2019

Foreign-Born Doctoral-Level Counselor Supervisors' Use and Experience of Supervision Theories/Models

Keiko Sano
Antioch University Seattle

FOREIGN-BORN DOCTORAL-LEVEL COUNSELOR SUPERVISORS' USE AND

EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISION THEORIES/MODELS

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of

Antioch University Seattle

Seattle, WA

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Keiko Sano

ORCID SCHOLAR No. 0000-0002-5745-2556

December 2019

FOREIGN-BORN DOCTORAL-LEVEL COUNSELOR SUPERVISORS' USE OF

SUPERVISION THEORIES/MODELS

This dissertation, by Keiko Sano, has been approved
by the committee members signed below who
recommend that it be accepted by the faculty of the
Antioch University in Seattle, WA in partial fulfillment
of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dissertation Committee:

_____
Ned Farley, PhD

_____
Colin Ward, PhD

_____
Mariaimeé Gonzalez, PhD

_____
December 11, 2019

ABSTRACT

FOREIGN-BORN DOCTORAL-LEVEL COUNSELOR SUPERVISORS' USE AND

EXPERIENCE OF SUPERVISION THEORIES/MODELS

Keiko Sano

Antioch University Seattle

Seattle, WA

Learning about supervision theories/models is part of counselor educator and supervisor training; however, the number of available empirical studies exploring supervisors' use of supervision theories/models is limited. Diversity and globalization in the field of counseling and doctoral students in the counselor education and supervision program have been increased in the last two decades; however, multicultural issues in supervision literature often focus on the supervisors' multicultural competency by assuming that supervisors are white Americans and supervisees are foreign-born or from diverse background. The present study was designed to fill gaps in the current literature by focusing on foreign-born racially/ethnically diverse doctoral-level supervisors' experience in clinical supervision in order to assess the cultural sensitivity of available supervision theories/models. The present study was conducted to answer two research questions: (a) How do foreign-born supervisors use supervision theories/models with their white American-born supervisees? and (b) What do those foreign-born supervisors experience in supervision? A qualitative constructivist grounded theory methodology was utilized, and data were collected in two levels: an initial written survey to construct interview questions (N = 30) and individual semi-structured interviews (N = 12). The results suggested three significant findings in the foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision theories/models and experiences.

First, foreign-born supervisors take the supervisee-centered approach regardless of their supervision theories. Second, supervision theories/models offer a framework to facilitate supervision sessions, tools to build supervisory relationships, and roles to fill cultural gaps in supervision. Third, foreign-born supervisors use their supervisees' perspectives toward themselves to evaluate the quality of the supervisor relationship, effectiveness of the supervision theories/models, and their competency as a supervisor. Implications for supervision training and development of culturally sensitive supervision theories/models, recommendations for future research, and this researcher's biases in studying foreign-born supervisors were discussed. This dissertation is available in open access at AURA, http://aura.antioch.edu/ and Ohio Link ETD Center, https://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd.

Keywords: foreign-born supervisors, cross-cultural supervision, multicultural supervision, culturally sensitive supervision theories/models, supervisors' experience, supervision process

Acknowledgements

My learning in this program and for this dissertation study would not have been possible without the empathic support, guidance, wisdom, encouragement, energy, and the community, so many people have offered me. I am grateful to have them in my life and this challenging journey.

First and foremost, I would like to send my deepest appreciation to my dissertation committee members who have always been by my side and provided me extensive time, endless support, and thoughtful encouragement by sharing their knowledge, guidance, and compassion in engaging with this project. The committee has been extremely supportive in conducting this culturally sensitive topic by offering me a safe environment to explore my interests and learnings. Dr. Ned Farley has been the department chair, my dissertation chair, and my academic advisor throughout my doctoral program. Dr. Farley's calm, empathic, and insightful feedback and support have been the foundation of my self-explorations, which have increased my awareness and motivation to move forward. Dr. Colin Ward has been my mentor since I was in the master's program, who was also my clinical supervisor in my graduate and post-graduate training. Dr. Ward helped me expand my professional identity and pursue the doctoral degree by navigating my professional development. Dr. Ward's strengths approach has been encouraging me to challenge myself to grow. Dr. Mariaimeé Gonzalez has been inspiring me with her global perspectives, multicultural sensitivities, and her warm and empathic understanding and approach in cross-cultural contexts personally and professionally. She has been offering me hope as a person-of-color professional in the United States and modeling me to advocate in the field.

Outside of my committee, Dr. Katherine Fort, Dr. LoriAnn Stretch, and Dr. Patricia Kimball have also been my invaluable mentors, who have always offered me to process my experience, as well as their empathic understanding, support, and encouragement by sharing their personal and professional experiences. Dr. Sandra Meggert, who was my advisor in my master's program, and pushed my back to enter into the doctoral program. Dr. Meggert has been in my heart with her cheerful smile throughout this program and the dissertation project.

My doctoral cohort, and I consider them as my sisters I have never had, Dani, Erin, Leah, and Michelle. They have been providing me unlimited support, wisdom, encouragement, caring, love, friendships, humor, and the incredibly warm community. We have shared every moment together and going through this journey with them has been extremely meaningful in my life.

My friends and family have been patiently witnessing my journey and supporting me even as I had been often unavailable for them. I am so grateful that you are still in my life, and I consider you have been a critical part of this work and my learning.

I am so grateful to have been guided, supported, inspired, and influenced by those amazing professors, cohorts, and friends, and I sincerely appreciate all of you and this opportunity to be able to learn from all of you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

INTRODUCTION

Clinical supervision is essential in counselors' development, which is mandatory for masters level's counselors-in-training during their practicum and internship (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2015), as well as for postgraduates while working toward licensing (Peace & Sprinthall, 1998). Professional organizational boards in the field of counseling require clinical supervisors to obtain knowledge and techniques informed by theoretical frameworks and models of supervision (American Association of State Counseling Boards [AASCB], 2007; American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014; CACREP, 2015; Center for Credentialing and Education [CCE], n.d.). Conceptual models can help understand the process (Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Moorhead, 2008), and this study focused on supervision models in cross-cultural clinical counseling supervision settings.

Supervision models help counselor educators and supervisors reach their goals (Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017). In the 1980s and 1990s, when supervision was not the main focus of counselor education, numerous supervision models were published (Goodyear et al., 2016). Thus, those supervision models heavily emphasized the needs and elements of supervisees, including their development, personal characteristics, anxiety, gender, and ethnicity (Simpson-Southward, Waller, & Hardy, 2017). Those models provide supervision strategies in assisting supervisees to increase their professional development (Stoltenberg, 1981). In the last two decades, authors have expanded their studies to include clinical supervision nationally and internationally.

Forrest (2010) noted a remarkable paradigm shift in the counseling supervision practice and training to competency-based models, including multicultural and international supervision competencies. The most recent literature acknowledges the rapid increase of studies about

clinical supervision (Pendse & Inman, 2017), particularly the shift of its direction to enhance multicultural issues and globalization in supervision (Goh, Yon, Shimmi, & Hirai, 2014; Smith, Benshoff, & Gonzalez, 2018; Watkins, 2014a) along with the multicultural and social justice considerations in the field of counseling.

The United States receives the most international students in higher educational institutions in the world (NAFSA, 2017). Consistent with the increase of international student population (International Institute of Education, 2018), the enrollment of the foreign-born students in counseling programs has been increasing (Lau & Ng, 2012). A survey conducted in 2006 reported that over half of CACREP accredited doctoral programs have more than one international student (Ng, 2006). CACREP (2017) reported that 26.37% of faculty and 40.76% of graduate students identified as a racial minority in CACREP accredited counseling programs. Further, ethnic minority doctoral students in CACREP accredited programs increased from 40.82% in 2012 to 45.95% in 2015 (CACREP, 2013, 2016). Although the enrollment data of foreign-born students were not separately reported, increasing research related to supervision at the international level (Goodyear et al., 2016) indicates the growth of the foreign-born supervisor population.

Professional organizations acknowledge the rapid increase of diversity in counselor education, and professional standards emphasize multicultural competencies of supervisors and counselor educators (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015; CCE, n.d.). All supervision is considered to be multicultural (ACES, 2011; Chopra, 2013), and supervision models published in the last decade highlight multicultural sensitivities in supervision in order to assist the professional and multicultural competency development of counselors-in-training (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Field, Chavez-Korell, & Rodriguez, 2010; Inman & Ladany, 2014; Ober, Granello, & Henfield, 2009;

Stoltenberg, 1981). However, Utsey, Hammer, and Grant (2005) argue that those studies often

assume a white supervisor and minority supervisees in the supervisory relationship.

Compared to American-born supervisors and supervisors-in-training, foreign-born

individuals face unique challenges, such as interpersonal isolation (Sangganjanavanich & Black,

2009), cross-cultural understanding (Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009), and lack of English

proficiency (Gazzola, De Stefano, Thériault, & Audet, 2014). Because ideas can be lost in

translation between two different languages (McDowell, Goessling, & Melendez, 2012),

supervision and supervision training can be among the toughest areas for those foreign-born

supervisors and supervisors-in-training (Chung, 2009). Studies also report that conflicting

cultural values and power dynamics can arise in cross-cultural supervisory relationships

(Gutierrez, 1982). Minority supervisors can significantly influence their supervisees'

multicultural competency (Seo, 2010); therefore, understanding supervisors' worldviews,

theoretical frameworks, and perspectives on supervisory tasks are equally important to

understand supervisees and their needs.

According to research conducted with over 2,300 counselors in more than 12 different

countries, one in five counselors experienced providing supervision within their first three years

in practice, and about 90% of counselors who were over 15 years in practice had provided

supervision (Rønnestad, Orlinsky, Parks, & Davis, 1997). Based on the increasing number of

foreign-born graduate students in counseling programs in the United States, the number of

foreign-born supervisors will likely continue to increase. Regardless of whether those

foreign-born supervisors remain to provide supervision in the United States or in their home

countries, they are going to become part of multicultural and global counseling and supervision.

Statement of Problem

The problem addressed by this study is the gap between existing literature in multicultural supervision models and the actual application of those models utilized by foreign-born supervisors. Supervisors have a professional and ethical obligation to meet the needs of supervisees and protect their clients (ACA, 2014). The knowledge about those supervisors' own supervision model is one of their core professional competencies. Truly understanding the supervision process is not possible without theory or conceptual models (Hart, 1982), and lack of understanding about the supervision process can negatively influence the improvement of both supervisees and their clients (Foo Kune & Rodolfa, 2013).

A majority of supervision models were developed within the western context and lack universality (Goodyear et al., 2016). Those models mainly focus on elements of supervisees rather than supervisors (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017). Although recent multicultural studies in clinical supervision stress supervisors' multicultural competency and culturally sensitive relationships with their supervisees (Burkard, Knox, Clarke, Phelps, & Inman, 2014; Christiansen et al., 2011; Garrett et al., 2001; Inman & Ladany, 2014), culturally sensitive supervision models and literature discussing the process of using supervision models in multicultural contexts are extremely limited (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004; Field et al., 2010; Jang, Woo, & Henfield, 2014).

Although there is no one right method in conducting culturally relevant supervision (Christiansen et al., 2011), counselor educators should not ignore the fact that most of the published supervision models were developed within western norms (Son & Ellis, 2013) and multicultural supervision models are absent (Jang et al., 2014; Woo, Jang, & Henfield, 2015). In order to fill the gaps in the existing literature, some authors have suggested examining the

effectiveness of supervision models from a global perspective (Borders, 2014; Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017; Lee, 2018) and adequately developing and addressing the multicultural aspects of the supervision process (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Simpson-Southward et al., 2017).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this constructivist grounded theory study (Charmaz, 2006) was to increase scholarly understanding of the process and experience of foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision models in cross-cultural supervision sessions. This research method embraces constructivist perspectives in qualitative inquiry through including interpretation and co-construction of knowledge and analysis. Examining models of supervision that foreign-born supervisors use and their application of those models with their American-born white supervisees can help identify the strengths, weaknesses, effectiveness, and challenges of existing supervision models in multicultural and cross-cultural supervision contexts.

For this study, 32 participants were recruited through the Counselor Education and Supervision Network Listserv (CESNET-L), the International Student and Faculty Interests Network (ISFIN) mailing list, as well as personal and professional referrals. The criteria of those participants were that they be foreign-born CACREP accredited doctoral-level counselor supervisors, including doctoral students, who identified themselves as a person of color. Those candidates were required to have a minimum of one year experience in supervising American-born white supervisees in the United States. Although studies about supervision often mistakenly generalize the multicultural identity among ethnic minorities and foreign-born individuals (Yoon & Portman, 2004), this study demonstrated cultural sensitivity by distinguishing among those identities. This study excluded supervisors who had not received supervision training in the United States or never provided supervision in the United States.

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

This study integrated constructivist theories (Guiffrida, 2015; Mahoney, 1988) and supervisory theories (Bernard, 1979; Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Stoltenberg, 1981). Constructivism offers integrative frameworks with anthropological, sociological, insightful, multiple knowledge, and existential-humanistic perspectives to understand human development (Mahoney, 1988). This theory emphasizes individuals create their own meanings in their lives, relationships, and experiences. Constructivism influences several theories of counseling (Guiffrida, 2015), counselor education and supervision (Burton, 2011; Fernandez, 2013), and clinical supervision (Neimeyer, Woodward, Pickover, & Smigelsky, 2016; Ward & House, 1998).

These supervision theories helped this researcher obtain a better understanding about the participants' perspectives and the process of supervision based on those frameworks. The constructivist frame helped hold culturally-specific experiences and perspectives of both participants and this researcher simultaneously. Integrating these theories for this study allowed this researcher to help the participants' experiences and meanings unfold in multiple layers without analyzing them within one particular framework.

Nature of the Study

Researchers in counseling studies well recognize qualitative research methods, particularly in exploring multicultural issues, increasing accessibility to the readers, and bridging the gaps between practice and science (Ponterotto, 2010). Grounded theory is widely utilized and considered to be an appropriate approach to formulate new theoretical perspectives because of its focus on the individuals' experience with a process and theory of how that process works (Richards & Morse, 2013). Grounded theory offers a framework and guidelines for conducting

qualitative studies as well as strategies for collecting and analyzing data, which help researchers develop an objective understanding of the process and experience of individuals' activities in a real-life setting (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Only the data collected in the study, not from other resources, is used to generate the theory.

Grounded theory is also utilized around the globe; however, some authors criticize that this approach is dominantly shaped based on a western inquiry model (Alasuutari, 2004). Although researchers imply grounded theory can be used to determine cultural differences between or among cultures, the original theory ignores the researcher's cultural background and its impact on research participants, such as social hierarchy and language differences between the researcher and participants (Charmaz, 2014; Shakespeare-Finch & Copping, 2006). Because the center of this study was multicultural issues, and because the prospective participants for this study were from diverse cultural backgrounds who likely speak English as a second language, the constructivist grounded theory method was the best option among other methodologies in order to take multicultural sensitivity into consideration throughout this study.

A qualitative method of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) was used for this study, which allows researchers to engage in the research process proactively, co-constructing outcomes with the participants through the collected data (Alemu, Stevens, Ross, & Chandler, 2015). This approach is adapted to the originally developed grounded theory method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and the constructivist aspects (Charmaz, 2006). This approach views the research as constructing theories rather than discovering them, which fosters the researcher's research process, choices, and perspectives (Charmaz, 2014). Social constructivism assumes multiple realities, and individuals create realities through their views and actions. Constructivist grounded theory adds the element that the researchers' interpretation,

perspectives, interactions, privileges, and geographic locations influence the process of theorizing about the participants' views, constructed meanings, and actions, in particular situations (Charmaz, 2014). Qualitative studies also help empower the participants and the population being studied by describing their own voices to develop unique theories, which correspond to their specific experiences (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This study offered foreign-born supervisors an opportunity to express their voices through participating in this study.

For this researcher, constructivist grounded theory helps explain a way to understand the complex process of the human experience and create an emergent theory without ignoring the researchers' own cultural perspectives (Charmaz, 2006). Constructive grounded theory is a method for the researcher and participants to co-construct meaning rather than to verify existing hypotheses objectively.

Research Questions

This study concentrated on two research questions:

1. How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in supervising American-born white counselors-in-training and supervisees?

2. What do foreign-born supervisors experience in providing supervision to them?

Sub-questions included the following: (a) What supervision theories do foreign-born supervisors use?; (b) How do foreign-born supervisors perceive themselves as a supervisor, including their roles and responsibilities?; (c) What challenges or benefits do they perceive when using the supervision model they use?; (d) How do they apply those theories in cross-cultural supervision settings?; and (e) What do they see as cross-culturally specific concerns, issues, and benefits as a foreign-born supervisor providing supervision to American-born white supervisees?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because of its unique focus on the process of how supervision models are utilized by non-white foreign-born supervisors within their multicultural contexts, which has not been paid enough attention in existing literature. Multicultural studies in counseling supervision is still a new area (Pendse & Inman, 2017), and the existing literature tends to focus on professional competency, development, and relationships in supervision. Although a few authors published multiculturally sensitive supervision models (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011), how those models are utilized by supervisors from non-western cultures is unknown. Because those supervision models were developed in the western culture (Son & Ellis, 2013), and supervision models emphasize supervisees more than supervisors, the supervisors' experiences in supervision have had limited exploration.

Learning about models of supervision is required by multiple professional organizations and counselor education programs; thus, increasing understanding about the supervisors' experience, particularly how supervision models are utilized, is essential because supervision models play a critical role in supervision. Supervisors are also responsible for the supervisees' development and their clients' wellbeing (Jacob, 1998). This researcher aimed to explore the possible gaps between the supervision models developed based on western perspectives and how supervisors who are from non-western cultures use those supervision models.

The result of the study provides supervisors, supervisors-in-training, counselor educators, and supervisors of supervisors awareness about foreign-supervisors' experiences in learning to be supervisors and practicing supervisory sessions with counselors-in-training. Counselor educators and supervisors of supervisors will increase understanding about how they support those foreign-born supervisors and supervisors-in-training in academic and clinical settings.

Because supervisors influence their supervisees and their supervisees' clients, increasing understanding about supervisors' experiences and their supervisory process directly influences their supervisees' supervisory experience, development, and clinical work.

Additionally, the results of this study help generate a new form of culturally responsive supervisory theory, which may be tested by other researchers to find its applicability to other population samples, as well as its variables and reliabilities. Because a lack of study and knowledge about multicultural issues can mistakenly marginalize the diversity in counselor education and training (Seo, 2010), the present research demonstrated an acknowledgment of the intercultural diversity within ethnic minority populations. This researcher also aimed to offer opportunities for the foreign-born supervisors to raise their unique voices through this study.

Review of the Literature

A preliminary literature review was conducted by using online databases including PsycINFO, ProQuest Psychology Database, Google Scholar, and Antioch University Library. This researcher used the following keywords in searching journal publications: counseling supervision, foreign-born supervisors, international students, cross-cultural supervision, multicultural supervision, supervision models, international doctoral students, and minority supervisors. Primarily, the literature published within eight years was targeted. Although studies related to counseling and counselor education were prioritized, this researcher expanded the literature search to the areas of psychology, social work, and education because of the limited number of publications about multicultural supervision and supervision models in counseling. Also, only a few results distinguish between foreign-born and racial or ethnic minority individuals, and there seemed to be no literature about the experience of using supervision models.

To date, this researcher has found the following themes from the published literature:

1. An increase of foreign-born supervisors in the United States and its recognition by professional counseling organizations (CACREP, 2016; Goodyear et al., 2016; Lau & Ng, 2012).

2. Growth of research regarding multicultural supervision (Ancis & Marshall, 2010. Field et al., 2010; Inman & Ladany, 2014; Ober et al., 2009).

3. The supervisors' obligations and impacts in supervision (AASCB, 2007; ACA, 2014; ACES, 2011; CACREP, 2015).

4. Western-developed supervision models (Goodyear et al., 2016; Son & Ellis, 2013).

5. Lack of empirical studies in examining supervision models in cross-cultural contexts (Hunsley & Barker, 2011; Levinger & Lander, 2013; Simpson-Southward et al., 2017).

6. Minority supervisors' influence of supervisees' multicultural competency (Foo Kune & Rodolfa, 2013; Seo, 2010).

As such, it appears that no studies explored foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision models. The study was conducted to increase understanding of the process and the experience of foreign-born supervisors in using supervision models in cross-cultural contexts.

In order to further conduct a more comprehensive literature review for this dissertation, this researcher looked for other related studies, particularly empirical research and research utilizing constructivist grounded theory methodologies (Charmaz, 2006). Because this researcher found limited resources, the search was further expanded to the leadership, marriage and family therapy, and nursing areas. This researcher also searched similar studies published outside of the United States by using specific keywords, such as Korean supervisors, Japanese

supervisors, supervision training and education for minority supervisors, and white supervisees, in addition to those she had used for the preliminary literature review.

Methodology

This study aimed to increase understanding about the doctoral-level foreign-born supervisors' experience and process in utilizing supervision models with their American-born white counselors-in-training. A qualitative approach helps address the research question when a limited amount of knowledge is available because this approach does not require the researcher to identify hypotheses or variables (Charmaz, 2014). This researcher used the constructivist grounded theory method (Charmaz, 2006), which is adapted from the grounded theory method where researchers aim to understand the process of the core phenomenon, causality conditions, strategies, and consequences by systematically collecting qualitative data and coding in multiple levels to analyze them (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The goal of a grounded theory study is for the researcher to reach theoretical saturation, where the researcher finds no new information from the collected data (Kohl, 2016).

The constructivist grounded theory integrates the co-constructing theoretical explanations developed by the participants and the researcher (Charmaz, 2014). This approach can help fill the gap between the lack of multicultural considerations of the researcher and the classic grounded theory (Nagel, Burns, Tilley, & Aubin, 2015). This theory emphasizes that the literature review should be conducted before data analysis in order for the researcher to minimize her biases during the data collection and analysis and develop a conceptualized approach (Charmaz, 2006, 2014).

The fundamental data for this study were collected online. The participants answered structured interview survey questions in writing. The advantages of this interview design include

the ability to collect larger samples, the accessibility of wider geographic areas regardless of the time differences, the flexibility for the participants to respond in their own evironment, and the minimization of the time spent collecting data and transcribing them (Gruber, Szmigin, Reppel, & Voss, 2008). Possible disadvantages of using this data collection method were a lower response rate, as well as the openness of questions and responses to interpretation.

Individuals from collectivistic cultures value non-verbal communication and expect others to understand their experiences without verbalizing them (Kasai, 2009). Because this researcher shares the collectivistic culture, starting with a face-to-face interview may have unwillingly facilitated the phenomenon that the participants would expect this researcher would understand them without verbalizing their experiences fully. In the meantime, this researcher may have been at risk of unconsciously assuming she understands the participants' experience, mistakenly leading the participants' responses in specific directions. Further, the tendency of valuing relationships in the collectivistic culture may have risked inadvertently pressuring participants to maintain harmony with this researcher (Hashimoto & Yamagishi, 2013), which may have led them to say what they think this researcher wanted to hear instead of answering honestly. Thus, the online written survey minimized those biases in collecting and analyzing data.

Procedures

The research followed the methodology of the constructivist grounded theory approach suggested by Charmaz (2016). Once the proposal was approved by the dissertation committee, this researcher first submitted an application of the proposed study to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Antioch University Seattle (Appendix A). After obtaining IRB approval, this researcher aimed to recruit about 20 to 25 participants, as suggested by Charmaz (2006, 2014)

through mailing lists of CESNET and ISFN, as well as personal and professional referrals. Informed consent and participants' guidelines for the study were attached to the invitation email.

Contacts who agreed to participate in this study signed the informed consent electronically and responded to demographic questions. The participants self-screened the participation criteria by answering those demographic questions. The qualified participants then continued to respond to the structured interview questions in an online written survey interview format. This procedure was repeated until the sample size reached 32.

After coding and analyzing those initial data, this researcher interviewed 12 samples from the survey participants based on their written descriptions of their experiences. This researcher conducted those interviews individually in face-to-face format by using an online video conference function. This researcher formed up to three semi-structured interview questions reflecting the initial data analysis of the survey. This interview was also an opportunity for this researcher to ask the participants clarification questions about their responses to the written survey. The interviews were limited to no more than 30 minutes per participant. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed, and all the participants provided consent for those follow-up interviews before responding to the initial survey questions.

A 15-dollar gift card was randomly offered to three participants as compensation for answering survey questions. Additional 15-dollar gift cards were offered to all the participants who participated in the individual interview. Due to the varied geographic location of the participants and the availability of the gift cards, participants had two options to choose from: (a) Amazon gift card or (b) Starbucks gift card. This researcher sent those gift cards to the chosen participants through email.

This researcher answered survey questions before conducting data collection, kept a researcher's journal, and sought consultation from the dissertation committee and peers to identify and minimize her biases. Also, this researcher collected data from memo-writing throughout this study (Howard-Payne, 2016) and also gathered observation data during the follow-up interviews in order to triangulate the data and analysis to enhance the trustworthiness of the research outcomes (Konecki, 2008; Patton, 2015). The written survey data and this researcher's analysis were checked for objectivity and appropriateness by a third party before conducting the interview as well. All of the gathered data were coded based on categories and analyzed in multiple levels: open coding, focused coding, and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2014; Mills, Bonner, & Francis, 2006). The process of the coding and analysis was conducted until saturation was reached and grounded.

Ethical Considerations

All the data were treated as confidential, and this researcher removed the participants' names from the collected data before analyzing them. The participants' contact details were collected for the communication, interview, and prize drawing purposes only. Third party individuals who checked the coding data signed a consent form, agreeing to maintain the confidentiality of any data collected for this study.

Due to the fact that this researcher conducted individual interviews, the responses of the participants may have been influenced by the interactions and relationship with this researcher. Also, because English may not be the first language for certain participants, this researcher used universal terms and simple descriptions of the survey interviews in order to minimize the potential misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the interview questions. In order to maintain consistency, all the interviews were conducted in English regardless of the participants' first

language. Although the purpose of offering compensation to participants is for increasing the number of contacts to participate and complete this study, some participants may have been motivated to participate in this study because of this compensation rather than their interest in sharing their experiences.

Limitation of the Study

A major limitation associated with this study was participants' data because these data were provided by self-report. Participants controlled the amount of the information they shared, and their willingness to share those data can be influenced by multiple variables (Lancaster, Balkin, Garcia, & Valarezo, 2011). The sample of this study was a small size and specified with a particular population, which limited generalizing the result of this study. Importantly, this researcher's biases and emotional reactions were considered because she was the sole researcher of this study. However, it should not be ignored that this researcher consistently consulted with the dissertation committee members, consultants, and peers, as well as integrating multiple data to triangulate any possible impact the researcher will create, including developing interview questions and interactions with participants.

Data Presentation

The results of the study were presented both in the narrative format of the analyzed data and the direct quotes of the participants. Although demographic information, such as age, gender, country of origin, and year of providing supervision were reported, information that can potentially identify a particular participant, such as name and specific geographic location of the participants, were excluded in order to protect the participants' privacy. The coded themes were described on a chart based on each level of the coding process, and the analysis was presented in writing. Limitations of this study and future suggestions were reported as well.

Definitions of Key Terms

- *Cross-cultural supervision* – a supervisory relationship in which the supervisor and supervisee come from different cultural groups (Daniels, D'Andrea, & Kim, 1999).

- *Foreign-born* – individuals who identify themselves as a person of color (non-white) who were born and raised outside of the United States by non-white caregivers.

- *Multicultural supervision* – supervisory relationships and activities in which supervisors, supervisees, or clients differ in cultural variables, such as race, ethnicity, and language (Estrada et al., 2004).

- *Supervisees* – master's level counselors-in-training in practicum and internship courses, as well as postgraduates who are working toward becoming a licensed professional counselor.

- *Supervision* – clinical supervision in counseling rather than administrative supervision.

- *Supervisor* – licensed doctoral-level counselors and/or counselor educators who provide clinical supervision to counselors-in-training in order to promote their clinical development and ensure the welfare of the clients (ACA, 2014).

- *White* – a European American, who was born and raised in the United States.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to explore and increase understanding of foreign-born doctoral-level supervisors' supervision process and experience in utilizing supervision theories and models. Despite the rapid increase of diversity in the field of counseling in the United States (CACREP, 2016; Baggerly, Tan, & Pichotta, 2017) and the globalization of professional counseling (CCE, 2019; NBCC, n.d.), cultural considerations in supervision is still a developing area outside of the United States. Because of the increasing acknowledgement of supervision and supervision training, as well as lack of resources outside of the United States, counselors-in-training have been pursuing their education in the United States. Currently, the major focus of culturally sensitive approaches has been on serving minority counselors-in-training but not on the supervisors' diverse identities. Thus, understanding the foreign-born supervisors' experience in engaging with their Euro-American/white supervisees in applying theoretical frameworks helps us understand their application and perspectives toward supervision and its process. A critical review was conducted for this section to explore the major supervision theories/models and the unique characteristics of doctoral-level foreign-born racially/ethnically diverse supervisors and how these are manifested in supervision practice in the United States.

This chapter begins with definitions of clinical supervision and an overview of major supervision theories/models with their historical movements. Four major areas of literature were critically reviewed: (a) foreign-born supervisors, (b) gaps in supervision literature, (c) gaps in supervision in the global contexts, and (d) cross-cultural supervision. Five disciplinary areas are the center for this review: (a) peer-reviewed journals and articles in counselor education, counselor training, supervision, and supervisor training; (b) peer-reviewed journals and articles in multicultural and cross-cultural aspects in supervision; (c) standards, ethical codes, guidelines,

and articles published by professional boards and organizations; (d) doctoral dissertations that explored supervision theories/models and multicultural contexts in supervision; and (e) international journal articles in supervision and supervision training around the globe. In order to identify the databases and articles, multiple search engines were accessed, including EBSOhost, Electronic Journal Center, ERIC, ProQuest, and PsychINFO, as well as sources through official websites of professional organizations in counseling and counselor education, including international education in counseling and psychology because some countries have no clear distinctive professions between counseling and psychology. Types of literature included mental health counseling, counselor education, international counseling, international education, marriage and family therapy, counseling psychology, psychology, nursing, social work, clinical supervision, and multiculturalism.

