial stereotypes (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). Many of us still recognize race as one primary understanding of people and how to interact with individuals visibly different from ourselves. More specifically, Carter & Pieterse (2004) note that despite adopting legal enactments that prohibit inhuman and unjust treatment of people of color, the idea that race determines one's value has remained a strong aspect of American behavior, even while people express principles of equality

and fairness. Race relations shifted during the 1960s and 1970s at the same time racism and the meaning associated with one's race began to be less overt and more aversive, (Kovel, 1970) covert, or symbolic (Carter & Pieterse, 2004; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kwakami & Hobson, 2002; Jones, 1998). This new covert form of racism was originally coined by Kovel as *aversive racism*, which represents a more subtle often unintentional form of bias that characterizes many White Americans who possess strong egalitarian values and who believe that they are not prejudiced (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hobson, 2002).

Research on White racial attitudes has found that the expression of overt White racism has generally been on the decline in the last three decades (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004; Duckitt, 1992; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kovel, 1970) while this subtle and more covert or aversive form of racism has surfaced (Jones, 1997; Kovel, 1970). A similar concept has most recently been coined by Carter and Pieterse (2004) as modern or symbolic racism and refers to the fact that one would not express negative racial attitudes openly but would do so indirectly. In contrast to the feelings of open hostility and clear dislike of Blacks, the negative feelings that aversive racists experience are typically more diffuse, such as feelings of anxiety and uneasiness similar to those physiological symptoms identified in a Utsey, Hammer, & Gernat (2005) study, which found that focus group discussions on race and racism in the therapeutic realm continued to be anxiety provoking as displayed by difficulty with articulation, faltering and/or trembling voices.

They further specified that observable anxiety manifested psychologically in expressions of fear, anger, and defense mechanisms. This shift in the way racist attitudes are exhibited or expressed could be responsible for the varying understandings of current race relations.

Despite less overt racist attitudes and behaviors Blacks view discrimination as a dominate force in their lives and experience differences in the way they are treated compared to their White counterparts. The vast majority (69%) of Whites perceived that Blacks were treated “the same as Whites,” whereas, the majority of Blacks (59%) reported that Blacks were treated “more badly” than Whites (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002; Gallup, 2001). Given the magnitude and persistence of these different views held by Blacks and Whites, it is not surprising that current race relations in the United States are characterized by distrust (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002). Exploring issues of race and racism tends to generate a different mood than exploring cultural differences, such as language and customs (Pinderhughes, 1989; Tummala-Narra, 2004). The discomfort associated with racially derived dialogue has led many to attempt to address racially specific issues and concerns through “safe” practices (e.g. diversity training vs. anti-racism training) utilizing “safe” language (e.g. cultural sensitivity vs. anti-racist).

Feagin (2004) recognizes racially derived terms such as “inner city” and “at-risk” as fragmented euphemistic language disconnected from the primary issue. Beyond Feagin’s (2004) study, current literature utilizing terms such as “culture”,

“multiculturalism”, and “ethnicity”, illustrate the same disconnect and fail to address dynamic implications specific to race relations more directly. While all of these terms, concepts, and phenomena have a place within the overarching multicultural literature; these terms used to illustrate specific race relations distort and hide the unspoken yet no less real impact of racial beliefs (Feagin, 2004). For these reasons it appears the findings associated with Utsey, Hammer, & Gernat (2005) study remain accurate in that discussing race and racism directly, beyond service-level explorations is still taboo.

Counseling Supervision

Supervision is an active mentorship process which can be shaped by social, educational and cultural context. This specified form of training may be influenced by our values, beliefs, and attitudes regarding sexual choice, lifestyle, dress, social costumes and ways of relating (Rapp, 2000). Bent, Schindler, & Dobbins (1991) state that approximately one half of a professional psychologist’s formal training involves learning through supervision (Falender, & Shafranske, 2004). This approximation illustrates the importance of this role within counseling psychology training. Despite its importance, diversity is one of the most neglected areas in supervision training and research (Falender & Shafranske, 2004). Constantine (1997) reported that 70% of supervisors had not received formal training in multicultural counseling, thus contributing to the difficulties in raising such issues in supervision (Bhat & Davis, 2007). Because racial implications rest under the umbrella of the multicultural framework, it is safe to assume that

Constantine's data remains accurate for the lack of training received with respect to addressing racially specific concerns.

Bernard and Goodyear (1997, 2004) defined counseling supervision as “an intervention provided by a senior member of a profession to a junior member or members of that same profession.” Supervision research focused on race has investigated satisfaction with the supervisory relationship (Cook & Helms, 1998), positive and negative critical incidents (Fukuyama, 1994), conflicts and communication problems (Daniels, D’Andrea, & Kim, 1999), perceptions and evaluations of supervisory relationships (Duan & Roehlke, 2001), racism (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004; Constantine & Sue, 2007), and issues surrounding control and power (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Yi, 1998).

In supervision literature there is great variation in the terminology used to describe racial dyads. Much of the literature explores terms such as race or ethnicity interchangeably to illustrate a multicultural scenario, while other literature uses the term cross-cultural to denote racially different interactions. This comprehensive review of the literature looks closely at supervision dyads that encompass racially different supervision relationships, keeping in mind the fact that the literature broadly uses terms interchangeably to denote racially different or similar interactions and is greatly inconsistent. This concept was best illustrated by the works of Leong & Wagner (2004) where they define cross-cultural counseling supervision as a supervisory relationship in which the supervisor and the supervisee are from culturally different groups and is most

often recognized as a racial one (e.g. White supervisor-Black supervisee, Black supervisor-White supervisee).

Supervisors are considered to be “crucial catalysts” in facilitating their supervisees’ growth and awareness of racial and cultural issues (Constantine, 2001). Because racial identity interactions have been found to be related to the supervision alliance, (Ladany et al, 1997) it is imperative that one addresses its prevalence. Racial identity attitudes of White and visible racial-ethnic group supervisors and supervisees may relate to how they respond to each other in supervision (Cook, 1994). Tummala-Narra (2004) notes that all supervision must integrate race and culture, particularly if supervision is to be most effective (Reynolds, 2004). If race is ignored, an essential part of the student’s identity is left unattended and unfortunately can become nonintegrated with his or her professional identity as a therapist (Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin IV, & Siegel, 2006) and ultimately as a supervisor. Racial identity has become a major research topic in racial-cultural supervision (Reynolds, 2004) and refers to the way one responds to his or her race. Racial identity reflects the extent to which one identifies with a particular racial group and how identification influences perceptions, emotions, and behaviors toward people from other groups (Carter, 1995; Carter & Pieterse, 2004; Helms & Cook, 1999).

Racial Identity Development

Racial identity assists the individual in interpreting and making meaning of a racial event, as well as in creating and maintaining social relationships (Helms, 1995).

Helms (1990, 1995) further describes racial identity as a multidimensional construct pertaining to how one feels, thinks, and behaves in regard to oneself, others within one's identified racial group, and others not belonging to the identified racial group (Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997). Understanding the implications of racial identity development within the supervision relationship may yield more clarity about cultural differences in the supervision process than simply considering race as a demographic variable (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Helms, 1994), cultural characteristic (Cook, 1994), social construct (Graves, 2001), or sociopolitical classification (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). Bradshaw's (1982) work identified that failure to address racial identity development issues in counselor supervision can lead to perpetuate stereotypes, misdiagnosis, and racially based countertransference in later professional counseling experiences (Grant, 1999; Hays & Chang, 2003). More contemporary and widely utilized racial identity development models used include Helms' (1994) People of Color Racial Identity Model and White Racial Identity Model. For Persons of Color, these racial identity ego statuses include:

- (1) Pre-encounter/Conformity as characterized by beliefs that denigrates one's race, culture, and values and while idealizing the White race, culture and traditions (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). When in this stage of racial identity development an individual depends on (Cook, 1994) and may seek the approval of White society (Carter & Pieterse, 2004).

- (2) Encounter/ Dissonance as characterized by a personal and challenging experience with White or non-white society that leads the person to question his or her race and its meaning and could potentially begin to see members of his or her own group in the same way it is seen by the oppressors (Carter & Pieterse, 2004; Cook, 1994).
- (3) Immersion – Emersion as characterized by the search for answers to questions from the encounter experience and involves learning the meaning and value of one's race. The individual works to reject (immersion) the old views (Cook, 1994) and replace (emersion) them with new ones (Carter & Pieterse, 2004).
- (4) Internalization/Integrative Awareness is characterized by the individual's experiencing his or her race as valued and understands that strengths and weaknesses exist in both his or her racial group's culture as well as White culture (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). This ego status is marked by a positive commitment to one's own racial group and includes empathy and collaboration with members of other oppressed groups (Cook, 1994).

While, White racial identity development ego statuses include:

- (1) Contact Status which is characterized as the color-blind status or influence, in which one denies the existence of racism and is taught not to see race yet reflects behavior and attitudes that are guided by racist principles that have never been questioned. This person is not aware of how he or she benefits from institutional

and cultural racism (Carter & Pieterse, 2004) and represents obliviousness to one's own racial identity (Cook, 1994).

- (2) Disintegration Status is characterized by a conscious awareness of one's Whiteness and feelings of conflict and typically experience guilt regarding that awareness. This status also involves unresolved racial moral dilemmas that force an individual to choose between her or his-own group loyalty and humanism (Cook, 1994).
- (3) Reintegration is characterized by one's ability to see his or her Whiteness as a fact and recognize that their life circumstances are different from and in most cases better than those of non-whites. This recognition is shielded with defensiveness, characterized by denial and distortion. At this stage the white person actually accepts the notion of white racial superiority and black inferiority (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). This status refers to the idealization of Whites and the denigration of Blacks (Cook, 1994).
- (4) Pseudo-independence is characterized by the process of defining a more positive White racial identity and often begin to question the notions of inferiority about Blacks and other people of color. Individuals in this status begin to understand that Whites are responsible for racism (Carter & Pieterse, 2004) and start to intellectually accept one's own race and the race of others (Cook, 1994).
- (5) Immersion-Emersion is characterized by a White person's ability to change

myths and misinformation about people of Color and Whites, and replace them with more accurate information about the historical and current significance of and meanings of racial group memberships. Individuals in this status also start a process of integrating emotional and cognitive information and experiences, a process fueled by questions about race and racism at many personal and interpersonal levels. Changing and fighting for Blacks is no longer the goal as individuals at this level are more focused on changing Whites (Carter & Pieterse, 2004) and harbor an honest appraisal of racism and the significance of Whiteness (Cook, 1994).

- (6) Autonomy is characterized as the most mature of statuses and is reached after entry into and cognitive and emotional reconciliation of the previous statuses. Race is no longer a psychological threat therefore these individuals are able to have a more flexible worldview and it is possible to abandon much cultural, institutional, and personal racism (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). Helms (1996) suggest that the person at this level of White racial identity development is able to operate more effectively across races (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). The internalization of a multicultural identity including non-racist Whiteness at its core, and activism toward eliminating racism (Cook, 1994) is the most mature and final characteristic of this status.

Helms (1990, 1995) posits that both White supervisors and supervisors of Color at less developed statuses of racial identity development tend to focus on a “common

humanity” and often ignore the race of their supervisors (Bhat & Davis, 2007). For White supervisors and supervisees evolving a non-racist White identity means accepting one’s Whiteness and recognizing the ways one participates in and benefits from individual, institutional, and cultural racism (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). In another way we can come to understand White racial identity development as movement from a state of obliviousness to a reeducation process in which racial standards are challenged, and ultimately to an understanding and relinquishing of privileges and racism (Hays & Chang, 2003). The privileges most commonly associated with this frame of literature remains the notion of *white privilege*. McIntosh (1988) originally coined this term as an invisible and overlooked condition (Hays & Chang, 2004) often lived and not recognized by Whites. Such privilege gives Whites entitlement to take the initiative in discussing or refusing to discuss racism and oppression (Frye, 1983; Hays & Chang, 2003).

The views associated with the reintegration status of white racial identity development are typically expressed outside of consciousness, as is typical of larger numbers of Americans (Carter & Pieterse, 2004). Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson (2002) emphasize that original attitudes are not replaced, but rather stored in a memory and become implicit (unconscious), whereas the new attitude is conscious and explicit. Americans society’s norms make it possible for many Whites to be fixated at this Reintegration identity status (Carter & Pieterse, 2004) hence denying or unaware of the more unconscious or aversive ways in which they respond to Blacks’. Some European

American supervisors feel they act without discrimination and therefore culture (Brown, Acevedo-Polkovich, & Smith, 2007) or race is irrelevant. The phenomenon of White obliviousness to or denial of race and racism impact the ability for Whites to build connections to people of color and greatly limit racial interactions (Lucal, 1996).

White supervisors may be less aware of their cultural selves and subsequently less likely to discuss culture in supervision (Bernard, 1994 & 2004) or more specifically broach issues related to obvious racial differences. Helms and Cook (1999) also note that it is the supervisor's racial identity status that has a more powerful role in shaping interactions between supervisor and supervisee (Bhat & Davis, 2007). The supervisor whose behavior has been shaped by the dominant culture needs to have an understanding of the cultural identity of the supervisee and must possess skills and knowledge to work competently with persons from diverse backgrounds or risk limiting the growth of the supervisee (Gardner, 2002). It is equally as pertinent for the supervisor of color to have the same understanding and devise ways of assisting supervisees whether Black or White in similar competency development.

Disparities between supervisors and supervisees on levels of racial identity status or racial-cultural competencies, independent of race or ethnicity, present potential challenges in supervisory relationships (Chen, 2004). Supervision dyads with parallel high racial identity interaction had the strongest working alliance, whereas dyads with parallel low racial identity interaction had the weakest working alliance (Bhat & Davis,

2007) which suggest that working alliance and the development of a positive supervisory relationship was most pronounced when supervisors rated their supervisees as attaining a more advanced racial identity status or at least one comparable to their own. Cook (1994) further states that individuals of the same status that are “parallel” and share the same attitudes about people of color and Whites represent a supervisory dyad that is complimentary and functional. In a study conducted by Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso (1999) it was concluded that White racial identity attitudes significantly influenced counselor trainees perception of the working alliance in same-racial and cross-racial counseling dyads. Their findings allude to the idea that White racial identity may affect a counselor’s ability to form a productive working alliance beyond supervision with the client.

Supervision Relationship and Working Alliance

Counseling supervision takes place in a relational context, making the supervisory relationship of paramount importance and equally salient (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Watkins, 1997). Bordin (1983) first introduced the concept of the working alliance and can be conceptualized as a model comprised of three components; (1) goals, (2) tasks, and (3) bond. These three working alliance components can be used as a framework for providing direction for what occurs during counseling supervision (Wood, 2005). Building a strong working alliance involves mutual agreement and understanding regarding the goals sought in the change process and the tasks of each

partner. The extent to which the supervisor and supervisee trust each other, respect one another, and care for each other is known as the bond (Wood, 2005). Necessary in the process of establishing goals and tasks as well as developing a supervisor-supervisee bond is the understanding of each other's cultural background and worldview (Sue & Sue, 1999). Issues related to the practicum experience have included inadequate discussion of supervisee's feeling and attitudes regarding cultural differences as well as the lack of experience with culturally diverse supervisees (Cook, 1994; Gardner, 2002).

The dynamics of the supervisory encounter are greatly impacted in the supervisor's and the supervisee's attempts to either avoid or engage with issues of racial and cultural differences and similarities (Tummala-Narra, 2004). This limitation was found in a study conducted by Webb (2005), which identified a positive correlation between supervisee's perception of the level of rapport with a supervisor and the ability to disclose sensitive issues related directly to the client. Similarly, sensitive issues relating to the supervisor and the supervision itself could be discussed with greater openness where there existed a high level of rapport with the supervisor (Webb, 2005). The notion that counselors frequently misconstrue rapport to mean initial "small talk" designed to put the counselee at ease (Vontress, 1971) remains alive and well within therapeutic sessions and also supervision. Harrison and Carek (1966) indicated that rapport is not merely a "small talk" conversation but rather an emotional bridge or line of communication. One could suspect that based on the former research, that racial differences could impact one's ability to be open about such differences within a

supervisory context. Gatmon, Jackson, Koshkarian, Martos-Perry, Molina, Patel, & Rodolfa (2001) suggest that cultural discussions contribute to personal growth, validation, and increased safety and trust.

In the literature that evaluates the relationship between client and therapist (Lui & Pope-Davis, 2004), the *real relationship* (Gelso & Carter, 1994; Sexton & Whiston, 1994) has been denoted by the connection between client and therapist. Such a relationship is often represented by honesty and the capacity to be genuine, and free from distortions. These same concepts appears to have applicability within the supervisory dyad as literature specifically identifies empathic connection, fostering safety, support, trust, respect, genuineness, self-knowledge, tolerance as themed characteristics of great value within the supervisory relationship (Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). When addressing the additional variable of race related issues in supervision, Gatmon et al. (2001) states that a safe atmosphere, depth of dialogue, and frequent opportunities to discuss cultural issues contribute to better alliances, increased satisfaction, professional growth, validation, and trust. Self-disclosure is especially critical in the rapport establishing phase of the relationship because it is the most direct means by which an individual can make himself known to another person. Racial differences become crucial barriers to self –disclosure (Vontress, 1971).

Gardner (2002) conducted an investigation that identified which factors in supervision relationships contribute or limit a growth-promoting climate by interviewing

eight racial minority supervisees. With respect to the interpersonal bond, positive supervisory experiences were associated with supervisees describing their supervisors as genuine, empathic, and respectful. Supervisees felt supervisors were competent if they were knowledgeable, demonstrated good facilitative skills, and possessed attributes of compassion, concern, fairness, honesty, openness, and compassion. Overall, supervision experiences described as rewarding characterized their supervisors as being receptive, dedicated, genuine, humble, empathic, respectful, and humorous. Additionally, being able to communicate interest in and caring for supervisees were also important (Cook, 1994).

Falender & Shafranske (2004) add that a nonjudgmental stance, attitude of acceptance, encouragement to explore, integrity, and relational qualities are important. There were many supervisees and supervisors who discussed the influence of race on the supervision experience. The supervisees who viewed the supervision experience positively did not believe their supervisors ascribed to racial stereotypes (Gardner, 2002). Conversely, a study conducted by Kolk (1974) stated that Black students expected their supervisors to be less empathic and respectful. This same mistrust likely plays out in the supervisory relationship when the supervisor identifies as Black with a supervisee identifying as White depending on racial identity status among other variables. Kolk (1974) further illustrates that race is an issue in the supervision for Black trainees and believed that Black trainees learn to expect low levels of acceptance and understanding from Whites as a result of the racism and prejudice that almost all Black students experience as part of the educational system.

Variations of this dynamic are still prevalent in current literature as Constantine (1997) reported that supervisees and their supervisors spent only 15% of their supervision time addressing cultural issues (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005). Supervisees and supervisors revealed that more time spent discussing culture would have enhanced the supervisory relationship, and such discussions influence the “quality, content, process, and outcome, of supervision” (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005). This study comprised of racially similar and racially different supervisory dyads found that racial minorities spent more time discussing cultural issues than White supervisors indicating that racially different supervision dyads were more likely to consider language, race, and racial identity as issues applicable to the supervision process than did supervisors in racially similar supervision dyads. Hence, race may be more of a cultural reality for racial minority supervisors and as a result spent more time discussing such issues in same race supervision dyads.

Helms (1990) formally stated that racial attitudes toward self, for individuals who classify themselves as “White” develop in relation to their attitudes toward Blacks (Utsey & Garnet, 2002). This may account for the reasons White supervisors and White supervisee’s spend less time addressing racial factors unless a critical incident or client of color enters the dynamic of the relationship. Supervision difficulties experienced by racial ethnic minority supervisors are illustrated in Toporek et al. (2004) who reported that some supervisees challenged their authority and made negative assumptions when

cultural issues were discussed in supervision. A study conducted by Kleintjes and Swartz (1996) found that in White universities the silent culture of a “colourless zone” is often felt and internalized resulting in Black trainees not feeling secure enough to raise the issue of color, hence being ignored at greater cost (Falender & Shafranske, 2004).

Now that researchers have illustrated the components empirically supported as key factors in the development and sustainability of a positive working alliance and ultimately a valuable supervisory relationship, we must consider the racial implications that impact the ability for such a relationship to be acquired. Carter & Pieterse (2004) state that, Whites have not been taught how they live as oppressors and the social and personal costs to them. One could suspect that this unknown aspect of inherited “Whiteness” results in the difficulty to build authentic connections with persons of color either personally or professionally and serves as one of many personal costs to the overarching systems of racism and oppression. As a result of such costs, Whites can lose compassion, the ability to hear and feel others experiences, the ability to be kind, and the ability to be just (Carter & Pieterse, 2004) based on the racial dynamic and presenting issues associated with it. Such limitations could make it difficult to express characteristics associated with positive supervision working alliances and directly impede the ability for cross-racial supervision relationships to develop authentically. The influence of racial differences on the supervision process has been examined thoroughly as researchers have speculated that racially mixed dyads are more conflictual than racially similar dyads (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005).

Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson (2002) propose four aspects of contemporary prejudices held by Whites toward Blacks in the United States that contribute to the divergence of perceptions and interracial distrust in the United States: (1) Contemporary racism among Whites is subtle, (2) these racial biases are often unintentional and unconscious, (3) these biases influence the perceptions that Whites and Blacks have of these same behaviors or events, and (4) these racial biases have different consequences on the outcomes for Blacks and Whites. Literature has found that despite the charge for acknowledging and addressing race, culture, and the larger and safer scope of multiculturalism within supervision; the training gap in racial-cultural issues appear to be one of the major contributors to the difficulties experienced in supervision (Reynolds, 2004). Although more publications have been exploring the effects of race and racial identity on the supervision process (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999; Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Cook, 1994; Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997) these writings have often focused on how to assist White supervisees or supervisors in increasing their racial-cultural competence through supervision (Reynolds, 2004).

Recent literature that has explored the dynamics associated with supervisors of color (Kushner, 1999) and supervisees of color in a homogenous supervisory relationship with a supervisor of color (Banks-Johnson, 2002) has produced varied results in relation to the working alliance. Some studies suggest that findings specific to race matching and working alliance have not indicated that matched race supervision dyads have a stronger

more positively viewed working alliance (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Gatmon et al. 2001; Ladney et al., 1997), while other research (Kushner, 1999; Banks-Johnson, 2002) suggests that supervisees of color and supervisors of color experience a more immediate sense of commonality, connection, and relationship. Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis (2004) conducted a study that found openness, support, culturally relevant supervision, and opportunities to work with multicultural activities as positive critical incidents.

