

Supervision

A Synergistic Model to Enhance Multicultural Competence in Supervision

Anne M. Ober, Darcy Haag Granello, & Malik S. Henfield

The Synergistic Model of Multicultural Supervision is an integration of 3 existing models to provide concrete and practical guidance for supervisors wishing to enhance supervisee multicultural competence in personally meaningful and developmentally appropriate ways. The model attends to both content and process within the supervisory session and promotes multicultural counselor competence through increasing cognitive complexity, self-reflection, and structured interventions.

Within the counselor education literature, there is consensus that supervision is a developmental process (Borders, 2001; Borders & Brown, 2005; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) and that a purpose of supervision is to promote multicultural counselor competence (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Borders & Brown, 2005; Miville, Rosa, & Constantine, 2005). To date, however, little progress has been made in developing and assessing models of supervision that attend to supervisee developmental level or in using intentional and specific interventions and methods to increase counselors' multicultural competencies. We propose a model of supervision that enhances multicultural counselor competence in developmentally appropriate ways, what we refer to as the Synergistic Model of Multicultural Supervision (SMMS).

The model is based on the intersection of three important concepts that provide guidelines for both process and content in supervision sessions. The first is Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956), a well-known and well-researched model to promote cognitive development. Bloom's Taxonomy attends to the process of learning. It offers a mechanism that simultaneously supports the current developmental stage of the supervisee and encourages supervisee growth through intentional cognitive scaffolding—the hierarchical structure from which the student first learns basic and later more advanced concepts and skills. The second concept on which the SMMS is built is the Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development (HMNID; Ancis & Ladany, 2001). The HMNID also attends to the process of learning, and it sup-

Anne M. Ober, Department of Counseling and Human Development, Walsh University; Darcy Haag Granello, Counselor Education, The Ohio State University; Malik S. Henfield, Counselor Education, Rehabilitation Counseling, and Student Development, University of Iowa. Correspondence concerning the article should be addressed to Anne M. Ober, Department of Counseling and Human Development, Walsh University, 2020 East Maple Street, North Canton, OH 44720 (e-mail: aober@walsh.edu).

plies a method for understanding multiculturalism and multicultural counselor competence in personally meaningful ways. The third concept is the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCCs; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992), which provide the content for this model.

Developmental Supervision

The developmental models theorize that supervisees advance through sequential and hierarchical stages, progressing to more complex and integrated stages (Blocher, 1983; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). Supervisees' rigid thinking marks the early stages of development, including the assumption that there is a "right" answer to a client's disclosure or problem. Supervisees express high levels of performance anxiety, demonstrate low confidence in their skills, and have little awareness of their strengths compared with advanced trainees (Borders & Brown, 2005).

During the middle stages, supervisees fluctuate between autonomy and dependence in relationship with their supervisors (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg, 1981). In general, supervisees become more flexible in their thinking and behaviors and are able to differentiate the unique qualities and contexts among clients despite similar clinical presentations. In later stages of development, supervisees are able to incorporate complex information and a variety of perspectives into their conceptualizations of clients (Borders & Brown, 2005).

As the supervisee's needs and abilities change, so does the supervisory relationship. The early stages are typically defined by the supervisee's desire for specific and directive feedback in a structured format along with significant support (Borders & Brown, 2005; Stoltenberg, 1981). Supervisees typically focus on processing transference and countertransference during the middle stages. In the later stages, the supervisory relationship is more collaborative. Presumably, the supervisee identifies the focus of supervision in these later stages, asking the supervisor for specific feedback on the basis of self-identified areas of growth (Borders & Brown, 2005; Stoltenberg, 1981). The underlying premise of the developmental models of supervision—that both supervisees and the supervisory relationship change and grow over time—is a cornerstone of many of the multicultural supervision models.

Multicultural Supervision

Carney and Kahn (1984) proposed one of the first models of multicultural supervision with five stages of competency development. In this model, the supervisor helps the supervisee move from limited awareness about race/ethnicity to an increased understanding. Subsequent models asserted similar developmental approaches to multicultural supervision (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Peterson, 1991; Robinson, Bradley, & Hendricks, 2000), wherein supervisors promote further awareness of cultural differences between client and counselor as well as between counselor and supervisor. As the

supervisory relationship develops, supervisors challenge supervisees' assumptions about diversity. Other authors recommended modifying existing supervision models to incorporate multicultural concerns (Gonzalez, 1997; Martinez & Holloway, 1997). Still others suggested a list of questions for supervisors to initiate multicultural discussions in supervision (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997) and a general framework from which to understand how cultural experiences and norms affect the supervisory and therapeutic relationships (Garrett et al., 2001).