Primarily, journal articles published between January 2014 and May 2019 were reviewed focusing on variables in supervision theories/models, foreign-born supervisors, and cross-cultural supervision; however, this year range extended to 2013, then later to 2010 and earlier in certain areas due to the limitation of newly published peer-reviewed literature. Variations of the following keywords and combined terms were used to search relevant literature: "supervision," "supervisor," "supervisory," "counselor educator," "doctoral student," "clinical supervision," "counseling supervision," "supervision training," "supervision theory," "supervision model," "multicultural, "cross-cultural," "foreign-born," "international," "non-American," "minority," "supervisors-of-color," "relationship," "competency," and "empirical study." Nationality and ethnicity group were also used as a representation of the foreign-born identities, such as Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Asian, Caribbean, etc., in order to capture foreign-born supervisors.

Clinical Supervision

Supervision is one of the five core professional identities as a counselor educator, distinguished from other four identities that are counseling, teaching, supervision, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy (CACREP, 2016). The definition of clinical supervision varies (Falender & Shafranske, 2014; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). CACREP (2016) defines individual supervision as "a tutorial and mentoring relationship between a member of the counseling professional and one counseling student" (p. 43). Inskipp and Proctor (2009) defined supervision as "a working alliance between the supervisor and the counselor . . . to enable the counselor to gain ethical competence, confidence, and compassions to give her best possible service to the client" (p. 1). Supervision is considered to be

> a distinct professional activity in which education and training aimed at developing science-informed practice are facilitated through a collaborative interpersonal process. It involves observation, evaluation, feedback, the facilitation of supervisee self-assessment, and the acquisition of knowledge, and skills by instruction, modeling and mutual problem solving. (Falender & Shafranske, 2004, p. 3)

According to the empirical definition, supervision is "[T]he formal provision by senior/qualified health practitioners of an intensive relationship-based education and training that is case-focused and which supports, directs, and guides the work of colleagues (supervisees)" (Milne, 2007; p. 440). Supervision is part of graduation requirements for counselors-in-training in accredited masters' programs, and CACREP (2016) requires a minimum of 50 hours of individual supervision sessions with approved supervisors during their internship. Supervision is also a part of licensure requirements for the postgraduate counselors-in-training (CACREP, 2016; NBCC, n.d.).

Principles and Functions of Supervision

Wilson, Davies, and Weatherhead (2016) conducted a qualitative meta-synthesis study of 15 empirical studies published between 1996 and 2012 and concluded four key concepts in supervision: (a) learning opportunity, (b) supervisory relationship, (c) power in supervision, and (d) impact of supervision. Suggested primal supervision functions are managerial, educational, and supportive (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012), which are specified as follows: (a) quality control of supervisees (Milne & James, 2002), (b) facilitating and maintaining supervisees' competence, and (c) assisting safe and effective clinical work of the supervisees (Milne & Watkins, 2014). Supervisors are in compliance with professional standards and ethical decision-making, and they are also responsible for their supervisees' professional conduct, including their clients' welfare and ethical gatekeeping, as well as personal and professional development of both supervisors and supervisees (AASCB, 2007; ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016; CCE, 2019; Falender & Shafranske, 2014; Wang & Byram, 2018). Supervisors are also responsible for facilitating and evaluating their supervisees' professional development (ACA, 2014; ACES, 2011). Thus, supervision training is crucial for counselor educators and supervisors for becoming a board approved supervisor (CCE, 2019) and an effective and ethical supervisor (Ladany, 2014).

Supervisor Training in the United States

In the 1990s, standardized supervisory training curriculum was published with three training areas for supervisors: supervisors' theoretical knowledge; skills and technique; and self-awareness (Borders et al., 1991). Later, Borders and Brown (2005) suggested four major supervision training areas for supervisors: supervision models; supervision practice and approach; supervisory relationship; and facilitation of supervisee development. This shift indicates the increased emphasis on the supervisory relationship as a newer element in

supervision. Specific training goals for supervisors are indicated: supervision theory or knowledge; skill development; integration of theories and supervisory skills with effective supervision; and professional identity development (Bradley & Whiting, 2001). Despite the number of published articles that discussed supervision training, Nate and Haddock (2014) debated the inconsistent and incongruent requirements for supervisors.

Each state has regulations for counselor supervisors with various requirements to become an approved supervisor (Field, Ghoston, & McHugh, 2019). The standards for credentialing and its mobility across the states are a concern. The Center for Credentialing and Education (CCE) has been collaborating with the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) and admitting credentials for the Approval Clinical Supervisor (ACS) for qualified mental health professions who meet their standards, including clinical experience, specialized training, and a minimum of 100 hours of supervision (CCE, 2016; n.d.). However, only 16 states offer benefits to supervisors with the ACS credential, such as waiving some of the clinical experience and supervisor training (Field et al., 2019). Those factors demonstrate that the standardization and quality of supervision training, credentials, and professional competence of supervisors have been acknowledged, yet not fully implemented across the United States.

Theoretical Framework

CACREP (2016) specified 11 educational elements in the standards of doctoral supervision training as part of their accreditation requirements. This literature review discusses four major standards: theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision (6B.2.b); roles and relationships related to clinical supervision (6B.2.c); skills of clinical supervision (6B.2.d);

and culturally relevant strategies for conducting clinical supervision (6B.2.k.). First, this section

reviews major supervision theories/models as the fundamental framework of the present study.

Supervision Theory

Supervision theories help supervisors conceptualize the supervision process (Simon,

Cruise, Huber, Swerdlik, & Newman, 2014) and understand supervision practice (Hansen et al.,

2006; Simon et al., 2014). Understanding and utilizing objective and comprehensive supervision

theories based on supervisory needs lead supervision goals of both supervisors and supervisees

(Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017). Thus, considering supervision theories and models before starting

the supervision session is essential for supervisors (Tangen, Borders, & Fickling, 2019).

Various literature introduced supervision theories and models, and the number of

publications related to supervision theories and models was at its peak in the 1980s and 1990s

(Simpson-Southward, Waller, & Hardy, 2017). Theory has been developed to provide a

fundamental and comprehensive framework in supervision (Loganbill et al., 1982). Originally,

supervision theories were developed for supervisors to help understand the supervision process

(Smith, 2009); therefore, the central focus of supervision varied based on supervisee related

factors, such as characteristic, needs, skills, and developmental level (Simpson-Southward et al.,

2017). Quality or experience of supervision were paid little attention (Shaffer & Friedlander,

2017). Major supervision theories and models developed during those periods were often

categorized into three types: psychotherapy-based theory (Avery, Guiffrida, & Lynch, 2017),

developmental-based theories (Rønnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Stoltenberg, 1981), and social role

theories (Bernard, 1979; Hawkins & Shohet, 2012). The next section describes the brief

historical overviews of major supervision theories/models and recent development and

integration of new theories.

Psychotherapy-based supervision theories. Supervisors utilize psychotherapy-based supervision theory and techniques in psychotherapy and counseling as a fundamental approach in supervision (Avery et al., 2017; Leddick & Bernard, 1980). This approach is beneficial when the supervisor and supervisee share the same therapeutic orientation because of the congruency of the worldviews and techniques in supervision and clinical practice (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). For example, within the person-centered supervision model adapted with Rogers' (1964) client-centered approach, supervisors demonstrate empathy, acceptance, and unconditional positive regards in supervision (Patterson, 1983; Rice, 1980). This approach facilitates the supervisors' ability to be present and non-directive with their supervisees by considering that the supervisees are the expert for their clients (Callifronas & Brock, 2017). Another example, solution-focused supervision is goal-oriented, which emphasizes supervisees' strengths and solutions instead of focusing on problems of the supervisees or the clients (Juhnke, 1996).

Within the framework of psychotherapy-based supervision, supervisors view supervision from a psychotherapy theoretical lens and apply those psychotherapy theories in the interaction with their supervisees (Blount & Mullen, 2015). Supervisees' learning occurs through observing and experiencing the supervisors' theoretical application in the supervision. Supervisees transfer those learnings from the supervision sessions to their clinical work with their clients.

Critiques of psychotherapy-based supervision theories/models. Some authors argued that applying psychotherapy theories consistently between supervision and counseling is inappropriate because supervisory training is a distinct educational and training practice unlike counseling (Watkins, 2011). Authors also questioned the supervision effectiveness provided by supervisors as a counselor (Bernard, 1997; Dye & Borders, 1990; Doroff, 2012) because a psychotherapy-based supervision approach influences supervises' theoretical orientation and

limits their supervision experience (Putney, Worthington, & McCullough, 1992). One empirical study supported those critiques. Norberg, Axelsson, Barkman, Hamrin, and Carlsson, (2016) interviewed 15 senior supervisors who had experience in providing psychodynamic-based supervision. The result indicated a paradox that although supervisors assisted supervisees to develop their own clinical styles, they provided negative feedback to their supervisees when their supervisees did not apply psychodynamic theory properly. Also, the authors pointed out that supervisors tended to understand the supervisees' emotional reactions toward the negative feedback provided by those supervisors only from the psychodynamic theoretical lens. This study highlighted a limitation of utilizing psychotherapy-based supervision theories.

Developmental-based supervision theories. One of the first non-psychotherapy supervision models was a Development-Based Model introduced by Hogan (1964). This model focuses on supervisees' autonomous developmental stages. Similarly, various development-based models mainly focus on supervisees' development. For example, the Integrated Developmental Model (Stoltenberg, McNeil, & Delworth, 1998; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) fosters supervisees' development and growth by identifying supervisees' development stages along with their self-and other-awareness, autonomy, and motivation. This model was further integrated with other theories/models and re-introduced by focusing on its application for the specific cultural background of the supervisees, such as Latinx (Field, Chavez-Korell, & Rodríguez, 2010) and Asian international students (Li, Liu, & Lee, 2018).

The Four-Stage Supervision Model {Formatting Citation} is one of the newest developmental-based supervision models by expanding Egan's (2010) three-stage model, which defines exploration, challenging, and action planning stages based on the supervisees' skill levels. The Four-Stage Supervision Model identifies the states of readiness, informing,

improvement, and evaluation (Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017). One of the empirically developed models in this category is introduced by Rønnestad and Skovholt (2003) which defined six phases of counselors' life-time development.

Few authors acknowledged the supervisors' professional development in supervision, such as distinguishing the function of the supervision theory/model for beginner supervisors differently from experienced supervisors. A Process-Based Model (Loganbill et al., 1982) emphasizes supervisors' personal and professional quality as a supervisor. The authors further claimed that theories or models offer factual concepts and procedures for beginner supervisors to understand the complicated supervision process and language for the supervision process, as well as activities for the experienced supervisors. The Systemic Dual-Developmental Supervision Model (Harris, 2017) was further developed based on the Systemic Developmental Supervision Model (Carlson & Lambie, 2012), which emphasize the developmental needs of both supervisors and supervisee.

Critiques of developmental-based models. Developmental-based theories/models offer specific guidelines of their supervisees' developmental levels and allow supervisors to select their roles based on the assessed levels and stages of their supervisees. However, those models tend to assume that development progresses and ignore possible developmental regression (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017). Thus, although ACES (2011) suggests that "the supervisor's training is based in a developmental perspective and approach" (p. 15), the authors argued the needs for empirical evidence of developmental-based supervision models before assuming the effectiveness of supervision models (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017).

Social role models. The Social role model framework views supervision from multiple dimensions including supervisees' skills, awareness, and professional behaviors (Crunk &

Barden, 2017). The supervisory approach in this model identifies the supervisors' role in engaging with their supervisees during the supervision session. For example, the Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979) identifies supervisees' functional skills, such as processing, conceptualizing, and personalizing skills. This model also suggests three core roles of the supervisor: teacher, counselor, and consultant. Supervisors select an appropriate role based on the supervisees' unique needs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Various authors identified other additional supervisor roles, such as administrator (Ekstein, 1964; Carroll, 1996), evaluator, and gatekeeper (Barnett & Molzon, 2014; Gazzola, De Stefano, Thériault, & Audet, 2013; Homrich, DeLorenzi, Bloom, & Godbee, 2013) that are matched with the critical responsibilities as a supervisor (ACA, 2014).

The Systems Approach Supervision Model (Holloway, 1995, 2016) also conceptualizes the supervision process from a systemic view. The Seven-Eyed Supervision Model (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012), as well as its expanded version, The Eight-Eyed Model (Darongkamas, John, & Walker, 2014), identify elements of the supervision process more from relational and systemic perspectives by identifying multilayered relationships and interventions between the supervisor, supervisee, and client. This relationship-focused framework has further developed, and the most recent theory in this category is the Self-Model of Humanistic Supervision (Peters & Rivas, 2018). Within this framework, supervisors and supervisees take a relational approach to probe the intersections of their unique variables in interacting with each other as self, a counselor, a supervisor, and a profession.

Critique of social role models. Although utilizing the role-based models can be less complicated and helpful to set boundaries in those supervisory roles (Timm, 2015), the theory assumes that those roles are universal regardless of the uniqueness of the supervisor, and they

lack consideration of the supervisory relationship. Although many authors studied the supervisory relationship, literature examining the relationship based on the supervision theories/models are extremely limited. The next section explores literature regarding empirical studies in supervision.

Empirical Studies in Supervision Theories

Researchers have continued to develop newer supervision theories and models by exploring or integrating other theories. Developmental supervision models were adapted with psychotherapy theories, such as Adlerian theory (Bornsheuer-Bowswell, Polonyi, & Watts, 2013) and Narrative theory (White & Epston, 1990; Zeligman, 2017). The Systemic Dual-Development Supervision Model (Harris, 2017) was integrated with systems based models, supervisor-focused developmental models, and the Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979), and the Developmental Narrative Model (Zeligman, 2017) was integrated with the Integrated Developmental Model (Stolenberg & McNeil, 2010) and Narrative theory (White & Epston, 1990). However, those theories have not been empirically examined for effectiveness, applicability, or limitations. Instead, many supervision theories/models have been developed by citing empirical evidence without obtaining empirical evidence (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017).

A great number of authors addressed the lack of empirical research in the field of supervision (Borders, 2019; Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017; Falender & Shafranske, 2014; Gosselin, Barker, Kogan, Pomerleau, & Ioro, 2015; Phillips, Parent, Dozier, & Jackson, 2017). Simpson-Southward et al. (2017) conducted a content analysis of 52 supervision theories/models published between 1964 and 2015 and found over 88% of the supervision theories/models they

reviewed cited empirical studies, yet none of those theories/models were tested. Instead, the majority of supervision theories and models are developed by citing other literature (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017). Furthermore, the researchers primary focus has been on supervisees, and supervisors have had limited contribution as participants of those studies (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017; Thériault & Gazzola, 2019).

Areas of empirical studies conducted in supervision are issues about supervisory training (Gazzola, De Stefano, Thériault, & Audet, 2013; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015; Woo et al., 2015), supervisory relationship and dynamic (An & Szto, 2019; White-Davis, Stein, & Karasz, 2016), and feedback in supervision (Burkard et al., 2014). However, none of those studies addressed or examined any specific supervision theories, models, or perspectives.

Only one study was found that investigated within theoretical frameworks to understand supervisors' experiences in utilizing supervision theories. Arczynski and Morrow (2017) interviewed 14 supervisors identified with diverse cultural backgrounds and explored their conceptualizations in applying Feminist Multicultural Supervision (Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006). The finding highlighted the supervisors' perspectives and management of their power in supervision. In this study, the diversity of the participation was broad, including race/ethnicity, nationality, sexual identity, and religious/spiritual beliefs; therefore, culturally unique elements were unreported.

Best Practice and Competency Based supervision

The number of published articles introducing a new supervision theory or model had dropped by almost half in the 2000s and 2010s from the previous decade (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017). However, due to the concerns of limited empirical studies and emphasis on the quality of supervision (Shaffer & Friedlander, 2017), newly introduced supervision

theories/models have further shifted to evidence-based approaches (Gosselin et al., 2015), such as best practices in supervision (ACES, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2014) and competency-based supervision models (Falender, Burnes, & Ellis, 2013; Falender & Shafranske, 2010, 2014; Gaete & Strong, 2017; Gonsalvez & Calvert, 2014; Gonsalvez, Deane, & O'Donovan, 2017; Grus, 2013; Keenan-Miller & Corbett, 2015; Wilson et al., 2016).

Authors suggest the core elements in supervision best practice include the supervisory alliance and relationship (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Falender, Shafranske, & Ofek, 2014), feedback (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Simpson-Southward et al., 2017), effective supervision skills and techniques (Borders, 2014; Ladany, Mori, & Mehr, 2013), and demonstration of ethical practice (Barnett & Molzon, 2014). *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision* (ACES, 2011) was published to support supervisors and develop effective supervisor training. This guideline specifically offers criteria and protocols in conducting ethical practice, meeting needs of supervisees' professional development, and protecting clients' welfare. The newest supervision guideline suggests seven steps for supervisors to plan structures for their supervision session, beginning with their own preparation before entering a session (Tangen et al., 2019).

Competency is defined as "the habitual and judicious use of communication, knowledge, technical skills, clinical reasoning, emotions, values, and reflection in daily practice for the benefit of the individual and community being served" (Epstein & Hundert, 2002, p. 227). A competent person is "qualified, capable, and able to understand and do certain things in appropriate and effective manner . . . consistent with standards and guidelines . . . that protect and . . . benefit the public" (Rodolfa et al., 2005, pp. 348–349). Competency-based supervision is defined as "the knowledge, skills and values that are assembled to form a clinical competency and develop learning strategies and evaluation procedures to meet criterion-referenced

competence standards" (Falender & Shafranske, 2007, p. 233). Competency based supervision

models offer benchmarks, which is useful for evaluation procedures in supervision practice.

Also, a competence based approach is adaptable with various supervision theories, and

empirically supported that supervisor's competence influences supervisees' development and

clients' welfare (Farber & Kaslow, 2010; Wrape, Callahan, Ruggero, & Watkins, 2015).

Competent supervisors can promote supervisees' development throughout their career

and clients' positive outcomes (Borders et al., 2014; Falender, 2018; Falender et al., 2014;

Falender & Shafranske, 2007; Gonsalvez & Calvert, 2014; Grus, 2013). Thus, recent

supervision training has emphasized the facilitation of supervisors' competence (Falender et al.,

2004; Falender & Shafranske, 2007, 2014; Forrest, 2010; Keenan-Miller & Corbett, 2015).

However, clear definitions and guidelines of supervision or supervisor development are

unavailable (Gosselin et al., 2015), and supervision training curricuulums are seldome updated

(Gazzola et al., 2013). A few authors explain this phenomena as the complexity of coming to

agreed definitions and areas of competence in supervision (Falender & Shafranske, 2014;

Thériault & Gazzola, 2019).

Competency-based supervision models demonstrate considerable recognition of

supervisors' multicultural competence (Goh, Yon, Shimmi, & Hirai, 2014; Kissil, Davey, &

Davey, 2015; Smith, Benshoff, & Gonzalez, 2018; Watkins, 2014a). Culturally competent

supervision practice is defined and distinguished among general competence areas, and four

areas are highlighted: (a) supervisors' self awareness of their own worldviews including their

values and biases; (b) supervisors' assistance for supervisees to be aware of their values, beliefs,

biases, and culturally sensitive clinical skills and interventions; (c) supervisors' culturally

sensitive supervision approach including when evaluating supervisees' multicultural

competency; and (d) supervisors' considerations toward the supervisee's clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). On the other hand, some authors critiqued that best practice and competence-based supervision models are supported by limited evidenced-based studies regarding the element of supervisors' cultural competence (Falender & Shafranske, 2014).

Multicultural Competency

Supervisees' multicultural competency is defined as "the supervisor's ability to address and facilitate cultural discussions in supervision; incorporate culturally sensitive interventions, assessments, client conceptualizations; and evaluate the multicultural competence of her or his supervisee" (Soheilian, Inman, Klinger, Isenberg, & Kulp, 2014, p. 380). Multiculturally competent supervisors demonstrate their ability to facilitate culturally sensitive discussions with their supervisees and suggest they offer culturally sensitive counseling practice with their clients (Soheilian et al., 2014). Authors have been paying increased and committed attention to the cultural issues in counseling and supervision (Guiffrida, Tansey, & Miller, 2019; Ladany, 2014; Pendse, 2017; Ratts, 2011, 2017; Sato, 2014; Tohidian, 2015; Ulus, 2016).

Supervisors' levels of cultural competence directly influence the supervisees, suspervisees' cultural competence development, and their work with their clients (Chopra, 2013; Falender et al., 2014; Foo Kune & Rodolfa, 2013; Inman & Ladany, 2014; Kissil et al., 2015; Mo & O'Donoghue, 2018; Ratts, 2017; Tohidian & Quek, 2017; Woo et al., 2015). Thus, culturally insensitive supervision can be harmful and unethical (Burkard et al., 2014; Burkard, Knox, Hess, & Schultz, 2009; Singh & Chun, 2010). Cultural consideration is one of the crucial elements of best practice guidelines in supervision (Borders, 2014; Borders, Welfare, Sackett, & Cashwell, 2017; Gosselin et al., 2015). However, cultural competence is still a new area in supervision, lacking theoretical models available that demonstrate culturally relevant supervision

(Inman & Ladany, 2014). Understanding multicultural competency fully is impossible without exploring the multicultural sensitivity of supervision theories and models as well as how supervisors utilize them and what they experience by utilizing them.

Cultural Responsiveness of Supervision Models/Theories

Understanding of applications of supervision theories are limited because supervision theories and models were developed within the western perspectives (Goodyear et al., 2016; Son & Ellis, 2013). The appropriateness of applying those frameworks for the present study is unknown because the participants for this study are from non-western cultures. Although supervision theories are the core frameworks for this study, utilizing only western-influenced theoretical frameworks can limit the exploration of the participants' unique worldviews. In order to avoid unintentional influences of theoretical and researcher biases in exploring the participants experiences, the present study integrates with a constructivist approach to maximize the exploration of the participants' experience.

Constructivist Theory

Within counselor education, constructivism is defined as one's beliefs and truths are constructed by making meanings within social contexts (Nelson & Neufeldt, 1998), which emphasizes multiple realities instead of an absolute truth (Guiffrida, 2015). Constructivist theories believe that individuals' experience and understanding about their subjective reality construct meanings (Anderson, 1997) through their lived experience (Doolittle & Hicks, 2003). Individuals learn through their actively constructing knowledge in the interaction with other individuals and the environment (Ertmer & Newby, 1993; Gray & Smith, 2009; Kantar, 2013). This theory offers possibilities to bridge the existing gap between knowledge and truth (Goodyear et al., 2016) and aims to understand human experiences by conceptualzing their

narratives (Hays & Wood, 2011). The constructivism framework is often utilized in qualitative studies to explore the participants' unique experience where previous studies had neglected by minimizing the researchers' knowledge, biases, or hypotheses.

Several authors utilized constructivism based theories in multicultural studies in counseling and supervision. Sato (2014) utilized social constructivist's perspectives for conducting a phenomenological study to explore ethnic minority supervisors' experiences in their cross-cultural supervision in the United States and Canada. Li and Gale (2018) also utilized this theoretical framework to interview 13 Taiwanese international marriage and family therapy program graduates who had returned to Taiwan after obtaining a degree in the United States. Authors stated that this theory helped understand the participants' constructed meanings about their experiences in two different countries and their transitions by analyzing and interpreting the data: cross-cultural clinical differences and transformation of clinical models, language, and power as a therapist.

Constructivist supervision theory. Constructivism is still a new approach in supervision (Neimeyer, Woodward, Pickover, & Smigelsky, 2016), and more studies are required to further explore its process and effectiveness in supervision (Goodyear et al., 2016). Currently, Guiffrida's (2015) Constructive Clinical Supervision Theory is considered to be the most comprehensive approach among a few other constructivism supervision theories (Neimeyer et al., 2016). This theory emphasizes a non-judgmental supervisory relationship, and the supervisor encourages the supervisee to practice critical self-reflection towards their clients, their clients' perspectives, and their own knowledge. Instead of supervising an approach from authoritative or hierarchical positions (Neimeyer et al., 2016), supervisors ask reflective question

(Guiffrida, 2015). Supervisors also demonstrate their understanding and validation toward their supervisees' perceived realties rather than the generalized realties (Goodyear et al., 2016).

Empirical studies support that this supervision model facilitates the supervisory alliance (Hathaway, 2012), as well as acceptance of supervisees' unique styles, a warm and non-directive supervisory relationship, and past and present experiences (Avery et al., 2017). Furthermore, Avery et al. (2017) developed a constructivist supervision scale by further expanding constructivist supervision theory and studying core methods in applying this theory in the supervision. Although the results identified supervision components and its reliability of the scale, this study only focused on the supervisees' experience, so the supervisors' process, experience or perspectives in utilizing this scale or using constructivism supervision theories are unknown. Thus, more studies around constructivist supervision is needed in order to understand the application of this theory in supervision.

The present study is applying both constructivism and constructivist supervision theories together along with referring to other traditional supervision theories. Due to the limited literature regarding the foreign-born supervisors' cultural contexts and perspectives in applying supervision theories/models; understanding the participants' experience without specific hypotheses or perspectives suggested by western-influenced theories may help explore their versions of the truth

Gaps Between Literature and Supervision in the Global Contexts

The professional field of counseling has been expanding globally. American credentialing organizations in counseling, such as NBCC and CACREP have been promoting their international departments. The National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) has been promoting NBCC-International (NBCC-I) since 2003. NBCC-I offers international credentials

and aims at strengthening the counseling profession around the globe (NBCC-I, n.d.). CACREP created the International Registry of Counselor Education Program (IRCEP) in 2009 in order to develop international standards of the counseling profession and quality assurance of counselor education nationally and internationally (IRCEP, n.d.). In 2015, ACA facilitated their first ACA-Asia Pacific Counseling Conference in Singapore (ACA, n.d.). *The principles for Unifying and Strengthening the Profession* (Kaplan & Gladding, 2011) includes counseling professions internationally by advocating counselors-in-training and faculty outside of the United States to increase the cohesiveness of the professional identity of counseling professionals worldwide.

Despite of all those organizational efforts in expanding and unifying the counseling profession, supervision practice, including supervision theories and training have not been discussed in the global level as much as counseling theories or practice. Supervision theory and models are utilized in a limited capacity outside of the United States. In Turkey, there is a lack of supervision models utilized (Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017); in Uganda, there is no supervisor training or supervisors available for clinicians (Hall, Kasujja, & Oakes, 2015); and in Japan, counselors have limited understanding about the concept of clinical supervision (Miyoshi, 2016). These gaps can be caused by the shortage of empirical supervision theories and knowledge (Barker & Hunsley, 2013) and universality of supervision training or supervision theories/models.

Gaps in target study participants. Some authors critiqued that available supervision theories and models focus on limited aspects of supervision (Miyoshi, 2016; Watkins, 2014a) and lack understanding of its application (Watkins, 2014b). One of the major contribution to this gap was found in the various literature focused on supervisees' experience to understand the effectiveness of supervision (Dawson, Phillips, & Leggat, 2013; Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012;

Johnston & Milne, 2012; Kozlowski, Pruitt, DeWalt, & Knox, 2014; Ladany et al., 2013; Peters & Rivas, 2018; Simpson-Southward et al., 2017). Although a lack of awareness and understanding of supervisees' needs can negatively influence the supervision process (Ladany et al., 2013), the supervisors' lack of awareness of their own needs for their personal professional development should not be ignored.

Among limited studies that explored both counselor educators' and supervisors' experiences, Smith et al. (2018) interviewed nine U. S. based counselor educators' experiences in working trans-nationally. This study included five foreign-born counselor educators including individuals from Asian, European, and Southern American regions. The study explored the participating counselor educators' cross-cultural experiences such as their cultural awareness and competence in working with counselors-in-training outside of the United States.

Gaps in assumptions. Another gap is the general assumption of the diversity in the supervision dynamic where the supervisor is from a mainstream culture and the supervisee is from a marginalized culture. Not only is there a limitation of studies focused on supervision; studies regarding culturally diverse supervisors seem to be far more limited. The literature tends to assume the supervision dynamic as American faculty and supervisors supervising their foreign-born counselors-in-training (Shillingford, Trice-Black, & Butler, 2013) or international counseling students (Lorelle, Byrd, & Crockett, 2012), or supervising American counseling students during their cultural immersion trips outside of the United States (Smith, et al., 2018).

Within the extremely limited studies, a study conducted by Arczynski and Morrow (2017) explored 14 psychology supervisors' experiences in conceptualizing supervision by feminist perspectives. This study included Caucasian participants (n = 6), racial and ethnicity diverse participants (n = 8) included foreign-born supervisors (n = 2). Although those studies

identified the participants' racial/ethnic identifications, the result was not categorized based on the participants' cultural identifications. Another study conducted by Woo et al. (2015) specifically studied experiences of international doctoral students in counseling program; yet this study focused on those participants' coping strategy instead of their supervision experience. Jernigan, Green, Helms, Perez-Gualdron, and Henze (2010) acknowledged the increased racial/ethnic diversity within the field of psychology and the needs of exploring the experience of the supervisors of color.

Cultural Considerations: Foreign-Born Supervisors

In the United States, enrollment of international students has increased for the last two decades up until 2015, after which time the figure has begun declining mostly due to the social and political climate in the United States ( ). On the other hand, the United States has the most Ph.D. graduates in the world (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2016), and the number of the international doctoral enrollments in U.S. institutions has continued to be increasing over the last two decades (National Science Foundation, 2018; OECD, 2016). CACREP (2019) reported the increase of student enrollment in accredited counseling related programs, and diversity of counseling students and faculty in CACREP accredited institutions have been increasing as well (CACREP, 2017). In 2014, CACREP reported 61.12% of students and 75.10% of faculty in counseling programs were white/Euro-American (CACREP, 2015), which decreased to 59.24% of students and 73.63% of faculty in 2016 (CACREP, 2017). Baggerly et al. (2017) examined the population shift in both CACREP and the American Psychological Association and reported that only 5.6% were racially/ethnically diverse faculty in the 1960s—1970s, which had increased to 18% by 2015. Although no report is available regarding international or foreign-born doctoral supervisors

practicing in the United States, they are likely increasing just like the expanding international counseling students' population (Alvarez & Lee, 2012; Reid & Dixon, 2012).