One of the common critical incidents that arise from a supervisory relationship comprised of a supervisor of color where the supervisee is White, remains the notion that the supervisor is all knowing with respect to cultural competencies and serves as the expert on racial and cultural information. This type of co-dependence on the supervisor of color illustrates a negative critical incident and serves to perpetuate a lack of initiative on the part of the supervisee to explore beyond the requirements of the supervisory relationship (Tummala-Narra, 2004). This dynamic, could potentially impact a well-balanced and more positive working alliance. This could ultimately serve to shape and impact the supervision relationship as a whole.

Rosen & Frank (1962) share that negative transference issues do not always lead to obvious expressions as they often manifests in sullen reserve, loquaciousness, obsequious overaffability, or even frequent smiles (Vontress, 1971). Beyond basic competency development Hays & Chang (2003) propose that supervisors create a safe

environment of honesty and openness about how their own racial and cultural heritage influence counseling and the supervisory relationships. They acknowledged that it is pertinent that supervisors openly and honestly discuss with the supervisee the impact race, racism, and oppression have on counseling relationships and personal development. Addressing race, racism, and oppression within the supervision relationship could prove to be especially challenging when we consider the fact that authentic discussions about such topics still appear to be socially taboo and confrontational.

When a supervision relationship is characterized primarily by a majority-minority dynamic it could lead to feelings of fragmentation, disempowerment, mistrust, and hypervigilance (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001) particularly on the part of the minority whether supervisor or supervisee. Priest (1994) highlighted how concerns about how others perceive them and the challenges of self-examination may be a unique consideration or dilemma for supervisors of color (Reynolds, 2004), and could potentially remain a variable in self-efficacy for supervisors of color. Concerns salient to dyads of White supervisors and supervisees of color, described in detail by Fong and Lease (1997), include issues of unintentional racism, power dynamics, miscommunication, distrust, and vulnerability in supervision (Chen, 2004). Supervisors of color with White supervisees may face challenges such as supervisor patronization and supervisee resistance or supervisors of color could have their level of competence called into question, both overtly and covertly by their white supervisees and may doubt the

supervisors level of expertise (Chen, 2004; Priest, 1994). It has been suggested that racial ethnic minorities may be reluctant to introduce cultural issues in supervision for fear of being labeled a “trouble maker” (Peterson, 1991) or perceived as having a cultural agenda (Priest, 1994). Lee (2005) writes candidly about the indoctrination to bypass issues of oppression and race in presenting problems, which could easily be transferred into the silencing of similar barriers in supervision practices. Communication and power have been the most prevalent supervisory concerns related to cross-racial supervision relationships.

Communication and Power

Communication and communication styles are key factors in supervisory relationships (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006) and are influenced by race, ethnicity, culture, and gender (Sue & Sue, 1999). Ignoring the impact of racial or cultural issues in the supervisory relationship can create or heighten conflict and miscommunication (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Cook, 1994; Daniels et al., 1999; Helms & Cook, 1999; Reynolds, 2004). Such conflict can be directly attributed to the notion that Blacks and Whites assign different meaning to their own behavior and the behaviors of others, which reflect Black and White perspectives (Kochman, 1981). Kochman (1981) also notes that Black and White cultural differences are generally ignored when attempts are made to understand how and why Black and White communication fails. Cross-racial and cross-cultural supervision literature continuously points out the tendency for miscommunication and misperception to contribute to

ineffective communication. However, the literature has failed to look beyond simply identifying communication as important in supervision and seek to gain greater understanding into how meanings, attitudes, beliefs, and expectations are not only communicated verbally and nonverbally but how they are experienced in the supervision dyad. Not to do so will allow for both parties (Black and White) to assume that the meanings they assign to all matters are the same (Kochman, 1981).

Two aspects of communication that are particularly important in culturally appropriate supervision are context and complementarity (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006). Complementarity is based on the notion that communication occurs across three important levels; universal, group, and individual (Leong, 1996). When complementarity goes unrecognized and unaddressed, this may lead to decreased supervisory rapport (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2007). Failing to discuss cultural issues in supervision may lead to miscommunication, misunderstandings, “hidden” agendas, assumptions, and disconnections between supervisors and supervisees (Constantine, 1997). Miscommunication in the interracial supervision dyad occurs when differences in communication styles, verbal and nonverbal, relationship expectations, racial attitudes, interpersonal style, and perception of roles are not monitored appropriately which if addressed unsuccessfully could contribute to a sense of distrust and vulnerability (Chen, 2004; Daniels et al. 1999; Reynolds, 2004).

Critical to the understanding of communication and non-verbal communication specifically when engaged in cross-racial dyads has been identified by Dovidio, Gaertner,

Kawakami, & Hodson (2002) who emphasize that White impressions of their behaviors were related primarily to their explicit attitudes, whereas Black's impressions of Whites were related mainly to Whites' implicit attitudes. They go on to conclude that because people and their interaction partners have different perspectives and different access to thoughts and observable behaviors, there is significant potential for miscommunication, particularly in cross-racial instances. Kochman's (1981) text entitled, *Black and White Styles in Conflict*, further distinguishes some social differences in racial communicative patterns.

Where Whites use the relatively detached and unemotional discussion mode to engage an issue, Blacks use the more emotionally intense and involving mode of argument. Where Whites tend to understate their exceptional talents and abilities, blacks tend to boast about theirs. Where White men...defuse the potency of their sexual messages by disguising their sexual content, Black men make their sexual interest explicit and hope to infuse their presentations with sexual potency through artful, bold, and audacious sexual proposals. (Kochman, 1981 – p. 106-107)

While Kochman's text clearly reflects racial communication differences of nearly 30 years ago, it is still helpful to note that such differences have and in some respects still exists and further illustrate the need for additional and more current exploration. One of the more critical distinctions displayed by Kochman (1981) is that differing potencies of

Black and White public presentations are a regular cause of communicative conflict. As displayed in the above quote, the emotionless and more restrained style of interaction is in direct opposition to the more emotion-filled and expressive interactions of Blacks.

Black presentations are emotionally intense, dynamic and demonstrative; White presentations are more modest and emotionally restrained (Kochman, 1981). Because the supervision process could potentially be considered a public presentation and potentially embody the same type of interaction for incongruent communication styles and patterns to take place, it is essential to recognize how racial difference take shape in the supervision. Equally as critical is to begin to further explore the potential congruence or incongruence in communicative patterns of racially similar supervision dyads.

Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis (2004) found that negative perceptions and experiences resulted from conflicts in communication and in the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. The literature has consistently identified communication issues in all its variations could potentially have a beneficial or detrimental effect on the supervision relationship. Communication can be greatly influenced by the power differential often ascribed to the supervisor. Helms and Cook (1999), note that it is the supervisor's racial identity status that has a more powerful role in shaping interactions between supervisor and supervisee (Bhat & Davis, 2007). While the typical supervision dyad attributes power to the supervisor one questions how power dynamic may be altered when taking into consideration the power status associated with white privilege and social hierarchy. In supervision relationships where the supervisee is

Caucasian and the supervisor is a person of color, both participants may attribute power to the Caucasian or majority group membership (Young, 2004).

Michele Owens-Patterson (2000) states that there exists the potential for supervisor and/or supervisee to respond in a manner that will maintain the more familiar power relationship. She contends that the specialness of this arrangement derives from the reality of racism and discrimination on a broader societal level that usually results in the White person in the dyad occupying the position of conferred expertise, knowledge, and power. One such common power struggle is displayed when White social norms and comforts take precedent over Black emotion. This type of struggle produces an environment where Blacks are left invalidated and must suppress feelings or risk disturbing socially acceptable displays of emotion, which are typically based on White norms. This could be described as an exercise of power and privilege. Kochman (1981) solidifies that the different considerations to feelings most frequently experienced and most troublesome are those incidents that threaten to override White established order and procedure.

For supervision to be effective in the development of therapist, addressing racial-cultural issues must be viewed as fundamental to the process of supervision (Reynolds, 2004). Power impacts the supervisory process, where the supervisor's power to assess the therapist efficacy, to guide his or her performance and influence patient outcomes is ever present particularly in interracial triads. The impact of power and its meaning for all interracial parties is present on at least three levels: (1) within the context of race

relations and their associated hierarchies in the United States, (2) within the broader context of clinical practice, and (3) within the context of the supervisory process (Michele Owens-Patterson, 2000). The price of ignoring race in supervision specifically may be greatest for those with the least amount of power (Cook, 1994). Power dynamics in the supervision process and its impact on the ability of both supervisor and supervisee to freely address racial and cultural issues must be acknowledged and explored (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Porter, 1995). When the supervisor is White and the supervisee and the client are both African American, the White supervisor's belief in his or her own normalcy, superiority, or essential "rightness" is assumed, and with that assumption the supervisee's and patient's "difference" may in fact be confirmed. When the supervisor and the patient are African American and the supervisee is White, the supervisee may experience his or her racial/ethnic difference more profoundly (Michele Owens-Patterson, 2000).

Eckler – Hart (1987) point out that supervision can evoke a fear of being found inadequate not only as a therapist but also in terms of success or failure as a person (Webb, 2000), this leads one to explore such notions when taking into consideration cross-racial supervision where the supervisor is a person of color and the societal white power differential works against the supervision power differential. When European Americans supervise ethnic minority trainees, the power differential is often exaggerated (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006). Such a power differential greatly impedes the building of a positive supervision relationship and could potentially be damaging to

the idea of developing a satisfactory and positive working alliance. Hird et al. (2001) conducted in-depth interviews and found that cultural interactions greatly affected the dynamics of the supervision relationship in terms of power and lack of discussion in supervision regarding cultural issues resulting in individuals with the least socio-cultural or contextual power experiencing the greatest negative effect.

Toporek, Villalobos, & Pope-Davis (2004) support the notion that supervisors of color report feeling that their supervisees challenged their authority and made negative assumptions about their attempts at socially addressing multicultural issues in supervision. The supervisory role, laden with social power over both supervisee and client, influence whether racial identities either evolve or are suppressed (Helms & Cook, 1999; Rankin IV, & Siegel, Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, 2006). While the notion of power and miscommunication greatly impact supervisory relationships for persons of color, whether in the supervisor or supervisee role; it also proves to greatly influence White supervisees. Whites are as diverse a population as any other group, and greater consciousness needs to be raised among Whites that they do have a culture, a history, and a story (Falender & Shafranske, 2004). The cross-racial dyad is comprised of many variables that are not present in homogenous dyads derived of white supervisor and white supervisee as we have come to recognize that racial issues do not arise as consistently.

Racial-cultural factors affect the intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics in the supervision relationship (Helms & Cook, 1999). An ethnic minority supervisor may be the first non-European American instructor a supervisee encounters. Because supervision

is intended to assist supervisees in integrating their personal and professional identities (Bradley, 1989) race should not be ignored, as supervisees may not develop fully integrated professional identities (Cook, 1994). The limitations and obstacles associated with supervisors of color broaching race and racism as a part of professional development must be explored further. Supervisors who are committed to competent training must be willing to withstand their own awkwardness and discomfort in dealing with race as they teach their supervisees to “break the silence” in revealing and openly discussing their racial identity attitudes (Cook, 1994).

The inability for supervisors or supervisees to address racial dynamics within the supervisory relationship could be avoidance due to discomfort in addressing such issues. In particular, White counselor trainees struggle with actively acknowledging the importance of racial issues in U.S. society (Casas, 2005). Personal values and attitudes derived from socio-cultural or other personal influences may delimit one’s ability to understand and to empathically attune to the other’s experiences and worldviews. Miss-attunement, whether based on socio-cultural insensitivity or other personal factors, may cause clients or supervisees to experience the therapist or supervisor as not being understanding and helpful (Falender & Shafranske, 2004).

Depending on the White supervisees racial identity status, Swim & Miller (1999) found that awareness of white privilege and racism may create guilt and anxiety, potentially leading to the resistance to engage in racial discussions in classroom settings (Hays & Chang, 2003). This same concept in addition to the notion of racial power easily

translates to supervision relationships especially considering the more intimate dynamic, particularly if the supervisor is a person of color. Utsey & Gernat's (2002) study illustrate that White counselor trainees struggle with acknowledging the importance of racial issues and effectively dealing with the intense feelings that may accompany such issues. Whites who are challenged to deal with their own racism may experience the same feelings indicated above (e.g. guilt and anxiety) that are masked by anger and frustration toward other racial and ethnic groups. They further note that feelings of "White privilege" may cause some Whites to subconsciously express feelings of anger and hostility because of their awareness that they benefit from undeserved favorable treatments. It is likely that supervisees will feel unsupported, blamed, and even defensive, while the supervisor of color feels disempowered and frustrated when addressing the issues illustrated above (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005).

The need to avoid anxiety about the differences between African American supervisor and White supervisee frequently results in the denial that issues of power (as they relate to race, status, and therapy) are present in the therapeutic (or supervisory) space just as they are present in the outside world (Michele Owens-Patterson, 2000). Before it is possible for the supervisee and supervisor to explore issues of White privilege in supervision, it is necessary to understand how the constructs of race, racism, and oppression intertwine with privilege (Hays & Chang, 2003). These topics of discussion are ones that could ignite great anxiety and are often not easily broached or received.

Supervisors of color have expressed feeling unprepared to deal with issues of white privilege and racism, hence tiptoeing around such issues (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005). A supervisor may bypass the possibility of being perceived as racist by undermining racially relevant clinical material in supervision (Tummala-Narra, 2004). This same avoidance may be exhibited with supervisees in an effort to be seen favorably in the eyes of the racial minority supervisor.

Counselors who are not fully cognizant of the ways in which they import racism into the counseling and supervision relationship may be unable to effectively meet the mental health needs of racially and ethnically diverse individuals (Utsey & Gernat, 2002). Likewise, Peterson (1991) found that a lack of attention to such relevant issues in this form of counselor training may have a negative impact on the supervision relationship. Conversely, an attitude of not acknowledging privilege categorically silences and invalidates the reality of the person of color (Lee, 2005), illustrating yet another form of privilege and exertion of power.

These discussions become even more difficult when the focus goes beyond traditional awareness building practices and competency skill sets, and are related directly to the conflictual racial dynamic exhibited between minority supervisors and their supervisees as well as the unconscious ways in which supervisors and supervisees respond to one another based on previously acquired social understandings of race. Webb (2000) acknowledged in an investigation of the literature on supervision that there is

reluctance on the part of both the supervisor and supervisee to address feelings in supervision. All of these factors contribute to the use of euphemistic language as a means of making those in dominate racial categories feel comfortable discussing uncomfortable oppressive circumstances and ideologies. Another strategy often exhibited in counseling setting as well as supervision settings include the notion for one to disassociate oneself from being White. This is expressed by deliberately directing attention to others of a different racial identification or simply rationalizing ones attitudes or behaviors away from their own observed Whiteness (Lee, 2005). These tactics prevent the development of therapeutically authentic supervisory relationships, which can only be derived from trusting and authentic dialogue and interaction.

Lee (2005) expressed the impact that absorbing disturbing and hurtful statements while accepting them in passive silence had on his ability to share “self” and be authentic with clients. Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, & Ho (2001) held sessions structured around discussions of multicultural supervision and found that discussions were initiated with cautious self-disclosure demonstrating the necessity for the development of trust and safety. Once more trust and safety were developed they further note that group participants began to take more risk, disclose personal experiences, and emotionally supported one another hence paralleling the process of multicultural supervision relationships and its cautious trust-developing nature. Furthermore, it was noted that “good multicultural supervision doesn’t feel like multicultural supervision” but rather attempts to understand the conceptualizations of supervisees.” Considerable fears about

being thought badly of by the supervisor, and of abilities being assessed negatively, were reported as inhibiting disclosure regarding supervisee feelings toward or about supervision (Webb, 2000). These limitations make didactic components of training within cross-racial supervision dyads most difficult.

The didactic component to training addresses two major content areas: (1) general racial-cultural issues, and (2) issues and challenges specific to supervision. Specific attention should be given to their manifestations in the counseling or supervision processes (Chen, 2004). Common problems or issues in supervision unique to race and racially derived issues include over and under-interpretations of the influence of race and culture, avoidance of racial-cultural issues, and interactions dictated by a fear of being perceived as culturally insensitive or racist (Chen, 2004; Helms, 1999; Leong & Wagner, 1994). One challenge Reynolds (1995) identified with overemphasis on the didactic component of the learning process within supervision relationships, is the notion that the process may lead to an intellectual exercise that obscures the complexity of racial-cultural issues and allows supervisees to minimize the need to examine their own racial-cultural beliefs and assumptions. Another approach to such concerns was addressed by Helms and Cook (1999) who propose that supervisors utilize a here-and-now focus to uncover and clarify the nature of racial identity interactions. However, they further note that many supervisors do not know how to address race and culture in the here and now with their supervisees, even though they are able to use the same here-and-now skills in teaching supervisees how to be effective therapist generally (Chen, 2004).

The inability for supervisors to address these racial dynamics within the supervisory relationship could be a result of their lack of awareness indicating their identity development status or the discomfort and uncertainty about how to address such issues. The profession of counseling psychology must address sociopolitical factors (e.g. racism, stereotyping, oppression) that affect the psychosocial development of racial-ethnic minorities of which have only recently received the attention they merit (Casas, 2005); sociopolitical factors that often find their way into the supervision experience.

In supervision dyads two people meet and immediately engage in a negotiation assessing similarities and dissimilarities, some of which are based on presumed race (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). The extent to which the supervision relationship is a collaborative one with respect to training is largely influenced by theoretical orientation. Nonetheless, there is a collaborative nature to the overall experience. It is fair to suggest that supervisors as well as supervisees impact the climate of openness experienced and illustrate the notion that both supervisor and supervisee bring something to the supervision relationship. The extent to which supervisors become visibly uncomfortable and consistently reframe issues related to race and racism continue to perpetuate the discomfort and unresolved issues pervasive in supervisory dyads (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). This ultimately supports the status quo and inhibits counseling psychology in the progressive movement toward more multicultural practices. The following excerpt from Gardner (2002) illustrates the impact of race and cultural implications on practice and therapist competence.

A lot of times I thought that some of the things he would hear on tapes or some of the situations that they were going through he wouldn't completely understand because they were of two totally different cultures. So a lot of advice and insights he would have, I wouldn't necessarily agree with and I think that it did have an impact on the interaction. (Gardner, 2002 – p. 102)

This difference in perception and understanding led to the supervisor and supervisee disagreeing on the client's diagnosis and further emphasized the potentially detrimental impact disparities of racial and cultural understanding could have on client well-being. It also illuminates implications for the climate of the working alliance between the racial minority supervisee and the White supervisor. The paradigm of African American supervisor and African American supervisee has the potential for particularly intense experiences in the confrontation of the color difference (both in therapy and in supervision) because of the powerful symbolic associations of African American-ness and Whiteness, and the powerful meaning and effect of race and racism in the United States (Michele Owens-Patterson, 2000). Ultimately, supervisors of color are experiencing grave limitation in how they deal with issues in supervision centered around race and racism often feeling conflicted about supervisees, angry, fearful, incompetent, invisible, unprepared, invalidated, vulnerable, uncomfortable, confused, doubtful, and lonely greatly impacting their ability to remain authentic and compassionate toward supervisees (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005).

African American supervisees go on to note unique descriptors such as language/dialect, cultural sensitivity, and communication styles as necessary in growth promoting climates. Much of the research identifies which supervision characteristics are necessary for the experience to be positive and beneficial for supervisees. However, it remains to be explored if and how these same characteristics are necessary with respect to supervisors of color. Furthermore how they are expressed, communicated, perceived, and received are potential areas for extended exploration in an effort to better practice and operationalize the characteristics we already find to be critical to working alliance and positive growth-promoting supervision experiences. We must actively foster departmental and program environments in which the pain, anger, embarrassment, and shame that racism provokes can be named, shared, and processed dispelling the notion that maintaining a professional identity of being the “good guy” as valued over supporting the clinical training for students of color (Ali, Flojo, Chronister, Hayashino, Smiting, Torres, & McWhirter, 2005).

Finally, supervision needs to provide a safe place for the exploration of the personal responses to the psychological demands placed on the psychotherapist, taking into account that negative reactions come with the clinical territory (Falender & Shafranske, 2004). Better understanding of the “growing pains” of authentically and honestly exploring limitations surrounding issues related to race, racism, and oppression will allow for us to contribute to the dearth of treatment and developmental narratives

(Lee, 2005) pertinent to address these issues in supervision. Retreating from these situations and the charge to address such realities in counseling supervision potentially places our profession in the position of being yet another system of oppression (Lee, 2005).

Based on previous and current literature we have come to recognize that racial dynamics greatly influence supervision dyads ultimately shaping characteristics identified as contributors to positive supervision experiences. Racial identity development models have been examined, signifying the importance of complementary statuses. Ultimately, we have come to understand that multicultural supervision is essentially as critical as the overarching multicultural counseling movement and should be explored in more depth. The cross-racial and cross-cultural supervision literature has also specified common themes around power and communication as potential impediments to cross racial and cross-cultural learning itself as well as relationship development among supervisor and supervisee. What is currently lacking in the literature is greater understanding into the experiences of supervisors who self-identify as African American providing supervision to supervisees whom also self-identify as African American. By exploring emerging racial supervision relationships such as this one in combination with the already explored cross-racial supervision; there is the potential to gain greater knowledge into the unique needs, expectations, and characteristics of underrepresented homogenous supervision dyads.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Many have explored multicultural concepts within the supervision dyad; however in-depth experiences of race relations have yet to be explored from the unique perspective of the African American supervisor. Prior literature has looked at cross-racial supervision experiences from the perspective of minority supervisees (Banks-Johnson, 2002; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004) and from minority supervisors (Banks-Johnson, 2002; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin IV, & Siegel, 2006) but have yet to delve into the experiences of African American supervisors solely and specifically. We know the characteristics that constitute positive supervision experiences within the traditional context, just as we have also become aware of the characteristics that constitute negative supervision experiences; particularly within racialized supervision dyads. The review of literature up to this point has illustrated what we know about African American supervision expectations and assumptions with respect to cross-racial supervision. As such, we must begin to explore these assumptions and expectations when African Americans engage in the supervision process together. Furthermore, one must gain greater awareness of the proposed power dynamic when it is not convoluted by the socio-racial hierarchy we have all grown accustomed to.