Call for Supervisors and Training

In the United States, the requirements for supervisor credentials have expanded considerably since 2010 (Field et al., 2019). Foreign countries also call for well-established supervisor training programs and well-trained native clinical supervisors. The scholars in those countries addressed their challenges including little attention paid to supervision in Cambodia and Ukraine (Bannan, 2017; Seponski & Jordan, 2018); limited formal training programs in Canada (Thériault & Gazzola, 2019); and a lack of trained supervisors in Japan and Cambodia (Miyoshi, 2016; Seponski & Jordan, 2018). Cambodia and China have been establishing new graduate programs (Mo & O'Donoghue, 2018; Seponski & Jordan), and the first national standardized licensure and credential rudiments had implemented in Japan in 2018 (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, 2018; Miyoshi, 2016). In demonstrating the recognitions of intercultural diversity among racially/ethnically diverse supervisors in the United States, the present study distinguishes individuals with foreign identities from broad a definition of the racial/ethnic diversity in the United States, which often include larger identities such as Native Alaskan/Americans, Pacific Islanders, new and multigenerational immigrants, and international students.

Foreign-Born Supervisors' Supervision Experience

In studies, foreign-born doctoral students and supervisors reported they experienced challenges in the United State differently from American-born racially/ethnically diverse supervisees or faculty. Some of their challenges are consistent with the international counselors-in-training in the United States (Akkurt, 2016; Kashima, Kent, & Kashima, 2015; Lee, 2013; Lau

& Ng, 2012; Pendse, 2017), such as loneliness, linguistic challenges, different academic traditions, social connections, and relationships (Elliot, Baumfield, & Reid, 2016; Interiano & Lim, 2018; Jang et al., 2014; Wang & Byram, 2018). On the other hand, one of the unique challenges reported by foreign-born doctoral students in a counselor education program was: requirement of developing certain professional competences as a supervisor, which conflict with their values and professional identities associated with their culture of origin (Interiano & Lim, 2018). This statement indicates a lack of culturally sensitive considerations in supervision training or practice. However, as of May 2019, none of the literature discussed foreign-born supervisors' experience in their supervision practice.

Cultural issues in supervision offers useful information, but understanding culturally sensitive supervision application has been developing incoherently (Watkins, 2014a). In supervision, supervisors' previous supervision experience as a supervisee can lead their supervision approach (Crook-Lyon, Presnell, Silva, Suyama, & Stickney, 2011); however, past experiences are not always relevant in their current supervision especially in the culturally diverse contexts (Mo & O'Donoghue, 2018). Despite the increasing emphasis on culturally sensitive counselor and counselor-educator training, supervisors-of-color experience ignorance and racism when they were a trainee (Hernández, Taylor, & McDowell, 2009). Siddique (2017) who identified herself as a Black Muslim female supervisor reflected on her own experience as a supervisee that she had to hold back her feelings that her supervisor did not want to understand her. Instead, Siddique (2017) stated that she was "agreeing and trying to get along with the supervisor to pleas him" (p. 161).

Foreign-born doctoral students in previous studies addressed their concerns about effectiveness as a supervisor because of their lack of confidence in English and unfamiliarity

with the professional and living environments of their supervisees and clients (Jang, Woo, & Henfield, 2014). Those challenges may limit their ability or their demonstration in articulating their perspectives or approaches in supervision. Doctoral-level beginner supervisors may not have accumulative clinical experience because they begin providing supervision as part of their counselor educator training coursework (CACREP, 2015), which may also influence their level of confidence and skills as a supervisor. Supervisors who experience self-doubt when they have not obtained much more clinical experience than their supervisees, and they feel they have little to offer for their supervisees (Gazzola et al., 2013; Theraiult & Gzaaola, 2019). The supervisors' lack of confidence can also negatively influence supervisees' satisfaction (Allsbrook et al., 2016). Thus, doctoral supervisors may rely on supervision theory/models more than their own clinical experience as a clinician or supervisor (Guerin, Kerr, & Green, 2015).

Recent literature stresses that limited research exists conceptualizing supervisor development and the function of supervision (Gosselin et al., 2015), as well as exploring an effective supervision approach (Akkurt, Ng, & Kolbert, 2018). Supervisors' perspectives about effective work while holding possible cultural and language differences are unknown (Gazzola et al., 2013). In order to fill the gaps in the current literature, Eryılmaz and Mutlu (2017) suggested examining the effectiveness of supervision models. Increasing a deep understanding of supervision theories/models and their empirical evidence can enhance the supervisors' intentional selection and application of appropriate supervisory approaches with clear reasons for its effectiveness (Borders, 2019). However, because of the extremely limited empirical studies particularly focused on foreign-born supervisors and their supervision practices, the next section consists of literature regarding supervisors, cultural gaps in theories, and critical elements in supervision from the foreign-born supervisors' perspectives.

Cultural Gaps in Supervision Theories/Models: Foreign-Born Supervisors' Perspectives

The United States is often considered to be the most advanced country in the field of professional counseling because of the standardized credentialing systems and counselor education programs, as well as the well-established professional associations (Hohenshil, 2010). Many foreign countries apply supervision theories/models taken from the United States (An & Szto, 2019; Hiraki, 2012); however, counselor education and supervision training are based on the western values (Interiano & Lim, 2018), which might not be fully appropriate for foreign-born supervisors (Smith et al., 2018). Although western- or U.S.-based knowledge in supervision is considered to be superior and be implemented globally (Smith et al., 2018), knowledge and experience obtained based on the western approach can also hinder the needs in culturally sensitive supervision and minimize unique elements of diverse supervisors (Ladany, 2014; Tohidian & Quek, 2017). Because of the limited understanding about application of supervision theories and models (Aladağ & Kemer, 2016) and lack of cultural considerations in major western theories (Alvarez & Lee, 2012), international researchers stress the needs for a new supervision model, which fits with their culture (An & Szto, 2019; Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017; Miyoshi, 2016).

The literature emphasize supervisors' intentional approach based on the supervisees' cultural background (Poyrazli & Graham, 2007). Although supervision theories are developed within their supervisees' cultural contexts, foreign-born supervisors may view those theories and models differently from their supervisors. As a result, the supervisors' use of theories/models may be influenced by their cultural perspectives. The following sections explore possible considerations in cross-cultural supervision from a foreign-born supervisors' perspectives. Exploring core elements by highlighting cultural concerns in supervision can fill possible gaps

between the lack cultural considerations of available supervision theories/models (Goodyear et al., 2016) and the foreign-born supervisors' utilization of those supervision theories/models.

Language Gaps

Counseling in a second language causes negative feelings, such as inadequacy, nervousness, anxiety, stress, confusion, embarrassment, and fear (Trepal & Hammer, 2014). For counselors-in-training, their supervisors' empathic understanding about their concerns and anxieties in supervision and clinical work may reduce those negative feelings (Callifronas & Brock, 2017). On the other hand, as foreign-born supervisors' experience of negative feelings in their supervisory relationship due to their language proficiency, they need to manage those feelings by themselves during the supervisory session while providing a comfortable learning space for their supervisors.

Vanneste, Chiu, Russell, and Fizpatrick (2013) studied 265 genetic counselors and supervisor who speak more than two languages. The study found most of the participants felt their supervision was different when other languages were involved. Some of the supervisors reported their uncomfortable and difficult experiences when they did not understand the contents of the session fully and when they assessed the supervisees' counseling skills. The results of this study offered some insights of supervisors' experiences in speaking a different language in supervision, such as their hesitations in offering feedback to their supervisees due to their concerns of making verbal and written linguistic errors. Although the 80% of the participants of this study identified English as their first language, foreign-born supervisors who speak English as a second language may experience the supervision differently based on their language skills.

Gaps in Cross-Cultural Supervisors

Cross-cultural supervision is defined as supervisory relationships where the supervisor and supervisee are from culturally different groups (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Other authors identified cross-cultural supervision as various cultural elements exist in the relationship between supervisors, supervisees, and clients (Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2003; Falender & Shafranske, 2014). Supervisors in cross-cultural settings bring questions and issues that are not present within the same cultural settings (Bannan, 2017). Supervisors' personal aspects and characteristics influence the effectiveness of supervision (Wong, Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013). Supervisors' acknowledgement and awareness of cultural aspects, safe environment, and ongoing discussion about multicultural issues in supervision can result an effective cross-cultural supervision (Falender et al., 2013; Wong et al., 2013).

Cross-cultural issues in supervision often focus on how to better assist supervisees who are from diverse cultural background (Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Foo et al., 2013; Li et al., 2018; Kissil et al., 2015; Tohidian, 2015; Westefeld & Rasmussen, 2013). Ongoing conversations about cultural and diverse issues throughout the training and supervision can be beneficial for supervisees (Tohidian & Quek, 2017). Supervisors' understanding can help examine the impact on the supervision process in cross-cultural settings (Park-Saltzman, Wada, & Mogami, 2012). Soheilian et al. (2014) stated that topics about race were most frequently discussed within the cross-cultural supervision, followed by gender, ethnicity, and religion. White-Davis et al. (2016) also found from their survey study that the majority of racially/ethnically diverse supervisors initiated conversations about race in supervision, and 75% of them reported those conversations were beneficial. However, the data for this study were dependent on the participants' self-report, and the results are varied in other similar studies.

For example, Hammond (2013) reported that cultural competence, including topics about race and racism were seldom discussed in supervision, but they were more often addressed during the graduate training. Supervisors also tend to address cultural issues between their supervisees and clients far more than between their supervisees and themselves (Levinger & Lander, 2013). Summers (2018) found a similar phenomenon that African-American supervisors addressed racial identity topics once or twice at the beginning of supervision whereas non-African-American supervisors broach racial issues repeatedly. Due to those conflicted discussions, cross-cultural studies focusing more on supervisors with diverse background can help further examine the cross cultural dynamic in supervision.

Studies in cross-cultural context among different countries can be more complex than cross-cultural studies within the same country (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009). Multicultural issues may be discussed differently based on their own cultural perspectives (Bannan, 2017). Although each supervision theory/model offers specific frameworks, sharing those concepts or understanding those meanings can differ. Thus, literature for the next section highlighting elements between the foreign-born supervisors and American-born Euro-American supervisees by reviewing major supervision key concepts suggested by Wilson et al. (2016): learning opportunity, relationship, and power in supervision.

Learning opportunity

International counseling students in the United States reported they talk to their Euro-American supervisors with only certain areas they think their supervisors understand (Gardener, 2002). As a result, those international students can utilize the supervision within a limited capacity. Interiano and Lim (2018) reported that foreign-born supervisors experience a difficulty being assertive with their supervisees because of their cultural differences and dynamic

in supervisory relationship. Thus, foreign-born supervisors may also become selective or avoidant in discussing certain topics with their Euro-American supervisees by assuming the levels of those supervisees' understanding about the supervisor or the contexts. Minority students often feel pressured when they were perceived as a representative from a specific cultural group (White, 2011). Foreign-born supervisors may also feel pressured, and moreover, feel responsible for identifying the best benefit for their supervisees. Although over-valuing western contexts may influence non-western supervisee's clinical work and professional development (Lee, 2018), dismissing diverse cultural contexts or disengaging from meaningful cultural or diverse discussions can limit the supervisees learning opportunities or development. Supervisors' hesitations in engaging with specific interventions can so cause supervisees' negative experience in supervision (Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004).

Ancis and Marshall (2010) interviewed four doctoral-level supervisees with culturally diverse supervisors. The authors found that supervisors' open, non-judgmental, and understanding attitude encouraged the supervisees' to be open and vulnerable to take risks in supervision. A safe and comfortable environment also offers supervisees valuable learning opportunities where they can examine their emotional experiences and ideas to strengthen their awareness without being afraid of the supervisors' judgement (Henriksen, Polonyi, Bornsheuer-Boswell, Greger, & Watts, 2015). Although the supervisors' unawareness about supervisees' needs can negatively influence the supervisory relationship (Ladany et al., 2013), supervisors' unawareness about their own needs and ineffective supervision approach should not be ignored.

Feedback. Feedback is provided by both supervisors and supervisees, which is one of the most fundamental and effective elements of clinical training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014;

Watkins & Scaturo, 2013, 2014). Providing effective feedback is considered to be one of the

critical supervisory skills (Ladany et al., 2013). According to Mann and Merced (2018), the

characteristics of supervisors' effective feedback are: nonjudgmental, respectful, and detail

oriented, which meet the levels of the supervisees' knowledge and skills. During the feedback

process, supervisors manage their power difference between their supervisees and connect their

feedback with specific expectations and goals. For foreign-born supervisors, offering effective

feedback to their Euro-American supervisees can be challenging because of the possible cultural

and linguistic differences, as well as communication biases.

   Corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is referred to be a confrontation of

information about the supervisees' behaviors, such as harmful interactions with their clients

(Borders & Giordano, 2016) and the clients' areas of improvement (Hoffman, Hill, Holmes, &

Freitas, 2005). Burkard et al. (2014) interviewed Euro-American supervisors (n = 9) and racial

minority supervisors (n = 8) who had experienced in providing feedback in cross-cultural

settings. The authors concluded that although the overall experience of both the Euro-American

and the racial minority supervisors were similar; their experiences were significantly different

when they were providing corrective feedback. The result of the study conducted indicated that

Euro-American supervisors reported providing difficult feedback to their non-Euro-American

usually lead to positive outcomes. On the contrary, non-Euro-American supervisors viewed the

outcome of providing corrective feedback was poor. This result can be seen as hesitancy or

discouragement for foreign-born supervisors in providing corrective feedback to their

supervisees.

   Possible conflicted cultural values between Euro-American and other cultures may

contribute to creating gaps in providing feedback (Interiano & Lim, 2018). For example, timely

and consistent feedback and clearly stated supervisors' expectations can reduce

miscommunication (Tohidian & Quek, 2017); however, culture influences communication styles.

Non-western cultures emphasize non-verbal communication (Iwakabe, 2008) whereas western

approach values verbal and direct expressions, including emotional explanations and cause-effect

thinking (Enns & Kasai, 2003). If this cultural gap were misunderstood as poor communication

skills, the supervisees may experience ambiguity in the supervisory roles and feel discouraged to

engage with discussions with their supervisors (Phillips et al., 2017). As a result, facilitating

difficult conversations becomes even more difficult.

Providing corrective feedback is also challenging for beginner doctoral supervisors

(Borders et al., 2017; Mann & Merced, 2018). Borders et al. (2017) studied doctoral students (N

= 7) who identified themselves as white (n = 6) and international student (n = 1). The

participated beginner supervisors reported providing feedback about certain areas were more

challenging than others. Identified difficult areas in providing feedback are relationship,

personal issues, and multicultural topics. A study conducted by Gazzola et al. (2013) helps

understand those supervisors' challenges. According to Gazzola et al. (2013), doctoral

supervisors feel unclear about their realistic expectations towards their supervisees and have

doubts about their ability to evaluate their supervisees' counseling competencies.

Another study added that supervisors feel hesitant to provide feedback from a different

worldview because they are worried about enforcing their cultural perspectives onto those

supervisees, and they were uncertain about how their supervisees take their feedback (Burkard et

al., 2014). Euro-American supervisees' culturally insensitive behaviors or attitude toward their

clients also increase supervisors' feeling of discomfort in providing feedback. Burkard et al.

(2014) concluded that racial/ethnic minority supervisors likely to provide feedback to their

Euro-American supervisees about their lack of multicultural sensitivity, whereas Euro-American supervisors focus more on their supervisees' of colors' counseling skills.

Interiano and Lim (2018) highlighted one of the foreign-born supervisee's challenge was that their supervisor suggested them to be more confident. This supervisee reported to the authors that feeling comfort is impossible while their part of self are not being accepted. This statement can also be understood that foreign-born supervisors' internal struggles occurring in the cross-cultural supervision. Jang et al. (2014) suggested that foreign-born supervisors' open disclosure about their examinations of values, biases, stereotypes, and identity development can model their cultural competence that helps provide feedback for Euro-American Supervisees.

Particularly in cross-cultural supervision, supervisors' support and validation for supervisees' emotional reactions during the feedback process are essential (Christiansen et al., 2011). Previous studies found that the supervisory relationship and supervisors' difficult feedback to their supervisees are related (Hoffman et al., 2005). Supervisory relationship can also change supervisees' open attitude in receiving feedback (Stark & Greggerson, 2016). Furthermore, problematic supervisory relationships increase supervisors' feedback (Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001). However, the result of Burkard et al.'s study (2014) was inconsistent with those previous studies. Burkard et al. (2014) argued that the prior supervisory relationship did not influence in providing corrective feedback in cross-racial/ethnic supervision. Instead, providing corrective feedback in cross-racial/ethnic supervision is difficult (Burkard et al., 2014).

Supervisory Relationship

The supervisory relationship is considered to be a crucial opportunity to learn about themselves in the relationship while learning about each other (Bannan, 2017; O'Donvan,

Halford, & Walters, 2011). Supervisors are responsible for building and maintaining positive

supervisory relationship with their supervisees (Stinson et al., 2013). The supervisory

relationship is one of the most empirically examined areas in supervision (Borders, 2014). Open

and trusting supervisory relationship facilitates a safe supervision experience for supervises to

learn their professional and cultural aspects (Bannan, 2017). Supervisors' self-awareness,

transparent self-disclosure, open discussions about their personal and cultural challenges, as well

as multicultural elements provide culturally sensitive supervisory relationship (Ancis &

Marshall, 2010; Christiansen et al., 2011; Falender et al., 2014; Inman & Ladany, 2014).

Recently, Phillips et al. (2017) quantitatively tested the supervisory relationship and

dialogues regarding cultural identities with 132 supervisees in doctoral counseling and clinical

psychology programs, including 69% Euro-Americans. The study found the positive correlation

between culture-related discussions and supervisory relationship. In particular, the authors

highlighted one of their findings that the Euro-American supervisors discuss cultural issues more

with their racial/ethnic minority supervisees than their Euro-American supervisees. The authors

pointed out the possible negative effects in discussing only certain cultural identities of the

supervisees and neglecting to discuss privileges because the "issues of privilege often collude to

keep silent discussions related to majority identities" (p. 206). Although this study did not

disclose supervisors' cultural identities, foreign-born supervisors may follow this norm of

emphasizing the racial/ethnic diversity. As a result, foreign-born supervisors' focus too much on

the racial/ethnic identities, which causes to inappropriately ignore their Euro-American

supervisees' invisible or subtle diverse identities or privileges. As a result, this supervisory

relationship can minimize the multicultural dialogues, which may limit supervisees' learning

opportunities or development of the supervisory relationship.

Supervisory Relationships Outside of the United States

A supervision study conducted in China (An & Szto, 2019) highlighted one of the non-Euro-American cultural perspectives within supervisory relationships. This case study was conducted by qualitatively analyzing audio-recording conversations between supervisors and supervisees in China for 10 months. The authors noticed the Chinese supervisors' strong emphasis on the western supervision values, such as encouraging autonomy (Ladany et al., 2013), by verbally stressing the equality and shared responsibilities in the supervisory relationship. However, this study highlighted the fundamental cultural gaps between China and western cultures. Chinese norms value traditions and hierarchy in social relationships, whereas western supervisory approaches encourage supervisees to take control in their learning and the supervision process (Stark & Greggerson, 2016). The authors acknowledged the incongruences in Chines supervisors' verbal and behavioral approaches in supervision. Those Chinese supervisors dominated the conversations in the supervision as a non-negotiable authority figure when their supervisees tried to speak up and show their accountabilities. The study also revealed the Chinese supervisors' conflict avoidant attitudes, which demonstrated one of their cultural values, harmony, instead of addressing their dilemmas in supervision.

Another study conducted in Uganda also highlighted the unique supervisory relationship. For this case study, Ugandan supervisors had received supervision training in England. After returning to Uganda, they supervised 12 Ugandan supervisees in psychology (Hall et al., 2015). The study found that the supervisees depended on the supervisors. When they perceived their supervisors were unreliable, they viewed those supervisors were unhelpful. As a result, the supervisors focused on being more available for their supervisees. The supervisors offered advice and corrective responses instead of discussions regarding their emotions. Although the

quality of the supervision relationship within the western perspective is related to the "supervisee's perceived safety, trust and alliance" (Hernández et al., 2009, p. 89), Eurocentric supervision views the supervisory relationship observed in the Uganda's study (Hall et al., 2015) differently. From the western worldviews, those supervisors' response to their supervisees' dependency can be seen that the supervisors mistakenly enlarge the supervisors power and hierarchy in the relationship, which can lead supervisory relationship to be harmful (Ladany et al., 2013).

Seponski and Jordan (2018) added similar cultural perspective in Cambodia where clinicians preferred western theories and models. Cambodian clinicians value keeping face, and they also avoid discussing areas they have limited understanding or show their weaknesses. Although the above studies were conducted within the supervisors' countries of origin, the results provided some of the culturally unique supervisory dynamics which foreign-born supervisors may continue to carry in their supervisory relationships in the United States.

Power in Supervision

In supervisory relationships, considering power imbalance in the supervisory relationship is critical (Seponski & Jordan, 2018; Tanaka, 2009). The Eurocentric supervision approach assumes supervisors' inherent power (Guiffrida et al., 2019; Kemer, Borders, & Yel, 2017; Lambers, 2000; Ooijen & Spencer, 2017), and that supervisors' power can be extended because of the nature of the supervisory roles where supervisors evaluate, endorse, and assure their supervisees' development and clients' wellbeing (ACA, 2014; Arczynski & Morrow, 2017; Ellis et al., 2014). From a developmental perspective, novice supervisees require more hierarchical interventions (Prouty, Thomas, Johnson, & Long, 2007) and directive approaches (Borders & Brown, 2005). In the meantime, supervisors' granted power can be seen as abusive depending

on the supervisees' culture (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012). Novice counselor educators from minority cultural background also require to be empowered and protected in their professional experience and development (Shillingford, Trice-Black, & Butler, 2013). Therefore, supervisors need to initiate an open discussion of power and cultural variables in supervision without ignoring them (Soheilian et al., 2014).

Supervisors facilitating conversations about the power difference with their supervisees offer them opportunities to openly address their clinical experiences (Quek & Storm, 2012). However, Ober, Granello, and Henfield, (2009) suggest conversations regarding certain power and cultural dynamics can be less likely occurring. Mangione, Mears, Vincent, and Hawes (2011) added that even though all the supervisees address their acknowledgement about their power in supervision, only half of the supervisors address power issues in supervisory relationship, such as their constructive use of power and their supervisees' vulnerability, Supervisors may have limited awareness of how their power might manifest in the supervisory relationship.

According to Tanaka (2009), supervisory styles have limited impact on supervisors' use of their power, except for their power of being an expert as a counselor. Similar to the aspects of some counseling theories, such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Rosenbaum & Ronen, 1998), highlight counselors' expertise more than some others, such as Rogerian (Rogers, 1942; Rice, 1980). Thus, even though supervisors may address their granted power in the supervisory relationship in general, they may not address their power specifically related to their theoretical approach as a counselor or supervision theories/models may not be addressed. Tanaka (2009) hypothesized that supervisors may not be utilizing their power appropriately in order to effectively apply their supervision theories/models or roles.

Power in Cross-Cultural Supervision

The power difference can also occur in cross-cultural supervisory relationship (Shannon, 2019). Supervisees' perspectives toward power in the supervisory relationship varies depending on their cultural aspects (Lian et al., 2012; Pendse, 2017; Sato, 2014; Vogel et al., 2015). The power difference from the supervisors' various cultural perspectives do not seem to be explored, and no previous studies explored the power or hierarchy between foreign-born supervisors and Euro-American supervisees. Adding other layers of nationality or race/ethnicity-related power and hierarchy possibly influence the foreign-born supervisors' perspectives and use of their power in the cross-cultural supervision. Although some non-western cultures expect the power and hierarchy in teaching or supervisory dynamics (Cheng, 2015), supervisory relationships where ethnic minorities supervise ethnic majority members create issues in communication, cultural awareness of supervisors, and models of supervision (Priest, 1994). Thus, foreign-born supervisors may have less awareness of their own power, which might manifest differently as a supervisor between whey they are in their country of origin and when they are in the cross-cultural supervisory relationship with their white supervisees in the United States.

Foreign-born supervisors in the cross-racial supervision may experience the sense of "simultaneously benefit from privilege while being disadvantaged by oppression" (Ratts, 2017, p. 90). In addition to the incongruent power dynamic as a supervisor while acknowledging their racial/ethnic status in the western culture, foreign-born supervisors may unintentionally increase their sense of expertise when the supervisees have immigrant or racial/ethnic minority clients. This power shift may negatively influence their supervisees' sense of accountability, empowerment, or self-efficacy as a counselor. Arczynski and Morrow (2017) suggested specific strategies in preventing and handling possible consequences caused by the supervisors' power

based on their roles and responsibilities. Thus, the power issues can be an important element when viewing supervisors' use of supervision theories/models.

Summary

Supervision theories/models is an important part of the supervisor training, and authors have introduced various frameworks. The globalization of the counseling field, recognition of the diversity, and increase of the international counseling student enrollments in the United States have been increasing the culturally sensitive approach in supervision and supervision training. However, the majority of the supervision theories/models have been developed based on philosophies or other studies within western contexts, and empirical studies in supervision primarily focused on the development or experience of the supervisees, rather than on the supervisory dynamic between Euro-American supervisors and racial/ethnic minority supervisees.

Through this review, three fundamental themes were identified to describe current understanding about supervision theories/models and applications of those: trends of supervision study, supervision outside of the United States, and increasing attention to diversity in supervision. This review highlighted the lack of empirical studies regarding the use and effectiveness of supervision theories/models and lack of supervisors' participations in studies to explore their own experiences as a supervisor. Because supervisors influence supervisees' professional and personal development, as well as their clients as a long term effect, the specific question for the present study is to increase understanding of how foreign-born supervisors supervise Euro-American counselors-in-training.

RESEARCH METHOD

The present study aimed to fill the gaps between literature in supervision theories/models and its application in multicultural contexts. Compared to multicultural studies in counseling, research in multicultural supervision is still a new area (Pendse & Inman, 2017). Currently available multicultural supervision studies primarily focus on supervisors' multicultural competency (Burkard et al., 2014; Inman & Ladany, 2014) and often ignore the diversity of the supervisors and multicultural sensitivity for those supervisors. The present study explored the foreign-supervisors' use of supervision theories/models and their experiences.

This chapter explains the research methodology chosen for the present study and its purposes. This chapter also includes the descriptions of population, instruments, study procedure, data collection, and data analysis. The last part of this chapter lists this researcher's assumptions and positionality, as well as the study limitations, delimitations, and ethical statements.

Research Methodology and Design: Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative research design has been widely applied in the field of counseling and counselor education (Newsom, Hays, & Christensen, 2008). Qualitative design helps researchers increase insights of individual subjects and address their research questions (Sutton & Austin, 2015) without identifying variables or having enough previous studies (Charmaz, 2014). Researchers also utilize qualitative methodology to understand emerging areas or increase in-depth understandings of the existing field (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hunt, 2011). The exploratory nature of qualitative research also allows participants to address their experiences in their own way within their comfortable boundaries (Heppner, Wampold, Owen, Thompson, & Wang, 2016). A quantitative research design was an option for the present study because

quantitative inquire is utilized for testing hypotheses, analyzing the statistical relationship between variables, or generalizing research findings to a larger population (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

The purpose of the present study was to learn about the foreign-born supervisors' process and experience instead of comparing variables or generalizing the findings; therefore, a qualitative methodology was the best option for the present study. A grounded theory design was selected over a phenomenological design. Phenomenological studies seek to understand or identify a mere description of the common phenomena of the participants' lived experience in the social context (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hays & Wood, 2011). In contrast, Grounded Theory study is an option when researchers seek to understand the process and develop a new theory constructed from the meanings of participants' subjective experience and interpretation of the social reality (Neimeyer, Klass, & Dennis, 2014; Suddaby, 2006). The present study was conducted to understand the supervision process by interpreting the meanings of the foreign-born supervisors' experience (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) rather than identifying phenomena of those participants. The result obtained from qualitative studies can also identify variables to further develop quantitative or measurement tools (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Constructivist Grounded Theory

Grounded theory offers researchers a process to follow in developing and conducting their research (Glaswer & Strauss, 1967). The goal of grounded theory is to explain the process and the causality of the process in the psycho-social contexts (Charmaz, 2014). Researchers seek more in-depth insight into processes and actions of individuals' experiences (Hays & Wood, 2011) and analyze qualitative data systematically (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Grounded theory's systematic approach guides researchers to identify conceptual categories and develop a new

theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). "Theory is a statement of concepts and their interrelationship that shows how and/or why a phenomenon occurs" (Corley & Gioia, 2011, p. 12). Results of the study emerge by reaching theoretical saturation, where no new information is found from the collected data (Kohl, 2016).

For the present study, the methodology was built on constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014), which was adapted with traditional grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This methodology was used for various research in counseling supervision. For instance, Rønnestad, Orlinsky, Schröder, Skovholt, and Willutzki (2019) studied counselor's professional development with 100 participants, Araneda (2015) studied group supervision with 15 participants, Johnston and Milne (2012) studied supervisees' learning process with seven participants, and Arczynski and Morrow (2017) studied power in feminist multicultural supervision with 14 participants. Within the multicultural counseling and psychotherapy literature, Li and Gale (2018) studied the reentry experience of the international marriage and family therapy graduates in Taiwan with 13 participants, and Behrens (2018) studied clients' spirituality in counseling with 17 participants.