In full, the prior review of literature illustrates a clear definition of race within the context of this study, supervisory training, cross-cultural and cross-racial research. In an

effort to expand the literature attuned to race relations in supervision, the present study allowed for a focus on African American supervisors full range of supervision experiences. The central aim for the present research is to illuminate the experiences of race relations from the perspective of one particular racial group – African American supervisors. No prior research has explicitly captured the voices and experiences of racial minority supervisors in this capacity. The identified limitations and challenges of cross-racial supervision support the need for this study to unveil potential advantages in same-race supervision experiences. Literature further articulates the need for initiative in addressing diversity dimensions, the importance of being aware of the impact of the social hierarchy present in supervision, and the call for more mentoring of future therapist of color (Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin IV, & Siegel, 2006). However, previous literature did not address or focus on the supervisory relationship.

African Centered Approach to Qualitative Inquiry

Within American psychology, the preferred methodology for conducting research has been experimental and quantitative in nature as it is considered to be superior with respect to validity (Belgrave & Allison, 2006). However, experimentation may not be the best way to obtain information about African Americans and some scholars have cautioned against using pure experimentation to gain greater understanding of African Americans (e.g. Belgrave, & Allison, 2006; Carruthers, 1996; Semaj, 1996). Belgrave and Allison (2006) further note that a more naturalistic method, such as interviewing or observation, may be more useful with African American populations. Storm et al. (2001)

indicated that there is a need for an increase in both quantitative and qualitative research on diversity dimensions in supervision (Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin IV, & Siegel, 2006). However, many researchers have recognized the importance of qualitative methodology to better explore diversity issues. Utsey, Hammer, and Gernat (2005) found that an over-reliance on quantitative approaches restricts the ability of researchers to capture the complex dynamics inherent in cross-racial counseling and supervision context.

In support of this notion, Toporak, Ortega-Villalobos and Pope-Davis (2004) found it empirically necessary for more qualitative research to be conducted as it is also essential that studies focus on how specific cultural variables (e.g. race, ethnicity, gender, religion, class, sexual orientation) for which supervisor and supervisee differ. Rigorous qualitative studies that investigate supervisees' experiences in culturally different and similar supervision relationships are still needed (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). Although not specific to issues of race, earlier works by Giorgi (1985) claim that the natural scientific approach could not do justice to human phenomena. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) qualitative methodology is enhanced by credibility and makes findings and interpretations reliable. While a majority of the research supporting the need for more intensive and rigorous qualitative inquiry appears to be within the scope of cross-racial literature (Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felixe, & Ho, 2001; Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin IV, & Siegel, 2006), qualitative inquiry with respect to its relevance in gaining greater understanding of race in general remains pertinent to future research.

Historically culture and race has been approached as a variable (Parham, White, & Ajamau, 2002). This conceptual flaw has greatly limited the impact and conceptual understanding of race and race relations within therapeutic settings as well as training and supervision. Furthermore, a vast majority of studies conducted by psychologist on African Americans during the first half of the 20th century were studies that compared Colored, Negroes, and Blacks with Whites (Belgrave & Allison, 2006).

One cannot adequately conceptualize the lived experience of African Americans without adopting an African-Centered perspective. Parham, White, and Ajamau (2002) contend that one of the primary flaws of psychological inquiry rests in the limitation of our research practices with a European focus rather than adapting our efforts to better fit the population in question. They further note that theory and methodology are culture-bound, that is to say that they are derived from a people's worldview and assumptions about the nature of reality. For this reason, the exploration of race relations in the supervision relationship when both parties identify as African American is most appropriately addressed using a qualitative approach that is sensitive to the potential uniqueness of the African American experience. The behavior of African Americans is rooted in both African and American culture (Belgrave & Allison, 2006). Originally elaborated upon by Cole (1970), Parham, White, and Ajamau (2002) posit that African American students must successfully navigate three distinct but interrelated realms of experience of the mainstream Euro-American cultural experience as normative, the minority experience as typified by the African Americans' marginalized status in

American society, as well as an Afrocultural orientation. The terms Africentric, Afrocentric, African-Centered, and Black psychology are often used interchangeably to reference the experience of African Americans in the field of psychology. Asante (2003) refers to Afrocentricity as a mode of thought and action in which the centrality of African interest, values, and perspectives is dominant. Essentially, it is placing African people in the center of any analysis (Asante, 2003). Utsey, Belvet, and Fischer (2009) further emphasize the conceptual foundation of the African/Black personality are grounded in African philosophical notions of the self. In defining this concept, African-centered psychology is that which is concerned with understanding and/or explaining the psychological experiences of African-descent persons from an African reality and worldview (Grills, 2002; Utsey, Belvet, & Fischer, 2009). Because it is impossible to understand the lifestyles of Black people using traditional theories developed by White people to explain White people (White, 1972); it is necessary to more intentionally employ an African-Centered perspective with respect to exploring supervision for African American supervisors.

Methodological literature related to race often reference Critical Race Theory (CRT) as the conceptual framework. Critical Race Theory focuses theoretical attention on race and how racism is deeply embedded within the framework of American society (Parker & Lynn, 2002). While this study is focused on the experiences of race relations from the perspective of African American supervisors, and recognizes that racism has directly shaped the experience of minorities in the psychological field; its foundation

does not rest within the Critical Race Theory (CRT) framework. The primary goal of this study is to illuminate the unique experiences of African American supervisors in its entire capacity without limiting or labeling the study by utilizing a narrow theoretical model. Finally, Parham, White, and Ajamau (2002) acknowledge the struggle of how best to understand, study, and appreciate Africanness in an American context within a replicable research methodology.

African- centered perspectives in addition to the historical understanding of any limitations present within current methodological approaches, is critical to further inquiry into the African American supervisor experience. Such sensitivity is critical in an effort to lessen the inclination to inherit European centered biases. Intentionally focusing on and giving voice to the African American supervisory experience will aid in greater conceptualization of their training. To do so will support research efforts of eliminating racist oppression of silencing this population. African Americans in general have said that they see race as a determining factor in their lives, especially in the areas of education, housing, and employment (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). Supervised training is a direct element of the educational institutions of counselor education, counseling psychology, and clinical psychology programs and therefore should be explored in a culturally responsive modality from the perspective of the African American participants.

The purpose of this study is to explore African American supervisors' experiences of supervision using a qualitative phenomenological research approach and analyzed

through phenomenological and discourse methods. The type of problem best suited for a phenomenology is one in which it is important to understand several individuals' common experiences in order to develop a deeper understanding about the features of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2007).

Phenomenological Methodology

Methodology refers to the philosophic framework, the fundamental assumptions and characteristics of a human science perspective (Manen, 1990). Qualitative inquiry focuses on meaning in context and requires a data collection instrument that is sensitive to the underlying meaning when gathering and interpreting data (Merriam, 1998). A form of qualitative inquiry, phenomenological research is increasingly appreciated in social science research (Cohen & Omery, 1994; Thorne, 1994). Qualitative methods, such as phenomenology is solely a human science with its subject matter always being structures of meaning of the lived human world (Manen, 1990). This form of research allows for a fuller grasp of what it means to be in the world as a man, a woman, a child, [an African American supervisor], taking into account the sociocultural and historical traditions that have given meaning to our ways of being in the world (Manen, 1990). The main emphasis would be on the essence or structure of an experience (Merriam, 1998). Unique to phenomenological research is the practice of science within the "context of discovery" rather than the "context of verification" (Giorgi, 1985).

To be phenomenological, in general, means to return to the phenomena themselves (Giorgi, 1985), which in this case would be the supervision experience form

the unique perspective of African American supervisors. A phenomenological study describes the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). The fundamental aim of this study will be to explore, capture, and describe what all the participants have in common (Creswell, 2007) with respect to receiving and providing supervision. While the central aim of this study can be captured through a phenomenological approach it is worth noting the similarities to narrative perspectives. In therapeutic settings, individuals turn to narrative to excavate and reassess memories that may have been fragmented, chaotic, unbearable, and/or scarcely visible before narrating them (Riessman, 2008). In this way, the proposed study seeks to connect the experiences of race relations across the professional history for African American supervisors up to the present. Furthermore, narrating in this fashion has effects in social interaction that other modes of communication do not (Riessman, 2008). With race relations at the heart of the proposed study, social interaction is inevitable and will be illuminated during the analysis phase of this study. Despite these narrative similarities the final product from this study is in line with Creswell (2007) who identifies the main purpose of phenomenology is to reduce individual experiences to the description of a universal essence. Phenomenology attempts to disclose the essential meaning of these human experiences (Ray, 1994).

Phenomenology while first and foremost regarded as philosophy; has also evolved to include approach and method (Ray, 1994). Beginning with Husserlian and Heideggerian thought arrived concepts of phenomenology as a philosophical concept.

Husserl (1970) is regarded as the father and central figure to the phenomenological movement and considered it to be philosophy, approach, and method (Cohen & Omery, 1994; Ray, 1994). Following Husserlian and Heideggerian thought came more sophisticated distinctions between *transcendental* (descriptive) and *hermeneutic* (interpretive) traditions of phenomenological inquiry (Ray, 1994). Moustakas (1994) elaborated upon transcendental phenomenology to focus less on the interpretations of the researcher and more on a description of the experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2007). Historically, phenomenology was derived from in-depth philosophical thoughts and has evolved to include a variety of forms including that which is strictly connected to methodological research. Giorgi (1985) specifies a phenomenological perspective specific to psychology, which focuses mainly on description and understanding of phenomena directly relevant to psychology.

Phenomenological methods can best be understood by four characteristics according to Giorgi (1985): (1) descriptive, (2) bracketing, (3) essence, and (4) intentionality. The goal of descriptive phenomenology is to uncover the meaning of an experience from the perspective of those who have had that experience (Cohen & Omery, 1994). This descriptive recollection of experiences is therefore not an individual subjective perspective of meaning but rather one that is fundamental and essential to the experience of others (Cohen & Omery, 1994). Manen (1990) later

developed this concept of hermeneutic phenomenology in his text, *Researching Lived Experience*. He reminds us that phenomenology is not only description, but also an interpretive process rather than viewing each concept separately. According to Cohen and Omery (1994) regard phenomenological study as the only way to really see what surrounds human beings. Because one cannot experience something fully while living through the experience; phenomenological reflection is not introspective but retrospective (Manen, 1990). In other words, phenomenological research consists of reflectively bringing into nearness that which tends to be obscure (Manen, 1990).

Phenomenological inquiry of this form is less interested in the factual status of particular instances but rather the essence of the perceived experience. This approach attempts to describe and interpret these meanings to a certain degree of depth and richness (Manen, 1990). In this instance, phenomenology is an in-depth attempt to uncover and describe the structures and internal meanings of African American supervisor's experiences with race relations specific to receiving and providing supervision. In true form of philosophical assumptions of phenomenology Manen (1990) descriptively offers the following understanding of phenomenological qualitative inquiry:

Lived experience is the starting point and end point of phenomenology and is to transform lived experience into a textual expression of its essence—in such a way that the effect of the text is at once a reflexive re-living and a reflective appropriation of something meaningful: a

notion by which a reader is powerfully animated in his or her own lived experience (Manen, 1990).

Dominant forms of conducting phenomenological research such as the one referenced above requires in-depth interviewing. Seidman (1998) supports the notion that as a method of inquiry, interviewing is most consistent with people's ability to make meaning through language. When investigating phenomena that are not readily articulated by most members and where there is potential for highly conflicted emotions in-depth interviewing is ideal (Johnson, 2002). To be effective and useful, particularly with respect to African American populations (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002), in-depth interviews must develop and build on intimacy. Kvale (1996) recognizes that qualitative interviewing is based on conversation. This conceptual understanding of in-depth interviewing will ultimately aid in the establishment of intimacy. Likewise, psychology cannot operate in a vacuum and is embedded in social and historical factors that constantly influence people and the systems for which they operate (Giorgi, 1985).

Years of misrepresentation and misinterpretation have legitimated skepticism and distrust among African American research participants (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). Casas (1985) states that conceptually biased research paradigms are used in research with racial and ethnic non-dominant groups (Ibrahim & Cameron, 2004). These practices aid in the perpetuation of skewed understanding of people from racial and ethnic backgrounds. Nor do Euro-American research philosophies adequately measure the perspectives of oppressed groups. It is for this reason that the development of trust

through self-disclosure, communication of empathy (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002; Merriam, 1998), and empowerment (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002) throughout the interview process is imperative to acquiring an authentic relationship and gaining truthful data.

These attributes of the interview process are traditionally looked upon as contamination of the interview protocol; however when engaged in research of this nature with African American participants, we must approach the interview process through the lens of an African-Centered framework. This framework relies heavily on relationship and authentic sharing from both the participant and the researcher. This approach is similar to what Jack Douglas (1985) referred to as “creative interviewing”, in which the researcher forges common ground to sharing with the participant (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). The notion that researcher should remain objective by shelving beliefs, values, and experiences, does not always serve well in the pursuit of rich interview data (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). This is of particular importance given the population and the sensitivity of the phenomena in question. It is typical for African American participants to expect an exchange in the interview process rather than a rigid question-answer protocol format. Prior research by Mishler (1986) further cautions that a one-shot meeting with interviewee’s could potentially impede the likelihood of gaining a full understanding of the phenomenon in question (Seidman, 1998). For this reason; the three-series interview approach (Seidman, 1998) to phenomenological interview methodology was used for this study.

The principle task within this study is to adequately explore then describe the phenomenon of supervision practiced by African American supervisors in an effort to avoid premature analytic constructs (Giorgi, 1985). The proposed approach to phenomenological interviewing will allow for the maximum breadth of data before arriving at descriptive conclusions. In addition to the selection of the most appropriate research methodology; making sure the proposed methodology supports the identified tenets of African American culture are equally essential. Those central to the conceptualization of this study include the following as described in the Parham, White, & Ajamau (2002) text entitled, *The Psychology of Blacks*:

- (1) Oral tradition, which is the preference for oral/aural modes of communication.
- (2) Communalism, which is a commitment to social connectedness that includes an awareness that bonds and responsibilities transcend individual privileges.
- (3) Expressive individualism, which is the cultivation of a distinctive personality and proclivity for spontaneous, genuine, and personal expression.
- (4) Affect, which is an emphasis on emotions and feelings, together with a special sensitivity to emotional cues and tendency to be emotionally expressive.

The sensitivity to affect and emotional cues is an orientation that acknowledges the emotional and affective states of self and others (Belgrave & Allison, 2006). Parham, White, and Ajamu (2000) contend that multicultural models in research recognize cultural strengths yet it is not immune to conceptual and methodological flaws that have plagued psychological research efforts in the past and the present. Despite the

multicultural movement, general psychology has yet to provide a full and accurate understanding of Black reality (Parham, White, & Ajamu, 2000) particularly with respect to training and supervision. Interviewing using “standardized” methods has always been problematic with respect to non-mainstream subjects, especially in the area of race (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). The interview process and the interpretation of interview material must take into account how social and historical factors associated with race mediate both the meanings of questions that are asked and how those questions are answered (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). They further note the importance for one to be attuned to both the lived and procedural complexities of the racialized minority experience, as it may help the interviewer engage the participant.

Seidman (1998) highlights the notion that researchers and participants of different racial and ethnic backgrounds face difficulties in establishing an effective interviewing relationship, which has been illustrated by the cross-racial supervision literature previously described. Such research has documented hierarchical power issues and communication issues prevalent in cross-racial dyads; issues that have yet to be explored in supervisory dyads when both parties identify as African American. This has led many to infer that the researchers need to be “insiders” in order to conduct productive, insightful, nuanced, and revealing interviews (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002).

Conversely, we are also aware that racial similarities may not necessarily equate to cultural and social similarities in experience as Seidman (1998) also states that even relationships between individuals of the same racial-ethnic background but of different

genders, class, or age group may have a varied worldview. Based on the text, *Black and White Styles of Conflict* (Kochman, 1981), there tends to be a common understanding of communication prevalent within the African American community, which may aid in the development of more authentic and comfortable dialogue. Orbe and Harris (2008) further emphasize the key for effective communication lies with the other person's ability to decode the phrase in a manner consistent to that in which it was encoded. Meaning is created not by the words themselves, but how the words are interpreted by both parties.

For this reason the ability to communicate effectively depends not only on language capabilities but also commonality of experiences. Because of the shared cultural experiences and an acknowledged relationship status, two members of a particular racial group may use language that is appropriate between them but highly inappropriate when others use it (Orbe & Harris, 2008). In line with Kochman (1981) and the more recent works of Orbe and Harris (2008), Seidman (1998) also noted that shared assumptions that come from common backgrounds may make it easier to build rapport.

Research Design

Interviewing is both a research methodology and a social relationship that must be nurtured, sustained, and then ended gracefully (Dexter, 1970; Johnson, 2002; Seidman, 1998). Johnson further supports the development of a strong relationship between researcher and interviewee as he states intimacy is directly related to effective and useful interviewing. Patton (2002) places interviews into three general categories: the informal,

general interview, and the standardized interview (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). For the purpose of this study an informal, in-depth phenomenological interview was employed as it allowed for in the researcher to develop rapport through a more conversational interview approach. Some have argued that the success of qualitative inquiry depends primarily on the interpersonal skills of the researcher (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). This researcher supports that notion and sought to build authentic connection with each interviewee. This form of interviewing under the philosophical traditions of phenomenology rests on the assumption that there is a structure and essence to shared experience that can be narrated (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

In qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Qualitative researchers make cultural inferences from three sources: what people say, the ways they act, and the artifacts they have (Spradley, 1979; Warren, 2002). African American speech has more vocal range, inflection, and tonal quality than European American speech (Garner, 1994). Furthermore, when interviewees become excited, their voices tend to become louder as an indication that the topic of discussion is of sheer importance (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). Observing facial expressions, vernacular, voice intonations, nonverbal cues, and other forms of body language is an important part of interviewing African Americans (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). Some researchers suggest that the majority of the meaning in a message comes through vocal qualities and facial expressions, illuminating the notion that the actual meaning of a

message is carried through the verbal portion of the message is actually quite low (Orbe & Harris, 2008).

Interview Protocol

Polkinghorne (1989) recommends interviewing from 5-25 individuals to be considered a strong study. The meaning of the supervision experience for 10 African American supervisors was captured throughout this study. By electing to explore the experiences of a smaller sample of individuals, this researcher was better able to manage the breadth of data retrieved from in-depth interviews. This approach to the interviewing process allowed for a more accurate and rich conceptualization of each individual experience as well as the collective development of essence narratives.

Creswell (2007) also stated that the more diverse the characteristics of the individuals, the more difficult it would be to find common experiences, themes, and overall essence of the experience. This point was taken into consideration when soliciting interviewee participation. African American supervisors were solicited for participation in this phenomenological study from the American Psychological Association (APA) contact listings, Association of Black Psychologist (ABPsi) contact listings, and by contacting academic departments and counseling centers. Potential participants were then contacted via email requesting their participation (Appendix C). A criterion sampling strategy was employed as it is insured that all participants were experienced with respect to the phenomenon in question (Creswell, 2007). Participants were selected based on the following:

- Self-identify as African-American or Black
- Received clinical supervision during his/her training as a masters and/or doctoral student
- Currently or recently provided clinical supervision to a self-identified African American supervisee
- Currently or recently provided clinical supervision to a self-identified White American masters or doctoral student

A snowball sampling strategy was also employed as a secondary recruitment approach to increase the likelihood of acquiring a workable sample. Unique to this study was the solicitation of African American supervisory experiences. This was likely to present two primary limitations: (1) the ability for this researcher to solicit up to 10 African American supervisors that meet the above criteria. Because the desired population is still relatively small, measures were employed to achieve a workable sample size, (2) homogenous supervision experiences for African American supervisors is also a relatively new occurrence, thus a limitation in recruiting participants who had this experience. For this reason, their experience receiving supervision from an African American was not a required criteria for participation in this study although such information was solicited.

Because context is essential to the understanding of any phenomena, I wished to gain as much information as possible about the supervisor's experience in a way that is reflective of his/her worldview. This required adequate investigation of background

experiences. For this reason each interviewee was given a demographic/information questionnaire prior to the first interview (Appendix B). Following the collection of the questionnaire; each participant was to be interviewed a maximum total of three times, lasting anywhere from 60-90 minutes per interview.

Seidman (1998) proposes a three-interview model. The first interview establishes the context of the participants' experience. The purpose of this initial interview as described by Seidman (1998) is to gain as much information as possible regarding the participants experience about him/herself in light of the topic up to the present time. The second interview allows the interviewee to reconstruct the details of their experience within the context in which it occurs at the present time. The purpose of this second interview as described by Seidman (1998) is to concentrate on the details of the participant's present experiences within the topic area of study. The third and final interview encourages the participants to reflect on the meaning their experiences hold for them (Seidman, 1998). The purpose of the third interview as described by Seidman (1998) is to allow for the participants to reflect on the meaning of their overall experience. This phenomenological interview study followed an adapted version of Seidman's (1998) three-interview protocol described above. Prior to the start of the first interview each participant was provided with a document outlining the three interview questions. At this time the participant was advised that a minimum of two interviews (the first was to be completed in-person) was required for participation in this study. The third interview was offered as optional and intended to allow for additional clarification.

During the first interview each participant was asked to provide their recollections of the following phenomenon (Appendix D):

Question 1: Take a few moments to reflect on your supervision relationships during your clinical training when you received supervision. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisors and African American supervisors.

Question 2: Take a few moments to reflect on your current/recent supervisor/supervisee relationships as a supervisor. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisees and African American supervisees.

Question 3: Take a few moments to think about your full range of experiences as an African American supervisee and now as an African American supervisor. How have you have come to understand race relations over the course of your clinical training? What will this mean as you continue to provide supervision to African American supervisees in the future?

Prior to the second interview the participant was provided with a transcript of their first interview. The second interview allowed for two processes to occur: First, participant could cross-check the accuracy of the initial interview transcript and make necessary corrections. Second, the same three inquiries listed above were revisited in the following manner:

Question: During our last interview you were asked to reflect on three things: (1) your supervision relationships during your training, (2) your current/recent supervision relationships as a supervisor, and (3) your understanding of race relations during both your supervised training and now as a supervisor. After reviewing the transcription of your first interview and having some time for additional reflection, would you please elaborate on any of the three questions.

During this time, the researcher also asked participants to elaborate on unfinished or misunderstood thoughts from the prior interview. This format allowed for the development of the participant /researcher relationship and work to establish a level of comfort not allowed for in traditional one-time interviewing. Additionally, this approach

to phenomenological interviewing allowed for access to more comprehensive and well-rounded data collection. Both in-person and telephone interviews were conducted. The first interview was conducted in-person and recorded via audio recording. The second interview was conducted via telephone and recorded via audio recording. The third interview was introduced as optional. None of the interview participants opted to participate in the third interview. There are advantages and disadvantages to both forms of interviews.