Constructivist grounded theory follows the core framework, strategy, and process of traditional grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014; Farrell, 2018); however, this methodology considers the social context and cultural sensitivity more significant than the traditional grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2014, 2017). Selecting a culturally sensitive research methodology was critical for the present study to explore the cultural sensitivity of the supervision theory by interacting with foreign-born participants. The authors stress that the western-influenced nature of grounded theory (Alasuutari, 2004) cultivate its methodology to take individualistic worldviews without examining non-individualistic aspects in the social contexts during the

research (Charmaz, 2017). As a result, traditional grounded theory could ignore social power dynamics and language difference between the participants and the researcher (Charmaz, 2014; Shakespeare-Finch & Copping, 2006).

Another significant difference highlighted within constructivist grounded theory is the researchers' positionality (Chamaz, 2014). Grounded theory stresses researchers' objectivity by minimizing their predetermined knowledge, perspectives, and hypotheses. In contrast, constructivist grounded theory encourages researchers to engage with their pre-existing knowledge critically, instead of disregarding or assuming their objectivity (Charmaz, 2014; Thornberg, 2012). Unlike the grounded theorists who try to understand the social process by finding single-core categories (Apramian et al., 2017), Charmaz (2014) believes having one category over-simplifies the process and changes meanings of the social process. Instead, the suggested approach is realistic, narrative, and descriptive.

Constructivist grounded theory considers that theory is co-constructed by both the participants and the researcher (Charmaz, 2014; Meek, 2003); therefore, this researcher actively sought to acknowledge her subjectivity and unconscious process that could influence the study. In order to increase self-awareness, this researcher followed Charmaz' suggestion (2017): "methodological self-consciousness [that] means detecting and dissecting our worldviews, language, and meanings and revealing how they enter our research in ways we had previously not realized" (p. 36). This researcher examined her methodological self-consciousness consistently throughout the study by journaling, memo-writing, and consulting with committees and peers.

Population and Sample

The purpose of the present study was to understand the foreign-born supervisors' process and experience in utilizing supervision theories/models in clinical supervision. Despite the rapid growth of diversity in counseling and counselor supervision (Baggerly et al., 2017; CACREP, 2016) limited literature has empirically explored supervision theories/models from the diverse supervisors' perspectives (Son & Ellis, 2013). The present study focused on cross-cultural supervision settings where the foreign-born supervisors had American-born white counselors-in-training. Particular emphasis was placed on exploring the foreign-born supervisors' process, experiences, and perspectives in applying their supervision theories/models by answering two research questions: (1) "How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in supervising American-born white supervisees?" and (2) "What do foreign-boron supervisors experience in providing supervision to them?" The following sections explain sampling and participant recruitment strategies utilized for the present study.

Sample

Various sample sizes are suggested in qualitative studies (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006), even though sample size influences the saturation of the data (Bowen, 2008; Glaser & Holton, 2007; Mason, 2010) and trustworthiness (Hennink, Kaiser, & Marconi, 2017). Hennink et al. (2017) stated that small sample size sufficiently captures various issues contained in data, yet the researcher needs a larger sample to understand more about those issues. Mason (2010) stated that interviewer's competency to conduct a small size interview can analyze the data more significantly than others conducting a large size interview. In grounded theory methodology, researchers focus on appropriateness of the sampling rather than its size because the purpose of the study is not about generalizability to a larger population (Bowen, 2008). Although the

sample size needs to be large enough to explore the participants' meaningful data, too large a sample size can also create redundant data (Bowen, 2008; Charmaz, 2014; Mason, 2010).

Sample size and data saturation. The concept of theoretical saturation in a grounded theory approach means developing theory from coded data to explain social processes and phenomena (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Theoretical saturation is the point where "no additional issues or insights emerge from data" (Hennink et al., 2017, p. 592). In grounded theory, the saturation of data determines the accuracy of the sample (Bowen, 2008) rather than the sample size itself. Various conditions influence saturation, such as study purpose, population, sampling strategy, and data quality (Hennink et al., 2017). Thus, instead of determining the exact sample size in advance, this researcher followed the strategy offered by Charmaz (2014) and preliminarily targeted 25 samples to start the sampling process. The initial online survey helped begin the research process, which guided the directions and determination of the sampling criteria for the interview. The final sample size of the initial survey was 16, and the interview sample size was 12. Although the theoretical saturation met at the 10th interview, this researcher interviewed two more participants to ensure saturation.

Purposeful sampling. The appropriately selected methodology of data collection was a critical first step for the present study in order to increase the credibility of the results (Jensen, 2008). Similar to other qualitative research, grounded theory researchers select study samples purposefully, but not randomly (Charmaz, 2014). Purposeful sampling identifies the populations and research settings before collecting data (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973) based on the researchers' knowledge about the population or the data to be collected (Berg, 2017). Purposefully selected samples can provide the answer to the research question (Draucker, Martsolf, Ross, & Rusk, 2007).

The present study targeted the population of foreign-born counseling supervisors with the following four participation criteria. Foreign-born supervisors who (a) were from racially/ethnically diverse backgrounds; (b) were born and raised by non-white caregivers during their childhood outside of the United States; (c) obtained a doctoral degree, including current doctoral students, from a CACREP accredited doctoral program in the United States; and (d) had provided clinical supervision to American-born white supervisees or counselors-in-training at least one year in the United States.

The characteristics of the sample were set to minimize the variables of the participants. That participation limited to the education level and the counseling professional identity in order to minimize the variable of supervision training the participants had obtained. CACREP (2015) specifies the accreditation standards including the program, admission process, training, and professional identity. The standards list 11 elements of the doctoral counselor educators' professional identity in supervision: (a) purpose of clinical supervision; (b) theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision; (c) roles and relationships related to clinical supervision; (d) skills of clinical supervision; (e) opportunities for developing a personal style of clinical supervision; (f) assessment of supervisees' developmental level and other relevant characteristics; (g) modalities of clinical supervision and the use of technology; (h) administrative procedures and responsibilities related to clinical supervision; (i) evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping in clinical supervision; (j) legal and ethical issues and responsibilities in clinical supervision; and (k) culturally relevant strategies for conducting clinical supervision (CACREP, 2015, p. 35). In addition to the purposeful sampling, theoretical sampling methodology was also applied for the individual interviews.

Theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling was utilized in conducting individual interviews. In theoretical sampling methodology, researchers conduct data collection and data analysis simultaneously (Charmaz, 2014). The initially collected survey data assisted the theoretical sampling process throughout (Currie, 2009), which helped this researcher determine the first interview participant based on the survey result. The initial sampling obtained through the first interview participant guided this researcher to determine the starting point, directions, and types of data to collect from the remaining interview participants (Alemu et al., 2015).

Once tentative categories are identified and analyzed, initial and exploratory themes and concepts start to emerge (Coleman & O'Connor, 2007). Newly collected data were compared to the previously collected data throughout the process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The theoretical sampling process was repeated during the data collection until no new themes or categories were identified (Charmaz, 2014). After the 10th interview participant, no new categories emerged and met theoretical saturation; however, this researcher conducted two more interviews in order to ensure the saturation of the themes.

Those additional two participants were recruited through professional and personal referrals. Three potential candidates to participate in the individual interviews responded to the initial survey for this researcher to clarify their participation criteria. This researcher also conducted semi-structured interviews with the selected two participants by following the same interview protocol utilized for the first 10 interviewees. Following the same data collection procedure also helped minimize the variable of the present study.

Member-checking. Member-checking (Charmaz, 2014) was part of the theoretical sampling process to ensure conceptualized theories and categories constructed from the gathered data reflect the participants' perceived experience and approach in supervision.

Participant Recruitment

The recruitment of the survey participants began after obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board of Antioch University Seattle. Recruitment occurred via the Counselor Education and Supervision Network Listserv (CESNET-L), Association for Counselor Educator and Supervision International Student and Faculty Interest Network (ACESIFIN), personal and professional referrals, emails to the CACREP accredited counselor education institutions, snowball sampling, and flyers distributed at the professional conference facilitated by American Counselor Association in March 2019. The potential participants received the participation invitation by email, which included the description of the study, participation criteria, compensations, types of survey questions, survey link, and the contact details of the director of IRB, dissertation chair, and this researcher (Appendix B). The flyer had the survey link and the contact details of this researcher.

The potential participants who were interested in participating in the survey opened the survey link indicated on the invitation email. The participants first read and signed the Informed Consent electronically before obtaining access to the survey questions. The Informed Consent described the nature and purpose of the study, study procedures, voluntary nature of their participation, risks and benefit in participation, confidentiality, and the contact detail of the dissertation chair and this researcher (Appendix C).

The interview participants were recruited at the end of the initial online survey. All the survey participants indicated their interest in participating in an individual interview. The study participation was voluntary. The interview participants were recruited only from the participants who met the participation criteria identified in the survey, and who clearly articulated their supervision approach and experience. The potential interview participants received an email to

clarify their participation interest. The participants received the interview questions two days before the scheduled interview date.

Snowball sampling and referrals. Snowball sampling was utilized to recruit more participants (Marshall, 1996). All the study invitations included a request for forwarding the invitation email they received. All the interviewees received a request for forwarding the invitation email.

Compensations. Two levels of compensation were offered for participation. The compensation information was included in the invitation emails. All the survey participants who completed the survey had an opportunity to participate in a raffle to win one of three 15-dollar gift cards. The participation in this raffle was voluntary. After completing the survey, the survey participant was asked to list their email in participating in this raffle. All the interview participants were offered a 15-dollar gift card after completing an individual interview.

<div align="center">

Study Procedures

</div>

The present study followed steps within the constructivist grounded theory methodology to plan for data collection, data analysis, and interpretation in order to construct the reality of the participants' experience in the supervision process (Charmaz, 2009). After obtaining IRB approval, this researcher began collecting data through an online survey. All the data were collected in English in order to maintain methodological consistency (Santos, Black, & Sandelowski, 2015) and minimize potential translation errors between two different languages as well. All the collected data were transcribed, coded, and analyzed.

Data Collection

Data collection methodologies influence the credibility of study results (Jensen, 2008). This researcher obtained data from two different phases. The first phase was the initial online

survey, and the second phase was the semi-structured individual interviews. Other data sources

included literature review conducted as part of this study, the researcher's memo-writing,

journals, and feedback from the dissertation committee and peers. This section describes the

data collection strategies and types of data collected for the present study.

Online survey. The initial survey was developed and distributed by utilizing an online

survey tool, Qualitics, prior to the individual interviews. The purpose for collecting the first

round of the data by using an online survey was to (a) recruit participants from a larger

geographical area; (b) collect data quickly and reasonably; (c) screen participation criteria; (d)

collect demographic data; (e) save time to analyze data; (f) develop semi-structured interview

questions; and (g) create a pool of potential interview participants. The survey invitation was

sent to the potential participants from February to April 2019 via CESNET, ACESIFIN,

referrals, snowball sampling, and direct emails to CACREP accredited institutions listed on the

CACREP website. Reminders were sent up to three times through the same communication

methods as the initial survey request. Additional survey requests were distributed through

referral emails to recruit a few more participants in June 2019.

The online survey consisted of seven demographic questions and three open-ended

questions that were approved by IRB before the distribution. The demographic questions

included the participants' academic level, CACREP accredited doctoral program, years in

providing supervision, gender, race/ethnicity, birth and/or country where on grew up, and current

residency. Four open-ended questions asked about their supervision theories/models that they

utilize, roles and responsibilities as a supervisor, description of how to apply supervision

theories/models, and challenges and/or benefits in utilizing the identified supervision models.

Due to the high uncompleted response rate, this researcher revised the survey question after discussing this change with the committee members and obtained IRB approval. (Appendix D)

Individual interview. The primary data to answer the research question of the present study were obtained from the semi-structured interview questions. Individual semi-structured interviews allowed this researcher to explore and obtain the depth and rich descriptive data from the participants (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Hunt, 2011). Prior knowledge and results obtained from the initial survey led to developing interview questions (Kallio, Pietilä, & Kangasniemi, 2016). During the interview, utilizing open-ended interview questions that promoted the participants freedom to respond questios (McIntosh & Morse, 2015) and to avoid shaping or forcing the participants' responses (Charmaz, 2014).

This researcher developed and utilized three open-ended interview questions:

1. What has been your experience in utilizing your preferred supervision models/theories with white supervisees?

2. In what ways have supervision models/theories helped or hindered in filling the gaps between meeting your supervisees' needs and your role as a supervisor?

3. How might your supervisees' perspectives toward you influence the supervision models/theories you choose to utilize?

Although a subtle difference of the researcher during the interview could influence data (Charmaz, 2014), semi-structured interviews helped increase consistency by staying with the developed core questions and following the guidelines (Jamshed, 2014). As a result, the trustworthiness of the study methodology increased (Kallio et al., 2016).

Each interview was conducted between May and July 2019 by using an online video platform, Zoom, due to geographical constraints. Although each interview session was

scheduled for no longer than 30 minutes, two interviews took for 45 minutes because of the amount of information shared by the interviewees. Those two interviewees provided verbal consents of the extension before the time was extended. The other 10 interviews took between 25 and 30 minutes per interview. Ten participants voluntary turned on their video camera, and two other interviews were conducted without the visual image of those interviewees. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed after obtaining the participants' verbal consent at the beginning of the interview. All the interview participants received their transcripts by email to check its accuracy.

During the interview, this researcher also collected observation data of the participants because this researcher's assumptions could emerge during the data analysis (Charmaz, 2014). Also, observing the participants' facial expressions and voice tones were critical to understanding their experiences and perspectives because the majority of participants were from the collectivistic cultural backgrounds where non-verbal communication is emphasized (Kasai, 2009). All the observed data during the interviews were kept in the researcher's memo.

Memo-writing. Memo-writing is an ongoing critical step in the grounded theory study in order to conceptualize the gathered data (Alemu et al., 2015). The purpose of memo-writing for the present study was to increase the source of the data (Behrens, 2018) and fill gaps in analyzing data between the initial codes and theoretical categories (Charmaz, 2014). The memos also provided records of this researcher's thoughts, questions, emotional awareness, insights, reflections, and observations (Charmaz, 2014; Alemu et al., 2015). The memos also helped this researcher identify new codes, compare and assess the collected data, and explore biases of this researcher.

Literature review. Classic grounded theory considers that literature limits researchers in generating new theories (Glaser, 1978). Contrarily, constructivist grounded theory considers literature as pre-existing knowledge and encourages the researcher to acknowledge and critically reflect on the literature instead of ignoring them (Charamz, 2014). This researcher completed a thorough literature review, which included international studies. The literature review also offered fundamental knowledge in developing semi-structured interviews (Kallio et al., 2016) by conducting systemic analysis and developing strategies.

Data Collection and Analysis

Constructivist grounded theory collects and analyzes data simultaneously (Charmaz, 2014). Researchers collect data and data resources primarily through interviews and observations (Potter & Hepburn, 2005); therefore, qualitative research considers researchers as an instrument during the research process (Elliott, 2018; Charmaz, 2014). In general, coding is the fundamental analytic process in qualitative research (Elliott, 2018), which deconstructs a set of data for new aspects to emerge (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). Coding involves researchers' interpretation of the collected data (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013), which further identifies ideas, concepts, and themes (Saldaña, 2016). Researchers look for themes and patterns to explore the reality of the studied population by understanding the phenomena, meanings, and perspectives in the social contexts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). As a result, coding shapes the research into abstract theory or description (Draucker et al., 2007).

The present study applied the following three data analysis strategies suggested within constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014): open coding, focused coding, and theoretical coding. All the data were coded and analyzed by this researcher, manually focusing on processes, actions, and gerunds rather than themes. The researcher's "why" questions (Charmaz,

2014), reflections, and thought processes during the coding were recorded separately on the memos. All the analytic procedures and results were organized on excel sheets, which allowed this researcher to compare and analyze them systemically. The results obtained from the survey helped this researcher construct interview questions, and the data obtained from the interviews constructed the results of the present study.

Open coding. The initial stage of the coding methodology was open coding, which examined the data line-by-line (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Ulus, 2016) to identify and categorize the participants' responses in any possible way (Glaser & Hon, 2016). This researcher underlined and made notes on the transcripts. All the identified codes were documented in the excel files. Continuing to focus on action words and gerunds helped define and explore the participants' behaviors, meanings, perspectives, and actions in supervision (Charmaz, 2014). Open coding also allowed this researcher to examine, compare, and categorize the data (Saldaña, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), which led the analysis process to the next step, focused coding.

Focused coding. The focused coding was utilized after open coding (Saldaña, 2016) to identify frequent, repeated, and significant codes and categories (Charmaz, 2014; Alemu et al., 2015). Instead of selecting researchers' interesting codes to move forward, the process of the focused coding helped this researcher engage with the initial codes by comparing the identified codes numerically. Those initial codes were re-organized based on the frequency within the similar themes and categories. The logical interpretations were necessary for defining the meanings of the initial codes (Charmez, 2014). As a result of focused coding, fundamental themes and categories were sorted, which helped check this researcher's biases and assumptions and move forward to the direction based on those identified categories.

Theoretical coding. Theoretical coding was the last and highest level of coding, which further analyzed the themes and categories identified by focused coding (Charmaz, 2014; Stenves et al., 2015). Theoretical coding examined the relationships between categories, as well as between earlier codes to check its accuracy. This final stage of data analysis shifted the categories from descriptive forms to conceptualized themes. Instead of forcing to produce or simplify the finding categories into one core theory (Charmaz, 2014), this researcher found three themes and included five categories in order to emphasize the reality of the findings.

Constant comparison. Grounded theory is significantly distinguished from other methodologies in its data analysis process, which is referred to as a constant comparison (Roberts, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). Unlike the way all the initial survey data were collected together before beginning the analysis, interview data were collected and analyzed in a parallel format from the beginning of the first interview. After completing the first interview, the data were analyzed by utilizing the same three coding strategies in order to identify categories and conceptualized themes before conducting the next interview. Newly obtained data were constantly compared with the data collected and analyzed from the earlier surveys and interviews, including this researcher's memo writings. The final conceptualized themes and categories were also compared to all the interview transcripts and initially identified codes to clarify the accuracy and appropriateness of the participants' reported experiences.

Peer coding review. Once the data analysis was completed, and themes were found, this researcher sought a third party to review the analysis. A doctoral-level counselor educator from a counselor education institution from outside of the committee or the institution of this researcher, reviewed the coding, analysis procedures, and the conceptualized categories. This review served as a means of examining the accuracy of the coding processes, themes, and

triangulation of the data with this researcher. The reviewers approved the accuracy and appropriateness of the analysis.

Assumption

Constructivist grounded theory emphasizes researchers' pre-existing knowledge and biases instead of ignoring them (Charmaz, 2014). The present study was designed based on this researcher's primary assumption: doctoral-level clinical supervisors apply at least one supervision theory/model during the supervision sessions. This assumption could create the researcher's biases, which also influenced the research questions, as well as the initial survey questions (Appendix E), interviews, data analysis, and results. This researcher consistently examined the potential impacts caused by her acknowledged and unacknowledged biases during the data collection. Memo-writing and reflection with committee members and peers helped assess this researcher's assumptions and biases.

Limitation of the Study

The focus of the present study was on an emerging area where extremely limited empirical data about the population was available. Thus, the major sources of research design, data, and data analysis heavily relied on the participants and this researcher. The shared identity between the participants and this researcher as a foreign-born supervisor with racial/ethnic minority backgrounds helped understand the participants' descriptions of their experiences; however, shared cultural background could also block this researcher's awareness and increased biases (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2004). The observed similarity also influenced perspectives to the counterparty (Wortman, Wood, Furr, Fanciullo, & Hams, 2014). Although "constructivist ground theory systematically brings doubt into the analytic process . . . [in which] facilitates defining and developing emergent critical questions" (Charmaz, 2017, p. 35), shared cultural

understanding between the participants and this researcher could hinder this researcher's awareness of having critical "why" questions. The following three areas were also identified as study limitations associated with the participants and researcher domains.

Limitations in sampling. Sampling influenced the study limitation significantly because this researcher relied on the participants' ability to articulate their experiences and aspects (Currie, 2009). The distribution of the survey resulted in excluding specific characteristics (Fowler & Cosenza, 2009), such as foreign-born supervisors who did not register on the listserv systems or belong to the counseling-related organizations or educational institutions in the United States. Although this researcher utilized referrals and snowball sampling to reach out to the larger geographical areas and professional settings, no participants were found who provided supervision in a community or a private setting.

Limitations in data collection. The limitations during the data collection occurred due to the nature of the qualitative study that relies on the participants' voluntary responses (Lancaster et al., 2011). The participants' levels of knowledge in supervision contexts had created impacts on the data (O'Hara et al., 2016). This researcher's biases, beliefs, previous knowledge, and interpretation of the data also influenced data collection and analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Patton, 2002), particularly because this researcher purposefully selected the first interview participant based on the initial survey responses.

Limitations in data analysis. English was the only language utilized throughout the study, regardless of the participants' first language. Because of the participants' language and cultural differences; this researcher interpreted and understood the meanings of words only in the contexts of those words utilized by the participants (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Thus, unconscious misinterpretations possibly occurred. Campbell et al. (2013) suggested that

researchers' adequate knowledge about the area being studied is essential in the coding process; therefore, this researcher reviewed the literature to obtain information about supervision theories participants identified. Additionally, the results section included the participants' exact quotes for the readers to agree or disagree with this researcher's analysis and interpretations of the data (Maxwell, 2013).

Delimitation of the Study

The delimitations provide boundaries within the research design (Fitzpatrick, Secrist, & Wright, 1998), which determines the area, question, and methodology of the study. To explore cultural sensitivity in supervision theories, this researcher selected foreign-born supervisors in emphasizing the globalization of counseling and supervision (Smith et al., 2018; Watkins, 2014a). This population selection purposefully distinguished from 'person-of-color' 'racial minority' or 'immigrants' in order to demonstrate the sensitivities in intercultural diversity and highlight the uniqueness of the population. This study also focused on the foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision theories and their experiences during the supervision process to maintain the study focus.

<div align="center">Ethical Assurance</div>

This researcher obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Antioch University Seattle before data collection and revision of the survey question. This researcher also referred to the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics (ACA, 2014), and consulted with the dissertation committee throughout the study. Considered and addressed potential ethical considerations included the potential risks, confidentiality, data storage, and role of as researcher.

Risks and Benefits

Potential risks and benefits caused by participation in this study were estimated as minimal. I sought consultations from the committee throughout the study. All the participants were informed to their right of withdrawal from the study participation at any time without penalties. The interview participants received their interview transcript to review and make corrections.

Confidentiality

I took every possible effort to assure the participants' confidentiality. The IRB application highlighted clauses regarding the protection of the participants' confidential information and the research procedures in accordance with the ACA Code of Ethics (ACA, 2014). Prior to study participation, all the participants received the disclosure statement of the study. All the sensitive information, which could potentially identify the participants, were removed from the data, such as names or cities of institution and organizations, specific events or experiences involved with other third parties, and current geographical locations. The study results included the participants' supervision models/theories, academic status, length of experience, gender, and their country/national of origin, without reporting them together to increase the anonymity of the participants who were selected from the small population. All the interviews were transcribed by me alone. The participants' demographic and sensitive information were removed from the coded data before having an accuracy check.

Data Storage

All the survey data were kept on a password-protected online survey tool, Qualitics, and the Zoom platform with a password recorded interviews platform during the data collection. Those online data were erased immediately after the data were transferred to the

password-protected USB flash drives. All the tangible data, including USB flash drives,

interview transcriptions, contact details of the participants, and this researcher's memos and

journals are kept in a locked drawer.

Role of the Researcher

Researchers' examination of their views and values is essential for the credibility of the

study, which influences the inquiry and the results of the study (Charmaz, 2014; Chiovitti &

Piran, 2003). This researcher identified herself as a female Japanese foreign-born supervisor

who was born and raised in Japan until adulthood. This researcher's professional identities were

also similar to the participants, including counselor, counselor educator, supervisor, and doctoral

student in a counselor education and supervision program in a predominantly white institution in

the United States. The person-centered supervision model and discrimination model

fundamentally influenced this researcher, and this researcher also applied techniques offered by a

developmental model and strengths-centered approach. Addressing this researcher's awareness

and exploring unconscious biases were critical elements of qualitative research (Morrow, 2005);

therefore this researcher engaged with ongoing self-reflection and consultations with the

dissertation committee, consultant, and peers to discuss personal experiences in supervision,

perspectives toward supervision models, and interactions with supervisees.

In the interaction with the individual interviewees, this researcher was aware of the

collectivistic cultural values shared with the participants, particularly the hierarchy manifested

due to the age, gender, and social position differences between the interviewees and this

researcher. To minimize the possible anxiety or confusion during the interview, all the

participants receive the interview questions at least two days before the interview date. All the

interview sessions started with a greeting and simple demographic questions in order to build

rapport with the interviewees. Because the interview asked the participants' culturally sensitive experiences through their supervision experience, this researcher attempted to understand the interviewees' authentic experiences rather than their success stories. Therefore, this researcher initiated conversation to demonstrate vulnerabilities at the beginning of the studies by sharing her developing English skills and having a thick accent, appreciating their participation, and requesting corrections whenever the participants noticed misunderstandings. Thus, this researcher also attempted to increase the consistency in interacting with interviewees by following the semi-structured interview questions and minimal open-ended questions with brief summaries.

Summary

The purpose of this constructivist grounded theory study was to understand foreign-born counselor supervisors' use and experience of supervision theories with their American-born white supervisees. The culturally sensitive framework of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) guided this researcher to understand the substantive topic in supervision theories applied in an emerging population without having enough available resources to begin. This chapter reported the sampling criteria, detailed sampling strategies, data collection procedures, and coding methodologies. The data sources included the participants' initial survey data to construct the semi-structured interviews, which led to collect the core data to answer the research questions of the present study, as well as this researcher's memo-writing and journals. Although this methodology emphasized the researchers' subjective perspectives in conceptualizing theories, this researcher's unconscious biases and inconsistencies in interacting with the participants could influence data and results of the study; therefore, this researcher triangulated multiple data sources to increase the trustworthiness of the data and its analysis.

The overview of the semi-structured interview and its procedures were also included in this

chapter.

PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH

This constructivist grounded theory study (Charmaz, 2014) aimed to learn about foreign-born counselor supervisors' experience and process of utilizing supervision theories/models. This chapter consists of four major areas: (a) trustworthiness of the data, (b) findings from the initial online survey, (c) findings from the individual interview, and (d) evaluation of the findings. For the present study, data were collected on two levels: an initial online survey and individual interview. The data obtained by the initial survey guided determination of the interview participants based on the criteria and their articulations about their experience. The themes emerged through the initial online survey, which also helped construct the three semi-structured interview questions. Individual interviews allowed for collection of in-depth information about the participants. The obtained data were analyzed together with this researcher's memos. The results of the study presented the participants' direct quotes to highlight the conceptualized categories.

Research Question

This chapter was organized to answer two research questions:

1. How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in supervising American-born white counselors-in-training and supervisees?

2. What do foreign-born supervisors experience in providing supervision to them?

The initial survey gathered preliminary information about the potential participants and essential information to prepare for individual interviews. The initial survey gathered information about the following five sub-questions:

1. What supervision theories do foreign-born supervisors use?

2. How do foreign-born supervisors perceive themselves as a supervisor?

3. What challenges or benefits do they perceive when using the supervision model they use?

4. How do they apply those theories in cross-cultural supervision settings?

5. What do they see as cross-culturally specific concerns, issues, and benefits as a foreign-born supervisor providing supervision to American-born white supervisees?

Trustworthiness of the Data

The methodology of the study determines the trustworthiness of the study (Hays & Singh, 2012), and that the trustworthiness of data in qualitative research needs to be closely examined because of its nature of the subjectivity and possible influence of the results (Shupp & Mattingly, 2017). To validate the findings (Patton, 2014) and strengthen the trustworthiness of the study, this researcher enhanced the following four guidelines: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Denzin, 2009).

Credibility. The credibility of the research increases by recording findings accurately with researchers' close examinations of data and research procedures (Shenton, 2004). For the present study, credibility was gained by collecting multiple data sources (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and triangulation of data (Denzin, 2019; Patton, 2002). Data sources for the present study included an initial online survey, semi-structured interview, follow-up questions, observation of the interview participants, literature review, and this researcher's journal and memo-writing. The present study also included participants reviewing their interview transcript, constant comparison of the data (Charmaz, 2014), and the third-party's review of the coding and data analysis. One of the committee members had extensive experience in counseling supervision and grounded theory to review and verify the study procedures, analysis, and conclusion of the study.

Transferability. Including the participants' rich and thick descriptions obtained from both survey and interview increased transferability of the data (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 1990). The results section included the initial survey data and development process of the semi-structured interview questions to increase the transferability of the study procedure. Also, the demographics of the participants (Hunt, 2011) and the detail description of the sampling and coding procedures added a clear study procedure.

Dependability. The memo-writings indicated this researcher's subjective experiences including decision-making process, awareness, thoughts, questions, and reflections to the process and findings. The journal contained the research procedures, methodological choices, and explorations knowledge obtained from literature, as well as the feedback from the peers and committee members. The present study followed the designed methodologies, and a third-party reviewer checked the accuracy of the coding, coding procedure, and analyzed data.

Confirmability. Constructivist grounded theory includes researchers' subjectivity as part of the research process (Charmaz, 2014); therefore, using open-ended questions and closely monitoring this researcher's biases were critical components of the study. This researcher's roles and positionalities stated in Chapter 3 included the researcher's biases and perspectives as an instrument of the present study (Charmaz, 2014; Elliott, 2018). Confirmation was promoted by the third party check, journals, memo-writing, and consultations with committee members, consultants, and peers (Shenton, 2004).