Telephone interviews allow for the following advantages; fewer interview effects, better interviewer uniformity in delivery, greater standardization of questions, and finally greater cost-efficiency (Shuy, 2002). In-person interviews allow for the following advantages; accuracy of responses due to contextual naturalness, greater likelihood of self-generated answers, greater likelihood of thoughtful responses, and an increase in response rates (Shuy, 2002). Of particular importance is the literature (Shuy, 2002) that supports in-person interviews as more advantageous for participants of marginalized populations (e.g. African Americans) and for topics involving sensitive topics (e.g. race relations). Both in-person and telephone interviews served a purpose within this study. The in-person interviews allowed for the researcher to build rapport, while the telephone interviews were most conducive to the full participation of the interview participants. Ultimately, researcher/participant familiarity as a result of; study recruitment, establishment of rapport via the initial in-person interview, and statement of study purpose/informed consent (Appendix A) all served to eradicate many of the potential

issues associated with conducting telephone interviews. Additionally, participants were provided with a typed manuscript of interview questions to aid in accuracy and the comfort of both researcher and interviewee.

If and when socio-political occurrences or topics associated with the phenomena in question were directly discussed or alluded to, this researcher began to ask participant about social, political, or historical factors as well as the power dynamic more directly. In an effort to avoid leading questions, this researcher only asked such questions when applicable. When participants appeared to offer disclosures specific to White supervisors or supervisees, this researcher would often ask directly about Black supervisors or supervisees. When participants appeared to offer disclosures specific to Black supervisors or supervisees, this researcher would often ask directly about White supervisors and supervisees. This strategy allowed for a greater breadth of data and greater ability to decipher similarities and differences, minimizing researcher assumptions.

Ultimately, eleven participants total were interviewed once with one participant dropping out during the transcription review member-checking process. For this reason a total of 10 participants were interviewed on two separate occasions, with no one requesting the optional third interview follow up. Each participant was interviewed first in person, with interviews lasting anywhere between 45-90 minutes. Each participant was interviewed a second time over the telephone, with interviews lasting between 30-60 minutes. Prior to the start of the first interview, each participant was provided with the informed consent and general information about the study before completing a brief

demographic background questionnaire. In accordance with the participation criteria, each participant self-identified as Black or African American, received clinical supervision, and had the experience providing supervision to both White/Caucasian supervisees and Black/African American supervisees.

Data Analysis

Data analysis steps are generally similar for all forms of phenomenological research. This particular study adopted a rather sophisticated collaborative approach to analysis in an effort to capture both the phenomenological essence of the interview protocol illustrated above and also to honor and give voice to the communicative processes so essential in cultural/racial research (e.g. Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002; Kochman, 1981; Orbe & Harris, 2008). An adapted process of analysis included methods introduced by Gee (1999), which illustrates a narrative approach termed *Discourse Analysis* and Moustakas (1994), which illustrates a traditional phenomenological approach.

Discourse Analysis

Gee (1999) emphasizes the notion that if one has no idea who a person is and what they are doing, then one cannot make sense of what has been said, written, or done. The fact that people are of differential access and therefore are connected to different sorts of status and social goods is a root source of inequality in society. For this reason Gee (1999) goes on to state that language is integrally connected to matters of equality and justice. This is of particular importance to the proposed study for the following

reasons: (1) the target population of African American supervisors is one population that has been historically oppressed and my therefore express their lived experience through varied lens from Euro-American supervisors, (2) status (e.g. power differential) has been a large focus in cross-cultural/cross-racial supervision literature and therefore might be recounted in unique fashion during the interview process, and (3) communication and miscommunication has been a large focus of cross-cultural/cross-racial literature, which may poses the assumption that more complimentary communicative patterns may be present during the interview protocol. Different assumptions about how information is introduced and connected, as well as details of pitch and emphasis all work together to lead to misunderstandings in communication (Gee, 1999). The three reasons listed above are also grounds for the need to conduct a study that looks at the homogenous dyad in supervision relationships.

The key to discourses is “recognition” and contends that if you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of who (identity) engaged in a particular type of what (activity) then you have pulled off a discourse (Gee, 1999). In this way there are multiple types of “discourse” illustrated throughout the proposed study. The first is recognition that specific types of individuals with specific types of training are considered supervisors. The second is recognition that specific types of individuals have been identified as “minority” in the American society and also within the field of

psychology. Finally, Discourse analysis allows the researcher to not only retrieve thematic data (commonly retrieved from traditional phenomenological analysis) but *how* a narrative is spoken (Riessman, 2008). The *how* of spoken language is important because each social language has its own distinct grammar. One grammar is the traditional set of units (e.g. nouns, verbs, etc.) the second grammar, often less studied is the rules by which grammatical units like nouns and verbs are used to create patterns (Gee, 1999).

In most qualitative interview methods, analysis begins following the transcription process. Within *Discourse Analysis*, the transcript is a theoretical entity and does not stand outside of analysis but is a part of it. The data analysis employed within the proposed study is as follows:

- (1) Transcription – audio recordings were transcribed verbatim, including the indication of nonverbal behavior, captured through memo writing and voice intonations detected from the audio recordings.
- (2) Member-Checking – following interview one and two, verbatim transcriptions were offered to each participant for verification and accuracy.
- (3) Clusters of Meaning – development of clusters of information (Moustakas, 1994) were identified by organizing the content from the verbatim transcriptions, which ultimately served as the proposed themes of the phenomenon in question.

(4) Textual Description – significant statements and themes derived from the clusters of meaning were then used to write a description of what each participant experienced with respect to each interview inquiry (Moustakas, 1994).

(5) Essence – a composite description derived from the textual descriptions was developed and on the common experiences of all participants (Moustakas, 1994).

Unstructured *Memo writing* (Merriam, 1998) was incorporated into the analysis of this study in an effort to capture researcher reflections. Memo writing enabled the researcher to capture reflections of participant behavior (e.g. facial expressions, vernacular, voice intonations, nonverbal cues, etc.), which served as a complimentary method to Discourse Analysis and could later be used to further validate the data retrieved from audio recordings. Ray (1994) emphasizes the act of data analysis as a reflective process and involves a sensitive attunement to opening up to the meaning of experience both as discourse and text.

Validity and Reliability

The three-interview structure incorporates features that enhance the accomplishment of validity (Seidman, 1998). Often critics speak to the notion that qualitative research is less likely to have strong reliability and validity. The interview method coupled with the collaborative analysis places participants comments in context and checks for internal consistency by taking note to interviewee syntax, pauses in

speech, and individual groupings of words (Gee, 1999; Seidman, 1998). Each of the ten participant interviews were transcribed, totaling 20 transcribed interviews. Each of the transcribed interviews were then coded based on discourse analysis coding (Appendix E) in an effort to capture discourse style, intonation, stress, repetition, and general flow between researcher and study participant. Venacular and natural language, including verbal utterances such as “uhm”, “uhu”, and “mmhmm” were included in the original transcriptions also intended to capture flow and natural discourse. For the purposes of the final product, natural language has been edited into clean quotations. Furthermore, triangulation was achieved by having a minimum of three data sources to include two interviews and the demographic questionnaire.

To strengthen the proposed research method a group of three graduate students were solicited to serve as “data rater informants”. Data rater informants were provided with the following information following the establishment of proposed clusters of meaning and prior to the textual description step in the data analysis process: (1) a verbal description of the study, (2) the direct quotation data for the participants identifiable by pseudonym, and (3) this researcher’s proposed themes. Data rater informants were directed to individually sort the quotations to fit researcher themes. In the event that participant quotations did not fit into a researcher theme, data rater informants were directed to denote a new theme or indicate if the quotation did not adequately reflect any theme. This step in the analysis process was crucial to the overall validity of the proposed study as it allowed for cross-validation of researcher themes.

Because few psychological principles and methods have been validated on all racial-cultural groups, researchers conducting studies on these populations have a difficult time showing internal validity (Ibrahim & Cameron, 2004). Ibrahim & Cameron (2004) further emphasize the lack of attention to external validity and its negative implications for people of color. Sue's (1999) work recommends that researchers develop stronger knowledge base on racial-cultural non-dominant groups by; explicitly specifying the population to which the findings are applicable, greater utilization of qualitative methods versus standard reliance on quantitative approaches, and the psychological meaning of race be examined in ethnic comparisons. This study was intended to meet these recommendations.

Ethical Considerations

The art of interviewing entails framing questions in a way that allows interviewees to maintain their dignity by maintaining their humanity while they tell the stories that are important to them (Dunbar, Rodriguez, & Parker, 2002). Because discussions of discrimination, racism, and prejudice were broached during the interview protocols; the researcher remained cognizant to the sensitivity of the subject as well as the vulnerability necessary for participants to share openly. Emotional costs are particularly relevant in qualitative interviewing because of its open-ended, exploratory character, probing for details, and the depth of the experience (Warren, 2002). This notion of emotionality was key in this study given the nature of race relations being

discussed. In-depth interviewing commonly elicits highly personal information about interview participants and therefore confidentiality of data was attended to ethically.

One traditional ethical principle has been that the researcher must do whatever is necessary to protect research subjects (Johnson, 2002). The privacy of the participants was kept by assigning a number system to all interview material, which was located in a secure location. Additionally, participants provided a pseudonym, which served as their identification for all transcriptions and for written report of the final narratives. Another ethical dilemma has been the facilitation of research methodologies that do not serve nor fit the sampled population. While a component of the study explored comparisons between experiences with African American supervisors and supervisees and White supervisees and supervisors; the overall focus of the study was on the general and broad African American supervisor experience. Thompson, Shin, & Stephens (2004) note that comparison studies of racial groups have one potential limitation in that the findings may present more on differences than race, or in this case the racialized experiences within supervision. Because a large number of studies that include racial-ethnic minorities within the sample are in fact comparison studies; this study focuses on the exploration of differences and similarities with respect to a full sample of African American supervisors having all experienced the same phenomenon of supervision.

Ibrahim and Cameron (2004) support the need for research of this nature, noting that researchers (e.g. Carter & Parks, 1992; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991) have repeatedly established there is vast heterogeneity within racial-cultural groups despite the notion that

literature tends to remain focused on differences between groups. Historically, research on variables such as race has been characterized as racist, unethical, and ineffective (Ibrahim & Cameron, 2004). Although methodological and conceptual problems persist (Ibrahim & Cameron, 2004), the study supported the eradication of ineffective, unethical, and culturally insensitive methodological approaches to phenomena studied. One fundamental component of this goal was to explore the phenomenon in question based on an African-Centered approach, through the lens of African Americans themselves.

Researcher as Instrument

Introduced by Husserl, epoch (bracketing) is the process by which investigators set aside their experiences to take a fresh phenomenon under examination (Creswell, 2007; Ray, 1994). My connectedness to this research inquiry rests in my identification as an African American female; having experienced the phenomenon in question. The process of developing an epoch and bracketing out recollections of my supervision experiences; will ultimately allow me to become increasingly aware of my viewpoints and assumptions regarding supervised training. Because I am keenly aware of how such assumptions may impede my ability to provide a purely authentic description of the participant experiences; I have opted to include a comprehensive heuristic inquiry, coined by Moustakas (1990).

This form of an epoch refers a more personalized analysis of my researcher experience (Merriam, 1998). Because it is recognized and affirmed that the human researcher takes on the role of research instrument (Seidman, 1998), I assert that my

experiences and connectedness to the phenomenon in question can be used appropriately to enrich the interviewing experience and aid in the articulation of empathy.

In the words of Lincoln & Guba (1985); I support the notion that as a human researcher I can serve as an adaptable and flexible instrument who responds with tact and understanding (Seidman, 1998) to the ultimate advantage of gaining authentic and thoughtful responses throughout the interview process. Because I have been trained as a counseling psychologist, received, and provided supervision I am familiar with the phenomena in question. As a self-identified African American female clinician and supervisor I often found it difficult to articulate my nuanced therapeutic and supervisory experiences. I have captured my reflections in an effort to give voice and bracket out my personal and professional experiences. The following form of bracketing allows for clearer representation of each interview participant.

Epoch

Researchers are encouraged to set aside their own beliefs, values, and opinions, in order to empathize with the description provided by the participants (Wood, 2011). I described my own personal recollections of the phenomenon in question by answering the interview questions. The epoch method serves to bracket out researcher experiences to ensure focus on participant experiences rather than the researcher's perspective. I have provided my epoch in full.

Question 1: Take a few moments to reflect on your supervision relationships during your clinical training when you received supervision. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisors and African American supervisors.

I can't think of any particularly negative supervision experience. However, having experienced supervision from self-identified African American supervisors I can attest to the fact that it has been a very different experience. It's not even that race has been a significant indicator of whether or not the supervision was good or bad but the experience with my African American supervisors allowed for more depth than my experiences with White supervisors. It's almost as if my African American supervisors expressed differently a real genuine interest in me as a person because maybe they saw themselves in me. They were invested in me developing as a clinician, professional, and even on a personal level, beyond teaching me basic clinical skills. Their supervision practices entailed more than reflection of feeling and this is how you apply a cognitive behavioral framework. It was about mentorship and support and an obligation to support me professionally and personally.

I can't say that my White supervisors did not want that for me but they definitely did not communicate that in the same ways. It seems as if in my experiences they were focused on simply being formally and, at times, rigidly professional. "I'm the teacher" and "I'm the supervisor" and "I am going to help you learn skills". It's funny because as I write this I am thinking about some of my non-traditional White supervisors. I've had a few White supervisors that assisted me outside of the context of a formal practica.

One White female in particular has been more like my Black supervisors in the way I have described above. I do notice that she is invested in me in ways beyond basic clinical skill development. I also notice that she is committed to issues of diversity and I

would consider her a White ally. She is well informed and confident in her role as a White ally. I am grateful for her and I really respect her. She is open to discussing issues of race and racism and various contextual factors. I have had that similar experience with another White female faculty member as well. I have felt safer with certain supervisors over others. That level of safety has contributed to a more intimate relationship. I think that it has been the distinction for me between good status quo supervision and memorable professionally altering supervision.

Question 2: Take a few moments to reflect on your current/recent supervisor/supervisee relationships as a supervisor. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisees and African American supervisees.

Having the experience of being a supervisor is what ignited my research interest in supervision simply because the dynamics were so rich, complicated, confusing and challenging. It left me questioning and wondering. I am thinking mostly about supervision with a White female supervisee who was older than me and brought with her some awareness and experience in the mental health field. She also brought insecurity and anxieties about being perceived as incompetent. Because I truly believe that multicultural awareness and sensitivity is essential to becoming competent I found myself having very strong reactions particularly around her debilitating discomfort around issues of race and culture. At the time I felt frustrated and challenged in how to break through her barriers. I especially felt challenged by our visible differences.

As a younger African American I felt strongly challenged by how to help her feel more comfortable discussing issues of race and racism, particularly since it was a major

element with one of her clients. I often suspected that she felt she needed to prove to me how non-racist she was and how culturally competent she was, which directly impeded her ability to actually become culturally competent. What was I to do? I couldn't step outside my own skin. I felt limited and I felt sad. I felt sad because this dynamic made the relationship fairly superficial. I don't know if I was able to help her grow as much as I had hoped to.

I also had a more significantly older White male who was much more in touch with his white privilege and unafraid of discussing issues of race and culture. While his anxieties and insecurities about his clinical work were also at times really debilitating, he was open and hungry for knowledge and support. I think he was also willing to have the difficult conversations. I got the sense that my youth did not intimidate him nor did he have to posture with me. He was often vulnerable. I admired this about him because I was initially intimidated by the white male privilege I was convinced he would bring into the supervision relationship. I was conscious of my want and need to prove myself, especially to him. My experiences with these two supervisees were vastly different and it taught me a lot about my own growth edges.

I've never provided supervision to African American supervisees but I suspect that there would be an element of excitement to pay-it-forward and nurture the clinical and professional development of African American supervisees much like my African American supervisors have done for me. I am hungry for the opportunity to supervise and mentor Black supervisees. I don't know if I've been taught necessarily how to work

effectively with them but I'm sure that a level of intuitive knowing will come to the surface...or so I hope.

Question 3: Take a few moments to think about your full range of experiences as an African American supervisee and now as an African American supervisor. How have you have come to understand race relations over the course of your clinical training? What will this mean as you continue to provide supervision to African American supervisees in the future?

I think I have discovered how ill-prepared we are to work effectively with minority supervisees, especially with respect to the dynamics with their clients. I don't believe our multicultural competencies emphasize the *what* and really offer much in terms of the *how* in supervision and therapy. There is a list of what we should and should not say essentially but nothing deeper. I think often about what I am suppose to do with my knowledge of racial identity development within a supervisory relationship to make it applicable to the therapy he/she is doing with a client. I have the theoretical knowledge but I'm not sure how to actually put this knowledge into practice, nor facilitate that experiential learning in my supervisees.

I am also cognizant of the stigma's associated with mental health. I am not exactly sure how to help my supervisee identify potential barriers with their clients and work effectively to eradicate them within the therapy relationship. I think the cultural or racial issues that clients bring into therapy are often really subtle and ingrained. I think this often takes a toll on minority clinicians. I'm trying to figure out how to address that dynamic in a supervision relationship. There are still a lot of gaps in supervision.

I would also hope to learn how to work more effectively with my White supervisees. As I described above, I think my visible minority racial and gender status sometimes serves as a barrier and people put their walls up or they try too hard to act more informed than they really are. I don't think White supervisees realize that honest and authentic disclosure can go a long way. I can work with that. Racial and cultural dynamics are always at play, whether we address them or not. I think it is just best to put things out in the open.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were generated from a background questionnaire developed by this researcher to serve as a demographic profile for each study participant. Specific, identifying information was not recorded due to the narrow research sample and the potential for participants to be identifiable. For this reason, general information was provided by participants. During the interview process, participants offered a wealth of information about their educational, professional/training background and experiences. That information has not been included in this results section in an effort to ensure their confidentiality. Please refer to table 1 for a summary of select descriptive information derived from the background questionnaire.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

<i>Name (N=10)</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Supervision Settings</i>	<i>Supervision Hrs. Rec.</i>	<i>Supervision Hrs. Prov.</i>	<i>**AA Visor/Visee</i>	<i>**White Visor/Visee</i>
Little Snake	F	UCC, CMM	201+	201+	N/Y	Y/Y
Connie	F	O	201+	201+	Y/Y	Y/Y
Stacey A.	F	SD, PP	201+	51-100	Y/Y	Y/Y
Cochise	M	UCC	201+	201+	N/Y	Y/Y
Dr. Mom	F	UCC, CMM, VA, UD	201+	201+	Y/Y	Y/Y
Valarie	F	UCC, CMM	201+	201+	N/Y	Y/Y
Rico	M	PP	201+	101-150	Y/Y	Y/Y
Vincent	M	H	201+	201+	Y/Y	Y/Y
Michelle	F	UCC	201+	101-150	N/Y	Y/Y
Gpsych	M	UCC, H, CMM	201+	201+	Y/Y	Y/Y

* UCC=University Counseling Center, CMM=Community Mental Health, SD=School

District, PP=Private Practice, H=Hospital/Health Care System, UD= University
Department, VA=Veterans Affairs, O=Other
** Visor/Vissee = Supervisor/Supervisee

Due to the nature of the explored phenomena and the previously described African Centered framework, researcher experiences mirrored those of the study participants. This common experience has been referenced throughout this manuscript in an effort to illustrate various themes

The findings highlighted throughout the remaining portion of this dissertation study have been categorized to include; (1) brief narratives (coded raw data) of the analyzed discourse between researcher and participant, (2) textual descriptions denoted by participant's direct narrative responses (clear data) to each interview question; and (3) themed essence(s) or composite descriptions (Moustakas, 1994) derived from the collective experience of all participants.

Study Findings: Discourse Analysis

In accordance with the proposed method, this researcher employed an adapted strategy to illuminate discourse between researcher and participant. This method allowed for the researcher to be attuned to nonverbal and verbal utterances as well as denote stress, intonation, repetition, pauses, elongated speech, final contour, simultaneous speech, and latching. Please refer to table 2 for the full transcription analysis coding guide.

Table 2 Discourse Analysis Coding Guide

	<i>Description</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Secondary Code</i>
Repetition	word or phrase		Green
**Stress	word or syllable	Underline	
**Intonation	Increase	↑	
	Decrease	↓	
	Whisper	{ }	
*Pause	time when seconds	()	
	time when less than seconds	(.)	
**Final Contour	completion of thought	/	
*Simultaneous Speech	between participant and researcher	[]	
*Nonverbal	specific gesture	(())	
*Latching	no space between participant and researcher speech	=	
*Elongated Speech	lengthened words or syllables	:	
Audible Expressions	non words or sounds		
	Sigh	-hh-	
	Laughter	-L-	
	active listening	-mhm-	Yellow
	Agreement	-mhm-	Orange

* Cameron, D. (2001). Working with Spoken Discourse. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

** Gee, J.P. (1999). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. NewYork, NY: Routledge

Because this study embodied a two-fold analysis process, both discourse and phenomenological content was analyzed. The content was transcribed in raw form, coded, then condensed and edited to reflect clean quotations.

As suspected by this researcher, there was a comfortability present during the interview process with each participant. This comfortability was verbally acknowledged and also identifiable by the natural “flow” in discourse. Additionally, participants

referenced similar dynamics among their African American supervisees and made parallels between themselves and this researcher.

Cochise: I think my experience with African American supervisees is (5) the conversation flow: is much easier: because there are a lot of assumptions we just make about each other so it's like this ((hand gesture)) ya know and you don't have to really: clarify some things/ I don't know↓ (2) does this makes sense?/

Researcher: It almost sounds like a baseline understanding/ (2) like I just kinda ((non-verbal gesture)) =

Cochise: yeah↑ like we start here↑ ((hand gesture)) instead of [here↓ ((hand gesture))

Researcher: uhu] uhuh] makes sense (2) maybe that's an illustration of the flow I don't know/ but it makes sense [to me - L -

Cochise: - L -] yeah↑ yeah↑ because (2) because you do it too↑ I mean that's why: because you do it as well↓

In addition to the above, participants vernacular and linguistic nuances were more present indicating an element of safety, comfort, and perhaps an accurate assumption of shared experience.

Researcher: ...how do you recognize the vibe or like the comfort? =

Michelle: the language is more relaxed/ (.) or it's not that (.) as I mentioned before that

talking white thing kind of goes out the window (.) and I even felt more comfortable speaking with them because there were words or (.) I can't even think of a specific word↓ (.) or like I mean↑ like if a client would say something like (.) "oh in the cut"/ or ya know (.) just using: different language ya know that I felt more comfortable using with them because they would understand what I was saying =

Researcher: you didn't have to define it?

Michelle: exactly↑/ where with some of my White supervisee's if I would say something they would be like (.) "huh? what's that" kind of thing...

(later during interview one)

Michelle: I discuss that I went to a Catholic school / I went to a school with a majority of White people anyway so my: culture↑ is not as Black or whatever as some other people/ So when they find those things out I can tell that there is like a different (.) like I had one (.) I remember her↓ very distinctively↓ ((non verbal expression)) she was kind of like uhm (2) very: uhm (2) {what's a word} (2) siditty =

Researcher: mhm [- L -

Michelle: - L -] and uhm: (.) now see you know what that words means↓ but I might of had to explain that to somebody who was White ya know/ uhm but she was very like lalala↑ Barbie like (.) my dad pays for everything (.) kind of thing and it was just kind of like so and I am your supervisor / ...

Study Findings: Textual Descriptions

Three general inquiries were asked of each participant. Additional probing questions or questions asked for the purpose of elaboration and clarity were determined based upon the experiences shared by each participant and general topics of discussion from participants interviewed prior to the participant in question. The participants in this study expressed ownership of multiple identities including but not limited to gender, socio-economical status, and age.

Little Snake: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences she expressed appreciation for her White/Caucasian supervisors, acknowledged the absence of Black/African American supervisors, and addressed the evolving appreciation for diversity within the field of psychology. After some reflection she also hypothesizes about alternative reasons for why her White

supervisors demonstrated their support through their lack of desired challenging and criticism.

I really didn't have any African American Supervisors. All my supervisors were White except one who was Asian. I would say that I had supervisors that really wanted to see me succeed and do well. I think they wanted the best for me and I think that part of that was there weren't that many African American counselors so it was like they were investing to see that I did well simply because I guess they really wanted to see more diversity in the field. (1-pg.2,3)

I thought it (referring to lack of criticism from white supervisors) was because there weren't many African American's in this profession. They wanted us to succeed and do well...but as I thought about it more we were into a time period where multicultural issues was coming to the forefront so I think taking that into consideration there were people who were trying not to appear to be racist. (2-pg.1)

When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her practices as a supervisor, *Little Snake* referenced distinctions between the supervision she received, the direct manner in which she provides supervision, and indicated experiencing good relationships overall.

I have attempted to provide a lot of very specific information for supervisees and maybe that is because I didn't feel like I got that information. I've had both African American and European American women and men as supervisees and for the most part those have been pretty positive relationships. (1-pg.4)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Little Snake* acknowledged the difficulty of addressing such a broad question and referenced the cross-racial relationship between supervisor and supervisee.

It's a difficult question....I think sometimes that African Americans get ignored...let's just skip over this [and] don't have to deal with

critical issues...in terms of relationships. I find that in a lot of cases White people just don't want to be bothered...you know...let's get to the task at hand but as far as the relationship that just bogs us down so let's not deal with it...yet the relationship could be very critical to what's going on. (1-pg. 9)

Connie: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences *Connie* talked about the differences between her White/Caucasian supervisors and Black/African American supervisor. She further shared the presence of assumptions and its impact on the supervisory relationship.

The most memorable thing being supervised by White or Caucasian individuals was not always having someone who understood my point of view or my ability to do more than one thing at a time. People assumed what I could or could not do. (1-pg.1)

With an African American person, it was the first time that I came face to face with the fact that not all Black people thought alike and that was just a very painful experience for me because I assumed that, that person would understand what I was talking about or what my needs were [but] their sensitivity to Black issues may never have existed or they had been educated out of them (1-pg.1)

When asked directly about key experiences within her practices as a supervisor, *Connie* indicated that she utilizes a mentorship model within her supervision practices.

My mentoring takes the form of my supervision too because part of the way I supervise is to mentor to help you with the personal and professional growth and development (1-pg.2)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Connie* acknowledged the presence of racialized dynamics within her general lived experience.

As an African American female that is something I've had to deal with from the time I was exposed to people of other cultures and so

some of it doesn't stand out like it might if I hadn't dealt with primarily Caucasian people all of my life. I learned to acclimate. It's apart of my whole upbringing and so the hardest thing for me was not so much in psychology as it was in education. (1-pg.8)

Stacey A.: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences she immediately reflects upon her first encounter with an African American supervisor and the hope associated with that relationship, illuminating assumptions and expectations for a positive relationship.

I guess the one that stands out the most for me is being supervised by [an] African American psychologist. That was kind of a different experience. I went into it very excited thinking that ok this is an African American. This is someone that is going to understand me and help me and mentor me but that ended up being a not so good relationship or supervision experience. (1-pg.1)

When asked directly about key experiences within her practices as a supervisor, *Stacey A.* continues to reflect upon the expectations demonstrated by her supervisees and describes a subtle challenging from her White supervisees as a result of other identifying factors, such as age.

I think sometimes when you are working with White supervisees you have to maybe prove your expertise a little bit more because the supervisee may come in with their own biases and expectations. There is also the age issue. Being a young professional, they may challenge you or may not be so quick to take your feedback. They may put you on the same...level whereas a supervisor is not the same level. (1-pg.3)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Stacey A.* first recognizes how her own training has shaped her

maturing perspective within supervision and discloses her own assumptions regarding the competence of White supervisees.

Having gone through a program that is very heavily into multiculturalism; I think when I first began I would expect for all White supervisees to not be multiculturally competent or just to not engage clients of different races (1-pg. 6)

Cochise: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within his supervision experiences he expressed astonishment about the absence of direct racial discussion, appreciation for the skill and general competence of his White supervisors and the hope for African American supervisors during his training.

I don't know if in my training it came up a whole lot...That's very interesting...I don't know if it came up a whole lot. I had some good supervisors. The third person was probably my favorite supervisor. She was just very good she would just have me reflect a lot on how I felt in the session and she was very supportive and complimentary and made me feel like I could do this (1-pg.2)

I would have liked to get a slathering of Black supervisors. I think I would have been more comfortable talking with them about being a Black male in this business. (1-pg.12)

When asked directly about key experiences within his practices as a supervisor, *Cochise* offered specifics about his supervision style and his commitment to address racial subtleties directly.

I am the type of supervisor where if the issues are there I'm just going to bring it up because I don't want to avoid them. If there are possible racial issues...a White intern is seeing a person of color I will always bring that up (1-pg.3)

When asked directly about his overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Cochise* references the developmental level of his supervisees.

I think as a supervisor I'm more relaxed in terms of taking people where they are. One thing I've realized over the years is that everybody isn't going to be a good therapist or counselor...they're just not so I just try to get them to the best that I can get them to (1-pg.10)

Dr. Mom: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences she acknowledges and expresses appreciation for the commitment to diversity within her department before verbalizing the gaps within her training. Later, *Dr. Mom* describes two different experiences with African American supervisors, one more positive and one less positive.

I guess speaking to White supervisors I was in a unique setting where diversity was really emphasized so everyone was really open to talking about diverse issues but it's almost like everything gets dumped into the broad term diversity and you're not getting specific supervision around what you might need to do in the actual therapy session (1-pg.2)

When asked directly about key experiences within her practices as a supervisor, *Dr. Mom* identifies salient differences in her experiences as a supervisor. She offers multiple examples of the differences between her White/Caucasian and Black/African American supervisees. She also cites the role multiple identities play in the supervisor/supervisee interaction.

I think my White students have a lot more difficulty with feedback. My African American students tend to be much more open in terms of what do you have to give me and is there something else I can read and asking for books. My White students tend to take a critique personal. I think age and race play a lot into it. (1-pg.8,9)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Dr. Mom* emphasizes the importance of establishing expectations and standards up front. She further expresses acceptance regarding the dynamics with White supervisees.

I think I have my expectations and I've just come to accept that there may be some resistance from my White students but these are my standard regardless of your opinions about the quality or the pickiness of those standards (1-pg. 9)

Valarie: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences she expressed some surprise when reflecting upon the fact that she had never had an African American supervisor. *Valarie* further expressed appreciation for the skill and general competence of her White supervisors despite the absence of racial discussion and processing.

I don't think I ever had a black supervisor. (1-pg.1) I had all white supervisors. I feel like my supervision was good. I enjoyed my supervisors. I think they were excellent. One of the things that dawned on me is that I didn't necessarily talk about racial issues with my white supervisors. I would talk about what I did and what I didn't do [with my clients]. I feel as though they made good feedback. I don't think I had someone who didn't understand the dynamics but I don't think we went maybe a little bit deeper. (1-pg.2)

When asked directly about key experiences within her practices as a supervisor, *Valarie* was transparent in describing her varied expectations with White/Caucasian and Black/African American students, citing her understanding of racialized dynamics between the supervisee and the client.

I probably was a bit inconsistent in the sense that with my white students if they told me they were working with a minority client I

would ask them did they bring up the racial differences but I never really expected my minority supervisees to bring up racial differences with their white clients. I noticed that when you are doing clinical work with white individuals, if you have established a good rapport and the person feels comfortable with you they're probably going to open up and share. If they are racist or if they have feelings about the minority group they may sort of excuse you and put you in that separate category and not necessarily notice your ethnic background or your race (1-pg.5)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Valarie* references the similarities among her experiences of racial dynamics between clients and supervisees. She notes the evolution of her own perspective and developmental growth, acknowledges the presence of a common experience among White/Caucasian and Black/African American supervisees, while also emphasizing the importance of addressing differences and individual lived experience.

When I started my clinical training it was clear to me that there were major differences in my clients. I think that in terms of supervising students I really went into it with the idea that working with minorities might be a very different experience than working with majority members. What I have found is that it's more complicated. I think I am much closer to really believing now after all my life experiences, all of my clinical experiences and working with students that we definitely have more in common than we have that makes us different but I still think it's important to pay attention to what an individual brings in. (1-pg. 10).

Rico: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within his supervision experiences *Rico* indicated that all of his supervision was provided by White/Caucasian during the start of his training. He reflected on the perceived arrogance of his first supervisor as well as how his identity as an older Black male with experience in the business industry shaped his supervision experiences.

In training all of my supervisors were White and they were male. The supervisor at school was...he was arrogant...He knew his stuff and you couldn't take that away from him but sometimes some people think they know everything...at least that was my impression. I was 40 years old and so I had been around the block a few times and I had the corporate experience under my belt (1-pg.4)

When asked directly about key experiences within his practices as a supervisor, *Rico* shares the difficulty that one particular White/Caucasian supervisee had working with clients of color as a result of limited exposure and training working with Black/African American people.

I had a White female and this young woman had good instincts but she was a little afraid of Black people. She told me, "I don't know how"... "I've never had any experience with Black people"....and I said that's ok and I just told her straight up Black folk don't bite (1-pg.10)

When asked directly about his overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Rico* reflected upon a specific supervisory relationship in which he is currently the supervisee. He highlights shared learning, a shared respect for one another, and open discussion about racial issues.

My current supervisor...it's almost collegial...and it's kind of quasi therapeutic at the same time. The race stuff...she brought it up...that there were things that she had to learn differently about people of color because she had a southern background so she got a first-hand look at some things and was able to make some internal shifts. It hasn't been a huge issue with us at all... (1-pg.19)

Vincent: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within his supervision experiences *Vincent* reflects on specific supervision experiences with both White/Caucasian supervisors and Black/African American supervisors. He emphasizes

varying degrees of comfort and considers the influence of race on his supervision experience.

Definitely I felt less comfortable certainly with him (referencing a particular white supervisor) and less at ease. My experience with XXXXX (referencing a particular black supervisor) was an open door policy and I felt supported. Do I think race played sort of a role in it...probably on both aspects...on both sides (1-pg.3)

When asked directly about key experiences within his practices as a supervisor, *Vincent* acknowledges differences and the range in developmental level among his supervisees. Similar to his recollections of his supervision experiences, he emphasizes his increased level of comfort with Black/African American supervisees.

It's interesting because I've had a range [but] I definitely feel like I am much more comfortable around African American supervisees (1-pg. 6)

When asked directly about his overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Vincent* first reflects on a recent experience within his current professional role that forced him to speak out against client disparities. He then offers his perspective on how biases can ultimately serve or hinder supervisee training. He emphasizes the importance of recognizing supervisor biases, how it impacts training with supervisees, and ultimately client care.

...we all need to be aware that we have biases and some biases are positive. I have a positive bias toward African American supervisees and sometimes that positive transference helps a situation. It could have a positive impact in terms of outcome with patients. It could have a positive outcome in terms of helping a supervisee grow [or] stick with it... just in terms of their development and treatment of patients we have to be more aware of those positive and negative biases and we have to take into consideration cultural variables and

sometimes we have to think outside of the box. We can't just have this mainstream sort of view of our patients and sometimes we often have to take into account the context (1-pg. 13)

Michelle: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within her supervision experiences. Immediately *Michelle* acknowledges the homogeneity in her supervision experiences and her disappointment with the lack of exposure to Black/African American supervisors.

I have had all White supervisors so I have not come across any Black supervisor in my whole career...the entire time, which is unfortunate for me and I think that's why I have such a passion for it. Thinking back all of my supervisors have been women...White women...usually older (1-pg. 3)

When asked directly about key experiences within her practices as a supervisor, *Michelle* disclosed her own reluctance to address race within the supervision dyad with her White/Caucasian supervisees.

I had two White female supervisees and it was funny because the entire semester I had not talked about race the entire time and I think I was trying to prove that I could be a good supervisor without anyone looking at my race (1-pg. 5)

When asked directly about her overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Michelle* acknowledges lack of access to Black/African American supervisors and the need for racially sensitive perspectives within research, therapy, and supervision.

What I've come to understand is that we are few and far between. There are not a lot of Black supervisors...especially male...that's like non-existent. Someone has to continue these efforts and do this research. I think it's necessary for supervisees to see as well as

clients to see that we exist and that we know what we are talking about and we can do supervision...I think it's necessary and it's not enough at all out there (1-pg.22)

Gpsych: When asked directly about key experiences specific to race relations within his supervision experiences, *Gpsych* emphasizes his love for the field of psychology, and reflects on the differences between the supervision he received from Black/African American supervisors and the style of supervision he provides to his supervisees with respect to racial issues.

I love, I love, I love what we do but I found on the racial issue that the Black supervisors weren't molding the type of thing I now give to people. One was a Dean and one was a psychologist but they were more mentors (1-pg.4)

When asked directly about key experiences within his practices as a supervisor, *Gpsych* describes his familiar style of supervision while also emphasizing the importance of taking clinical work seriously.

I come from a familiar good brother humoristic kind of person to make our experience kind of friendly and joyful. That's me but in the business that we do I'm very serious about your work because you're dealing with a human being (1-pg.14)

When asked directly about his overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad, *Gpsych* acknowledges the presence of racial dynamics and historical factors (i.e. generational times, values, beliefs, etc.) in all supervision interactions.

They're always there and because of the generation I'm in I think they are connected to what your supervisors or people who molded you, what they're values are (2-pg.13).

In addition to the direct answers of each phenomenological inquiry; participants offered multiple disclosures about their experiences within and outside of their training and supervision. Multiple themes were illuminated through open ended discussion and direct probing for elaboration. Once frequent topics of discussion surfaced among the early interview participants, this researcher more directly began to ask participants that were interviewed later.

Participant responses illuminated three general areas of interest. *Lived experience of the African American Supervisor, Training and Multicultural Learning,* and *Relationship* all serve as the general themed essence descriptions derived from participant responses. Because a wealth of data was gathered and each participant verbalized multiple reflections to answer the interview questions; the general themes were further condensed into subthemes (Political, Historical, Racial, and Cultural Context; Proving One's Competence; Entitlement and Privileged Power; Development; Mentorship; Limited Exposure: Comfort, Trust, and Safety) to further magnify participant experiences.

Study Findings: Essence Themes

Lived experience of the African American Supervisors

For the purpose of this study, *lived experience* refers to first-person reflective stories and interactions in the supervision dyads or interpretations that shape supervisory experiences. Sub-themes reflected within the scope of participant lived experience

included (1) recognition of political, historical, racial, and cultural contexts, (2) proving one's competence, and (3) entitlement and privileged power. Participants experienced the stated themes in varying degrees within and outside of supervision. They were careful to elaborate upon differences and similarities within the supervision dyad with White individuals and Black individuals whether supervisor or supervisee.

Participants often referenced their own cultural and racial identities, how their identity show up in the supervision relationship, and how this understanding may serve to better connect with his/her supervisees.

I've always been aware that everything I do whether it's supervision, counseling, [or] whatever is through my lens as a Black man and so within supervision that means if a client comes in talking about perceived racism in class or something like that and my supervisee's presenting that I'm going to see that differently than probably they do unless they're a person of color or very sensitive. (Cochise 1-pg.7)

It's very interesting because from my eyes a lot of times my race is always in consideration for me (Michelle 1-pg.11)

I grew up in the communities where people pulled together collectively and stuff like that so I've got that in me so I brought that to the profession...that's some of the attitudes that I operate from. (Rico 1-pg.9)

The same way that you and I finished each other's sentences sometime is the same thing that happens in supervision with a person that is African American. There is a shared experience you bring in that you don't have to explain to each other even if you grew up differently. You just start with that kind of common ground and you can use sayings that like ya mama n em told you...Black colloquialisms that you wouldn't use with your White supervisees because they wouldn't understand. They wouldn't get it (Cochise 2-pg.4,5)

Political, Historical, Racial and Cultural Context

Participants referenced the ways in which they have learned to navigate systems, particularly in the field of psychology with respect to their therapy, supervision, and professional relationships by assuming a bicultural or multicultural identity.

If you are a minority getting a doctorate, chances are you have been in the white system long enough to know how it operates so I think that we live in a dual culture. We know how to operate in the White world as well as how to operate in the minority world so I think that most of use probably know how to function pretty effectively doing counseling in a White world. (Valarie 1-pg.4)

As a black male I've had to be bicultural to get through being the only Black in a lot of situations (Rico 1-pg.18)

Participants reflected upon the history of race and racial dynamics in the United States and offered their perspectives on how it has shaped their understanding, experience of, and dynamics within supervision relationships.

I find that I take a historical perspective for most things because we live in a nation that is most typically a-historical. We don't want to remember stuff but recognizing what went before informs you in terms of why you're here and may help you (Rico 1-pg.20)

I would say always consider cultural issues in every supervisory relationship. Consider things like ethnicity, race, geographical background. Consider historical aspects of the cultural. Because its 100 years old doesn't mean it goes away. Those things might be factors that are going on in the relationship particularly when it comes to giving feedback, when it comes to addressing issue of competence, when it comes to challenging or maybe even asking personal questions. Notice that and talk about it. Bring it right up and talk about it. Maybe the supervisee doesn't even know. (Little Snake 2-pg.4)

I said first of all, you are a White male and you walking up in these people's houses and they are already dealing with the welfare and

already dealing with some other stuff and we have a history of white oppression and I just put it like that and it got a little tense for a minute because [he] just thought he was sensitive because he was helping all these Black kids (Rico 1-pg.5)

I guess as I think about it I wanted and want to not perpetuate the stuff that has happened before because sometimes inadvertently we can. Our training as psychologist frequently does not take our history into consideration. Freud didn't take you and me into consideration...Maslow didn't...so you have to think and question. You have to read Asa Hilliard...you need to read...you need to read Naim Akbar (Rico 1-pg.21)

Participants acknowledge the role that politics play within the supervision dyad, emphasizing ethical dilemmas that may arise.

How do you transcend the politics of you and [your supervisor] plus be effective with your clients and you don't want your supervisor to believe that you believe they don't know what the hell they're talking about (Gpsych 1-pg.4)

You've got to protect yourself and protect your client. The issue is are we all the same? No, if we are different do we do the same things with different people that we do with people who are like the people that the theory was written about? That takes a good level of sophistication on the part of the supervisee to understand those politics (Gpsych 1-pg.4)

Cultural context serves to highlight the worldview of the participants as well as their understanding of their supervisee's lived experience and how it impacts supervision dynamics. They also offer a snapshot into their own cultural, racial, and professional development.

For a lot of years I was just angry [and] pissed off about the system and the way Black folks have been treated and this and that and I had to work through that because anger can blind you...when I got passed the anger it made me more compassionate and when I

encounter ignorant Black people and ignorant White people...I can deal with them with compassion (Rico 1-pg.15)

Worldview perspectives I think are very different in terms of maybe working with African American supervisees and European supervisees. Now that I think about it, I think sometimes European American supervisees want the facts....give me, tell me, show me what I should do. Give me appropriate evidenced based, research based information. African American supervisees seem to really search out a bigger picture...if that makes sense. They don't want pat answers for things. They want to explore and they want to know more about themselves. (Little Snake 1-pg.10).

Participants were open in initiating discussion about the presence of racism within their lived experience from institutional/policy barriers to individualized microaggressions.

Instances of racism were present through the full range of the African American supervisor's reflections.

I think that there are some folks who realize we're here and black people are not going anywhere even though you all bought us over...so there are some folks who just accept that we are here and we have to work together. There are other people who are over the top like "oh my God please come in" and I think there are others (sigh) who are still like undercover racists...but I think what has happened with racism is it has become less overt. Now it is more covert. I don't know if I like that any better to be honest. Now it's more underhanded like I'll do this so you get in trouble or you look bad...and I think that has happened in supervision (Michelle pg.19)

I've never had a black students bring up the fact that they thought that their [client] was racist and didn't deal with black people. I just think that there is more comfort dealing with anti-Semitism than there is dealing with racism against blacks, Latinos, or even Asians and I just think that certain topics of racism are harder to talk about then being anti-Semitic. I just think that black students and other minority students sometimes just internalize the racism that they experience [and] don't even discuss it as a factor in supervision and that is what is missing from multiculturalism... fully exploring issues of racism (Valarie 2-pg.7,8)

A lot of times in class I would be the only black student and so of course a lot of times race would come up and it was like Michelle...well what do you think? I'm not like the voice for all black people and I don't know what all black people think so I think even in supervising I tried to get away from that, which is unfortunate again...because I should still be able to acknowledge who I am regardless (Michelle 1-pg. 5)

They would put me into the mold of you're not supposed to know that. I took that as an intellectual challenge to know it and to know it well so that I could battle because I know I saw it as racial and my feeling first was to play the game and be the little paternalistic pat on the head "oh you nice little negro you are so smart" (Gpsych 1-pg.11)

"you're not supposed to do that"... "gee that's amazing" and it was the way it was communicated. [It] was shallow. There wasn't real pleasure in it there was surprise (Gpsych 1-pg. 7)

I didn't say how I felt about racism. It's alive and well. My parents and their parents taught them to live with racism to learn how to survive and thrive in spite of it. I didn't teach that to my children because I thought we had eradicated a lot of that stuff in my idealism and so when I started seeing young Black people being devastated by overt and covert racism it made me back up and start talking to my children about what it looks like, what it feels like, what you have to do to survive it and how to consciously make the decision not to allow it to make you bitter. Just like any kind of trauma to you as a human being if you harbor bitterness you can't go forward. If you harbor bitterness you end up with all kind of psychosomatic illnesses that totally stop you in your tracks, impairs your ability to love and be loved by anyone, to nurture your children and so you need to forgive people's ignorance. (Connie 1-pg. 12)

Growing up in a segmented area and even when in school I still remember being in grade school and getting into fights with people and the n-word was much more liberally used and so coming from this background I've always been a little on guard, a little less likely to open up, always sort of feeling like I can [only] trust you once you've proven that you're trust worthy (Vincent 1-pg. 5)

Yeah I had an experience when I went to XXXX I had to find a place to live. I called on the telephone so I did everything by mail and so when I got down to the place they assigned me to this unit and the black people there said “what are you doing over there in that unit”? They said well the black people are over here in these units then it had dawned when I had come down to pick up my key that the receptionist had said “oh how are you doing I remember talking to you, you had such a lovely telephone voice” and what I realized she was saying is, I sounded white (Valarie 1-pg.14)

Proving One's Competence

Each participant offered descriptive recollections of being either implicitly or explicitly challenged or questioned by supervisees regarding their competence. They openly disclosed how they recognize and respond to such challenging. They often experienced this dynamic within and outside of the supervision relationship.