Results I: Initial Survey

This section contains three different data obtained by the participants. The first part is demographic information, the second part is a survey result with semi-structured interview construction procedures, and the last part is the study results obtained from the interview. The

purpose of the initial survey was to recruit potential participants, ensure the participation criteria, collect demographic information, and construct semi-structured interview questions. The initial survey consisted of nine demographic questions and four open-ended questions including (a) theory/model utilized in clinical supervision, (b) self-perceived roles and responsibility as a supervisor, (c) application of selected supervision theory/model and supervision process, and (d) challenges and benefits in applying selected supervision theory/model.

Demographic Information

A total of 32 participants responded to the initial online survey including two unqualified respondents due to the unmet participation criteria. As a result, all the 30 participants met the demographic criteria as indicated on the Table 1 based on their participation level. This demographic information included 14 participants who failed to identify their supervision theory/model to increase the transparency and reality of the results, and their data were excluded from the analysis.

Supervision Theory/Model

The participants reported supervision theories/models they currently utilize in supervision. Although 30 participants responded to the survey, 14 of them did not identify their supervision theory/model; therefore, the data obtained from those participants were removed except for the above demographic data. Four participants (12.5%) of the survey respondents reported they use only one supervision theory/model, and 14 (87.5%) participants reported they use more than two theories/models. Table 2 shows the reported supervision theories/models, which were categorized separately because two of the survey participants (16.7%) reported a different theory/model at the time of the interview, and four other survey participants (33.3%) added one or more supervision theories/models at the time of the interview (N = 12).

Table 1

Demographic Identification of the Participants

Characteristic	Survey Participants (N = 30)		Qualified Survey Respondents (N = 16)		Interview Participants (N = 12)	
Education Level						
Doctoral Degree	15	(50.0%)	6	(37.5%)	5	(41.7%)
Doctoral Student	15	(50.0%)	10	(62.5%)	7	(58.3%)
Gender						
Male	2	(6.7%)	2	(12.5%)	1	(8.3%)
Female	18	(93.3%)	14	(87.5%)	11	(91.7%)
Race/Ethnicity						
African American	4	(13.3%)	2	(12.5%)	2	(16.7%)
Arab	2	(6.7%)	0	-	0	-
Asian	19	(63.3%)	12	(75.0%)	8	(66.7%)
Multiracial	1	(3.3%)	0	-	0	-
Latinx	2	(6.7%)	1	(6.3%)	0	(8.3%)
Turkish	2	(6.7%)	1	(6.3%)	1	(8.3%)
Supervision Experience						
Less than 2 years	17	(56.7%)	9	(56.0%)	7	(58.3%)
3–5 years	9	(30.0%)	4	(25.0%)	3	(25.0%)
6–9 years	3	(10.0%)	2	(12.5%)	1	(8.3%)
Over 10 years	3	(10.0%)	1	(6.3%)	1	(8.3%)

Table 2

Survey Participants' Supervision Theory/Model

Model/Theory	Survey Participants (N = 16)	Interview Participants (N = 12)
Psychotherapy Model		
Person-Centered (Humanistic)	5	4
Cognitive-behavioral model	4	4
Adlerian	2	1
Psychodynamic/Psychoanalytic	1	0
Strengths-Focused	2	1
Postmodern	1	0
Narrative	0	1
Supervisees' counseling theory	1	1
(Subtotal)	(16)	(12)
Developmental Model		
Integrated Developmental Model	6	5
Developmental Model	1	0
(Subtotal)	(7)	(5)
Social Role Model		
Discrimination Model	8	6
Feminist	0	2
Holloway	1	1
Systems (general)	1	0
(Subtotal)	(10)	(9)

Note. 14 survey participants (46.7%) did not identify any theories/models. Some identified two or more models.

Supervisor Roles and Responsibilities

The survey results indicated the participants' perceived roles and responsibilities as a supervisor. All of the participants (N = 16) identified multiple roles. Teacher role was the most

frequently reported (n = 8), followed by consultant (n = 7), gatekeeper (n = 7), counselor (n = 6), supporter (n = 5), facilitator (n = 4), role model (n = 4), coach (n = 3), administrator (n = 2), empower supervisee (n = 2), challenge supervisee (n = 2), encourager (n = 2), collaborator (n = 1), coordinator (n = 1), and evaluator (n = 1).

Benefits and Challenges in Utilizing Supervision Theory/Model

The survey participants described benefits and challenges in utilizing supervision theories/models they identified in the survey. Reported benefits included the flexibility of theories, parallel to counseling theories, frameworks that theories offer, applicability to supervisees in different stages, and the use of the theories in evaluation and communication. On the other hand, challenges included unclear roles, supervisees' resistance, inflexibility of the theory, difficulty switching roles from one to another, and difficulty applying one theory in both group and individual supervision settings.

Application of Supervision Theories/Models

The participants were asked to describe how they use their selected supervision theories/models in an open-ended question format. The data included additional descriptions obtained from the interviews and organized based on the supervision theory/model to demonstrate the reported participants' perspectives and application of theory/model.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy based model. The participants reported that the Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) supervision model offers them to have a structure, framework, and agenda during the supervision session. This framework was reported to be useful where the supervisors asked their supervisees questions and manage their supervisees' anxiety. Those participants reported they focus on the supervisees' skills and clinical work.

Person-centered model. The participants reported that the person-centered model helps them interact with their supervisees, such as connecting to their supervisees, understanding about them, and offer them acceptance and support. Also, the participants use this model to encourage and promote the 'here and now' for their supervisees. The participants further reported they use this model to explore the supervisees' clients' perspectives.

Adlerian model. One of the participants reported that the application of this model in supervision helps the supervisor to reflect themselves. They quoted that "think why I did what I did" (SP8).

Strengths-focused model. One participant indicated that this model helps identify the supervisees' strengths, which could help them mediate tensions between supervisee and supervisor.

Feminist theory. Two participants reported their use of feminist theory during the interview. Those participants stated this approach allows them to have multicultural and social justice dialogues in the supervision and their supervisees' clinical settings.

Integrated developmental model (IDM). Two of the participants clearly explained the concepts and the approaches within IDM. The participants selected IDM reported that this model helps them explore their supervisees needs, growth, current needs, and future goals. They also reported using this approach to assess their supervisees' clinical domain and support their supervisees' challenges. One participant who identified IDM as their only supervision model changed their approach to the discrimination model at the time of the interview.

Discrimination model. The participants mainly described the roles they utilized within discrimination model, such as the different roles they utilize as a supervisor. Although two participants reported the flexibility of the roles, two of the other participants reported that the

roles suggested by this model were unclear. Instead of utilizing multiple roles, the participants

reported their tendency of utilizing specific roles among teacher, counselor, and consultant.

Holloway/Systems theories. The participants utilized this model reported that the

systematic approaches help them give concepts, including all the stakeholders, involved in the

supervision process as well as understand supervisees' cultural contexts.

Construction of Semi-Structured Interview Questions

The survey question aimed to primarily explore the participants' supervision approach

and experience in cross-cultural settings in order to develop the semi-structured interview

questions utilized as a primary instrument for the present study. The 16 survey participants'

descriptive responses were evaluated by utilizing open coding, focused coding, and theoretical

coding methodologies. A total of 91 unique codes was identified, and three major categories

were constructed: (a) strong emphasis on understanding supervisees; (b) change, shift, and

adjustment of the supervision theories/models and supervisor roles; and (c) supervisees'

perspectives of the supervisors (themselves). The next section explains the identified three

themes in detail.

Strong emphasis on understanding supervisees. The codes related to the foreign-born

supervisors' emphasis on understanding their supervisees was the most highlighted with 39

unique codes. The participants addressed their values for understanding about their supervisee as

a person, as well as their skills, developmental stages, values, needs, cultural backgrounds, social

and environmental contexts, perspectives, emotional needs, and previous experiences. The

participants further reported that they put effort into exploring their supervisees' awareness in

identifying unaddressed needs. The participants reported they utilize supervision theory as a tool

to interact with supervisees. SP2 stated that "I used the IDM to explore the needs of my

supervisees, and later used CBT to address those needs." SP1 added, "time is spent getting to know the individual supervisee, their past experiences, skills level, and current needs." The participants' value for understanding their supervisees outside of the supervision sessions was also highlighted. SP14 stated:

> I make an effort to understand what the supervisee's values are and how these impact, what is important to them. For instance, I have had supervisees discuss how they are distracted because of things happening outside of the clinic space. This is especially important for those in collectivist communities or in lower SES where they rely more on outside sources.

Use of supervision theories/models. The participants reported their supervision approach by selecting specific roles or theories/models of the supervision and making the necessary adjustment in applying them in order to meet their supervisees' unique needs. This adjustment involved with the participants' supervisee-focused considerations. SP11 reported, "I find myself tailoring my supervision style to my supervisees' needs," and SP5 added their strategy that "The benefit of this supervision model is that I can tailor it to each students' development. I can offer more support or challenge, depending on students' readiness." However, SP6 described difficulties in playing multiple roles by stating that "It is a challenge to smoothly sifting one role to another role during the supervision."

Supervisees' perspectives toward supervisors. The participants described their supervisees' perspectives toward themselves as a supervisor influence greatly on their supervisor roles and approaches. Supervisees' racial stereotypes, resistance, and challenging attitudes in supervision were identified. The participant SP8 reported that

89

I find it challenging to be acknowledged as a supervisor from student sometime. They

have already some racial/cultural stereotypes about me even before I become their

supervisor (e.g. Asians are less direct, higher expectation, not fluent in English, etc.).

Participants reported their multicultural considerations in the cross-cultural contexts

among their supervisees, clients, and themselves. SP9 addressed their considerations in utilizing

supervision models by identifying their supervisees' culturally specific needs and developmental

levels that "I do have also to take on the role of providing the majority perspective in addition to

broader multicultural concerns." Otherwise, "when [a supervisor] began to challenge

assumptions. . . . [supervisees] usually become very resistant."

Based on the identified themes as above, this researcher constructed three semi-structured

interview questions to explore depth understanding of the foreign-born supervisors' experience

in supervision. A committee member checked the accuracy and appropriateness of those

questions before interviewing the first participant. The next section introduces the three

interview questions and the data obtained from 12 interview participants.

Result II: Semi-Structured Interview

The purpose of conducting the semi-structured interview was to answer two research

questions of the present study: "How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in

supervising American-born white supervisees?" and "What do foreign-born supervisors

experience in providing supervision to them?" Due to a lack of available literature exploring

foreign-born supervisors or empirical data about the use of supervision theories/models, the data

obtained from the initial survey and literature review (Charmaz, 2014) helped develop the

following three interview questions:

1. What has been your experience in utilizing your preferred supervision models/theories with white supervisees?

2. In what ways have supervision models/theories helped or hindered in filling the gaps between meeting your supervisees' needs and your role as a supervisor?

3. How might your supervisees' perspectives toward you influence the supervision models/theories you choose to utilize?

Demographic Information of Interview Participants

The data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously, which was guided by the theoretical sampling methodology (Charmaz, 2014). The survey results initially determined 13 in the interview pool who met the participation criteria and articulated their experience in detail. The interview pool became 16 by adding three more potential interview participants during the interview in order to ensure the data saturation. Those three additional interview participants followed the same study procedures as other participants by responding to the online survey before participating in the interview in order to minimize the variables in responding to the interviews. The data collection followed the theoretical sampling methodology (Charmaz, 2014). From the sample pool (N = 16), the interview was conducted with 12 foreign-born supervisors until the data met saturation. The participants were from 10 different countries including India (n = 2), China (n = 2), Japan (n = 2), as well as one participant each from Columbia, Haiti, Malaysia, South Korea, Turkey, and Trinidad and Tobago.

Table 3 shows the participants' pseudonyms, supervision theories/models reported at the time of the interview, and the total number of coding identified. All the demographic data were removed from the Table 3 to protect the participants' privacy. The present study targeted a

small-sized emerging population; therefore, including the participants' multiple demographic

information could mistakenly lead identify a particular individual and fail to protect their

anonymity.

Table 3

Interview Participants, N = 12

No.	Participant Pseudonyms	Supervision Theory/Model	Total Code	New Theme
1	Ann	Person-centered, IDM, CBT, Strength-focused	41	22
2	Beth	CBT, IDM	30	20
3	Cathy	IDM, Discrimination model	21	10
4	Dine	IDM, Discrimination model	26	11
5	Ed	IDM	39	9
6	Fam	Discrimination model	19	9
7	Gill	Discrimination model, CBT, Narrative, Feminist, Person-centered	27	5
8	Helen	Discrimination model, Adlerian, Feminist Incorporate Supervisees' theoretical model	34	2
9	Ivy	Discrimination model, Person-centered	16	1
10	Jane	Holloway	35	0
11	Kim	Person-centered, CBT	21	0
12	Lisa	IDM	24	0

Data Collection and Analysis

The individual interview process began by selecting Ann as the first interviewee based on

the purposeful and theoretical sampling strategies (Charmaz, 2014). The determination of the

first interviewee was based on Ann's participation criteria including their experience as a

supervisor and articulation of their supervision process in utilizing their selected supervision

theories/models. After completing the interview with Ann, this researcher transcribed the recorded interview and analyzed them by utilizing open-coding, focused-coding, and theoretical coding to identify categories and themes before conducting the next interview. From the first interview transcript, 41 new codes were identified through open coding, which was further analyzed by applying focused coding and categorized into 22 codes. This researcher utilized memo-writing and peer-consultations along with the entire coding process to increase awareness of insights, biases, and further questions to explore. The above Table 3 indicated identified codes defined by open coding and newly constructed themes by focused coding. This researcher further examined those 22 codes by utilizing theoretical coding and categorized into 5 dimensions: supervisory relationship, adjustment of theory/model, gaps, supervisees' perspectives, and multicultural issues.

The second interview was conducted with Beth, who identified the different level of supervision and clinical experiences from the first interviewee, Ann. The data obtained from Beth were compared to the data collected from the first interviewee, Ann, as well as the analyzed codes, themes, and categories. Beth's data were coded, and the new theme was identified before conducting the third interview with Cathy. This data collection and analysis process was repeated until the 10th interview with Jane, where theoretical saturation was reached. This researcher conducted two more interview and analyses with two more participants to ensure saturation.

Research Questions

The present study was conducted to answer two research questions:

1. How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in supervising American-born white counselors-in-training and supervisees?

2. What do foreign-born supervisors experience in providing supervision to them?

The semi-structured interviews conducted with 12 participants resulted in conceptualizing five themes, which overlay the responses to the two research questions. Therefore, this section reports the findings organized by the conceptualizing the following five aspects: (a) supervisory relationship, (b) adjustment of roles and theories/models, (c) supervisors' sense of competence, (d) supervisees' perspectives, and (e) cultural gaps in supervision.

Supervisory Relationship

The most significant aspect of the foreign-born supervisors' supervision process and experience were associated with their relationship and interactions with their supervisees. This result was consistent throughout the present study, and the participants stressed that their supervisee was the fundamental focus in supervision. The participants reported that understanding their supervisee is the priority, and their supervisory relationships and the level of understanding about their supervisees influence other aspects of supervision, such as their roles, approaches, and selection of the supervision models. All 12 interview participants stated that meeting their supervisee's needs was the most critical component in supervision regardless of supervision theories/models.

The first interview participant, Ann, described their focus on the supervisory relationships by highlighting the value for having positive communication skills and matching with their supervisees' personality and communication styles.

How personalities and communication skills are really matching because a lot of time,

what it's about is personality and communication skills and what a person is comfortable

in communicating . . . You just can't force a person to communicate, which you have to step back.

Gill and Kim identified the person-centered theory as one of their primary supervision approaches. They described that the person-centered approach helped build their positive relationships with their supervisee and that their relationships expand to outside of the supervision. Gill said, "I realized I was encouraging my supervisees to be more present and here and now with the person-centered. I was noticing that helped the supervisees and the client relationship." Kim added that "relationship is very important part of the process. When I use the models, it kind of helping the supervisees feel like I am their social support."

Eight participants, who did not identify the person-centered theory as their supervision approaches, also highlighted the critical component of building a relationship with their supervisee to be their fundamental supervision approach. Ed identified they utilize the integrated developmental model, and they stated that "any supervision is how much or how strong the relationship is between the supervisor and the supervisee. I first have to establish a climate of trust, and build on the relationship."

Power and hierarchy. In the person-centered supervision model, minimizing power and hierarchy in the supervisory relationship is emphasized as part of supervisors' responsibilities (Rice, 1980). The participants also addressed their values for minimizing their power by carefully avoid approaching their supervisees as an expert. The result of this study spread the participants' perspectives toward the power dynamic in the cross-cultural supervision settings into two dimensions. The first dimension was the supervisors' unnegotiable power, and the second one was the reversed power manifested between the foreign-born racially/ethnically diverse supervisor and the American-born white supervisee.

For example, Gill emphasized the supervisors' power by stating that "regardless of where I'm from or what language I speak, I'm still in the position of power. So, humbleness is key." On the other hand, Beth said:

> I am a more experienced counselor, [but] I still feel the power difference coming from being a minority in the United States . . . I don't think that experience can compensate [for] the power difference of the identity because that's how I feel every day.

Five participants also reported that they try to minimize their use of power and hierarchy as a supervisor. Kim reported their supervisees perceive that Kim had expert opinions; however, Kim avoids showing their expertise by "disintegrating the power" with their conscious effort; however, two of the supervisors reported their increased expertise while discussing multicultural issues with their white supervisees. Kim said, "When my supervisees that are white, it never impacted what they said [about the cultural difference in supervision]. In fact, they wanted to learn from me because they wanted to learn from me about the multicultural aspect." During the interview, Kim also reported that the cultural differences between their white supervisees cause no impact on their supervision approach because of their supervisees' willingness to learning more.

Stepping out from the person-centered framework. The first interview participant, Ann, further described the time when the person-centered approach was not effective in the relationship with their supervisees. Ann explained how they shifted from their person-centered approach to strengths-focused interactions with their supervisees when there was a lack of connection with their supervisees.

> We had a difficult time connecting in terms of their needs and how I can help them the way we communicate . . . I had to move away from person-centered and used

strength-based, and come from an area of, 'let's take a look at something which you are

good at.

Other participants also described this tendency in adjusting their supervision approach based on

their supervisees' unique needs and perspectives toward supervision and the participants

themselves as a supervisor. The next section reported the aspect of the supervisors' adjustment

in their supervision process.

Adjustment of Roles and Theories

The second conceptualized aspect was the foreign-born supervisors' choice and

application of supervision theories/models. All 12 participants described that learning about

their supervisees was the fundamental role of a supervisor. Various areas were listed as the

supervisors' critical knowledge about their supervisees including their supervisees' values,

worldviews, needs, expectations, developmental levels, clinical skills, communication and

learning styles, previous experiences, current challenges, and future goals.

All the participants reported that their obtained information about their supervisees

influences their supervision approach and role as a supervisor. Ann stated, "When I start seeing

a [new] supervisee, I don't know which approach is going to work best." Six participants

reported that their supervisees' needs influence their choice of supervision theory/model (n = 6).

Nine of the participants reported they integrate with various supervision approaches to meet their

supervisees' needs, and seven of them said they make necessary adjustments in applying

supervision theories/models based on the obtained knowledge about their supervisees. Kim said,

"I'm changing my model based on my supervisor's expectation," and Jane said, "I am doing the

supervision the way they [my supervisee] want me to supervise them."

The supervisees play another vital role when the participants assess the effectiveness of their supervision approach. The participants described that they examine their supervisory relationship and their supervisors' attitude toward themselves to measure the efficacy of the supervision theory and approach. Gill described that they observe supervisees' non-verbal signs and their clinical development, which are equally important in evaluating the effectiveness of Gill's supervision approach. Gill described, "When I do find out it (supervision model) is not working, it's because either I'm not seeing [the supervisees'] improvement, or I start to read the cues from the supervisees, that [are] any signs of uncomfortableness."

In the meantime, Helen described the process of bracketing their perspectives in order to meet their supervisees' needs and expectations. Helen said the supervisees' multicultural awareness and understanding influence her introducing diverse issues, including the cultural differences in supervision.

> I feel frustrated because I have this . . . I have an idea about what a counselor or ethical practice should look like. This is my bias, and therefore, I cannot really push my own theoretical orientation . . . because it was influenced by my lived experience and that is not their experience for white supervisees . . . so, I have to step back and look at where they are at in terms of the developmental states and racial identity development because white supervisees have white identity development.

Gill further explored that increasing their knowledge and understanding about specific supervision theory/model is as critical as understanding about their supervisees in order to select an effective approach to meet their supervisees' unique needs. Gill stressed that "I have to know when, what [models] works for who." The next section explored more about the competency of the participants as a supervisor.

Supervisor's Sense of Competency

The third conceptualized aspect was the participants' sense of competency. All 12 participants identified supervision theories/models they utilize, but only eight of them addressed the reason for their choice of those approaches. During the interview, four participants provided clear descriptions of their supervision approaches, along with theoretical perspectives and examples. On the other hand, Fam and Dine reported that their choice of supervision theory/model is based on their comfort level in its application. Fam described that "discrimination model is the most, at least, easiest for me to use. Because it provides a lot of roles I can provide to my supervisees." Dine added the usability of the model by highlighting the flexibility that:

> [Discrimination model] has been not that difficult I found . . . Discrimination model to be probably the most useful for myself with specifically white supervisees. There is a lot of flexibility, at least for me . . . I stick pretty much with the discrimination model. I don't really use elements from other ones because personally, I don't find them useful.

At the time of the interview, one participant had changed their supervision theory from the time they responded to the initial survey. Six participants described uncertainty and ambiguity transforming their knowledge about supervision theory/model into their supervision practice and applying them. Gill explained this phenomenon by explaining their thought process in preparing this individual interview:

> In preparation for our interview, I did some reflection on exactly what approach I was taking in the past years. And that's when I came up with "oh, these are the approaches that best fit with what I do, and this is why."

Furthermore, two participants reported their choice of supervision theories/models were based on their familiarity, such as their theoretical orientation as a counselor. Beth described they apply the cognitive-behavioral model in supervision by stating that "I know why CBT works there, also that makes me feel sense of security because I know I am good at CBT."

Other participants also described their knowledge and familiarity with the specific supervision theory that influences their supervision approach. Gill stated that their supervision approach had shifted over the years, and Jane and Kim reflected their earlier experience as a newer supervisor. Gill highlighted they used to apply supervision theories based on their vague preference. Also, Jane said, "Beginning of my supervision experience, I didn't think a lot about the theory or my supervision philosophy. I used my counseling theory background." Kim shared their similar experience that:

> Initially, I was very hesitant in using the supervision models because I wasn't familiar with them theoretically, so immediately, as soon as I saw psychotherapy-based models, I was like "ok, that is something I would latch onto."

During this interview, Jane repeated their lack of understanding about the supervision process and feeling incompetent in utilizing the discrimination model. At first, Jane explained her challenges in applying discrimination model and that they had stopped utilizing that approach because they did not understand how to apply the model. As Jane talked about their experience as teacher role with their white supervisee, Jane shifted her perspectives. Later in the interview, Jane explored and began addressing possible gaps in perceiving the teacher role between Jane's culture of origin and the Euro-American culture. In the beginning, Jane repeated a few times:

I didn't understand how I am goanna use that [Discrimination] model . . . I understand

that model. I understand the teacher model, the counselor model, and the consultant

model, but I couldn't understand that process . . . So, I cannot see myself using that

model because I couldn't understand how the process can be utilized . . . And then, there

was still something missing.

Jane's perspectives of their challenges in applying the discrimination model from her

incompetency to the possible cultural gaps. Jane described that:

The background of my teaching idea wouldn't fit in the white American person's

teaching– . . . When I tell her (supervisee) 'you did something wrong here' in the

different language, but I can, I basically said you did something wrong here, then they are

not very familiar with that because there is an indirect language in that teacher's role in

the States.

Language gap. Two participants described their experience in language issues in

supervision. Both participants addressed possible misunderstanding caused by the language

difference; however, neither of them addressed the relationship between the language gap and

their confidence or competency as a supervisor. Beth clarified their perspectives.

I sometimes see my supervisee look confused, so I know that's probably something about

my language. But I don't take it as personally. I don't say it's because of my supervision

confidence. I know clearly it's about my language. So, that doesn't really impact on my

supervision model because I think it's easier for me to differentiate the cultural issues

from my supervision competency.

Although the language was not associated with the participants' sense of competency, Lisa described that their supervisees' negative perspectives toward the supervision or the supervisor themselves could directly cause the supervisor's self-doubt.

> With the supervisees [who] have positive [perspectives] to me, I have confidence . . . But those supervisees who do not have that positive relationship with me, or have doubt, do not have positive perspectives on me . . . I think twice of my role. I feel less confident about the role of myself. Because with this model (IDM), the roles of the supervisors are quite different between the beginning supervisees and experienced supervisees. So, [the supervisees] who do not have good perspectives toward me, I feel less confident in just follow this model. Because something is not working well, right?

The next section describes more about the impact on the supervision process caused by the supervisees' perspective.

Supervisees' Perspectives

The fourth aspect was the participants' emphasis on their supervisees' perspectives toward themselves as a supervisor. The participants described that their supervisees' negative perspectives directly influence the supervisors' level of confidence and sense of competency. The participants reported that their supervisees regularly evaluate their supervisors by comparing with their previous supervisors. The participants addressed their diverse identities when they talked about themselves, such as "I am an Asian female . . .I am a foreigner . . . [and that was why] I need to work more to be a good supervisor" (Fam). Beth described their fears in being judged by their supervisees. "I'm a minority and I'm afraid I would make a mistake. I don't want my supervisee to look down to me . . . I know it sounds silly."

Also, cultural stereotypes toward the foreign-born supervisors were discussed, and that the participants expressed ambiguity in engaging with those stereotypes their supervisees carry in the supervision. The participants questioned whether they should challenge those stereotypical perspectives or step back and remain silent. Fam stated they choose to challenge the stereotypes:

> Because of the stereotype, they might not expect me being firm or too hard on them . . . I needed to challenge their cultural stereotype. I'm not from here, so there is sometimes I feel the push back from my supervisee.

Fam added the roles, discrimination model offer, allow them to be firm. Helen addressed her experience similarly that they did not want to be perceived by their supervisees based on their stereotypes: "I don't want to be seen like 'all the immigrants talk about immigrant issues." Thus, Helen described they only bring cultural issues when it is relevant, such as their supervisees have clients from a diverse cultural background.

The participants also described that they use their supervisee' perspectives as a tool. Ed described that their supervisees' perspectives could measure the successful supervision approach. Ed reported they assess the quality of their supervisory relationship through obtaining their supervisees' feedback and understanding their supervisees. Beth reported that the supervisees do not offer honest feedback because of the hierarchical supervisory relationship. Ed reported they value for assessing their supervisees' perspectives by "understanding relationship with me, so how do they relate with me. Do they relate with me in a very polite manner because they don't want to offend me, or are they related to me in a manner of respectful?" Further, supervisees' perspectives determine Ivy's supervision approach. Ivy described that: "Integrated approach helps better. It's well-received as supposed to come as an expert, it might trigger some of their (white female supervisee) prejudices." Ivy added their considerations in causing their

supervisees' negative feelings or perspectives when their supervisees' privileges are highlighted. The next section describes other cultural considerations identified by the participants.

Cultural Gaps in Supervision

The last aspect conceptualized was the cultural gaps in supervision. The present study examined the cross-cultural supervision dynamics by learning about foreign-born racially/ethnically diverse supervisors experience with and an American-born white supervisee. The results highlighted two cultural gaps in supervision. The first gap was identified in the supervisory relationship, and the second gap was found in supervision theory, including its understanding and application. During the interview, seven participants acknowledged cultural differences in supervision, and five of them reported they broach or discuss multicultural issues with their supervisees. Fam said, "I do culture broaching first at the beginning of the supervision." Contrary, Helen reported that they address cultural issues in supervision based on their supervisees' needs, their level of multicultural competency, racial identity development. Helen described: "now they are working with clients who aren't going through systemic oppression, so maybe I don't really need to [talk about multicultural issues]."

Cultural gaps in the theory. Beth described, "The [cultural] gaps are always there no matter what supervision model you use." Specifically, Ed expressed the limitations of applying the integrated discrimination model in diverse settings by highlighting its limitations in universality.

Coming from a different culture, I do see the gaps in the theory. I think I address the cultural limitations of the theory pretty well, so I don't know if its challenge in implementing the theory as much as the gaps in the theory itself . . . I think the theory itself has some gaps.

Within the discrimination model, the teacher role was described by the three supervisors differently. For Fam, "teacher role as being a little bit firm with [supervisee]"; however, Cathy described that:

When I tended to play a teacher role, before the supervision, I was very prepared. I self-studied a lot of relevant techniques, strategies, or theories because I asked supervisees what are some areas that you would like me to provide.

Lisa added their own supervision experience as a supervisee in their home country that "supervisors are more in an authoritative role. So sometimes it's uncommon for supervisees to cry in supervision session because not all but many supervisors take a very direct, and, there is a hierarchy there." Thus, even though the foreign-born supervisors select one supervision theory/model, their understandings and perspectives about the aspect of the theory/model vary.

Fill cultural gaps. The participants described how they try to fill the perceived cultural gaps manifested in supervision. The most frequently discussed resources in filling the gap was referring to the participants' own experience as a supervisee. The following three resources were identified as the participants' resources in order to fill the cultural gaps: remembering their former supervisors' supervision approaches (n = 5), apply specific supervision theory/model (n = 5), and the participants themselves (n = 3). For instance, Jane said, "my supervisors created a safe space for me." Helen reported they apply feminist theory, which "help supervisee to be aware of their position in society." Ed described their cultural background and awareness help cultural gaps existing within the theory that:

I fill the gaps by myself . . . I think just my background as a person of color from another country helps in helping me navigate through the cross-cultural barriers . . . using the non-verbal method during supervision that brings up to a deeper level of understanding.

No cultural gaps. In the meantime, two participants stated that their supervision approach is consistent regardless of the cultural difference of their supervisees. Dine stated that "I am trying to stick with one thing (theory) so that I'm as consistent as possible." Cate described their intentions and possible unintentional approaches that "I don't think too much [about cultural difference] when I am providing supervision, although there may be times I'm unconsciously providing different supervision strategies."