I think sometimes when you are working with White supervisees you have to maybe prove your expertise a little bit more because the

supervisee may come in with their own biases and expectations. There is also the age issue being kind of a young professional they may challenge you or may not be so quick to take your feedback. They may put you on the same...I guess level where as a supervisor is not the same level. (Stacey A. 1-pg.3)

I think [my feedback] is minimized [by white supervisees]. I think a little bit like doubting you're competent because I remember one of training my first White supervisees on how to do session notes and she turned in her session note and I was like “where did this come from” and she was like “oh I asked one of my classmates how to do it”...So you asked a peer who is in the same situation as you...never having done therapy how to do a session note even though I told you how I wanted the session notes done... (Dr. Mom 1-pg.7)

I knew I was smart but I didn't feel smart sometimes with some of the young people who questioned everything you did and everything you said. What I learned is who I am and what I look like...if it didn't fit the stereotype that an individual had for what a teacher or your

supervisor should look like or be or sound like or behave like then it made them suspicious it made them question (Connie 1-pg.5)

I know that when my son goes to school because he will go to school with predominately white people that I will constantly have to prove who I am and who he is or who we are as a family (Michelle 1-pg.18)

You know for me it's like, ok you are the only African American female and of course you're gonna get some....are you competent? Do you know what you're doing? And I get that in a lot of different domains (Dr. Mom 1-pg.9)

Entitlement and Privileged Power

Participants reflected upon subtle instances of racialized power dynamics between supervisee and supervisor. They offered specific examples of how such dynamics are experienced and interpreted as racial or minority status slights, illuminating the presence of majority supremacy in general.

If you are a minority or ethnic supervisor sometimes your supervisees just find a way around you. It could be a gender thing. It could be a youth and age thing. It could be a physical attractiveness thing or it can just be that they talk to people that they feel comfortable with and who they feel are more competent to get around what you say or [what you] tell them. That's ok. That happens in life. When it's not ok I address it directly. It doesn't mean that it doesn't distress me from time to time. (Connie 2-pg.5)

I think that there's a difference in terms of how we sort of relate and I think that more of the African American supervisees they just seem more willing to learn...I think that they show more respect or reverence for their supervisors and I think that sometimes I've worked with some very arrogant Caucasian supervisees (Vincent 1-pg.7)

(referring to white supervisor) was a little more sensitive and sincere and he realized that some people had been beat down by the system but I don't think he understood that he was the system. He didn't

recognize that he could be intimidating or representative of the system that was oppressing the people. When you go in shooting questions at folks and asking one question behind the other and kind of coming in with some answers without really checking in to get input from that parent and appreciating some of the other pressures that were present...I think he missed some stuff (Rico 2-pg.4)

In terms of White supervisors I think that the role of a supervisor is you are supposed to present as confident and have all this training and experience to guide people but I also believe independent of that training and that experience there tends to be an air of privilege or superiority that extends beyond their (referring to White supervisors) training and years of experience and their position (Vincent 2-pg.4)

(referring to a white male supervisor) was a good guy in a lot of ways but he was just arrogant and viewing him in retrospect there was that white privilege attitude (Rico 2-pg.4)

I just think that it's a hot spot because I think women of color are kind of in a unique position in the hierarchy. They are not accorded the same power dynamics [and] trust as I think White males and White females and then you have men of color and then you have women of color down below (Valarie 2-pg.6)

Don't get out of this box...you're behind me...I control what you can do and what you can't do. The White [supervisors] weren't even dealing with my perspective. they were determining my box and then in a way using power or influence to remind me not to get out of it (Gpsych 2-pg3)

Regardless of whether it's supervisee to supervisor or vis versa there is that power differential that has nothing to do with who is the supervisor and who is the supervisee but that race piece in there (Dr. Mom 1-pg.16)

Training and Multicultural Learning

For the purpose of this study, training and multicultural learning refers to the structured and unstructured practices of clinical supervision and departmental instruction.

Participants referenced the climate within their training departments and how it facilitated or impeded their multicultural learning. They were careful in articulating the distinctions between general skill competence and multicultural competence among their supervisors and supervisees. Multicultural learning encompasses level of awareness, acknowledgement of differences, and application of skill in a multiculturally responsive manner. Sub-themes pertaining to training and multicultural learning described included (1) development, (2) mentorship, and (3) limited exposure.

Participants verbalized the absence of multicultural training, few participants acknowledged the evolution of multicultural training and the need for greater depth and more sophisticated skills in applying multicultural knowledge.

Because I had White supervisors, cultural issues were seldom addressed in the supervisory relationship. I shouldn't say seldom...it was never discussed. And as a student I don't know I probably didn't bring it up that much myself because I'm looking for them, the experts, to train me. (Little Snake 2-pg.4)

I know my training there was nothing on being an ethnic minority therapist working with a majority client. Everything was so Eurocentric in terms of the focus of the training as far as working with minority clients (Dr. Mom 1-pg.2)

I think training is better now. Students are getting more training in that and they are more aware that those issues could be out there but I will bring it up directly to see if it matters. It's interesting for African American students or practicum students...I think we always are bringing it up (Cochise 1-pg.3)

Development

Participants both reflected upon their own multicultural development and competency as culturally responsive supervisors as well as major distinctions among their White/Caucasian and Black/African American supervisees.

I noticed that African American supervisees are more willing to talk about race and multiculturalism in the supervision session whereas Whites may shy away from it or may not know how you will respond to it. It may come up less frequently within supervision so as the supervisor I find myself having to push them. African American supervisees tend to bring those things to the for front more often (Stacey A. 1-pg. 4)

I think those who have really explored cultural issues have really kind of researched their own identity regardless of their ethnicity or race. Those folks seem to do well in receiving feedback. They seem to be more open. (Little Snake 2-pg.5)

Beginning supervisors may have some concerns about their own competency and so now you have a supervisee who [has] some cultural issues coming up and they may not feel competent. That's why I say these things have to be discussed among us as supervisors so that you do feel more comfortable addressing cultural issues. Part of the problem with supervisors [is they] haven't looked at their own issues so when something comes up they don't feel confident (Little Snake 2-pg.6)

Participants appeared to be well-read with respect to racial identity development literature and could recognize varying degrees of mature statuses among their supervisees.

I guess it depends on where they are because to hear from someone from a different racial background if you're in the pre-encounter [stage], particularly say an African American supervisee and a White supervisor, you accept it. When it's turned around it might be that the African American supervisor gets challenged by the White supervisee and they're not ready to take it. If they're sort of in the

emersion stage that might sort of cause some conflict. I have a tendency to address [identity development models] early on in supervision. (Little Snake 2-pg.6)

I probably dealt with students who were at different stages and different phases and I know that I have gone through different stages and phases than when I first started. I did know there were differences and I did know that I had to treat people differently but I think that I've gone through a couple more stages over the last 30 years or so of my supervising people and my seeing clients as well. (Valarie 1-pg.11)

I have noticed that with Black supervisees they are more comfortable with talking about racial things. My White supervisees...a lot of them just stay away from the topic...like it wouldn't even come up...and if they did the ones with higher level racial identity they would ask questions that seemed genuine at least and they just didn't know and not that I know everything about being Black but there are some things that are different...there are different cultural variables there (Michelle 1-pg.11)

I had a supervisee ask me do Black people prefer to be called Black or African American. She didn't really want to be offensive (1-pg.8) and that to me was a bold step to actually ask me in that relationship, well how should I refer to them. She genuinely wanted to know what would be appropriate. I think that was good but I think a lot of times students or trainees don't want to be offensive and so it comes out as just shying away from it or not addressing the race issues or the other multicultural issues that are going on for their client. Really from my perspective I respect when the girl asked me. I was happy to give her an answer. I mean I can't speak for everyone but I think a lot of times when those conversations come up that shows that you have some maturity and that you are working towards multicultural competence. (Stacey A. 2-pg.5,6)

Particularly with White supervisees' lot of times I heard "well I don't see color I just see the client as an individual" and in my mind I'm saying that's BS. I have to challenge people on things like that because to me I think that's bogus. I don't know how you don't see it and I think for them that was multiculturalism because I don't see anyone to be a specific color and I mean I understand what they are trying to say but at the same time they're ignoring the client's culture

or race...that doesn't service the client [because] if race is an issue you have to see it (Michelle 2-pg.8)

In supervision experiences I notice that sometimes White students are more apt to talk about other areas of multiculturalism like LGBT issues. They are more apt to talk about those areas but shy away from when you get into race which causes me as a supervisor to have bring that up to them like you want to address this area but you don't want to address that area of the client's identity. I would say it definitely depends on where the person is at. (Stacey A. 1-pg.10)

Mentorship

Participant's often referenced a desire for mentorship, an element of mentorship within their own supervision, or mentorship as an element of the supervision they provide. They describe the characteristics of a mentorship relationship as well as the need for such a relationship with African American supervisees. It is largely through this capacity that supervisee's learn how to navigate the profession and gain support as a racial minority.

I think it's more indirect again but just showing up more frequently or engaging in conversation more frequently than say a white supervisee. I think it's just more of an eagerness that you sense within them that's through email or face to face contact. It's just more communication with them, which would let me know that this person is interested in developing the supervisory relationship beyond just their hour a week (Stacey A. 2-pg.5)

For my African American students its like "wow, you did it so I can do it" and it's much more like you're mentoring even if you're not formally mentoring them. It's more like they look up to you. It's more like what can I get from you. (Dr. Mom 1-pg.9)

I guess the one that stands out the most for me is being supervised by [an] African American psychologist. That was kind of a different experience. I went into it very excited thinking that ok this is an African American. This is someone that is going to understand me and help me and mentor me but that ended up being a not so good relationship or supervision experience. (Stacey A. 1-pg.1)

In my early years it sometimes was painful but as I talked to more seasoned minority clinicians they talked about how they dealt with those issues and how they coped and they would give me mentoring advice on how to navigate those treacherous waters. (Connie 2-pg.5)

The black ones...mentors made me feel that this is what you are capable of. This is what you can do [but] look at these parameters or look at this level of terrain [and] where the pit falls are (Gpsych 1-pg.6)

Limited Exposure

Participants acknowledge the limited number of African American supervisors and how this has impacted their clinical perspective, supervision experiences, assumptions, expectations, and dynamic with supervisees.

People that look like me weren't always necessarily available. They didn't hire Black folks back then. Dr. XXXXX was the first Black person that they hired and Dr. XXXX was another and they paved the way for a number of people...but back in my day they were rare. (Connie 1-pg.10)

I just think that people just aren't use to it. They are not use to seeing an ethnic minority in the role of supervisor and boss and that kind of thing so I think it's an adjustment for them. I don't think they are consciously like "I'm gonna revolt or rebel" but it's unconscious (Dr. Mom 1-pg.12)

Participants also discussed the limited exposure their supervisees have had with people of color in general, how this impacts their interactions, as well as the supervisee's clinical understanding often times illuminating stereotypes.

I don't think all White supervisees are not amendable. I've had experiences with White trainees where they have been amenable to supervision. It just depends on how much experience they actually had coming in. I guess maturity level as it relates to clinical experience [and] if they've had a position working across cultures

with supervisors or even if they had contact with other clinicians of different races if they had that experience working with other clinicians and different racial minorities. It really just depends on their maturity level and their exposure working with people of minority status. (Stacey A. 2-pg.1,2)

I had a [White male] supervisee and he was working with an African American male and how he described this guy (nonverbal gesture)...I mean I was expecting to walk in and see ya know this stereotypical guy that was in prison and I get in there and I'm like "him" (laughter and pointing hand gesture) and so we processed how he described this guy and how he talked about him being intimidating. I was looking at the guy like he kind of reminds me of my brother (facial expression) I mean I didn't really see what the issue was (Dr. Mom 1-pg.10,11)

Relationship

Each participant acknowledged the role of the supervisory relationship as key in understanding their experience as positive, negative, or useful with respect to their training, particularly around racial issues. The sub-theme reflected within the scope of participant experiences included (1) acquiring comfort, trust, and safety.

Comfort, Trust, and Safety

Few participants openly described common tactics utilized by supervisees to test the safety of the supervisory relationship.

[African American supervisees] will ask questions not because they don't know. They are asking the question because they are getting a perspective of the relationship because the relationship is important so how does that get interpreted by the White person? The White person interprets that as you don't know so I need to explain this to you and that wasn't the intention of the question...the intention of the question was to filter out the character and the relationship of the person. You already know the answer but you are asking the question because you are kind of getting a perspective on where is the other person coming from and how will they respond to me. So

those are the intentions of asking the question. It wasn't necessarily to get the answer. (Little Snake 1-pg.9)

At the time I didn't really have the language but an intuitive sense. When things are implicit and my intuition is up and running I'm paying attention to what I feel. I pay attention to how my body reacts to things and of course I'm taking in peoples body language and I'm listening to the words and I'm listening between the spaces and I'm aware of subtext (Rico 2-pg.5)

Other participants described the ways in which their supervisors facilitated an environment of safety. They emphasize the importance of addressing racial and cultural subtleties as a vehicle to acquiring comfort and trust within the relationship.

If you don't address cultural issues you're not providing an environment of safety. I can't talk to you about what I really think or what I really feel (Little Snake 2-pg.12)

If we were talking about a certain issue or professor or whatever she would ask "what was that like for you". She just really established that rapport right off the bat and she just made you feel comfortable. The first day I came in she just gave me a hug and was like "welcome"...it was always that over and above kind of thing that she provided (Dr. Mom 1-pg.4)

When I feel like there is something going on that perhaps is not being said I think years ago I would think about it, consider it as something that is happening that I'm not sure about but I would not always address it. I learned quickly that when it's not addressed things can go from bad to worse so it didn't do either of us any good not to address it. I think now through experience if I feel that some dynamic is going on, I will go ahead and try to address it. (Little Snake 2-pg.7)

My experience with him as a Black supervisor was first refreshing because I didn't feel like I had to sensor what I said I could just say it. I could bring myself into the environment. It was easy even when the cases were hard. I didn't feel like if I make a mistake that he was going to doubt my level of competence. If I made a mistake it was just a mistake or if I was being short sighted it was just being short

sighted. He held me to a standard he held everybody to a standard but he was the kind of guy he would push you to be your best. I could accept that from him because I sensed in him a genuine caring for the people that he supervised, a genuine caring for Black people, and a genuine caring for the profession (Rico 2-pg.7,8)

[I] definitely [felt] safer and I felt very comfortable with him (referencing a particular Black supervisor) he was my mentor so he would spend time and sort of spend time talking about processes and when I worked with somebody in therapy or counseling he would sort of integrate my experiences and he definitely brought into account cultural issues in terms of treatment...very professional and yet it seemed like we could talk about everything...and approachable and would sort of reinforce things that I've done and just made me feel comfortable in terms of my treatment of patients and my growth and would sort of help facilitate my growth and provided a lot of guidance and things like that (Vincent 1-pg.5)

At the conclusion of each interview, participants were asked if they felt this researcher missed anything, should have asked other questions, and if they had anything to add. All participants indicated that they enjoyed the interview process, engaging with this researcher, expressed interest in the final product, and felt as though the interview process made them think more deeply about their past and current supervision experience.

I'm just wondering how you're going to write this up? It just seems like because it's so subtle it will be hard. That is going to be a very, very interesting study. Like you probably could carve your niche in your career with that one (Dr. Mom 1-pg.16)

You really do seem to have thought about this a lot. Your questions are really good...I'm excited you're doing the research. (1-pg.13)... would you let me read this eventually? (Cochise 2-pg.9)

I think the nice part about answering these questions was that it just made me think more completely about race in supervision and how it's handled and what silences there are and I think that's what has motivated me to make sure that I bring up the topic of race with the people that I supervise (Valarie 2-pg.1)

You took me places I haven't been in a long time in my experiences and I'd like to definitely see how all of this comes out. (Gpsych 2-pg.17)

A few participants offered direct feedback such as *Vincent*, who expressed some interest in the literature on what informs supervisor perceptions of their supervisees.

I am wondering and I'm not too sure about this but are there different sort of questionnaires or sort of surveys that look at experiences or racial perceptions or things like that, that have been used or that you have been considering? (1-pg.15) I wondered to some degree the impact that racial identification of supervisors may have on their perceptions of supervision or white supervisees (Vincent 1-pg.16)

Valarie expressed an interest in seeing supervision literature focus on training supervisors to better address the nuances of being a minority clinician and the intrapersonal discomforts or conflicts that may surface when racial and cultural variables are visible within the therapy and subsequently the supervision relationship.

I think [what] is missing from multiculturalism is fully exploring issues of racism...I know that when a Black guy is sitting there talking about dating White women and he's talking to a Black female I think she probably has feelings about it but these are some of the issues in multiculturalism that we really don't talk about very much and so I think that's where the discussion needs to go...to talk in greater detail about these nuanced parts of relationships that are troublesome to people and that people don't like discussing. If I'm the supervisor I have to sort of say "Gee...ok now what do I think about this"...I have to say it to myself and then I can say are you having any difficulty with this and how do you know when you go into that clinical setting that you actually are neutral... If I'm picking

up that I'm uncomfortable and you're uncomfortable then it makes sense to me that you are probably uncomfortable in that session so I think those are dialogues that I have [to have] with my student (2-pg.9)

Several participants took the opportunity to elaborate upon specific supervision experiences, or more directly shared their perspective on the state of racism and multiculturalism in the United States, higher education, field of psychology, and supervision relationships specifically.

...you have to learn to be smarter. I would tell my boys if you are working with White women...this is what they'll do and this is how it happens and you can make a decision whether you will allow them to bring you down because they will. They won't ever tell you, "you scare me" but they will go and tell your boss, "well I just don't know...he scares me". (Connie 1-pg.12)

I have my own perspective but I just think that the major thing that universities care about now days is that you have grant dollars to support your research. The second thing is they want to make sure that you have publications and I think that [diversity] is becoming less of an issue. We have people going up for tenure now and I don't think that's a factor in terms of how they deal with diverse colleagues or diverse students or how diverse students perceive them (Valarie 1-pg. 13)

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

A wealth of data was derived from this dissertation study, all of which served to increase understanding of the phenomena in question – race relations within the supervision dyad among African American identified supervisors. The general scope of this study was intended to explore the wide range of experiences in supervision during their training up through their current experiences as supervisor. All participants engaged in a conversation about their personal, academic, and professional background. The study was comprised of a multifaceted phenomenological model which embraced an African Centered framework and utilized discourse analysis to highlight researcher/participant interaction. Three inquiries guided the interview process:

- (1) Supervision experiences of race relations during participant training as a supervisee with African American and/or White American supervisors
- (2) Supervision experiences of race relations recently or currently with African American and White American supervisees
- (3) Overall understanding of race relations within the supervision dyad

To explore these general inquiries I conducted a total of two in-depth interviews with ten participants on two separate occasions, totaling twenty interviews. Each interview was transcribed and cross-checked by participants to ensure accuracy. Each interview was then analyzed twice. First, through a discourse analysis (Cameron, 2001;

Gee, 1999) protocol and second based on the identification of traditional phenomenological meaning clusters (Moustakas, 1994). Once clusters of meaning were determined they were separated from the direct participant quotations and a group of three demographically diverse graduate students familiar with qualitative statistics engaged in a data rater process.

This data rater process required them as individuals to match direct participant quotations to theme clusters derived by this researcher. Textual descriptions were derived from participant interview responses to offer a snapshot of how each participant experienced the above inquiries. Finally, the essence was derived based upon the general themes or common experiences of all participants. In an effort to document the similarities and variation among the study participants, differences were also documented.

Throughout the course of the interviews, participant disclosures included topics such as socio-political occurrences specific to their experiences and more generally United States history as a whole (e.g. Civil Rights Movement, Detroit Riots, etc.). They also openly reflected upon culturally and racially charged occurrences from their past (e.g. segregation/integration, “talking White” phenomena, interracial dating/marriage, oppression, etc.). Participants referenced the power structure among their supervisors, supervisees, colleagues, and various training departments as a whole. In sharing their stories and experiences, participants often referenced both implicit and explicit messages derived from their interactions with both Black and White supervisors and supervisees.

Participants offered information about their full range of supervision experiences including dynamics present between African American supervisors and supervisees as well as minority supervisors and supervisees in general. The tendency for participants to disclose beyond racially homogeneous experiences to include minority supervisors and supervisees suggests that there are undoubtedly some similarities among all marginalized minority groups. All participants were asked *how* they arrived at certain conclusions or understandings of racialized occurrences in an effort to gain clarity on how specific dynamics were experienced and ultimately perceived. They cited hyper vigilance to non-verbal behaviors, verbal utterances that cued them into supervisor/supervisee multicultural understanding, dynamics with supervisors/supervisees over a period of time, and patterns in behaviors across supervisors/supervisees as evidence that defined their experiences.