<div align="center">

Evaluation of the Findings

</div>

The present study attempted to answer two research questions by examining foreign supervisors' supervision process and experience. Five conceptualized themes were identified through the data analysis (Appendix F). Instead of forcing or manipulating the analysis further to make a single theoretical category (Charmaz, 2014), five themes were categorized into three theoretical themes. The first theme is supervene-centered, which includes the first two themes: supervisory relationship and adjustment of roles and theories/models. The second theoretical theme is the supervisors' dissidence and uncertainty in the supervision process includes the aspect of supervisors' sense of competency and supervisees' perspectives. The third theme is the cultural mismatch of supervision theories/models, which includes cultural gaps in supervision. The results of this study showed the cross-over in answering two research questions; therefore, this section outlines the evaluation of the findings for two research questions together:

- Research Question 1: How do foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories in supervising American-born white counselors-in-training and supervisees?

- Research Question 2: What do foreign-born supervisors experience in providing supervision to them?

The results of the present study indicated that the foreign-born supervisors take the supervisee-centered approach fundamentally, regardless of their use of supervision theories/models. Building and maintaining a positive supervisory relationship is emphasized, and that foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories to learn and understand their supervisees. They utilize theories as a framework while learning and exploring their supervisees as a person and a trainee.

Supervision theories/models are the tools, which offer a structure and permissions for the foreign born-supervisors to utilize roles and aspects provided by those theories in order to manage their supervisees' anxiety, assess and explore their supervisees' needs, facilitate multicultural dialogue, and be assertive to make their points. In the meantime, some foreign-born supervisors do not determine their supervision approach until they learn enough about their supervisees in order to tailor their approach. The foreign-supervisors assess the effectiveness of their supervision approach based on the development of their supervisory relationship and their supervisees' professional competencies by observing their supervisees' attitudes and perspectives toward themselves as a supervisor rather than heir supervisees' formal feedback. Thus, supervisees' negative feedback, such as resistance and stereotypes, or obstacles in developing a positive supervisory relationship are considered as a sign that their supervision approach is not appropriate for that supervisee. As a result, those foreign-born supervisors shift, adjust, and modify their supervision model or approaches to rebuild the relationship or find the best fit with their supervisees' needs.

The findings also indicated the foreign-born supervisors' sense of mismatching, incompetency, and uncertainty caused by unsmooth transformation of their knowledge about supervision theories/models into their supervision practice. As a result, the foreign-born

supervisors tend to select supervision models that offer clarity, specific roles, usability, and confidence to apply. The cultural gaps between the supervisor and the supervisee, as well as between the supervisor and the supervision theories/models can cause the supervisors' sense of incompetence, uncertainty, and lack of confidence, which further cause difficulty building positive relationships with their supervisees. In the meantime, some foreign-born supervisors are aware of possible cultural gaps and use theories, previous experience, and themselves to fill those gaps; however, some supervisors maintain the consistent approach regardless of their supervisees' cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, supervisees' culturally specific stereotypes, hierarchy in the larger social contexts, and their multicultural competency can influence the foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision theories/models and approaches.

Foreign-born supervisors take the supervisee-centered supervision approach regardless of the use of their supervision theories. This approach is distinguished from the person-centered approach, where supervisors demonstrate empathy, acceptance, and unconditional positive regard in supervision (Patterson, 1983; Rice, 1980). Within the supervisee-centered approach, foreign-born supervisors prioritize the supervisory relationship and their supervisees' needs and perspectives toward themselves as a supervisor.

Foreign-born supervisors face cultural gaps in supervising their American-born white supervisees and applying their knowledge in supervision. Western-developed supervision theories/models offer foreign-born supervisors a framework to facilitate supervision sessions, tools to build a supervisory relationship, and roles to fill cultural gaps. Within the supervisee-centered approach, supervisors rely on their supervisees' perspectives toward themselves to evaluate the effectiveness of supervision and their competency as a supervisor. Immature or negative supervisory relationships directly influence foreign-born supervisors' use of supervision

theories/models. As a result, some foreign-born supervisors consistently use certain supervision theories/models they feel competent to utilize. Other foreign-born supervisors adjust and adapt supervision theories and their roles to increase supervisees' positive experience in supervision, which reflects as the supervisors' competency.

Summary

This chapter presented the research findings. The first section of this chapter included the participants' demographic data obtained from the survey, as well as the description of sampling procedures in determining the interview participants. Demonstrating the transparency and the reality of the data were emphasized in reporting the findings, including the collected data, conceptualized themes, and the analysis and interpretations of the findings. This chapter also included the development process of three semi-structured questions utilized for conducting individual interviews. The developed semi-structured interview questions helped maintain the consistency in engaging with each interviewee, which helped explore the interviewees' in-depth experiences in supervision.

The second section of this chapter included the overview of the interview process and the results obtained from the semi-structured interviews, which were organized based on the conceptualized five categories. The results included the participants' rich description of their experience in supervision. The results led to defining three theoretical themes: the foreign-born supervisors' supervisee-centered approach, dissidence, and uncertainty in the supervision process, and cultural mismatch in supervision. The conceptualized three theoretical themes related to each other, which explained the foreign-born supervisors' supervision process and experience in utilizing supervision theories/models. The final section included this researcher's evaluation of the findings that led to answer the research questions of this study.

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND OUTCOMES

The present study intended to fill gaps in how the current multicultural literature discussed supervision theories and models. Although the literature well-addressed multicultural issues in supervision (Bannan, 2017; Falender & Shafranske, 2014; Vanneste et al., 2013), they lack empirical evidence. Current supervision literature tends to focus on exploring diverse supervisees' experience (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017) and multicultural competency as a supervisor (Burkard et al., 2014; Garrett et al., 2001; Inman & Ladany, 2014) by assuming supervisors are from the mainstream culture. Thus, the present research studied foreign-born person-of-color counselor supervisors who supervise white American-born counselors-in-training. The data derived from the present study served to increase understanding of the process and experience of the foreign-born supervisors in using western-developed supervision theories in cross-cultural supervision.

Constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) offered a framework of the present study to follow traditional grounded theory methodology while taking culturally sensitive approaches without assuming the appropriateness of utilizing the western-developed research methodology with foreign-born participants as a foreign-born researcher. Due to the lack of available data or literature, the data were collected in two levels. The first part of the data collected by online survey contributed to developing the semi-structured interview questions based on the results gathered from 30 survey respondents. The second part of the data were collected through individual interviews, where all the 12 participants reflected and explored their personal, professional, and academic experiences as a supervisor in the United States. Each interview was transcribed and analyzed by coding in three stages (Charmaz, 2014), which constructed three theoretical themes: (a) a supervisee-centered approach, including the emphasis

on supervisory relationship and adjustment of roles and theories in supervision based on supervisees' needs; (b) supervisors' dissidence and uncertainty in the supervision process including the aspect of the supervisors' sense of competency and supervisees' perspectives; and (c) cultural mismatch of supervision theories/models, including cultural gaps in the supervisory relationship.

Once those themes were constructed, this researcher matched the participants' direct quotations collected during the interview with those themes. This process offered a snapshot of the participants' rich and unique experiences discussed with their own words. The similarities and differences manifested in those themes were documented, and this researcher integrated the memo-writings throughout the study. In order to increase the trustworthiness of the present study, the researcher sought member-checks and consultations by committee members and third-party counselor educators. Those reviews and consultations assessed the appropriateness of the semi-structured interview questions, accuracy of the coding procedures, themes, as well as this researcher's biases.

Despite the effort of increasing the credibility of the present study, several limitations were identified. The first limitation is sampling because the participants were recruited from a small-sized population. The second limitation was data collection, which relied on the participants' self-report. The third limitation is the data analysis due to this researcher's limited understanding of the participants' culture of origin and interpretation of their meanings in speaking English as a second language for the participants and this researcher. This final chapter begins with a summary of the present study integrating those limitations, followed by implications of the findings, recommendations for supervision practice and future research, and a brief conclusion.

Summary and Implications

Two research questions guided the process of the present study:

1. How foreign-born supervisors' utilize supervision theories/models with their white American-born supervisees?

2. What do foreign-born supervisors experience in supervising those white American-born supervisees?

The semi-structured interviews found that the participants' experience in supervision influence their use of supervision theories. The results constructed five sub-themes: (a) supervisory relationship, (b) adjustment of roles and supervision theories/models, (c) supervisors' sense of competence, (d) supervisees' perspectives, and (e) cultural gaps in supervision.

The findings of the present study suggested that foreign-born supervisors utilize supervision theories/models to facilitate a framework of supervision, understand their supervisees, build positive relationships with their supervisees, assess supervisees' development, and fill cultural gaps in supervisory relationships and supervision theories. Supervision theories/models also offer foreign-born supervisors permission to play specific supervisory roles suggested in the supervision theories, which help them assess supervisees' development and address concerns about their supervisees. In the meantime, foreign-born supervisors experience uncertainty in applying the specific roles and dynamics discussed in supervision theories/models. As a result, foreign-born supervisors experience dissidence, lack of confidence, and a sense of incompetence in applying those supervision theories. Foreign-born supervisors subjectively assess the quality of supervisory relationships and supervisees' perspectives toward them to evaluate the effectiveness of their use of supervision theories/models and their competency as a

supervisor. The following section is a summary of each three themes the present study constructed.

Supervisee-Centered Approach

Regardless of supervision theories/models, all the 12 interview participants in the present study stressed they value for building positive supervisory relationships (Stinson et al., 2013) and learning about their supervisees (Bannan, 2017; O'Donvan et al., 2011). This researcher defined this phenomenon as supervisee-centered approach, which foreign-born supervisors view differently from the person-centered supervision model (Patterson, 1983; Rice, 1980). The supervisee-centered approach for foreign-born supervisors is to select and adjust their supervision approaches based on their supervisees' unique needs, expectations, and feedback obtained from them. The supervisee-centered approach also means for foreign-born supervisors to put their own values and needs aside when they are considered to be unrelated to their supervisees' clinical work or conflicted with their supervisees' values and needs. For example, one participant referred to their approach as a person-centered supervision model, then use the Cognitive Behavioral Supervision Model (Rosenbaum & Ronen, 1998) to help their supervisee manage their anxiety before applying the Integrated Developmental Model (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010) to discuss their clinical cases. In this participant's approach, the aspects of the core person-centered approach were missing; therefore, they may define the person-centered approach differently from its original contexts, or they may refer to the supervisee-focused approach to be a person-centered approach.

Within the foreign-born supervisors' supervisee-centered approach, the foreign-born supervisors determine the need for initiating multicultural dialogues based on their white supervisees' multicultural awareness and the backgrounds of their clients. Although Phillips,

Parent, Dozier, and Jackson (2017) found that discussion about culture and positive supervisory relationships are positively correlated, and all the interview participants of the present study recognized cultural differences in their supervisory dynamics, only less than half of them reported that they discuss cultural differences in supervision. Racial/ethnic minorities tend to hold back their own needs and feelings, especially in areas where the individuals from mainstream culture do not or do not want to understand (Siddique, 2017), as well as to avoid discussing areas their counterparty have limited understanding of, in order to keep that counterparty's face (Seponski & Jordan, 2018).

Supervisors' Dissidence and Uncertainty

The second theme was the foreign-born supervisors' dissidence and uncertainty in the supervision process, including the aspects of supervisors' sense of competence and their supervisees' perspectives. The present study supports Bernard and Goodyear (1992) that some foreign-born supervisors tend to use psychotherapy-based supervision theories due to their familiarity and confidence in using those theories rather than other supervision theories. The participants defined their use of supervision models similarly to the previous literature: developmental-based supervision models by focusing on assessing their supervisees' developmental stages (Stoltenberg et al., 1998), and the social role models (Chunk & Barden, 2017) by viewing the supervision process systemically and playing specific roles within those theories. Throughout the study, none of the participants reported multicultural supervision models as their supervision approach.

Two novice supervisors in the present study stated they use supervision theories only in which they feel comfortable utilizing with no specific explanations, whereas other participants demonstrated their ability to define and explain the theories/models they utilize. The findings

further unveiled the gaps between those foreign-born supervisors' knowledge and application of those supervision theories. The participants reflected their initial hesitation in using supervision models as a beginner supervisor due to the unfamiliarity of transitioning theoretical concepts into practice.

Multiple participants in this study discussed the teacher role introduced in the Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979) by comparing three roles (teacher, counselor, and consultant) discussed within the model. Although taking a teacher role is the primal approach for a participant, other participants found that the teacher role is difficult to apply. The finding highlighted the cultural differences in teacher role between the Euro-American culture and the participants' culture of origin. The previous studies stated novice counselors require a directive supervision approach (Borders & Brown, 2005) and hierarchical interventions (Prouty et al., 2007). In the meantime, hierarchy in the supervisory relationship is also considered to be harmful in the western worldview (Ladany et al., 2013). Those conflicted expectations and unfamiliar western aspects of the supervisory roles may be confusing for novice foreign-born supervisors who value the supervisee-centered approach.

Cultural Mismatch of Supervision Theories/Models and Supervisory Relationship

The manifestation of cultural gaps in supervision was the most acknowledged and reflected theme during the individual interviews of the present study, which highlighted two aspects: cultural gaps in supervisory relationships and supervision theories/models. The Literature suggest supervisors' transparent self-disclosure and discussion about their personal and cultural challenges can offer a culturally sensitive supervisory relationship (Christiansen et al., 2011; Falender et al., 2014; Inman & Ladany, 2014; Jang et al., 2014); however, the

foreign-born supervisors' supervisee-centered approach appeared to discourage them from talking about themselves. The foreign-born supervisors in the present study frequently identified themselves as "foreigner" or "immigrant" rather than their racial or ethnic identities and said, "I'm not from here (United States)." Because racially/ethnically diverse immigrants tend to partake in the visiting culture in order to survive in that new environment (Navas, Rojas, García, & Pumares, 2007), foreign-born supervisors' immediate focus in supervision might be fitting with the given new cultural norms. Applying learned Eurocentric supervision theories/models in unfamiliar western clinical settings with their white supervisees can increase foreign-born supervisors' self-doubt of their ability to transform their knowledge to practice or be assertive. Facilitating a safe space for supervisee is considered to be the supervisor's responsibility (Milne & Watkins, 2014), and the quality of supervision relationships is related to the supervisees' sense of safety (Hernández et al., 2009); however, diverse supervisors' sense of safety in the cross-cultural supervision seems to be ignored.

Power and hierarchy. Racial difference influences the power dynamic (Hays & Chang, 2003), and the perspectives toward power in the supervision vary depending on cultural aspects (Lian et al., 2012; Pendse, 2017). The present study found two conflicting views on the power of the foreign-born supervisors in cross-cultural supervision. One was to emphasize their power as a supervisor and their intentional approach to minimize their power in the supervisory relationship with their white supervisees. Another was the unnegotiable power their white supervisees granted in the larger social contexts, which manifests in the supervisory relationship.

According to Ratts (2017), the person-of-color supervisors experience privilege and oppression simultaneously in supervising a white-American supervisee; however, the result of the present study about the foreign-born supervisors' perspectives of their power was

inconsistent. Foreign-born supervisors' multiple marginalized identifications can increase the negative impact in the supervisory relationship (Pritchett-Johnson, 2011), such as age, gender, immigration status, socio-economic status, and clinical experience, may have added complexity of the power dynamic and their perceived privilege and oppression; however, the present study did not explore those variables. Although facilitating dialogue about the power difference with supervisees is suggested (Quek & Storm, 2012), the results of the present study supports Mangione et al. (2011) that none of the participants of this study reported that they discuss the power dynamic with their white supervisees. This researcher did not define power or explore possible privilege and oppressions with the study participants in the preset study.

The positively developed supervisory relationship allows foreign-born supervisors to exercise their power (Tanaka, 2009), and supervisees' resistance and questioning the supervisors' authority or competence can be threats for foreign-born supervisors. In order to increase the sense of power as a supervisor, foreign-born supervisors may initially and primarily focus on building the supervisory relationship. Due to the lack of empirical data available for foreign-born supervisors to refer (Simpson-Southward et al., 2017), those supervisors may be over-sensitive of supervisees' opinion and heavily rely on their supervisees' perspectives to assess appropriateness of their exercise of power within the framework of specific supervision theories/models.

Foreign-born supervisors' use of power. In the initial survey of the present study, seven participants listed gatekeeping as one of their supervisor roles; however, none of them directly address the gatekeeping role during the interview. Providing corrective feedback can be uncomfortable for non-Euro-American supervisors (Burkard et al., 2014) and novice supervisors

(Borders et al., 2017; Mann & Merced, 2018). Additionally, unfamiliar cultural norms and expectations can increase foreign-born supervisors' hesitations in being assertive. The foreign-born supervisors' assertive conversation with their white supervisees was only highlighted in this study when those supervisors challenge their supervisees' stereotypes regarding their personalities and supervision styles relating to their culture of origin.

Further exploring the interview participants' experience has guided this researcher to acknowledge the supervision theories/models and training assume the supervisors' granted power with limited considerations of supervisors' diverse backgrounds. As a result, supervisors automatically attempt to try minimizing their assumed-power in order to facilitate a safe learning space for their supervisees. On the other hand, acknowledging the supervisees' granted power or questioning their granted power as a supervisor can further increase complexity and ambiguity in the supervisory relationship or approach. According to Zapata, Carton, and Liu (2016), "For supervisors from stigmatized minority groups, interpersonal justice is a double-edged sword. If supervisors violate interpersonal justice rules, then subordinates suffer, and the subordinate supervisor relationship is damaged" (p. 1169). In the present study, two participants of the present study discussed their consistent application of supervision theories regardless of cultural gaps in supervisory relationships or theories. Those participants may maintain their consistency by trying to fit with a Eurocentric supervision approach in order to minimize potential confusion, uncertainty, and ambiguity in supervisory relationships or their theoretical approach in order to offer a safe learning space for their supervisee.

Unveiled Biases

Initially, the findings of the present study ignited this researcher's strong emotional reactions by questioning the supervisors' limited application of supervision theories/models and

lack of initiating a dialogue about multicultural issues with their white supervisees. Exploring the participants' presented stories and this researchers' emotional experience together with one of the committee members helped acknowledge and process this researcher's biases of which she was previously unaware. This researcher's multiple shared identities with the study participants, such as foreigner and novice supervisor identities, assumed shared experience without carefully listening to the participants' unique experiences. Although this study intended to include foreign-born supervisors into the multicultural supervision studies in the counseling field, this researcher's biases and assumptions resulted in excluding foreign-born supervisors who did not identify the use of supervision theories/models on their initial survey response. This researcher mistakenly believed that we all should apply the learned western-developed supervision theories with our white supervisees. As a result, this researcher avoided listening to the unspoken messages of those participants in the initial survey who were excluded in the interviews for the present study.

Future Implications as Researcher

The results of this study highlighted the ambiguity and blindeness in the definition of power in supervision in cross-cultural supervision, as well as the cultural gaps in the supervisee-centered or person-centerd supervision aspects. Various questions emerged while further exploring the themes constructed through the present study: When does the use of power look appropriate or imappropriate?; How do foreign-born supervisors define power and use their power in supervision?; Is this power ambiguity manifested in supervision theories or is this ambiguity caused by the supervisors' personal experience, such as oppression?; and How do foreign-born supervisors define, perceive, and apply the person-centerd supervision model?

This researcher's new hypothesis is that promoting and emphasizing western-developed supervision theory universally mistakenly forces foreign-born supervisors to ignore their cultural values, identities or awareness when they are different from supervision theories/models or their supervisees. In other words, acknowledging the never-obtained power as a supervisor creates more conflict and complexity in applying supervision theories and supervising white supervisees in the United States. Increasing this researcher's awareness of her biases helped redirect the application of the results of the present study in practice and future research based on the above newly formed questions.

Recommendations for Practice

The findings of the present study can be applied to the supervision training, supervision practice, supervision research, and development of culturally sensitive supervision theories/models. Counselor educators and supervisors can increase dialogue about multicultural contexts and power dynamics in supervision without assuming Eurocentric supervision and supervision theories to be the norm or universal. Although previous studies suggest that the majority of racially/ethnically diverse supervisors tend to initiate conversations about race in supervision (White-Davis et al., 2016), the present study found only a few participants discuss their cultural differences with their white American-born supervisees in supervision. The literature regarding supervisors' multicultural competence and its positive influence in supervision is well studied (Burkard et al., 2014; Singh & Chun, 2010; Tohidian & Quek, 2017); however, foreign-born supervisors show hesitation in having those conversations, especially when their supervisees' clients are from mainstream cultures. This finding is one of the examples, which suggests the importance of acknowledging supervisors' diverse cultural backgrounds without assuming who they are as a supervisor in a broader context.

The finding of the present study also suggests that counselor educators to actively facilitate and engage with conversations about supervisors' appropriate power practice (Tanaka, 2009) during the supervision and supervision training. The present study supports Ober (2009) that conversation related to power dynamics in supervision is not occurring in supervision. The participants of the present study also support the finding of Crook-Lyon et al. (2011) that the supervisors' previous supervision experience as a supervisee influences their supervision approach; therefore, counselor educators and supervisors play a significant role in foreign-born supervisors' experience and their future use of power, culturally sensitive conversations, and supervision theories/models.

The authors pointed out the lack of multicultural studies in leadership development (Shore et al., 2011), inconsistent requirements for supervisors (Nate & Haddock, 2014), and lack of multicultural supervision training models (Seponski & Jordan, 2018; Thériault & Gazzola, 2019). Although the findings of the present study resulted in similarities to those authors' statements, identifying clear definitions, responsivities, and roles of supervisors within the specific socio-cultural contexts seem to be missing in supervision theories and training. Traditionally, leadership development is considered only within the western norms, which ignores the needs of ethnic minorities (Sy, Tram-Quon, & Leung, 2017). As the present study found, definitions of supervisory roles, such as a teacher in the United States, needs to be further explained during the supervision training without assuming the universality of the 'supervisor' or 'teacher' roles. This type of extended cultural sensitivity in supervision and supervisor training can offer foreign-born supervisors to set more explicit purposes and goals in supervision without assuming their granted or never-granted power or depending on their supervisees' perspectives.

The present study also found the strong influence of white supervisees' perceptions, opinions, and feedback toward foreign-born supervisors. In addition to further exploring this tendency, foreign-born supervisors can self-evaluate by considering the following statements made by authors: white supervisees' feedback can be unconsciously or unintentionally discounted toward minority supervisors (Pritchet-Johnson, 2011), and leadership application tends to decline when minority leaders become leaders of individuals from majority cultures (Prislin, Davenport, Xu, Moreno, & Honeycutt, 2018). Developing and utilizing more objective measurement tools for foreign-born supervisors' supervision competency and effectiveness of supervision can also increase objective assessment and minimize their dependency on their supervisees or their own previous experience.

<p style="text-align: center">Recommendations for Future Research</p>

The present study was designed based on the limited available literature, empirical studies, sample size, knowledge about variables, and diversity of the sample. Thus, conducting a similar study with a larger sample size by increasing gender and ethnic diversity is the first recommendation for future research. A larger and diverse sample can help identify more variables and intercultural characteristics of the sample. The purpose of the present study was to increase understanding about the participants' multicultural sensitivity of supervision theories/models from the global perspectives; therefore, possible cultural influence such as oppression, racial identity development (Atkinson, Morton, & Sue, 1989), or acculturation (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987; Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936) possibly manifested in supervision and professional development were not explored in the present study. Acknowledging and exploring foreign-born supervisors' experience and their supervision practice in relating to their cultural development can also help clarify and identify variables, as

well as increase further understanding of unexplored areas and biases in Eurocentric supervision theories/models.

The present study also revealed a possible existing blind spot in supervision theories and training: the assumption of supervisors' power in supervision, without considering the supervisors' cultural identities. In the United States, foreign-born supervisors learn about supervision and theories without obtaining enough understanding of norms and expectations of the western culture (Sy et al., 2017). Unlike individuals who were born and raised in the United States, individuals from high power distance cultures (Daniels & Greguras, 2014) may have difficulty understanding the power dynamic discussed in the Eurocentric supervision theories or approaches. Because focusing on the effective application of supervision theories can block supervisors' appropriate use of their power (Tanaka, 2009), which can influence their gatekeeping responsibility in clinical supervision, immediate examination of foreign-born supervisors assumed or never-granted power in supervision and role of the systemic structure of power is recommended.

Lastly, the present study suggested the importance of the researchers to increase cultural sensitivities in examining and developing supervision theories/training; otherwise, the results or newly developed theories still include blindspots. The next step in the future research is to conduct a similar study with two or more researchers throughout in order to increase the broader perspectives of the participants' experience and critical evaluation of appropriateness and accuracy of the study. Including the participants this study mistakenly excluded in the interview process, as well as studying supervisors practicing outside of the United States and comparing the results, can also help examine the currently available supervision theories and training to develop more culturally sensitive supervision approach and training.

Even though the present study did not result in developing a new supervision theory, five themes in foreign-born supervisors' experience in utilizing supervision theories/models with their white supervisees are grounded. Each theme contributes as a foundation of a future study and guides researchers to further explore supervision theory, practice, and training in cross-cultural and global settings. For future studies, the present study also highlighted that researcher's culturally sensitive approach throughout the study is critical.

Conclusions

The present study contributes to filling the current literature on multicultural contexts of supervision from the foreign-born racially/ethnically diverse supervisors' perspectives. The problem addressed in this study was the lack of attention paid to increasing diversity of supervisors and the lack of empirical studies exploring multicultural sensitivities of supervision theories/models while diversity in the counseling field has been increasing in the United States and expanding globally.

The present research studied foreign-born doctoral-level racially/ethnically diverse supervisors in the United States by exploring their use of western-developed supervision theories/models, the process of supervision, and experience in supervising American-born white supervisees in the United States. The constructivist grounded theory design (Charmaz, 2014) helped guide the sampling, data gathering, and data analysis procedures, in addition to consistently examining this researcher's previous knowledge, assumptions, and unrecognized biases throughout the study. The study findings led to constructing a theory based on three interrelated themes within the foreign-born supervisors' experience. The three constructed themes are:

1. Supervisee-centered approach, including developing a positive supervisory relationship and adjusting supervision theories, models, and approach based on supervisees' unique needs, which often requires bracketing their values and needs when they conflicted with their supervisees' needs or negatively influence the supervisory relationship.

2. Dissidence and uncertainty in the supervision process, including a sense of competence and confidence as a supervisor, which are measured by supervisees' perspectives toward themselves as a supervisor and the quality of supervisory relationship.

3. Cultural mismatch of supervision theories/models, including cultural gaps in the supervisory relationship, which foreign-born supervisors try to fill by applying other supervision theories/models, or by themselves without having enough reliable resources or references.

Eurocentric supervision theories and cultural norms seem to assume foreign-born supervisors' granted power in supervision and influence foreign-born supervisors in two different ways. One is to ignore the socio-cultural dynamic manifested in supervisory relationships with their white supervisees, and another is to face the difficulty applying and transforming their obtained knowledge from their supervisor training into practice. The present study attempted to increase the awareness of counselor educators and supervisors who train current and future supervisors who are from diverse backgrounds.

The findings of the present study were further analyzed and discussed in relation to the existing literature exploring supervision, supervision theories, multicultural supervision, and supervision training and practice outside of the United States. The foreign-born supervisors'

values for building positive relationships, experience in facing difficulty understanding western concepts, and offering constructive feedback to their supervisees were consistent with previous studies in supervision, and the present study added a new aspect, power, in multicultural supervision where supervisors are from diverse backgrounds.

With this study, this researcher aimed to create an opportunity for foreign-born supervisors to share their unspoken voice in developing culturally sensitive supervision theories/models and training; however, she discovered her critical biases as a researcher, which mistakenly ignore foreign-born supervisors' silent messages. The present study offered awareness of multiple parallel processes occurring during the research study in supervision within the dynamics among counselor educators or supervisors of the supervisors, foreign-born supervisors, white supervisees, those supervisees' clients, and researchers. Future studies need to continue exploring multicultural variables interrelating within those four dynamics by increasing researchers' cultural sensitivity in designing and conducting future research.

References

Akkurt, M. N. (2016). *International students in supervision: Multicultural discussion as a moderator between supervision related constructs: Acculturation, counselor self-efficacy, supervisory working aliance, and role ambiguity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10109533)

Akkurt, M. N., Ng, K.-M., & Kolbert, J. (2018). Multicultural discussion as a moderator of counseling supervision-related constructs. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *40*, 455–468. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-9337-z

Aladağ, M., & Kemer, G. (2016). Clinical supervision: An emerging counseling specialty in Turkey. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *35*(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2016.1223775

Alasuutari, P. (2004). The globalization of qualitative research. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.). *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 595–608). London, UK: SAGE.

Alemu, G., Stevens, B., Ross, P., & Chandler, J. (2015). The use of a constructivist grounded theory method to explore the role of socially-constructed metadata (Web 2.0) approaches. *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries*, *4*, 517–540. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Use-of-a-Constructivist-Grounded-Theory-Method-GetanehAlemu-Stevens/e0f6e47f5d43214c5a993f777e54000a6081ce26

Allsbrook, K., Atzinger, C., He, H., Engelhard, C., Yager, G., & Wusik, K. (2016). The relationship between the supervision role and compassion fatigue and burnout in genetic counseling. *Journal of Genetic Counseling*, *25*(6), 1286–1297. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10897-016-9970-9

Alvarez, C. M., & Lee, S. H. (2012). An international perspective on professional counselor identity. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research*, *39*(1), 42–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/15566382.2012.12033881

American Association of State Counseling Boards. (2007). *Approved supervisor model*. Retrieved from http://www.aascb.org/aws/AASCB/asset_manager/get_file/37297

American Counseling Association. (2014). *2014 ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.counseling.org/resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf

American Counseling Association. (2010). *Licensure requirements for professional counselors* -2010. Retrieved from https://www.counseling.org/docs/licensure/72903_excerpt_for_web.pdf

American Counseling Association. (n.d.). *ACA's first international conference begins!* https://www.counseling.org/news/updates/by-year/2015/2015/06/18/aca-s-first -international-conference-begins

An, Q. L., & Szto, P. (2019). Research on the relationship between supervisor and social work interns in China: A Shanghai case study. *International Social Work*, *62*(2), 905–917. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872818755855

Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2010). A multicultural framework for couselor supervision. In N. Ladany & L. J. Bradley (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (4th ed., pp. 53–94). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ancis, J. R., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *88*(3), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00023.x

Anderson, H. (1997). *Conversation, language, and possibilities: A postmodern approach to therapy*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Araneda, M. E. (2015). *Clinical group supervision in mental health counseling training: Experiences of supervisors and their supervisees* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3723221)

Arczynski, A. V., & Morrow, S. L. (2017). The complexities of power in feminist multicultural psychotherapy supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *64*(2), 192–205. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000179

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision*. Retrieved from http://www.acesonline.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/ACES-Best-Practices-in-clinical-supervision-document-FINAL.pdf

Atkinson, D. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). *Counseling American minorities: A cross-cultural perspective.* Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Avery, E. M. H., Guiffrida, D. A., & Lynch, M. F. (2017). Development and validation of the constructivist supervisor scale. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *30*(4), 439–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2016.1246992

Baer, J. (2018). *IIE Center for Academic Mobility research and impact: Fall 2018 international student enrollment hot topics survey*. IIE The Power of Interntational Education. Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/-/media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Special-Reports/Fall-Enrollment-2018ReportFinal.ashx?la=en&hash=04AFF9CAB03766F495253CE8E185F876841A96C9

Baggerly, J., Tan, T. X., & Pichotta, D. (2017). Race, ethnicity, and gender of faculty members in APA- and CACREP- accredited programs: Changes over five decades. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *45*, 292–304. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12079

Bang, K., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). South Korean supervisees' experience of and response to negative supervision events. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(4), 353–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2014.940851

Bannan, D. G. (2017). *Grounded theory inquiry into process of cross-cultural supervision in Ukraine* (Doctoral dissertation). Retreived from ProQuest. (10685334)

Behrens, R. D. (2018). *Client spirituality and counseling: The view of licensed professional counselor interns in the state of Texas using constructivist grounded theory* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10903514)

Barker, K. K., & Hunsley, J. (2013). The use of theoretical models in psychology supervisor development research from 1994–2010: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology*, *54*(3), 176–185. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029694

Barnett, J. E, & Molzon, C., H. (2014). Clinical supervision of psychotherapy: Essential ethics issues for supervisors and supervisees. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *70*(11), 1051–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22126

Berg, B. (2017) An introduction to content Analysis. In L. Howard & B. L. Berg (Eds.), *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (9th ed., pp. 181–200). England: Pearson.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, *21*(3), 491–511. https://doi.org/10.2307/2546607

Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisory training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *19*, 60–68. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Blount, A. J., & Mullen, P. R. (2015). Development of an integrative wellness model: Supervising counselors-in-training. *The Professional Counselor*, *5*(1), 100–113. https://doi.org/10.15241/ajb.5.1.100

Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *68*(2), 151–162. https://doi.org/10.1108/17506200710779521

Borders, L. D. (2019). Science of learning: Evidence-based teaching in the clinical supervision classroom. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *58*(1), 64–79. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12124

Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development, and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *31*, 58–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1991.tb00371.x

Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

Borders, L. D., & Giordano, A. L. (2016). Confronting confrontation in clinical supervision: An analytical autoethnography. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *94*(4), 454–463. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12104

Borders, L. D. A., Welfare, L. E., Sackett, C. R., & Cashwell, C. (2017). New supervisors' struggles and successes with corrective feedback. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *56*(3), 208–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12073

Bornsheuer-Boswell, J. N., Polonyi, M. M., & Watts, R. E. (2013). Integrating Adlerian and Integrated Developmental Model pproaches to supervision of counseling trainees. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *69*(4), 328–343. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.antioch.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2014-03802-005&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Bowen, G. A. (2008). Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, *8*, 137–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794107085301

Bradley, L. J., & Whiting, P. P. (2001). Supervision training: A model. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice*, (3rd ed., pp. 361–387). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., Hess, S., & Schultz, J. (2009). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual supervisees' experience of LGB-affirmative and nonaffirmative supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*(1), 176–188. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.56.1.176

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., Clarke, R. D., Phelps, D. L., & Inman, A. G. (2014). Supervisors' experiences of providing difficult feedback in cross-ethnic/racial supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *42*(3), 314–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012461157

Burton, S. (2011). *The need for a constructivist approach in supervising counseling students: The intersection of life experience and counselor development.* Retrieved from http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas11/Article_44.pdf

Callifronas, M. D., & Brock, S. (2017). A person-centered view of the aim, goals, and tasks in clinical supervision: Proposals on topics for experiential learning. *British Journal of Medicine & Medical Research*, *19*(8), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.9734/bjmmr/2017/29507

Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *42*(3), 294–320. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124113500475

Carlson, R. G., & Lambie, G. W. (2012). Systemic–developmental supervision: A clinical supervisory approach for family counseling student interns. *The Family Journal*, *20*, 29–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480711419809

Carroll, M. (1996). *Counseling supervision: Theory, skills and practice*. London: Cassell.

Center for Credentialing and Education. (2016). *ACS approved clinical supervisor*. Retrieved from https://www.cce-global.org/Credentialing/ACS

Center for Credentialing and Education. (n.d.). *Requirements: Approved clinical supervisor.* Retrieved from https://www.cce-global.org/Credentialing/ACS/Requirements

Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., & Shoffner, M. F. (2003). Cross-racial supervision: A developmental approach for White supervisors working with supervisees of color. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *22*(2), 121–138. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v22n02_08

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist grounded theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(1), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416657105

Cheng, W. J. (2015). Supervisors' uses of social power from perspectives of both supervisors and supervisees. *The Archive of Guidance & Counseling*, *37*(1), 1–20. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.antioch.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true& db=psyh&AN=2015-28682-001&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Chiovitti, R. F., & Piran, N. (2003). Rigour and grounded theory research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *44*(4), 427–435. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0309-2402.2003.02822.x

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

Christiansen, A. T., Thomas, V., Kafescioglu, N., Karakurt, G., Lowe, W., Smith, W., & Wittenborn, A. (2011). Multicultural supervision: Lessons learned about an ongoing struggle. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *37*(1), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00138.x

Chung, M. (2009). *International supervisors' social influence, self-efficacy, and acculturation in cross-cultural dyads of clinical supervision* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI:3387588).

Chunk A. E., & Barden, S. M. (2017). The common factors discrimination model: An integrated approach to counselor supervision. *The Professional Counselor*, *7*(1), 62–75. https://doi.org/10.15241/aec.7.1.62

Coleman, G., & O'Connor, R. (2007). Using grounded theory to understand software process improvement: A study of Irish software product companies. *Information and Software Technology*, *49*(6), 654–667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2007.02.011

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1515/zfsoz-1990-0602

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). Strategies for qualitative data analysis. In *Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(1), 12–32. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.55662499

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2013). *Annual report 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CACREP-2013-Annual-Report.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *Annual report 2014*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CACREP-2014-Annual-Report.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2015 CACREP standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2017). *Annual report 2016*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CACREP-2016-Annual-Report.pdf

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2019). *Annual report 2018*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/CACREP-2018-Annual-Report.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Crook-Lyon, R. E., Presnell, J., Silva, L., Suyama, M., & Stickney, J. (2011). Emergent supervisors: Comparing counseling center and non-counseling-center interns' supervisory training experiences. *Journal of College Counseling*, *14*(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1882.2011.tb00062.x

Crunk, A. E., & Barden, S. M. (2017). The common factors discrimination model: An integrated approach to counselor supervision. *The Professional Counselor*, *7*(1), 62–75. https://doi.org/10.15241/aec.7.1.62

Currie, K. (2009). Using survey data to assist theoretical sampling in grounded theory research. *Nurse Researcher*, *17*(1), 24–33. https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2009.10.17.1.24.c7336

Daniels, J., D'Andrea, M., & Kim, B. S. K. (1999). Assessing the barriers and changes of cross -cultural supervision: A case study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *38*(3), 191–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb00570.x

Daniels, M. A., & Greguras, G. J. (2014). Exploring the nature of power distance implications for micro- and macro-level theories, processes, and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, *40*, 1202–1229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527131

Darongkamas, J., John, C., & Walker, M. J. (2014). An eight-eyed version of Hawkins and Shohet's clinical supervision model: The addition of the cognitive analytic therapy concept of the 'observing eye/I' as the 'observing us.' *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, *42*(3), 261–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2014.895797

Dawson, M., Phillips, B., & Leggat, S. G. (2013). Effective clinical supervision for regional allied health professionals: The supervisor's perspective. *Australian Health Review*, *37*(2), 262-267. https://doi.org/10.1071/AH11164

Denzin, N. K. (2009). The elephant in the living room: Or extending the conversation about the politics of evidence. *Qualitative Research*, *9*(2), 139–160. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794108098034

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, *40*, 314–321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Doolittle, P. E., & Hicks, D. (2003). Constructivism and theoretical foundation for the use of technology in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Studies*, *31*(1), 71–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2003.10473216

Doroff, T. D. L. (2012). *Supervision in applied counseling settings: A socially constructed grounded theory* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 3523437)

Draucker, C. B., Martsolf, D. S., Ross, R., & Rusk, T. B. (2007). Theoretical sampling and category development in grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research*, *17*(8), 1137–1148. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732307308450

Dye, H. A., & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *69*(1), 27–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01449.x

Egan, G. (2010). *The skilled helper: A problem management and opportunity-development approach to helping* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.

Ekstein, R. (1964). Supervision of psychotherapy: Is it teaching? Is it administration? Or is it therapy? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *1*(3), 137–138. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0088588

Elliot, D. L., Baumfield, V., & Reid, K. (2016). Searching for 'a third space': A creative pathway towards international PhD students' academic acculturation. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *35*(6), 1180–1195. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1144575

Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about coding process in qualitative data analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *23*(11), 2850–2861. Retrieved from https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss11/14

Ellis, M. V., Berger, L., Hanus, A. E., Ayala, E. E., Swords, B. A., & Siembor, M. (2014). Inadequate and harmful clinical supervision: Testing a revised framework and assessing occurrence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *42*(4), 434–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000013508656

Enns, C. Z., & Kasai, M. (2003). Hakoniwa: Japanese sandplay therapy. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000002239403

Epstein, R. M., & Hundert, E. M. (2002). Defining and assessing professional competence. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association*, *287*(2), 226–235. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.2.226

Eryılmaz, A., & Mutlu, T. (2017). Developing the four-stage supervision model for counselor trainees. *Educational Science: Theory and Practice*, *17*(2), 597–629. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2017.2.2253

Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (1993). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *6*(4), 50–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1993.tb00605.x

Estrada, D., Frame, M. W., & Williams, C. B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 307–319. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ699294

Falender, C. A. (2018). Clinical supervision: The missing ingredient. *American Psychologist*, *73*(9), 1240–1250. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000385

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

Falender, C. A.,& Shafranske, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervisi: A competency-based approach*. Washington. DC: American Psychological Association.

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2007). Competence in competency-based supervision practice: Construct and application. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *38*(3), 232-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.38.3.232

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2010). Psychotherapy-based supervision models in an emerging competency-based era: A commentary. *Psychotherapy, Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *47*(1), 45–50. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018873

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2014). Clinical supervision: The state of the art. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *70*(11), 1030–1041. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22124

Falender, C. A., Shafranske, E. P., & Ofek, A. (2014). Competent clinical supervision: Emerging effective practices. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(4), 393–408. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2014.934785

Farber, E. W., & Kaslow, N. J. (2010). Introduction to the special section: The role of supervision in ensuring the development of psychotherapy competencies across diverse theoretical perspectives. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *47*(1), 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018850

Farrell, I. C. (2018). *Advocacy among counseling leaders: A constructivist grounded theory* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Retrieved from https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/4884

Fernandez, M. A. (2013). A model of pedagogy for beginning counselor educators. *American Counseling Association: VISATS Online*. Retrieved from https://www.counseling.org/knowledge-center/vistas/by-subject2/vistas-education-and -supervision/docs/default-source/vistas/a-model-of-pedagogy-for-beginning-counselor -educators.

Field, L. D., Chavez-Korell, S., & Rodríguez, M. M. D. (2010). No hay rosas sin Espinas: Conceptualizing Latina-Latina supervision from a multicultural developmental supervisory model. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *4*(1), 47–54. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018521

Field, T. A., Ghoston, M., & K. McHugh. (2019). Requirements for supervisors of counselor licensure candidates in the United States. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, *6*(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2018.1489315

Fitzpatrick, J., Secrist, J., & Wright, D. J. (1998). *Secrets for a successful dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Foo Kune, N. M. R., & Rodolfa, E. R. (2013). Putting the benchmarks into practice: Multiculturally competent supervisors–effective supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 121–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012453944

Forrest, L. (2010). Linking international psychology, professional competence, and leadership: Counseling psychologists as learning partners. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *38*(1), 96–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009350585

Fowler, F. J., & Cosenza, C. (2009). Design and evaluation of survey questions. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*, (2nd ed., pp. 375–412). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Gaete, J., & Strong, T. (2017). Facilitating supervisees' developing competence through supervisory conversation. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *30*(2), 166–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2016.1167013

Gardener, R. (2002). Cross-cultural perspectives in supervision. T*he Western Journal of Black Studies*, *26*(2), 98–106. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-08513-002

Garrett, M. T., Borders, L. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural supervision: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *29*(2), 147–158. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00511.x

Gazzola, N., De Stefano, J., Thériault, A., & Audet, C. T. (2013). Learning to be supervisors: A qualitative investigation of difficulties experienced by supervisors-in-training. *Clinical Supervisor*, *32*(1), 15–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2013.778678

Gazzola, N., De Stefano, J., Thériault, A., & Audet, C. (2014). Positive experiences of doctoral -level supervisors-in-training conducting group-format supervision: A qualitative investigation. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *42*(1), 26–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2013.799263

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. A. (2007). Theoretical elaboration of quantitative data. *The Grounded Theory Review: An International Journal*, *6*(3), 1–38. Retrieved from http://groundedtheoryreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/GT-Review-vol6-no3.pdf

Glaser, B. G., & Hon, (2016). Open coding descriptions. *The Grounded Theory Review*, *15*(2), 108-110. Retrieved from http://groundedtheoryreview.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Open-coding -descriptions-Dec2016.pdf

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). Theoretical elaboration of quantitative data. In B. G. Glaser & A. L. Strauss, *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research* (pp.185–220). New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction. Retrieved from www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Glaser_1967.pdf

Gnilka, P. B., Chang, K. Y., & Dew, B. J. (2012). The relationship between supervisee stress, coping resources, the working alliance, and the supervisory working alliance. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *90*(1), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-6676.2012.00009.x

Goh, M., Yon, K. J., Shimmi, Y., & Hirai, T. (2014). Experiences of Asian psychologists and counselors trained in the USA: An exploratory study. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *15*(4), 593–608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-014-9347-4

Gonsalvez, C. J., & Calvert, F. L. (2014). Competency-based models of supervision: Principles and applications, promises and challenges. *Australian Psychologist*, *49*(4), 200-208. https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12055

Gonsalvez, C. J., Deane, F. P., & O'Donovan, A. (2017). Introduction to the special issue recent developments in professional supervision: Challenges and practice implications. *Australian Psychologist*, *52*(2), 83–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12276

Goodyear, R. K., Borders, L. D. A., Chang, C. Y., Guiffrida, D. A., Hutman, H., Kemer, G., . . . White, E. (2016). Prioritizing questions and methods for an international and interdisciplinary supervision research agenda: Suggestions by eight scholars. *Clinical Supervisor*, *35*(1), 117–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2016.1153991

Gosselin, J., Barker, K. K., Kogan, C. S., Pomerleau, M., & Ioro, M. P. (2015). Setting the stage for an evidence-based model of psychotherapy supervisor development in clinical psychology. *Canadian Psychology*, *56*(4), 379–393. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039344

Granello, D. H., Kindsvatter, A., Granello, P. F., Underfer-Babalis, J., & Moorhead, H. J. H. (2008). Multiple perspectives in supervision: Using a peer consultation model to enhance supervisor development. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *48*(1), 32–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00060.x

Gray, S. W., & Smith, M. S. (2009). The Influence of diversity in clinical supervision: A framework for reflective conversations and questioning. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *28*(2), 155–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325220903324371

Gruber, T., Szmigin, I., Reppel, A. E., & Voss, R. (2008). Designing and conducting onlie interviews to investigate iteresting consumer phenomena. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *11*(3), 256-274. https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750810879002

Grus, C. L. (2013). The supervision competency: Advancing competency-based education and training in professional psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 131–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012453946

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822x05279903

Guerin, C., Kerr, H., & Green, I. (2015). Supervision pedagogies: Narratives from the field. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.957271

Guiffrida, D. (2015). A constructive approach to counseling and psychotherapy supervision. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *28*(1), 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2014.922911

Guiffrida, D., Tansey, M., & Miller, D. (2019). A constructive approach to help counselors work with clients who express discriminatory views. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *97*(1), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12240

Gutierrez, F. J. (1982). Working with minority counselor education students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *21*(4), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1982.tb01705.x

Hall, J., Kasujja, R., & Oakes, P. (2015). Clinical supervision for clinical psychology students in Uganda: an initial qualitative exploration. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, *9*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-015-0016-8

Hammond, E. (2013). *Racially aware supervision: Examining how white mental health clinicians address cultural competency with their white supervisors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

Hansen, N. D., Randazzo, K. V., Schwartz, A., Marshall, M., Kalis, D., Frazier, R., Burke, C., Kershner-Rice, K., & Novig, G. (2006). Do we practice what we preach? An exploratory survey of multicultural psychotherapy competencies. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *37*, 66–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.37.1.66

Harris, S. (2017). Systemic dual-developmental supervision: An approach for psychotherapy practitioners and supervisors. *Family Journal*, *25*(1), 84–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480716680183

Hart, G. (1982). *The process of clinical supervision*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Hashimoto, H., & Yamagishi, T. (2013). Two faces of interdependence: Hamrony seeking and rejection avoidance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *16*(2), 142–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12022

Hathaway, A. P. (2012). *Experiences of supervisors and supervisees utilizing a constructivist approach to supervision in community mental health settings* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester, Rochester, New York

Hawkins, P., & Shohet. R. (2012). *Supervision in the helping professions* (4th ed.). Maidenhead, Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Hays, D. G., & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *43*(2), 134–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01837.x

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

Hays, D. G., & Wood, C. (2011). Infusing qualitative traditions in counseling research designs. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *89*(3), 288–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00091.x

Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N., & Marconi, V. C. (2017). Code saturation versus meaning saturation: How many interviews are enough? *Qualitative Health Research*, *27*(4), 591–608. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316665344

Henriksen, R. C., Polonyi, M. A., Bornsheuer-Boswell, J. N., Greger, R. G., & Watts, R. E. (2015). Counseling students' perceptions of religious/spiritual counseling training: A qualitative study. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *93*(1), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00181.x

Hernández, P., Taylor, B. A., & McDowell, T. (2009). Listening to ethnic minority AAMFT approved supervisors: Reflections on their experiences as supervisees. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, *28*(1), 88–100. https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.2009.28.1.88

Heppner, P., Wampold, B., Owen, J., Thompson, M. & Wang, K. (2016). *Research design in counseling*. Boston, MA: Cengage

Hiraki, N. (2012). *Shinri rinsho supervision: Gakuha wo koeta tougou model*. Tokyo, Japan: Kongo Shuppan.

Hird, J. S., Tao, K. W., & Gloria, A. M. (2004). Examining supervisors' multicultural competence in racially similar and different supervision dyads. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *23*(2), 107–122. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v23n02

Hoffman, M. A., Hill, C. E., Holmes, S. E., & Freitas, G. F. (2005). Supervisor perspective on the process and outcome of giving easy, difficult, or no feedback to supervisees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.3

Hogan, R. A. (1964). Issues and approaches in supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, *1*, 139–141. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0088589

Hohenshil, T. H. (2010). International counseling introduction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *88*(1), 3. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00140.x

Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Holloway, E. L. (2016). Essential dimensions of systems approach to supervision. In E. L. Holloway, *Clinical supervision essentials. Supervision essentials for a systems approach to supervision* (pp. 13–31). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14942-002

Homrich, A. M., DeLorenzi, L. D., Bloom Z. D., & Godbee, B. (2013). Making the case for standards of conduct in clinic training. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *53*(2), 126 -144. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00053.x

Howard-Payne, L. (2016). Glaser or Strauss? Considerations for selecting a grounded theory study. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *46*(1), 50–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246315593071

Hunsley, J., & Barker, K. K. (2011). Training for competency in professional psychology: A Canadian perspective. *Australian Psychologist, 46*(2), 142–145. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742–9544.2011.00027.x

Hunt, B. (2011). Publishing qualitative research in counseling journals. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *89*(3), 296–300. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00092.x

Inman, A. G., & Ladany, N. (2014). Multicultural competencies in psychotherapy supervision. *APA Handbook of Multicultural Psychology*, *2*, 643–658. https://doi.org/10.1037/14187-036

Inskipp, F., & Proctor, B. (2009). *The art, craft and task of counselling supervision: Making the most of supervision*. Twickenham, UK: Cascade Publications.

Interiano, C. G., & Lim, J. H. (2018). A "Chameleonic" identity: Foreign-born doctoral students in U. S. counselor education. *International Journal of Advance Counseling*, *40*(3), 310–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-9328-0

International Institute of Education. (2018). *Open doors 2018: Infographic-international.* Retrieved from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-and -Infographics/Infographics/International-Student-Data

International Registry of Counselor Education Programs. (n.d.). *Quality assurance and IRCEP*. Retrieved from https://www.ircep.org/about/

Iwakabe, S. (2008). Psychotherapy integration in Japan. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, *18*(1), 103–125. https://doi.org/10.1037/1053-0479.18.1.103

Jacob, E. (1998). Clarifyiing qualitative research: A focus on traditions. *Educational Researcher*, *17*(1), 16–24. Retrieved from www.indiana.edu/~educy520/readings/jacob88.pdf

Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of Basic and Clinical Pharmacy*, *5*(4), 87–88. https://doi.org/10.4103/0976-0105.141942

Jang, Y. J., Woo, H., & Henfield, M. S. (2014). A qualitative study of challenges faced by international doctoral students in counselor education supervision courses. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *15*(4), 561–572. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-014-9342-9

Jensen, D. (2008). Credibility. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vols. 1 & 2, pp. 138–139). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018110

Johnston, L. H., & Milne, D. L. (2012). How do supervisee's learn during supervision? A grounded theory study of the perceived developmental process. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapist*, *5*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1754470X12000013

Juhnke, G. (1996). Solution-focused supervision: Promoting supervisee skills and confidence through successful solutions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *36*(1), 48–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1996.tb00235.x

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M. K., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *72*(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Kantar, L. D. (2013). Demystifying instructional innovation: The case of teaching with case studies. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *13*(2), 101–115. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/josotl/article/view/3217

Kaplan, D. M., & Gladding, S. T. (2011). A vision for the future of counseling: The 20/20 Principles for unifying and strengthening the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *89*(3), 367–372. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00101.x

Kasai, M. (2009). The role of Japanese culture in psychological health: Implications for counseling and clinical psychology. In L.H. Gerstein, P.P. Heppner, S. Ægisdóttir, S. A. Leung, & K. L. Norsworthy (Eds.), *International handbook of cross-cultural counseling* (pp. 159–171). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kashima, E. S., Kent, S., & Kashima, Y. (2015). Life satisfaction in the new country: A multilevel longitudinal analysis of effects of culture and 5-HTT allele frequency distribution in country of origin. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *10*(1), 50–54. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsu036

Keenan-Miller, D., & Corbett, H. I. (2015). Metasupervision: Can students be safe and effective supervisors? *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *9*(4), 315–321. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000090

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

Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., &Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*, 744–764. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43669971

Kissil, K., Davey, M., & Davey, A. (2015). Foreign-born therapists: How acculturation and supervisors' multicultural competence are associated with clinical self-efficacy. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *43*(1), 38–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2015.00063.x

Kohl, A. D. (2016). *Understanding mental fatigue: A grounded theory study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10251229)

Konecki, K. T. (2008). Grounded theory and serendipity. Natural history of a research. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, *4*(1), 171–188. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2359212/Konecki_Krzysztof_T._2008_Grounded_Theory_and_Serendipity._Natural_History_of_a_Research._Qualitative_Sociology_Review_Vol._IV_Issue_1_171_-_188

Kozlowski, J. E. M., Pruitt, N. T., DeWalt, T. A., & Knox, S. (2014). Can boundary crossings in clinical supervision be beneficial? *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(2), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2013.870123

Ladany, N. (2014). The ingredients of supervisor failure. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *70*(11), 1094–1103. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22130

Ladany, N., Mori, Y., & Mehr, K. E. (2013). Effective and ineffective supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012442648

Lancaster, C., Balkin, R. S., Garcia, R., & Valarezo, A. (2011). An evidence-based approach to reducing recidivism in court-referred youth. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *89*(4), 488–492. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2011.tb02846.x

Lau, J., & Ng, K.-M. (2012). Effectiveness and relevance of training for international counseling graduates: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *34*(1), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-011-9128-2

Leddick, G. R., & Bernard, J. M. (1980). The history of supervision: A critical review. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *19*(3), 186–196. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1980.tb00913.x

Lee, A. (2018). Clinical supervision of international supervisees: Suggestions for multicultural supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *40*(1), 60–71. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-017-9312-0

Lee, K. C. (2013). Training and educating international students in professional psychology: What graduate programs should know. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *7*(1), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031186

Lehrman-Waterman, D., & Ladany, N. (2001). Development and validation of the evaluation process within supervision inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(2), 168–177. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0167.48.2.168

Leong, F., & Wagner, N. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *34*(2), 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1994.tb00319.x

Levinger, M., & Lander, I. (2013). Supervisors and cross cultural sensitivity: Not (always) as I do? *The Journal of International Social Research*, *6*(26), 338–348. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/sosyalarastirmalar_english/index_eng.htm

Li, D., Liu, Y., & Lee, I. (2018). Supervising Asian international counseling students: Using the Integrative Developmental Model. *Journal of International Students*, *8*(2), 1129–1151. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v8i2.137

Li, P. F., & Gale, J. (2018). Reentry experiences and professional developments of international marriage and family therapy graduates in Taiwan. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *40*(4), 380–393. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-018-9464-z

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2012). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(1), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024610

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *10*(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000082101002

Lorelle, S., Byrd, R., & Crockett, S. (2012). Globalization and counseling: Professional issues for counselors. *The Professional Counselor: Research and Practice*, *2*(2),115–123. https://doi.org/10.15241/sll.2.2.115

Mahoney, M. J. (1988). Constructive metatheory: II. Implications for psychotherapy. *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology*, *1*(4), 299–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720538808412781

Mangione, L., Mears, G., Vincent, W., & Hawes, S. (2011). The Supervisory relationship when women supervise women: An exploratory study of power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity. *Clinical Supervisor*, *30*(2), 141–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2011.604272

Mann, S. T., & Merced, M. (2018). Preparing for entry-level practice in supervision. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *49*(1), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1037/pro0000171

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, *13*(6), 522–526. https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/13.6.522

Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.3.1428

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). Qualitative research design: *An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

McDowell, T., Goessling, K., & Melendez, T. (2012). Transformative learning through international immersion: Building multicultural competence in family therapy and counseing. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *38*(2), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2010.00209.x

McIntosh, M. J., & Morse, J. M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*, *2*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2333393615597674

Meek, H. W. (2003). The place of the unconscious in qualitative research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *4*(2), 38. http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-03/2-03meek-e.htm

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Mills, J., Bonner, A., & Francis, K. (2006). The development of constructivist grounded theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500103

Milne, D. (2007). An empirical definition of clinical supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *46*(4), 437–447. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466507X197415

Milne, D. L., & James, I. A. (2002). The observed impact of training on competence in clinical supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *41*(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466502163796

Milne, D. L., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2014). Defining and understanding clinical supervision: A functional approach. In C.E. Watkins, Jr., & D. L. Milne (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of clinical supervision* (pp. 3–19). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (2018). *Kounin shinri-shi towa*. Retreived from https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000116049.html

Miyoshi, M. (2016). *The elements of the clinical supervision: exporting concepts to Japan*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois.