This study offered a snapshot into the experience of within group dynamics among African American supervisors and supervisees, a perspective rarely and only more recently investigated (Banks-Johnson, 2002; Good-Cross, 2011; Jernigan, et al. 2010). Although more typically investigated, this study also offered more broad understanding of cross-cultural and cross- racial dynamics contributing to existing research (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006; Dovidio et al. 2002; Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Gardner, 2002; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Reynolds, 2004). The methodology used and two-fold analysis allowed for a greater understanding of variables such as researcher/participant dynamics, nonverbal interaction in addition to

verbal discourse, as well as contextual factors and how they inform the phenomena in question. Essentially this study aimed to illuminate *how* (process or implicit) data in addition to *what* (context or explicit) data.

Referring back to the literature, Kochman (1981) first recognized that Black style of communication as more self-conscious, more expressive, more expansive, more colorful, more intense, more assertive, and more aggressive. African Centered tenets also emphasize the prevalence of *expressive individualism* and *affect* (Parham, White, & Ajamau, 2002). The discourse analysis employed within this study supports this previous research. Participants were open, expressive in their language and corresponding affect often served to illustrate the content of their disclosures. This style of communication was often matched by the researcher, allowing for fluid and comfortable verbal interaction. For example, participants often emphasized content that they deemed important for this researcher to absorb through verbal stress, elongated speech, intonation, nonverbal facial expressions, hand gestures, and body re-positioning.

She judged Black families very harshly...just (non verbal gesture) ya know her demeanor in sessions was fine but the conclusions that she jumped to (.) she jumped to lots of conclusions about people and I said based on what?↑ Did they tell you that?↑ Well they did this and that and I'd say but did they tell you that?↑ (Rico 1-pg.12)

Participants also expressed areas of sensitivity or denoted a side bar through a whisper or engaged in laughter when discussing difficult topics, occurrences that highlighted obvious racialized slights, or when the interaction was genuinely lighthearted and/or funny.

I don't like to get into awkward debates with White supervisors↓ because I had a White supervisor who (.) we were trying to give one of our clients feedback about work place performance and a lot of the feedback was about him being a racist↑ and so - L - - hh - ...it was uhm...we were debating about how to tell him this and I was suggesting that it might be easier: and he might get less defensive if he heard it from her or one of the white colleagues than from me: and she just totally didn't agree with that↓ and it was like making parallels of being blond was the same thing as being Black and all these other: ya know great things where she thought she was relating to me and I just wanted to like↓ - L - really↑ like is it (Dr. Mom 1-pg.6)

Are you familiar with Frantz Fanon?...hh- Black Skin White Masks...I read that (.) it was on - L - oh it was on: and poppin: and I just started reading / I went broke buying books / I've got stuff just (.) I've got thousands of volumes around this joint↓ they're stored away in the basement and upstairs↓ / we've got a bad case of the stacks - L - (Rico 1 pg. 14)

Omnipresent within this study was the dynamic and communication style between researcher and participant. Participants also referenced communication style as one indicator that represented comfort, safety, and the presence of a shared lived experience between themselves and their African American supervisees. Specific indicators included; vernacular, discourse flow, increased disclosure, and instances of enthusiasm for being in relationship with someone of a similar racial background. All of which were present between researcher and participant.

Generally speaking all African American supervisors who participated in this study...

- (1) Demonstrated some level of multicultural awareness and a mature understanding of cultural and racial variables beyond demographic identification

- (2) Expressed a dedication to directly acknowledging cultural and racial differences and dispelling assumptions of similarity among African American supervisors and supervisees
- (3) Verbalized the need for additional more in-depth training within the realm of racially specific multicultural issues

While the broad findings listed above were endorsed by all participants, there were a variety of commonalities discovered based upon other variables. For example, participants that have been engaged in supervision for a longer period of time, often reflected upon how the field of psychology has evolved over the course of their training with respect to multiculturalism. Younger participants and those newer to the field did not directly address the changes visible within supervision and their training. However, most participants did reference the changing face of Black/White interaction within this country.

The findings derived from this study support the notion that we bring ourselves into the supervision relationship and ultimately our clinical work. The findings suggests that the lived experience of the African American supervisors who participated in this study coupled with their training experiences informed their supervision practices and ultimately impacted their supervisory relationships. This further suggests that the following domains, (1) Lived Experience, (2) Training and Multicultural Learning, and (3) Relationships cannot be compartmentalized as they have been for the purposes of this manuscript and are rather interrelated in nature. In an effort to maximize training

experiences it may be beneficial to attend to each of the identified domains. It is important to conceptualize the supervision dyad as simply a microcosm of the larger social structure. This understanding will help the reader better understand how the participant's lived experience directly influences their existence within the supervision dyad.

Lived Experience

The mere acknowledgement of race reflects a sociopolitical construction (Orbe & Harris, 2008). For this reason, it is inevitable that socio-political references surface in the exploration of race relations within supervision. Participants offered great transparency regarding their personal and professional experiences. They all discussed their upbringing, background, and the varying identities that informed their work. Participants talked openly about their personal lived experience as well as referenced a shared/common lived experience with their African American supervisors and supervisees. This component of shared/common lived experience was also illustrated through researcher/participant interactions.

In reflecting on their supervision many participants expressed some astonishment when they recognized the absence of cultural or racial discussion during their training. However, they all acknowledged race, racism and it's evolution as core to their identity. They were able to acknowledge the presence of racialized interaction within their lives and the supervision dyad specifically. This experience supports research which states that...

It was difficult to be black in America thirty or forty years ago, there is one area in which it is indisputably harder now: the area of knowing who and where your enemy is. In the days when segregation was a widely accepted political philosophy, those who bore black people ill will had no reason to deny it. The Civil Rights Movement made those views unfashionable, drove them underground, which is not the same thing as making them go away. (Pitts, 2008)

They highlighted explicit interactions and made attempts to articulate implicit racialized dynamics and acts of racism specifically. Pitts (2008) illuminates the invisible presence of racism in more general terms.

To be black in modern America is to feel the touch of hidden hands pressing down upon you. You know they're there. Their effect is clear in government, education, housing, justice, health, and other quality-of-life indicators, people like you lag behind the nation as a whole. (Pitts, 2008)

Specific to this study, participants shared the effects that limited exposure to African American supervisors had on them and how it impacts the dynamic between themselves and their supervisees. They highlighted instances of pressure to prove their competence, the dissonance associated with a desire to honor their racialized identity without being compartmentalized as only a racial being, and the difficulty they experienced attempting to navigate racial power structures.

Privilege (McIntosh, 1998) and white supremacy was implied and in many cases directly identified by participants through their recollections of White supervisor arrogance, perceived knowing, pushing personal/professional agenda (although often with good intentions), exertion of power, and the presence of racial microaggressions

(Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue et al, 2007; Sue et al, 2008). Race privilege means to set the agenda in a social situation and determine the rules, standards, and how they're applied (Johnson, 2008). Privilege grants the cultural authority to make judgments about others and it grants a presumption of superiority and social permission to act on that presumption without having to worry about being challenged (Johnson, 2008). *Gpsych* reflects upon an interaction which serves as a clear example of how entitlement and privileged power can be communicated.

...he was an administrator and a psychiatrist and we were at a meeting and someone said we need to post it [job announcement] and then the guy said "no, we're not gonna post it in the newspaper or anything until about three weeks from now"...but we had already had a funding deadline where we had to hire this person because it was a part of the grant and we were gonna lose the spot if we didn't hire by this certain date so I asked the question, "why aren't we posting it now?" and the man gave me without even thinking about it an answer that says we only post because we have to legally to let minorities know that we have positions and he looked me right in my face...but the issue was I think that was supreme paternalism in that "boy you're in your place", "you don't give us any trouble", "you must be a good nigga" (*Gpsych* 2-pg.4).

The act of entitlement is merely one feeling they have the right to demonstrate racialized privilege and exert power upon the other human being. The arrogance communicated through non-verbal communication demonstrates the philosophical although sometimes unconscious belief in White superiority. Although, this individual was not a direct clinical supervisor for *Gpsych*, his recollection of this occurrence and others serve as an illustration of how historical patterns of oppressive treatment and

socio-political messages such as subtle exercises of privilege and power may find its way into the supervision dyad, shaping the interpersonal interaction.

Finally, participants talked fluidly about how multiple minority statuses can serve as additional barriers within the context of supervision. For example, African American female participants often expressed the added difficulty of being identified with an oppressed gender group as well as an oppressed racial group. Younger African American participants expressed how their perceived youth/age made it even more difficult to be in a position of power or authority. Multiple minority identities or oppressed group identification appeared to “power” race (Gpsych 1-pg.9) making the supervision relationship more difficult.

Training and Multicultural Learning

While there have been significant gains with respect to clinical training related to multicultural learning and competence, literature is beginning to require more regarding multicultural training (Jernigan et. al, 2010; Sanchez-Hucles & Jones, 2005; Ponterotto, Utsey, & Pedersen, 2006; Sue et al. 2010; Utsey, Grange, & Allyne, 2006). This need was supported by study participants emphasizing the need for greater depth with respect to multicultural training within the departmental structure as well as the supervision dyad specifically. Participants articulated a hunger for supervision to first acknowledge cultural and racial variables, discuss and process culturally relevant literary works and theoretical frameworks, inquire about the intrapersonal and interpersonal experience associated with discussing racially charged variables, and finally tangible ways to apply

multicultural learning with their clientele. All participants expressed a need for the above in varying degrees. During the interview process, participants discussed the ways in which they attempt to provide this type of training to their supervisees. Participants were also fairly transparent and authentic in discovering the ways in which they themselves could better attend to racialized dynamics within the supervision relationship. They actively discovered and disclosed their blind spots throughout the interview process.

Each participant initiated discussion about supervisory assumptions and expectations, illuminating the impact that limited exposure to African American supervisors has on supervised training. Participants indicated that both White supervisees and Black supervisees were often surprised that they were in the role of supervisor. In some cases the surprise was supported by varied emotional reactions. Subtle instances of challenging, doubting, and questioning from White supervisors and supervisees were frequent occurrences for participants. Further, White supervisees often meet them with challenge and discounted their feedback, unless it was culturally specific. Participants were clear in acknowledging that this dynamic was largely unintentional, unconscious, and varied based on White supervisee's cultural understanding and identity development. The described acts of challenging and questioning was communicated in a way that felt negative and not reflective of a healthy and supportive challenging nor questioning that communicated genuine interest. The form of challenge and questioning the participants reflected upon communicated a disbelief in the competence of their skills and expected lack of knowledge.

The participants indicated that achieving excellence within their careers, consistently proving their competence, and communicating explicit expectations were often effective strategies to combat this dynamic with supervisees yet were not as utilized or as effective with White supervisors. They indicated that while challenging, doubting, and questioning were not as present among their Black supervisors or supervisees; Black supervisees were surprised to see them in the supervisory role and at times were uncertain what to expect. In this capacity, Black supervisees demonstrated an expectation that their supervisor would be White and likely doubted even the presence of a Black supervisor. Black supervisees communicated a subtle caution coupled with hope and enthusiasm for a positive mentoring supervision relationship.

A few participants indicated that White supervisees took critical feedback more personally while others stated that Black supervisees took critical feedback more personally. They were clear in hypothesizing that the sensitive nature in which some Black supervisees absorbed feedback may be due to the fact that from a socio-political and historical standpoint, Blacks are often criticized and challenged making them especially vulnerable in the supervision dyad. Limited exposure to Black supervisors or other non-White supervisors increased the likelihood for supervisees to act out assumptions based upon stereotypes, which suggests the need for increased exposure to diverse supervision experiences.

All participants informed this researcher that racialized interaction is always present and they all attempt to address and illuminate racial variables directly whether

they received such intentionality within their supervision or not. Meaningful, productive dialogue to raise consciousness and lead to effective action and social change (Tatum, 2008) seems to be endorsed as an area of continued attention within the scope of training and supervision. Participants acknowledged the gaps in multicultural training, stating that the Eurocentric nature of training is a core limitation to true multicultural learning. In addition to the notion that racial dialogue as essential to racial healing (Willow, 2008) and effective cultural competency (Sue et al., 2010), most study participants referenced the importance of learning and teaching African Centered perspectives and frameworks as well. This charge further supports the notion that educating oneself about varied theoretical models is critical and to not do so ultimately limits the scope of supervised training and competency in general.

Participant illuminated barriers to deeper multicultural learning interactions with their supervisees. Limited exposure served as one barrier because it produced assumptions and expectations based largely upon stereotypes, media, and previous experiences or lack thereof. Participants offered examples parallel to the findings of a study conducted by Sue, et al. (2010), color-blind attitudes, fear of appearing racist [or incompetent], and feeling as though they don't have a right to dialogue about race. According to *Michelle's* recollections of her White supervisee's, they often expressed seeing the individualism within each individual, discounting cultural and racial context. She suspects that the intention behind such a strategy is to communicate an appreciation for the unique lived experience of each individual personal equally, however this color-

blind attitude actually makes a core part of an individual's identity invisible which ultimately communicates invalidation and an immature understanding of race, racism, and racialized dynamics in general. Similarly, Tatum (2008) highlights how fear of ignorance can serve to impede White supervisee learning.

Some White students are afraid of their own ignorance, afraid that because of their limited experience with people of color they will ask a naïve question or make an offensive remark that will provoke the wrath of people of color around them (Tatum, 2008).

Stacey A. shared extensively about a White supervisee that was not afraid to broach topics of race and racism. She further discloses that, the supervisees' willingness to ask such questions and discuss openly cued her into the maturity and more sophisticated developmental level of the supervisee. *Rico* and *Cochise* both share instances where supervisees expressed concern and lack of confidence in their ability to work effectively with African American/Black clients. They each referenced their varied lived experiences as the reason for their lack of confidence and anticipated lack of competence. Participants expressed appreciation for the White supervisee's, citing that their willingness to disclose their insecurities and acknowledge the differences present between their lived experience and the lived experience of their client was actually an illustration that they were capable of developing the desired multicultural competence to work effectively with these clients. Acknowledgement of the racial and/or cultural variables communicated to *Rico* and *Cochise* that their supervisees were actively and authentically engaged in the cross-cultural or cross-racial dynamic.

The barriers associated with same-race supervision experiences resurfaced issues of assumptions and expectations. A few participants indicated that Black supervisees were especially familiar in hopes of a deeper mentorship relationship, making it important for them to set clear expectations and professional boundaries early on. While all participants noted that Black supervisees were more willing to engage in discussion and supervision related to race and culture there were a few barriers. The most general barriers to the facilitation of deeper multicultural learning interactions with their Black supervisees were minimal but included; defensiveness and emotional reactions to criticism as well as their participation in the perpetuation of stereotypes and pathological conceptualizations of clients due to internalized racism. Similar to White supervisees, Black supervisees exhibited such barriers based largely upon their developmental status and exposure to a diverse range of African American individuals within and outside of the training environment.

Relationship

Finally, most of the literature pertaining to the supervision dyad emphasizes the importance of a positive working alliance (Burkard et al. 1999; Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Lui & Pope-Davis, 2004; Wood, 2005) and its impact on training and client outcomes. This study revealed similar findings. Participants recalled only minimal negative relationships with either White or Black supervisors and/or supervisees, describing most relationships as “good”. The primary distinction identified

in their relationships with Black and White supervisors was the presence of discussing racial and cultural factors. Participants stated that most White supervisors were reluctant to address racial and cultural variables directly resulting in a more shallow relationship and training experience. Participants that had experienced supervision with Black supervisors stated that most were more willing and direct in broaching racial and cultural variables, which all participants appreciated. Participants were also clear in illuminating that demographically identifying as African American or Black did not ensure that supervisors were especially helpful.

Similarly, they indicated that White supervisees were less likely to bring up racial or cultural variables directly and more likely to challenge such discussion when they broached the subject, while Black supervisees were more likely to initiate conversation and openly engage in discussion when brought up. One factor that contributed to the varying degrees of comfort and willingness to discuss such issues among both White supervisors and White supervisees appeared to be their developmental level, instances of cross-racial and/or cross-cultural interaction prior to the supervision relationship, and/or a genuine vulnerability to move towards greater multicultural competence. How one recognized and conceptualized his/her Blackness or Whiteness was more a factor in relationship dynamic than phenotypical similarity or difference alone.

Scholars emphasize the discomfort that is likely to surface that White/European American's experience when dealing with racial differences (Change & Berk, 2009; Utsey, Hammer, & Gernat, 2005; Vontress, 1971). Findings from this study contribute

significantly to the standing literature as participants described similar discomforts from their White supervisees. They also highlighted the fact that comfort and safety was actually achieved in large part as a result of dealing with racial and cultural variables in the supervision relationship for African American/Black supervisees. Initiating discussion about subtleties associated with racialized interaction contributed to feelings of safety, comfort and trust. Because each participant seemed to identify strongly with their racialized identities at one point or another in their training, to have this element of their existence acknowledged served as self-validation. To not address such variables actually contributed to discomfort, supporting the notion that the lack of honest and open conversation can actually have a devastating consequence on the supervisory relationship with both White and Black supervisees (Sue et al., 2010).

African American supervisees appeared to be more attuned to nonverbal communication, implicit messages, and relational climate according to the study participants. They themselves described the ways in which they would often test the safety of their supervision relationships and could therefore recognize this same dynamic among their African American supervisees. In addition to explicit acknowledgement and discussion of cultural and racial variables; Black supervisees offered an anticipated trust and expectation of comfort solely based upon the expectation of shared experience. They also seem to seek safety through developing a mentorship relationship with their supervisors as well as tallying instances that communicated a commitment to true anti-

racism and/or multicultural understanding beyond the scope of the supervision relationship.

For example, *Cochise* reflects on his good relationships with White supervisors but indicated that he may have felt more comfortable in relationship with someone that had a similar racial identity. He elaborates on the likelihood that he would have received supervision/mentorship that would have helped him better understand how to use his multicultural lens and racialized identity effectively in the therapeutic relationship.

Nearly all of the participants expressed a desire for a strong mentorship relationship with an African American supervisor. In reflecting upon their interactions with Black supervisees, they often noted that their supervisees often demonstrated and/or verbally communicated an element of appreciation and respect for their mentorship. *Dr. Mom* shared that many of her African American supervisees seemed to have more respect for her and genuinely trusted her competence, seeing her ability to “make it” in the profession as evidence that she has something to offer them.

Strengths and Limitations

A considerable strength of this dissertation was the use of a research design that fit not only the area of interest to this researcher, but also employed frameworks that fit most appropriately with the study population. The general focus of the research was on exploring and describing the subjective experiences of self-identified African American/Black supervisors. The phenomenological qualitative approach supported by an African Centered framework and intentional two-fold analysis, adequately and appropriately addressed this

research area. By interviewing the participants' in-person and on multiple occasions, this researcher was able to develop a deeper rapport and compile a wealth of sensitive information. Due to the sensitivity of the phenomena in question, developing a safe relationship was critical in gaining access to authentic and uncensored participant recollections.

Additional strengths of this dissertation study included; (1) bracketing of researcher experiences, (2) manageable sample size, which allowed for greater depth and broader scope of data retrieval, (3) fairly even gender make up of study participants (female=6, male=4), (3) semi-structured interview protocol to minimize researcher bias and allow for participants to explore their experiences as they saw fit, and (4) a comprehensive analysis, which included transcription coding, cross-checking, memo-writing, and the inter-rater process.

The primary limitation of this study was that it did not account for the developmental status of the supervisor participants. Because racial identity development often shapes the filter through which an individual interprets his/her experiences, it is likely that varied developmental status played a large role in what the participants disclosed throughout the interview process. While it was perhaps a premature inquiry and beyond the scope of this dissertation study, focus on this variable in the future will allow for more accurate understanding of race relations in the supervision dyad. While the researcher consider the sample size a strength of this study, it is important to note that such a small sample size does not allow for generalization of study findings.

Implications for the Future

Research, Training, and Supervision

Research acknowledges the importance of investigating interracial communication styles (Orbe & Harris, 2008). While this need was supported by the participants, they also identified interesting nuances present when one investigates within group racial communication styles. This was most evident in their stated interactions with their African American supervisees as well as discourse between researcher and participant. Research has historically focused on between group comparisons neglecting the need to further explore what works effectively and what does not work effectively in within group studies. This fact in addition with the understanding that developmental status shapes the supervision relationship, supports the call for continued research on within group investigation taking into consideration development status rather than just demographic characteristics.

In accordance with Nilsson & Duan (2007) these study finding support the notion that supervision relationships are not isolated from the multiple context in which we live. Although focus on multiple identities, acknowledgement of context, and sensitivity to multicultural variables has increased within supervision research; the findings from this study further emphasize the need for more exploration into socio-political, historical, cultural, and racial phenomena. As a result of this study, readers may have a better understanding of the general supervision experiences of African American supervisors as well as interpersonal distinctions with White/Caucasian and Black/African American

individuals. One might consider investigating how the lived experiences of African American supervisors can be better utilized in supervision training. By appropriately disclosing and processing nuanced experiences that have been shaped by evidenced and perceived lived experiences of oppression the following considerations should be entertained. First, directly addressing such variables may create a safe place for supervisees to disclose and explore such slights in supervision. Second, modeling a developmentally appropriate level of transparency in this regard may facilitate meaningful and intentional attempts for supervisees to address multiculturalism with their clientele. Many of the participants in this study have suggested that while multicultural training has evolved, it is still largely didactic and absent of experiential depth. Utilization of lived experience and first person accounts may serve as the vehicle to facilitate deeper learning. Ultimately greater investigation is warranted to determine the specific uses of what appears to be valuable aspects of supervisor identity.

Most prevalent within this study was the stated importance for supervisors to broach race, racism, and cultural variables explicitly. Findings from this study further suggests that candid discussion about cultural and racial dynamics among client and supervisee as well as between supervisee and supervisor is an essential feature of useful supervision. However, specific supervision strategies intended to foster multicultural training was not the aim of this study and therefore an area worthy of continued exploration. This may be an area of continued interest. Participants were clear in acknowledging that there still exist gaps in theoretical and applied multicultural

knowledge. Future researchers may wish to investigate, what multicultural interventions were/are effective and how so?

It is also critical to acknowledge the fact that often times the supervisory relationship is neglected due to clinical demand and the tendency to focus solely on clinical skill development. Despite the fact that this study specified that there is more to successful supervision than simply micro skill acquisition. This is a limited understanding of the supervisory relationship, particularly when the supervisory relationship is the primary vehicle to facilitate meaningful learning. Because fear, discomfort, and unawareness often serve as a barrier to multicultural learning and even the likelihood for supervisors to broach such topics; it may be useful to more deeply investigate what barriers prevent supervisors from providing multiculturally responsive supervision. Future studies would also serve to investigate how supervisors were able to progress beyond his/her developmental limitations and further illuminate what does and does not work with supervisees.