Mo, Y. H., & O'Donoghue, K. (2018). Nurturing a budding flower: External supervisors' support of the developmental needs of Chinese social workers in Shenzhen, China. *International Social Work*, *62*(2), 950–964. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872818755856

Mori, Y., Inman, A. G., & Caskie, G. I. L. (2009). Supervising international students: Relationship between acculturation, supervisor multicultural competence, cultural discussions, and supervision satisfaction. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *3*(1), 10–18. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013072

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2), 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250

Nagel, D. A., Burns, V. F., Tilley, C., & Aubin, D. (2015). When novice researchers adopt constructivist grounded theory: Navigating less travelled paradigmatic and methodological paths in PhD dissertation work. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *10*, 365–383. https://doi.org/10.28945/2300

NAFSA. (2017). *International students contribute to our economy and American innovation: International students grow the U. S. economy*. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources/Policy_Trends_and_Data /International_Students_Contribute_to_Our_Economy_and_American_Innovation/

Nate, R. D., & Haddock, L. R. (2014). An exploration of counselor supervisor requirements across the United States. *VISTAS Online*, *31*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10428190802353625

National Board for Certified Counselors. (n.d.). *National certified counselor (NCC)*. Retrieved from https://www.nbcc.org/certification/ncc

National Science Foundation. (2018). Higher education in science and engineering. *National Science Board: Science & Engineerig Indicators 2018*. Retrieved from https://nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsb20181/report/sections/higher-education-in-science-and -engineering/graduate-education-enrollment-and-degrees-in-the-united-states

Navas, M., Rojas, A. J., García, M., & Pumares, P. (2007). Acculturation strategies and attitudes according to the Relative Acculturation Extended Model: The perspectives of natives versus immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *31*, 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.08.002

NBCC International. (n.d.). *Promoting counselor professionalism and credentialing worldwide*. Retrieved from https://www.nbccinternational.org/

Neimeyer, R. A., Klass, D., & Dennis, M. R. (2014). A social constructionist account of grief: Loss and the narration of meaning. *Journal of Death Studies*, *38*(8), 485–498. https://doi.org/10.1080/07481187.2014.913454

Neimeyer, R. A., Woodward, M., Pickover, A., & Smigelsky, M. (2016). Questioning our questions: A constructivist technique for clinical supervision. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, *29*(1), 100–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2015.1038406

Nelson, K. W., Oliver, M., & Capps, F. (2006). Counselor preparation becoming a supervisor: Doctoral student perceptions of the training experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *46*(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00009.x

Nelson, M. L., & Neufeldt, S. A. (1998). The pedagogy of counseling: A critical examination. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *38*(2), 70–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556- 6978.1998.tb00560.x

Newsome, D., Hays, D. G., & Christensen, T. M. (2008). Qualitative approaches to research. In B. T. Erford (Ed.), *Research and evaluation in counseling* (pp. 86- 106). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin/Lahaska Press.

Ng, K.-M. (2006). International students in CACREP-accredited counseling programs. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research*, *34*(1-2), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/15566382.2006.12033821

Norberg, J., Axelsson, H., Barkman, N., Hamrin, M., & Carlsson, J. (2016). What psychodynamic supervisors say about supervision: Freedom within limits. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *35*(2), 268–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2016.1219896

Ober, A. M., Granello, D. H., & Henfield, M. S. (2009). A synergistic model to enhance multicultural competence in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *48*(3), 204–221. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00075.x

O'Donvan, A., Halford, W. K., & Walters, B. (2011). Towards best practice supervision of clinical psychology trainees. *Australian Psychologist*, *46*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742- 9544.2011.00033.x

Ooijen, E. V., & Spencer, L. (2017). Practitioners' perspectives on how supervision training has impacted their practice. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *17*(4), 283–290. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12128

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2016). *Education at a glance 2016. OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/EAG2016-Annex3.pdf

Park-Saltzman, J., Wada, K., & Mogami, T. (2012). Culturally sensitive mentoring for Asian international students in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *40*(6), 895-915. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000011429831

Patterson, C. H. (1983). Supervision in counseling: II. Contemporary models of supervision: A client-centered approach to supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *11*(1), 21–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000083111005

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A Personal, Experiential Perspective. *Qualitative Social Work*, *1*(3), 261–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325002001003636

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Patton, M.Q. (2014). Qualitative inquiry in utilization-focused evaluation. In Goodyear, L., Jewiss, J., Usinger, J., & Barela, E. (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in evaluation: From theory to practice* (pp. 25–54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peace, S. D., & Sprinthall, N. A. (1998). Training school counselors to supervise beginning counselors: Theory, research, and practice. *Professional School Counseling*, *1*(5), 2–8. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/42731862

Pendse, A. (2017). *International supervisees' experiences with discrimination: A critical events model investigation* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10618941)

Pendse, A., & Inman, A. G. (2017). International student-focused counseling research: A 34-year content analysis. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, *30*(1), 20–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2015.1128395

Peters, H. C., & Rivas, M. (2018). The self-model of humanistic supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *40*(3), 237–254. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-9323-5

Phillips, J. C., Parent, M. C., Dozier, V. C., & Jackson, P. L. (2017). Depth of discussion of multicultural identities in supervision and supervisory outcomes. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *30*(2), 188–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2016.1169995

Ponterotto, J. G. (2010). Qualitative research in multicultural psychology: Philosophical underpinnings, popular approaches, and ethical considerations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(4), 581–589. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012051

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *2*(4), 281–307. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp045oa

Poyrazli, S., & Graham, K. M. (2007). Barriers to adjustment: Needs of international students within a semi-urban campus community. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *34*(1), 28–45. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohostcom.antioch.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2007-05751-005&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Priest, R. (1994). Minority supervisor ad majority supervisee: Another perspective of clinical reality. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*(2), 152-158. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1994.tb00322.x

Prislin, R., Davenport, C., Xu, Y., Moreno, R., & Honeycutt, N. (2018). From marginal to mainstream and vice versa: Leaders' valuation of diversity while in the minority versus majority. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*(1), 112–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12259

Pritchett-Johnson, B. L. (2011). *African American experiences of race relations in the supervision dyad* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3496364)

Prouty, A. M., Thomas, V., Johnson, S., & Long, J. K. (2007). Methods of feminist family supervision. *Journal of Family and Marital Therapy*, *27*(1), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2001.tb01141.x

Putney, M. W., Worthington, Jr., E. L., & McCullough, M. E. (1992). Effects of supervisor and supervisee theoretical orientation and supervisor-supervisee matching on interns' perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *39*(2), 258–265. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0167.39.2.258

Quek, K. M.-T., & Storm, C. L. (2012). Chinese values in supervisory discourse: Implications for culturally sensitive practices. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *34*(1), 44–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-011-9172-4

Ratts, M. J. (2011). Multiculturalism and social justice: Two sides of the same coin. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *39*(1), 24–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2011.tb00137.x

Ratts, M. J. (2017). Charting the center and the margins: Addressing identity, marginalization, and privilege in counseling. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *39*(2), 87–103. https://doi.org/10.17744/mehc.39.2.01

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, *38*, 149–152. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1936.38.1.02a00330

Reid, L. M., & Dixon, A. L. (2012). The counseling supervision needs of international students in U.S. institutions of higher education: A culturally-sensitive supervision model for counselor educators. *Journal for International Counselor Education*, *4*, 29–41. Retrieved from https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/jice/vol4/iss1/2/

Rice, L. N. (1980). A client-centered approach to the supervision of psychotherapy. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 136–147). New York, NY: Wiley.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Read me first for a user's guide to: Qualitative methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Roberts, T. (2008). Understanding grounded theory. *British Journal of Midwifery*, *16*(10), 679–681. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjom.2008.16.10.31238

Rodolfa, E., Bent, R., Eisman, E., Nelson, P., Rehm, L., & Ritchie, P. (2005). A Cube Model for competency development: Implications for psychology educators and regulators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *36*(4), 347–354. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.36.4.347

Rogers, C. R. (1942). The use of electronically recorded interviews in improving psychotherapeutic techniques. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *12*, 429–434. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1942.tb05930.x

Rogers, C. R. (1964). The concept of the fully functioning person. *Psychotherapy Theory, Research and Practice*, *1*, 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01769775

Rønnestad, M. H., Orlinsky, D. E., Parks, B. K., & Davis, J. D. (1997). Supervisors of psychotherapy: Mapping experience level and supervisory confidence. *European Psychologist*, *2*(3), 191–201. http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1027/1016-9040.2.3.191

Rønnestad, M. H., Orlinsky, D. E., Schröder, T. A., Skovholt, T. M., & Willutzki, U. (2019). The professional development of counsellors and psychotherapists: Implications of empirical studies for supervision, training and practice. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *19*(3), 214–230. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12198

Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovolt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *71*(4), 396–405. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1993.tb02655.x

Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development*, *30*(1), 555–567. https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530303000102

Rosenbaum, M., & Ronen T. (1998). Clinical supervision from the standpoint of cognitive -behavior therapy. *Journal of Psychotherapy*, *35*(2), 220–230. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087705

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *Ethnotheatre: Research from page to stage*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sangganjanavanich, V. F., & Black, L. L. (2009). Clinical supervision for international counselors-in-training: Implications for supervisors. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research*, *37*(2), 52–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/15566382.2009.12033860

Santos, H P., Black, A. M., & Sandelowski, M. (2015). Timing of translation in cross-language qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*(1), 134–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732314549603

Sato, M. (2014). *Experiences and perspectives of clinical supervisors in cross-cultural supervision: The impact of supervisor race and ethnicity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minneapolice.

Schatzman L., & Strauss, L. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for natural sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Seo, Y. S. (2010). Individualism, collectivism, client expression, and counselor effectiveness among South Korean international students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *38*(6), 824-847. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009359947

Seponski, D. M., & Jordan, L. S. (2018). Cross-cultural supervision in international settings: Experiences of foreign supervisors and native supervisees in Cambodia. *Journal of Family Therapy*, *40*(2), 247–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12157

Shaffer, K. S., & Friedlander, M. L. (2017). What do "interpersonally sensitive" supervisors do and how do supervisees experience a relational approach to supervision? *Psychotherapy Research*, *27*(2), 167–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2015.1080877

Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Copping, A. (2006). A grounded theory approach to understanding cultural differences in posttraumatic growth. *Journal of Loss and Trauma: International Perspectives on Stress and Coping*, *11*(5), 355–371. https://doi.org/10.1080/15325020600671949

Shannon, J. (2019). Gender differences or gendered differences: Understanding the power of language in training and research in supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *41*(4), 598–608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-019-09380-y

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, *22*(2), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.3233/efi-2004-22201

Shillingford, M. A., Trice-Black, S., & Butler, S. K. (2013). Wellness of minority female counselor educators. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *52*(4), 255–269. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00041.x

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1262–1289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943

Shupp, M. R., & Mattingly, R. S. (2017). A qualitative examination of cross-cultural supervision: Toward a revised model. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, *8*(1), 2954–2963. https://doi.org/10.20533/ijcdse.2042.6364.2017.0402

Siddique, S. (2017). Ellipses: Cultural reflexivity in transactional analysis supervision. *Transactoinal Analysis Journal*, *47*(2), 152–166. https://doi.org/10.1177/0362153717695071

Simon, D., Cruise, T., Huber, B., Swerdlik, M., & Newman, D. (2014). Supervision in school psychology: The developmental/ecological/problem-solving model. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*(6), 636–646. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21772

Simpson-Southward, C., Waller, G., & Hardy, G. E. (2017). How do we know what makes for "best practice" in clinical supervision for psychological therapists? A content analysis of supervisory models and approaches. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, *24*(6), 1228–1245. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2084

Singh, A., & Chun, K. (2010). "From the margins to the center": Moving towards a resilience -based model of supervision for queer people of color supervisors. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *4*(1), 36–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017373

Smith, K. L. (2009). *A brief summary of supervisiom models.* Retrieved from https://www.marquette.edu/education/graduate/documents/brief-summary-of -supervision-models.pdf.

Smith, P. H., Benshoff, J. M., & Gonzalez, L. M. (2018). Critical Guidelines for U. S. -based counselor educators when working transnationally: A delphi study. *International Journal of the Advamce of Counseling*, *40(1)*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-017-9306-y

Soheilian, S. S., Inman, A. G., Klinger, R. S., Isenberg, D. S., & Kulp, L. E. (2014). Multicultural supervision: supervisees' reflections on culturally competent supervision. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(4), 379–392. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2014.961408

Son, E., & Ellis, M. V. (2013). A cross-cultural comparison of clinical supervision in South Korea and the United States. *Psychotherapy*, *50*(2), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033115

Stark, M. D., & Greggerson, K. (2016). Differences in perceptions of supervisee contribution: Supervisors' vs. supervisees' evaluations. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.7729/81.1145

Stinson, M. A., George, D. V., McCoy, M. A., Hjelmstad, L. R., Mennenga, K. D., & Bermudez, J. M. (2013). Finding your cadence: Introducing the dynamic developmental framework of supervision. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, *32*(4), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1521/jsyt.2013.32.4.19

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *28*(1), 59–65. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59

Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM Supervision: An Integrated Developmental Model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, *13*(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00988593

Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(4), 633–642. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.22083020

Summers, LT, M. (2018). *An examination of predictive factors of self-efficacy among supervisors who conduct cross-racial supervision: Social influence, racial identity attitudes, and gender self-confidence* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (10837044)

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, Analysis, and management. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, *68*(3), 226–231. https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456

Sy, T., Tram-Quon, S., & Leung, A. (2017). Developing minority leaders: Key success factors of Asian Americans. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, *8*(2), 142–155. https://doi.org/10.1037/aap0000075

Tanaka, H. (2009). *The relationship between supervisors' power bases and supervisory style* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI 3394751)

Tangen, J. L., DiAnne Borders, L., & Fickling, M. J. (2019). The supervision guide: Informed by theory, ready for practice. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *41*, 240–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-09371-5

Thériault, A., & Gazzola, N. (2019). Becoming a counselling supervisor in Canada: Key elements from the perspective of supervisors. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *41*(1), 155–173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-018-9351-1

Thornberg, R. (2012). Informed grounded theory. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *56*(3), 243–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.581686

Timm, M. (2015). Creating a preferred counselor identity in supervision: A new application of Bernard's Discrimination Model. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *34*, 115–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2015.1021499

Tohidian, N. B. (2015). *Processes involved within the supervisory dyads that inform multicultural supervision* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3745473)

Tohidian, N. B., & Quek, K. M. T. (2017). Processes that inform multicultural supervision: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *43*(4), 573–590. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12219

Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*, 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2004.tb00362.x

Trepal, H., & Hammer, T. (2014). Critical incidents in supervision training: Doctoral student's perspective. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practical Theory*, *41*(2), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15566382.2014.12033931

Uellendahl, G. E., & Tenenbaum, M. N. (2015). Supervision training, practices, and interests of California site supervisors. *Counselor Educaion and Supervision*, *54*(4), 274–288. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12026

Ulus, I. C. (2016). *Bringing it home: Examining the challenges of integrating western counseling in Turkey* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, Texas.

Utsey, S. O., Hammar, 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000005276493

Vanneste, R., Chiu, S. M., Russell, L., & Jennifer Fizpatrick. (2013). Effects of second language usage on genetic counseling training and supervision. *Journal of Genetic Counseling*, *22*(1), 58–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10897-012-9509-7

Vogel, R. M., Mitchell, M. S., Tepper, B. J., Restubog, S. L. D., Hu, C., Hua, W. E. I., & Huang, J. (2015). A cross-cultural examination of subordinates' perceptions of and reactions to abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Bhavior*, *36*(5), 720–745. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1984

Wang, L., & Byram, M. (2018). International doctoral students' experience of supervision: A case study in a Chinese university. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *49*(3), 255–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2018.1518405

Ward, C. C., & House, R. (1998). Counseling supervision: A reflective model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *38*, 23–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1998.tb00554.x

Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2011). Does psychotherapy supervision contribute to patient outcomes? Considering thirty years of research. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *30*(2), 235–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2011.619417

Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2014a). Concluding remarks: Clinical supervision in the 21st century: Some pressing needs and impressing possibilities. American *Journal of Psychotherapy*, *68*(2), 251–272. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.251

Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2014b). The supervisory alliance: A half century of theory, practice, and research in critical perspective. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *68*(1), 19–55. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.1.19

Watkins, C. E., Jr., & Scaturo, D. J. (2013). Toward an integrative, learning-based model of psychotherapy supervision: Supervisory alliance, educational interventions, and supervisee learning/relearning. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, *23*, 75–95. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031330

Watkins, C. E., Jr., & Scaturo, D. J. (2014). Proposal for a common language, educationally -informed model of psychoanalytic supervision. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *34*, 619–633. https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2014.924374

Westefeld, J. S., & Rasmussen, W. (2013). Supervision: The importance and interaction of competency benchmarks and multiculturalism. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*(1), 110–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000012453945

White, J. (2011). Resistance to classroom participation: Minority students, academic discourse, cultural conflicts, and issues of representation in whole class discussions. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *10*(4), 250–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2011.598128

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

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

Wilson, H. M. N., Davies, J. S., & Weatherhead, S. (2016). Trainee therapists' experiences of supervision during training: A meta-synthesis. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *23*, 340–351. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1957

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

Woo, H., Jang, Y. J., & Henfield, M. S. (2015). International doctoral students in counselor education: Coping strategies in supervision training. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *43*(4), 288–304. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12022

Wortman, J., Wood, D., Furr, R. M., Fanciullo, J., & Harms, P. D. (2014). The relationship between actual and perceived similarity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *49*, 31–46.

Wrape, E. R., Callahan, J. L., Ruggero, C. J., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2015). An exploration of faculty supervisor variables and their impact on client outcome. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *9*, 35–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000014

Yoon, E., & Portman, T. A. A. (2004). Critical issues of literature on counseling international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *32*(1), 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2004.tb00359.x

Zapata, C. P., Carton, A. M., & Liu, J. T. (2016). When justice promotes injustice: Why minority leaders experience bias when they adhere to interpersonal justice rules. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(4), 1150–1173. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0275

Zeligman, M. (2017). Supervising counselors-in-training through a developmental, narrative model. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, *12*(1), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2016.1189370

Appendix A: IRB Approval

ANTIOCH
UNIVERSITY

Keiko Sano <ksano@antioch.edu>

Online IRB Application Approved:Foreign-born Supervisors' Use of Supervision Models January 31, 2019, 5:13 pm

mrussell@antioch.edu <mrussell@antioch.edu>   Thu, Jan 31, 2019 at 2:13 PM
To: ksano@antioch.edu, mrussell@antioch.edu, bsammons@antioch.edu

Dear Keiko Sano ,

As Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for 'Antioch University , I am letting you know that the committee has reviewed your Ethics Application. Based on the information presented in your Ethics Application, your study has been approved.

Your study has been approved for Exempt status by the IRB. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with the IRB as a matter of record. While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project. Please be reminded that even though your study is exempt from the relevant federal regulations of the Common Rule (45 CFR 46, subpart A), you and your research team are not exempt from ethical research practices and should therefore employ all protections for your participants and their data which are appropriate to your project.

Sincerely,

Mark Russell

Appendix B: Invitation Letter to Potential Participants

Dear Non-US born Counselor Educators & Clinical Supervisors:

You are invited to participate in a research study about the use of supervision theories/models in clinical supervision. The purpose of this study is to explore foreign-born supervisors' experiences in utilizing supervision theories/models in cross-cultural supervision sessions. This study was granted IRB approval on 1/31, 2019. Results will be used to guide the future direction of developing culturally sensitive supervision theories/models, which can be utilized by supervisors from diverse backgrounds.

Criteria of participation are as follows:

1) You identify yourself as a person-of-color.

2) You were born outside of the United States and raised by non-white caregivers during the majority of your childhood.

3) You are a doctoral-level counselor educator or clinical supervisor, including a doctoral student/candidate, from a CACREP accredited program in the United States.

4) You have provided clinical supervision to White/Caucasian/European American supervisees or counselors-in-training at least one year in the United States. (As long as the total experience is over a year, your supervisee does not have to be the same person.)

This study contains two participation levels:

1) Online Survey – Approximately 20-25 minutes to respond to questions. Upon completion of the survey, you may select to enter for a drawing to win one of three $15 gift cards.

2) Individual Online Interview (6 – 8 participants only) – Up to 30-minute online video interview to clarify and further explore your responses. Six to eight participants will be selected by this researcher based on your willingness of the participation. All the participants who participate in the interview will receive a $15 gift card.

If you chose to participate in this study, please access the survey from the link below.

Please click here to start the survey

The first page is an "Informed Consent" which will provide more specific details regarding the nature of this study.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you can reach me at ksano@antioch.edu or the faculty advisor, Dr. Ned Farley at nfarley@antioch.edu.

 If you have any questions about your rights or participation in this study, you may reach the chair of the Institution Review Board, Dr. Mark Russell, at mrussell@antioch.edu.

Thank you so much for your participation and valuable time.

Sincerely,
Keiko Sano, MA, LMHC, NCC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education and Supervision
Antioch University Seattle
Email: ksano@antioch.edu

Appendix C: Informed Consent

Dear Counselor Educators & Supervisors:

Thank you for your generous time to review this consent form and participating in this study. Please kindly find the following important information about this study. Thank you so much for your valuable time and feedback.

About the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore foreign-born doctoral-level supervisors' experiences in utilizing supervision theories/models in cross-cultural clinical supervision.

Participation

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decline to participate at any time. If you decide not to participate, you may withdraw from the study without having any penalty or prejudice.

Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept anonymous. Your name and contact detail (if any) will be removed from the data, and they are only used for communication, follow-up interview, and distribution or the reward gift card purposes. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study. No reference will be made in verbal or written reports which could link you to the study.

Risks and Benefits

There is minimal risk associated with this study. You will be asked about your experience in providing supervision, which may cause some emotional discomfort. Although you may choose what to share for this study, you are encouraged to seek support, such as consultation, supervision, counseling when needed. There is no direct benefit guaranteed to you for participating in this study. This study will provide some new information on the components of clinical supervision and its theories/models in multicultural contexts.

Procedures

This survey consists of a few open-ended interview questions some demographic questions, which will take approximately 20 - 25 minutes to complete. You will be asked about your experience in utilizing a supervisory theory/model in cross-cultural clinical supervision settings. A follow-up online video interview may be conducted in 6 -8 weeks, after submitting the first survey response, based on your agreement of the participation.

Researcher

This research will be conducted by Keiko Sano, a clinical mental health counselor and a doctoral candidate at Antioch University Seattle. You may reach Keiko at ksano@antioch.edu, or +1-xxx-xxx-xxxx, as well as her faculty advisor, Dr. Ned Farley at nfarley@antioch.edu. You may also reach Dr. Mark Russell, the chair of the Institutional Review Board, at mrussell@antioch.edu.

Agreement

By clicking the "Agree and Proceed" button below, you are providing the consent of agreeing to participate in this study as described above.

By clicking the button below, you acknowledge that your participation in the study is voluntary, you are 18 years of age, and that you are aware that you may choose to terminate your participation in the study at any time and for any reason.

Please note that this survey will be best displayed on a laptop or desktop computer. Some features may be less compatible for use on a mobile device.

Appendix D: Online Survey Questions

Foreign-born supervisors' experience in utilizing supervision theories/models in cross-cultural clinical supervision.

<u>*Qualification Criteria*</u>

1) **What is your highest education level?**
o Doctoral (CACREP accredited)
o Doctoral Students (CACREP)/ Doctoral Candidates (CACREP)
o Doctoral/ Doctoral Students/ Doctoral Candidates (Non-CACREP)
o Others (Please specify)

2) **Were you born and raised outside of the United States majority of your childhood?**
   o Yes
      (Please specify the number of years you have spent in the United States)
   o No

3) **Your racial/ethnic identity.**

   Black / African/ African American

   Asian / Asian American

   Arab / Arab American

   Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander

   Latinx / Hispanic

   Bi-racial/ Multi-racial / Multi-ethnicity

   Others (Please specify)

4) **Length of providing (provided) clinical supervision for White/ European American/ Caucasian supervisees and/or counselors-in-training in the United States.**

   None/ Yes but Outside of the United States

   Less than 1 year

   1-2 years

   3-5 years

   5-9 years

   Over 10 years

Interview Questions

Please respond your answers in writing to those questions specifically when you provide(d) supervisions specifically to your White/European American/Caucasian supervisees or counselors-in-training.

5) **Theories/models of Supervision you utilize(d).**
   Primary [   ]
   Secondary [   ]

6) **Please provide a brief description of how you apply (applied) those theories/models. *If you apply them differently in supervising racial or ethnic minority supervisees/counselors-in-training, please include those differences.**
   [   ]

7) Your perceived roles and responsibilities as a supervisor.
   [   ]

8) If any, what challenges and/or benefits do (did) you notice when using the supervision model you choose?
   Challenges [   ]
   Benefits [   ]

Demographic Questions

9) **Gender**

   Male

   Female

   Transgender

   Genderqueer

   Non-binary

   Intersex

   Do not want to answer

   o   Other (Please specify   )

10) **Birth Country (optional)**

11) **Current Residency**
    o   Within the United States
        (State:)
    o   Outside of the United States

12) Would you agree to participate in a follow-up online individual interview? This interview will be scheduled after 6-8 weeks from submitting this initial survey and take no longer than 30 minutes with a maximum of three follow-up questions. The interview will be recorded and transcribed. You will receive a $15 Gift Card.
- o Yes
  [Please provide your email:]
- o No

13) Do you like to enter the draw of winning one of three $15 Gift Cards?
- o Yes
  [Please provide your email:]
- o No

Appendix E: Revised Online Survey Question

ANTIOCH
UNIVERSITY

Keiko Sano <ksano@antioch.edu>

Online IRB Application Approved:Foreign-born Supervisors' Use of Supervision Models January 31, 2019, 5:13 pm

---

Mark Russell <mrussell@antioch.edu>   Mon, Apr 15, 2019 at 12:58 PM
To: Keiko Sano <ksano@antioch.edu>

Your amendments are approved.

On Mon, Apr 15, 2019 at 12:23 PM Keiko Sano <ksano@antioch.edu> wrote:
Dear Mark:

Regarding my approved dissertation study, I am contacting you to seek your feedback and permission in revising my initial survey question as below. I find many potential participants struggle with answering those original questions, so I discussed possible modifications with Ned, my dissertation chair.

I would like to combine those two questions into one, by making them be a more open format.

Original Questions
1)   Theories/models of Supervision you utilize(d).
2)   Please provide a brief description of how you apply (applied) those theories/models.
 *If you apply them differently in supervising racial or ethnic minority supervisees/counselors-in-training, please include those differences.

Changing to ONE question:
"Briefly, please talk about supervision theories/models you utilize. If you do not believe you utilize specific supervision theories/models, please talk briefly about your approach in supervision."

I have also attached the word document by showing those changes more clearly in the document.
I would appreciate your review and any feedback you may have.

Thank you so much.
Warm regards,
Keiko Sano, MA, LMHC, NCC
Doctoral Candidate: Counselor Education & Supervision
Adjunct Faculty: Clinical Mental Health Counseling
Antioch University Seattle

Foreign-born supervisors' experience in utilizing supervision theories/models in cross-cultural clinical supervision.

<u>**Qualification Criteria**</u>

14) What is your highest education level?
o   Doctoral (CACREP accredited)
o   Doctoral Students (CACREP)/ Doctoral Candidates (CACREP)
o   Doctoral/ Doctoral Students/ Doctoral Candidates (Non-CACREP)
o   Others (Please specify)

15) Were you born and raised outside of the United States majority of your childhood?
o   Yes
    (Please specify the number of years you have spent in the United States)
o   No

16) Your racial/ethnic identity.

Black / African/ African American

Asian / Asian American

Arab / Arab American

Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander

Latinx / Hispanic

Bi-racial/ Multi-racial / Multi-ethnicity

Others (Please specify)

17) Length of providing (provided) clinical supervision for White/ European American/ Caucasian supervisees and/or counselors-in-training in the United States.

None/ Yes but Outside of the United States

Less than 1 year

1-2 years

3-5 years

5-9 years

Over 10 years

Interview Questions

Please respond your answers in writing to those questions specifically when you provide(d) supervisions specifically to your White/European American/Caucasian supervisees or counselors-in-training.

18) **Theories/models of Supervision you utilize(d).**
Primary [   ]
Secondary [   ]
Briefly, please talk about supervision theories/models you utilize. If you do not believe you utilize specific supervision theories/models, please talk about how you approach in supervision.

19) **Please provide a brief description of how you apply (applied) those theories/models. *If you apply them differently in supervising racial or ethnic minority supervisees/counselors-in-training, please include those differences.**
[   ]

20) Your perceived roles and responsibilities as a supervisor.
[   ]

21) If any, what challenges and/or benefits do (did) you notice when using the supervision model you choose?
Challenges [   ]
Benefits [   ]

Demographic Questions

22) **Gender**

Male

Female

Transgender

Genderqueer

Non-binary

Intersex

Do not want to answer

o   Other (Please specify   )

23) **Birth Country (optional)**

24) Current Residency
- o Within the United States
  (State:)
- o Outside of the United States

25) Would you agree to participate in a follow-up online individual interview? This interview will be scheduled after 6-8 weeks from submitting this initial survey and take no longer than 30 minutes with a maximum of three follow-up questions. The interview will be recorded and transcribed. You will receive a $15 Gift Card.
- o Yes
  [Please provide your email:]
- o No

26) Do you like to enter the draw of winning one of three $15 Gift Cards?
- o Yes
  [Please provide your email:]
- o No

Appendix F: Table of 5 Constructed Themes – Experience of Foreign-Born Supervisors

With American-Born Supervisees

Experiences of foreign-born supervisors with American-born supervisees

Theme	Dynamics	Focus
Supervisory Relationship	• *Power Hierarchy* • *Supervisee-Centered* • *Bracketing Supervisor Needs and Perspectives*	Supervisor builds the supervisory relationship with a focus on supervisee strengths and how best to adapt approach to the supervisee.
Adjustment to Roles and Supervision Theories/Models	• *Assessment of Supervisee Needs and Characteristics* • *Formative Evaluation of "Goodness of Fit"* • *Bracketing Supervisor's Theoretical Orientation*	Supervisor puts effort on learning about supervisees' characteristics, worldviews, personal/professional needs, expectations, pervious experience, communication and learning styles to select and adjust supervisor roles and supervision theories/models.
Supervisor Perception of Competence	• *Influence of Ambiguity* • *Influence of Experience* • *Influence of Culture* • *Comfortableness, Confidence, Competency*	Supervisor experiences ambiguity in applying certain supervision theories/models developed in the western contexts, which is perceived as lack of competence in utilizing those approaches.
Influence of Supervisee Experience	• *Sensitivity to Supervisee Experiences and Opinions* • *Cultural Stereotypes* • *Evaluation to Relationship Quality* • *Multicultural Competency of Supervisee*	Supervisor evaluates own competency and supervision effectiveness based on supervisee experience, perspectives toward supervisor, and quality of supervisory relationship. Supervisor focuses on rebuilding relationship and adjusting approach when supervisee displays negative perspectives in supervision.
Cultural Gaps	• *Cultural Differences in Relationship* • *Insufficient Supervision Theory* • *Power Dynamics*	Supervisor fills cultural gaps by using supervision theories/models as a framework and personal/professional experiences as reference.