It is clear that this study offers a significant contribution to the sparse literature on African American supervisory experiences from the perspective of the supervisor. Noteworthy is the wealth of data about the experiences of African American supervisors over the course of time, which offered a snapshot of how race relations has been experienced, perceived, and interpreted over time. Also noteworthy, was the use of the researcher in illuminating discourse. The intentionality behind analyzing the interaction between same-race participant and researcher, illuminated the richness of within group

design and served as an active analysis of race relations. Ultimately, three fairly broad inquiries lead to the discovery of three inter-related themes of importance within the supervisory experience of African American supervisors. Each of the three inter-related themes offered deeper understanding of up to three sub-themes, all listed below:

- (1) Lived Experience – *Political, Historical, Racial, Cultural Context; Proving One’s Competence; Entitlement and Privileged Power*
- (2) Training and Multicultural Learning - *Development, Mentorship, Limited Exposure*
- (3) Relationship – *Comfort, Trust, and Safety*

The findings were discussed in relation to the existing literature on cross-cultural and cross-racial supervision (Brown, Acevedo-Polakovich, & Smith, 2006; Chen, 2004, Sue et al. 2010), supervision working-alliance (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Falendar & Shafranske, 2004; Ladany et al, 1997), multicultural learning (Jernigan et al. 2010; Sanchez-Hucles & Jones, 2005; Ponterotto, Utsey, & Pedersen, 2006; Sue et al., 2010; Utsey, Grange, & Allyne, 2006), racial identity development (Bradshaw, 1982; Hays & Change, 2003; Helms, 1994) privilege (Johnson, 2008; McIntosh, 1998) and microaggressions (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Sue et al., 2007; Sue et al., 2008). In addition, the literature that supported this study and its findings also are those areas of interest that remain unaddressed and are gravely lacking in the clinical supervision research. This researcher has attempted to give voice to the “silences” that still exist in the field of psychology.

REFERENCES

- Ali, S. R., Flojo, J.R., Chronister, K.M, Hayashino, D., Smiling Q.R., Torres, D., & McWhirter, E.H. (2004). *When Racism Is Reversed. Voices of Color First-Person Accounts of Ethnic Minority Therapists.*
- Atkinson, D.R. (2004). *Counseling American Minorities.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Banks-Johnson, (2002). *Perceptions of the supervisory relationship: Minority supervisors working with minority supervisees.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- Belgrave, F.Z. & Allison, K.W. (2006). *African American Psychology: From African to America.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bhat, C.S. & Davis, T.E. (2007). *Counseling Supervisors' Assessment of Race, Racial Identity, and Working Alliance in Supervisory Dyads.* The Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. 35, 80-91.
- Bottomoff, J.L. (1994). *Using Videotaped Recordings in Qualitative Research.* Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brown, T.L, Acevedo-Polakovich, I.D. & Smith, A.M. (2006). *Cross-cultural issues affecting the supervisory relationship in counseling children and families.* Helping others help children: Clinical supervision of child psychotherapy. Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.
- Burkard, A.W., Ponterotto, J.G., Reynolds, A.L, & Alfonso, C. V. (1999). *White Counselor Trainees' Racial Identity and Working Alliance Perceptions.* Journal of Counseling & Development. 77(3), 324-329.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Carruthers, J.H. (1996). *Science and Oppression.* African Psychology in Historical Perspective and Related Commentary. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Carter, R.T., Helms, J.E., & Juby, H.L. (2004). *The Relationship Between Racism and Racial Identity for White Americans: A Profile Analysis.* Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. 32(1), 2-17.

- Carter, R.T. & Pieterse, A.L. (2004). *Race: A Social and Psychological Analysis of the Term and Its Meaning*. The Handbook of Racial-Cultural Psychology and Counseling: Training and Practice - Volume 1. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Casas, J.M. (2002). *Race and Racism: The Efforts of Counseling Psychology to Understand and Address the Issues Associated with These Terms*. The Counseling Psychologist. 33(4), 501-512.
- Chang, D.F. & Berk, A. (2009). *Making Cross-Racial Therapy Work: A Phenomenological Study of Clients' Experiences of Cross-Racial Therapy*. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 56(4), 521-536.
- Chen, E.C. (2004). *Racial-Cultural Training for Supervisors: Goals, Foci, and Strategies*. The Handbook of Racial-Cultural Psychology and Counseling: Training and Practice - Volume 2. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cohen, M.Z., & Omery, A. (1994). *Schools of Phenomenology: Implications for Research*. Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Constantine, M.G, Warren, A.K, & Miville, M.L. (2005). *White Racial Identity Dyadic Interactions in Supervision: Implications for Supervisees' Multicultural Counseling Competence*. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 42(4), 490-496.
- Cook, D. A. (1994). *Racial Identity in Supervision*. Counselor Education and Supervision.34, 132-139.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). *Why can't We Just Get Along? Interpersonal Biases and Interracial Distrust*. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology. 8(2), 88-102.
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). *A Descriptive "Snapshot" of Cross-Racial Supervision in University Counseling Center Internships*. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29(2), 131-146.
- Dunbar, C., Rodriguez, D., & Parker, L. (2002). *Race, Subjectivity, and the Interview Process*. Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Falender, C.A. & Shafranske, E.P. (2004). *Clinical Supervision: A Competency-Based Approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gardner, R. (2002). *Cross Cultural Perspectives in Supervision*. The Western Journal of Black Studies. 26(2),98-106.
- 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 and Development. 29, 102-113.
- Gee, P.J. (1999). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Giorgi, A. (1985). *Phenomenology and Psychological Research*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Goode-Cross, D.T. (2011). "Those Who Lean Have a Responsibility To Teach" *Black Therapists' Experiences Supervising Black Therapist Trainees*. Training and Education in Professional Psychology. 5(2), 73-80.
- Hays, G.D. & Chang, C. Y. (2003). *White Privilege, Oppression, and Racial Identity Development: Implications for Supervision*. Counselor Education & Supervision.33,134-145.
- Helms, J.E. (1995). *An update of Helms's White and People of Color Racial Identity. Handbook of Multicultural Counseling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hernandez, P. & McDowell, T. (2010) *Intersectionality, Power, and Relational Safety in Context: Key Concepts in Clinical Supervision*. Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4,1, 29-35.
- Hernandez, P., & Rankin, P. (2008). *Relational safety in supervision*. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 34, 58–74.
- Hilton, D., B., Russell, R.K., & Salmi, S.W. (1995). *The Effects of Supervisor's Race and Level of Support and Perceptions of Supervision*. Journal of Counseling & Development. 73, 559-563.

- Hird, J.S., Cavalieri, C.E., Dulko, J.P., Felice, A.A.D, & Ho, T.A. (2001). *Visions and Realities: Supervisee Perspectives of Multicultural Supervision*. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. 29, 114-130.
- Hird, J.S., Tao, K.W., & Gloria, A.M. (2005). *Examining Supervisors' Multicultural Competence in Racially Similar and Different Supervision Dyads*. The Clinical Supervisor. 23(2), 107-122.
- Jernigan, M.M, Green, C.E., Helms, J.E., Perez-Gualdron, L., & Henze, K. (2010). *An Examination of People of Color Supervision Dyads: Racial Identity Matters as Much as Race*. Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4(1), 62-73.
- Johnson, A.G. (2008). *Privilege as Paradox*. White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism. Edited by Paula S. Rothenberg. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Johnson, J.M. (2002). *In-depth Interviewing*. Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kovel, J. (1970). *White Racism: A Psychohistory*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Kushner, J.E. (1999). *Charting an unfamiliar path. Black and White supervisors talk about multicultural supervision: An exploratory qualitative interview study* Rutgers The State University of New Jersey, New Jersey.
- Ladany, N., Inman, A.G., Constantine, M.G., & Hofheinz, E. W. (1997). *Supervisee Multicultural Case Conceptualization Ability and Self-Reported Multicultural Competence as Functions of Supervisee Racial Identity and Supervisor Focus*. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 44(3), 284-293.
- Lee, L. J. (2005). *Taking Off the Mask*. Voices of Color: First-Person Accounts of Ethnic Minority Therapists. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Leong, F.T.L. & Wagner, N.S. (1994). *Cross-Cultural Counseling Supervision: What Do We Know? What Do We Need to Know?* Counselor Education and Supervision. 34, 117-127.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lucal, B. (1996). *Oppression and Privilege: Toward a Relational Conceptualization of Race*. Teaching Sociology. 24, 245-255.

- Lui, W.M. & Pope-Davis, D.B. (2004). *The Working Alliance, Therapy Ruptures and Impasses, and Counseling Competence: Implications for Counselor Training and Education*. The Handbook of Racial-Cultural Psychology and Counseling: Training and Practice - Volume 2. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Majcher, J. & Daniluk, J.C. (2009). *The Process of Becoming a Supervisor for Students in a Doctoral Supervision Training Course*. Training and Education in Professional Psychology. 3(2), 63-71.
- Manen, M.V. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. Ontario, Canada: The State University of New York.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McIntosh, P. (1998). *White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack*. Revisioning Family Therapy: Race, Culture, and Gender in Clinical Practice. New York; Gilford Press.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Myers, L.J. (2009). *Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to African and African American Psychology*. Handbook of African American Psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Neville, H.A., Tynes, B.M. & Utsey, S.O. (2009). *African American Psychology : Trends and Future Directions*. Handbook of African American Psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nilsson, J.E. & Duan, C. (2007). *Experiences of Prejudice, Role Difficulties, and Counseling Self-Efficacy Among U.S. Racial and Ethnic Minority Supervisees Working with White Supervisors*. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. 23, 219-229.
- Orbe, P.M. & Harris, M.T. (2008). *Interracial Communication: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Owens-Patterson, M. (2000). *The African American Supervisor: Racial Transference and Countertransference in Interracial Psychotherapy Supervision*. Psychotherapy with African American Women. New York, NY: The Gilford Press.

- Parham, T.A., White, J.L., & Ajamau A. (2000). *The Psychology of Blacks: An African Centered Perspective*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Parker, L. & Lynn, M. (2002). *What race got to do with it? Critical Race Theory's Conflicts with and Connections to Qualitative Research Methodology and Epistemology*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.
- Pinderhughes, E. (1989). *Understanding Race, Ethnicity, and Power: The Key to Efficacy in Clinical Practice*. New York: Free Press.
- Pitts, L. (2008). *Crazy Sometimes*. White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism. Edited by Paula S. Rothenberg. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Polkinghorne, D.E. (1989). *Phenomenological Research Methods. Existential-Phenomenological Perspectives in Psychology*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Ray, M.A. (1994). *The Richness of Phenomenology: Philosophic, Theoretic, and Methodologic Concerns*. *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Reynolds, A.L. (2004). *Applications of Racial-Cultural Supervision*. *The Handbook of Racial-Cultural Psychology and Counseling: Training and Practice - Volume 2*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Riessman, K.C. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Semaj, L.T. (1996). *Towards a Cultural Science. African Psychology in Historical Perspective and related commentary*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Shuy, R. W. (2002). *In-Person versus Telephone Interviewing. Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sue, D.W. *The Invisible Whiteness of Being: Whiteness, White Supremacy, White Privilege, and Racism*. *Addressing Racism: Facilitating Cultural Competence in mental Health and Educational Settings*. Edited by Mondanna G. Constantine and Derald Wing Sue. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Sue, D.W., Rivera, D.P., Capodilupo, C.M., Lin, A.I., & Torino, G.C. (2010). *Racial Dialogues and White Trainee Fears: Implications for Education and Training*. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(2), 206-214.
- Sue, D.W. & Sue, D. (1999). *Counseling the Culturally Different: Theory and Practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tatum, B. (2008). *Breaking the Silence*. White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism. Edited by Paula S. Rothenberg. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Taylor, B.A., Hernandez, P., Deri, A. Rankin IV, P.R., & Siegel, A. (2006). *Integrating Diversity Dimensions in Supervision: Perspectives of Ethnic Minority AAMFT Approved Supervisors*. *Clinical Supervisor*, 25(1), 3-21.
- Thompson, C. E., Shin, C. E., & Stephens, J. (2005). Race and research evidence. *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling, vol 1: Theory and research*. (pp. 277-294). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Tummala-Narra, P. (2004). *Dynamics of Race and Culture in the Supervisory Encounter*. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*. 21(2), 300-311.
- Toporek, R.L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D.B. (2004). *Critical Incidents in Multicultural Supervision: Exploring Supervisees' and Supervisors' Experiences*. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*. 32(2), 66-83.
- Tsui, M.S. (1997). *The Roots of Social Work Supervision: An Historical Review*. *The Clinical Supervisor*. 15(2), 191-198.
- Utsey, S.O., Belvet, B., & Fischer, N. (2009). *Assessing African-Centered (Africentric) Psychological Constructs: A Review of Existing Instrumentation*. *Handbook of African American Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Utsey, S. O. & Gernat, C.A. (2002). *White Racial Identity Attitudes and the Ego Defense Mechanisms Used by White Counselor Trainees in Racially Provocative Counseling Situations*. *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 80(4), 475-483.
- Utsey, S., Grange, C., & Allyne, R. (2006). *Guidelines for Evaluating the Racial and Cultural Environment of Graduate Training Programs in Professional Psychology*.

- Utsey, S.O., Hammer, L., & Gernat, C.A. (2005). *Examining the Reactions of White, Black, and Latino/a Counseling Psychologists to a Study of Racial Issues in Counseling and Supervision Dyads*. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 33(4), 565-573.
- Vontress, C.E. (1971). *Racial Differences: Impediments to Rapport*. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 18(1), 7-13.
- Warren, C.A.B. (2002). *Qualitative Interviewing*. *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Webb, A. (2000). *What Makes It Difficult For the Supervisee to Speak? Taking Supervision Forward: Enquiries and Trends in Counselling and Psychotherapy*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- White, J.L. (1972). *Toward a Black Psychology*. *Black Psychology*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Wood, C. (2005). *Supervisory Working Alliance: A Model Providing Direction for College Counseling Supervision*. *Journal of College Counseling*. 88,127-137.
- Young, R. (2004). *Cross-Cultural Supervision*. *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 32(1),39-49.

Appendix A
Informed Consent Agreement

Western Michigan University
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Lonnie E. Duncan, Ph.D.
Student Investigator: Brandi L. Pritchett, M.A.
Title of Study: African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "*African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad*". This project will serve as Brandi L. Pritchett's dissertation for the requirements of the doctoral degree in Counseling Psychology. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the full supervision experiences of African American supervisors when engaged in training with other African American supervisors and supervisees, and White American supervisors and supervisees. Exploring such a phenomenon from this perspective may allow for greater understanding of how race relations are experienced and communicated within supervised training, a perspective yet to be explored. This study may ultimately aid in developing supervision competencies for future training.

Who can participate in this study?

Any clinical or counseling psychology student, faculty, or clinician who meets the following criteria:

- (1) Self identify as African American/Black
- (2) Have experienced clinical supervision from a White American/Caucasian supervisor
- (3) Have provided clinical supervision to a White American/Caucasian supervisee
- (4) Have provided clinical supervision to an African American/Black supervisee

Where will this study take place?

The primary method of data collection will include an interview protocol, which will take place in a location determined by each participant. The location will be negotiated pending feasibility and resources by each participant and the researcher collectively. The first interview will be conducted in-person in a location of the participants choosing. The location should be in a private, quiet, and comfortable location to participants. The

second and optional third interview can be completed via telephone or visual on-line modalities (e.g. Skype).

What is the commitment for participating in this study?

An in-depth phenomenological research approach will be employed for this study. You will be asked to participate in a series of two - three 60-90 minute interviews with your full participation not to exceed six months.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?

You will be asked to participate in a possible three series interview protocol. The initial interview will be conducted in-person and will be audio recorded and transcribed. To honor your time and participation, the second interview may be completed by telephone per your request and the third interview is optional pending the need for additional information. Telephone interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed. ** You will be provided audio transcriptions to validate accuracy and make any alterations.

What information is being measured during the study?

You will be asked to recall your supervision experiences both as a clinical supervisee and as a clinical supervisor. Specifically you will be asked about racialized interactions in your supervisory relationships. Any identifiable themes related to your experiences will be measured and recorded as well as the distinct verbal and nonverbal messages during the interview process.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?

Due to the potential for sharing private and what may be painful recollections of experiences related to race relations (e.g. racism, discrimination, etc.) there is some vulnerability and discomfort that may arise from your participation in this study. Beyond minimal discomfort there are no additional anticipated risks to your participation in this study. In an effort to reduce risks, anonymity will be protected. Data gathered from all interviews will be categorized by a number system and identified by a pseudonym, which you will provide.

In accordance with ethical guidelines and due to the sensitive nature of this dissertation topic, all of your identifying demographic information and all data gathered throughout the full duration of the proposed study will be kept confidential and stored in a secure location. The pseudonym you choose will be used in the reports of all information retrieved from the interviews. Additionally, your participation in this study is voluntary and therefore you have the right to withdraw from this study at any time. In the event that you withdraw from the study all recorded material will be deleted immediately. If you choose to participate in this study in its entirety, you may choose not to answer any

specific questions asked during any of the maximum three interviews. All recorded material will be deleted upon completion of the full study.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?

The proposed study will allow for a focus on African American supervisors full range of supervision experiences, which may ultimately aid in developing more sophisticated and diversified training competency methods.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?

There are no identified costs to you as a participant in this study.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?

There will be no monetary compensation for your participation in this study.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?

This researcher will have full access to the information collected throughout the duration of this study. All data will be consolidated into a final dissertation project to be submitted for completion of this researcher's doctoral degree and presented during the dissertation defense. Pseudonym information will be utilized and no identifying information will be used in the presentation of this study either in written or verbal form.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?

As a voluntary participant in this study you can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences either academically or personally if you choose to withdraw from this study.

Audio recordings will be used in this study for transcription and analysis by the researcher and/or select graduate research assistants. Immediately following the conclusion of this study your recorded material will be deleted.

- _____ I give permission for the audio recording to be used as described above.
 _____ I DO NOT give permission for the audio recording to be used as described above.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the Brandi L. Pritchett, M.A. at 269.615.4199 or brandi.l.pritchett@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of

the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I agree to participate in the research study described above:

Date: _____

Signature of Participant

Printed name of Participant

Appendix B

Demographic/Background Questionnaire

Number: _____

Demographic/Background Questionnaire

Name: _____

Pseudonym: _____

Gender: Male Female

Please indicate the setting of your clinical supervision experience:

____ University Counseling/Testing Center ____ Community Mental Health

____ School District ____ Hospital

____ VA ____ Prison System

____ Other: _____

Estimated total number of clinical supervision hours you have *received*:

0-50 51-100 101- 150 151- 200 201 or above

Estimated total number of clinical supervision hours you have ***provided***:

0-50 51-100 101- 150 151- 200 201 or above

Have you *received* clinical supervision from an African American supervisor?

Yes No

Have you *received* clinical supervision from a White American supervisor?

Yes No

Have you ***provided*** clinical supervision to an African American supervisee?

Yes No

Have you ***provided*** clinical supervision to a White American supervisee?

Yes No

Appendix C
Call for Participation

Call for Participation

My name is Brandi Pritchett, and I am a doctoral student in the Counseling Psychology program at Western Michigan University. I am currently in the process of completing my dissertation and would greatly appreciate your participation in my research study entitled, *African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad*. Interested participants must meet the following criteria:

- (1) self-identify as African American/Black
- (2) have received supervision during his/her training as a masters and/or doctoral student
- (3) have provided supervision to a White American/Caucasian supervisee
- (4) Have provided supervision to an African American/Black supervisee

If interested, this research study will require your participation in an in-depth phenomenological interview protocol. Because I am looking to develop a comprehensive understanding of your experiences, we will engage in up to three 60-90 minute interviews all of which should be conducted within a six month period. The first interview will be conducted in person in a location of your choosing, while the second and optional third interview may be conducted via telephone. All interviews will be audio recorded.

If you are interested in learning more about this study please feel free to contact me directly at 269.615.4199 or brandi.l.pritchett@wmich.edu. Feel free to forward this information on to others that may be interested.

Sincerely,

Brandi L. Pritchett, M.A.

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Researcher Copy

Interview Protocol

Researcher Copy

Study Title: **African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad**

Date: _____

Participant Pseudonym: _____

Interview: One Two Three (optional)

Question 1: Take a few moments to reflect on your supervision relationships during your clinical training when you received supervision. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisors and African American supervisors.

Question 2: Take a few moments to reflect on your current/recent supervisor/supervisee relationships as a supervisor. Please describe key experiences specific to race relations with White supervisees and African American supervisees.

Question 3: Take a few moments to think about your full range of experiences as an African American supervisee and now as an African American supervisor. Please describe how you have come to understand race relations over the course of your clinical training and what this will mean for you as you continue to provide supervision to African American supervisees in the future.

2nd Interview

Question 1: During our last interview you were asked to reflect on three things: (1) your supervision relationships during your training, (2) your current/recent supervision relationships as a supervisor, and (3) your understanding of race relations during both your supervised training and now as a supervisor. After reviewing the transcription of your first interview and having some time for additional reflection, would you please elaborate on any of the three questions.

3rd Interview (optional)

Question 1: During our last interview you were provided with a transcription of our first interview and asked to elaborate on any of the three interview questions. Now that you have had an opportunity to review each of the last two interview transcriptions is there anything additional you wish to add with respect to race relations in the supervision process?

Appendix E
Transcription Coding Guide

Transcription Coding Guide

	Description	Code	Secondary Code
Repetition	word or phrase		Green
**Stress	word or syllable	Underline	
**Intonation	Increase	↑	
	Decrease	↓	
	Whisper	{ }	
*Pause	time when seconds	()	
	time when less than seconds	(.)	
**Final Contour	completion of thought	/	
*Simultaneous Speech	between participant and researcher	[]	
*Nonverbal	specific gesture	(())	
*Latching	no space between participant and researcher speech	=	
*Elongated Speech	lengthened words or syllables	:	
Audible Expressions	non words or sounds		
	Sigh	-hh-	
	Laughter	-L-	
	active listening	-mhm-	yellow
	Agreement	-mhm-	Orange

* Cameron, D. (2001). Working with Spoken Discourse. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

** Gee, J.P. (1999). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. New York, NY: Routledg

Appendix F

HSIRB Approval Letter

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY



Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: August 18, 2010

To: Lonnie Duncan, Principal Investigator
Brandi Pritchett, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Amy Naugle", written over the printed name.

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 10-07-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "African American Experiences of Race Relations in the Supervision Dyad" has been **approved** under the **expedited** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: August 18, 2011