Although each of these models has contributed to our understanding of multicultural supervision, significant shortcomings limit their use. For example, some models focus primarily or exclusively on race/ethnicity, whereas others focus only on the developmental stage of the supervisee without consideration for the supervisor's multicultural competence. Significantly, few existing models of multicultural supervision offer clear instructions for application of the concepts, beyond simply introducing multiculturalism as a topic in supervision.

Supervisory Relationship and Multiculturalism

Whereas some authors focused on developing models for multicultural supervision, others explored the relationship between supervisor and supervisee, specifically focusing on diverse identities each person brings to the relationship. It has been asserted that the demographic variables of the supervisor and supervisee (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, spiritual/religious beliefs, and physical ability) affect the supervisory relationship (Constantine, 2003; Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Cook, 1994; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Granello, 2002; Helms, 1984; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997). The intersection of identities within each person and the individual's respective identification with each of the demographic groups can result in complex interactions between supervisor and supervisee.

Other researchers have investigated the interactions between supervisor and supervisee in terms of power, framing the supervisory relationship within a context of culturally and professionally determined privilege. The impact of gender (Granello, 1996; Nelson & Holloway, 1999), race/ethnicity (Cook, 1994; Hays & Chang, 2003), and sexual identity (Buhrke, 1989; Pfohl, 2004) within the supervisory relationship has been explained, with attention to how power exists within this professional interaction. It has been argued that issues of power and control can have significant effects on multicultural components in supervision. For example, supervisors who are invested in maintaining their power within the relationship may be reluctant to openly discuss their lack of experience and/or training in multicultural issues with their supervisees, particularly if a supervisee has had more multicultural training or experience (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001). The SMMS takes into consideration the supervisee's and supervisor's understanding of their identities and the roles of power and oppression, both within the supervisory relationship and in relationship to the client.

Research on Multicultural-Focused Supervision

Research has demonstrated that supervision that attends to multicultural issues has positive effects on the working alliance in supervision and, in general, leads to higher ratings of supervisee satisfaction (Gatmon et al., 2001). Other studies have found that multicultural-focused supervision leads to an increase in supervisees' self-perceived competence in working with diverse clients (Constantine, 2001; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Nielson, 1995) and improvement in the supervisees' ability to conceptualize clients within a multicultural framework (Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997). Although many of these studies are limited by the use of self-report assessments, the overall results suggest that supervisory relationships that include a focus on multiculturalism can lead to greater supervisee self-efficacy in working with diverse populations.

Leong and Wagner (1994) reviewed 11 multicultural supervision models and identified deficiencies in three areas: a theoretical framework for the model, empirical evidence to support the theory, and integration of developmental stages to help determine which interventions may be most effective. Miville et al. (2005) added that multicultural supervision must have specific and clear direction to increase competencies, including appropriate goals, interventions, and assessment of the effectiveness of interventions. Finally, a model of multicultural supervision must take into account other variables in addition to race/ethnicity, such as gender, sexual orientation, age, and socioeconomic status (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Integrating Multicultural and Developmental Supervision Models

Despite a previous call to integrate developmental and multicultural supervision models (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1994), a comprehensive model has yet to emerge. We argue that to be truly comprehensive, such a model must (a) incorporate developmental aspects of supervision by defining the stages of development and providing specific interventions to help supervisees move to higher levels of cognitive development; (b) provide an opportunity to discuss the supervisees' multicultural competence and heighten awareness of multicultural issues within the supervisory relationship; and (c) be based on the profession's firmly held stance about the appropriate content for multicultural counseling and supervision, the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992). The SMMS that we propose emerges from two existing models of supervision, one developmental and the other multicultural, which, when combined with the MCCs, form an integrated and synergistic model that can be used to help develop supervisees' multicultural competence.

Bloom's Taxonomy

Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) is a developmental model that has been applied to the process of supervision to help supervisors

encourage cognitive complexity in their supervisees (Granello, 2000; Granello & Underfer-Babalis, 2004). *Cognitive complexity*, broadly defined, is the ability to absorb, integrate, and make use of multiple perspectives (Elder & Paul, 1994). Within the profession of counseling, higher levels of cognitive complexity have been linked to many advanced counseling skills, including more flexibility in counseling methods, greater empathy (Benack, 1988), less prejudice, more sophisticated descriptions of clients, higher levels of confidence, lower levels of anxiety, greater tolerance for ambiguity (Jennings & Skovholt, 1999), and more focus on counseling and counseling effectiveness with less self-focus (Birk & Mahalik, 1996). Bloom's Taxonomy is one of the most widely accepted models to enhance cognitive abilities and educational objectives, and research has found it to transcend age, type of instruction, and subject matter content (Hill & McGaw, 1981). Even its severest critics agree that the model has had enormous influence (Mayer, 2002) and is an important step toward understanding the structure of learning outcomes (Marzano & Kendall, 2006).

Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) is a specification of six hierarchically ordered levels of instructional outcomes that are intended to help learners advance toward higher levels of cognitive complexity. The levels are cumulative, with each level of the system building on the successful attainment of the previous levels. The levels of the model are ordered from the least to the most complex: knowledge (simply recalling information), comprehension (grasping the meaning of material), application (using the learned material in new situations), analysis (breaking down the material into its component parts), synthesis (integrating component parts to form a new whole), and evaluation (judging the value of material on the basis of defined criteria). (For a more complete description of the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, see the Learning Skills Program at <http://what.csc.villanova.edu/csc1200f2000/bloom.html>.) Applied to counseling supervision, Bloom's Taxonomy provides supervisors with a mechanism to promote greater cognitive complexity (Granello, 2000; Granello & Underfer-Babalis, 2004). The supervisee's increased ability to integrate vast and sometimes contradictory perspectives dovetails with the second model, which requires self-reflection on identity and concepts of privilege and oppression.

The HMNID

Ancis and Ladany (2001) developed the HMNID after a review and analysis of existing multicultural supervision models. Ancis and Ladany noted weaknesses in the available models, most notably the lack of attention given to the supervisor's multicultural competencies, the primary focus on the issue of race/ethnicity, and the lack of inclusion of identity models within the supervisory relationship. The authors proposed a model for incorporating the complex identities of the supervisor and supervisee and a method for understanding how these identities can affect the interactions within the professional relationship.

Ancis and Ladany (2001) asserted that every person has components of identity (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation) that identify the person as a member of a group that is either socially oppressed or socially privileged. A person can belong to any combination of groups across the demographic variables, such as a woman (socially oppressed group [SOG]) who is White (socially privileged group [SPG]) and able-bodied (SPG) or a man (SPG) who is Latino (SOG) and gay (SOG). The critical issue is the person's perception of his or her place in an SOG or an SPG. This perception affects all interaction with others, either within or outside an individual's identified groups. These perceptions and behaviors are termed the *Means of Interpersonal Functioning* (MIF; Ancis & Ladany, 2001). The model includes four phases that move from complacency and limited awareness about differences, privilege, and oppression to increased awareness about diversity issues and a commitment to multicultural counselor competence (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

Adaptation is the first phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). It is defined by complacency, apathy, and conformity to a social environment that oppresses any of its members. Persons in this phase endorse stereotypes, give little credence to the significance of differences (in culture, race/ethnicity, gender, etc.), and have a limited awareness of oppression. Incongruence is the second phase of the MIF. In this phase, a person's beliefs about differences begin to be challenged. Individuals may feel confusion and tension between previous ideas and beliefs and more recent experiences that challenge these beliefs. Despite the changes in awareness, behaviors remain the same as those in Phase 1. The third phase, exploration, is defined by a change in behaviors. Individuals in this phase actively seek out others from different groups to interact with to better understand their experiences of oppression and privilege. The final and most advanced phase is integration. This phase is identified by an awareness of one's group identities and a commitment to exploring and appreciating different groups. People in the integration phase are able to connect to others, regardless of their group memberships, and they can recognize oppression and actively work toward producing change in others and their environment (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

Within the supervisory relationship, the supervisor and supervisee can be at different phases (adaptation, incongruence, exploration, and integration) across each demographic variable (race/ethnicity, gender, age, etc.). The combination of their respective phases results in one of four supervision relationship types. A progressive relationship is one in which the supervisor is more advanced than is the trainee within a specific demographic variable. A parallel-advanced or parallel-delayed relationship is one in which the supervisor and supervisee are at comparable phases, either advanced (exploration and integration) or delayed (adaptation and incongruence). Finally, the relationship can be regressive, in which the supervisee is at a more advanced phase than is the supervisor. The relationship type will determine the interventions used by the supervisor (Ancis & Ladany, 2001).

It is important to note that a criticism of all models that use supervision to enhance supervisee development in a particular area (e.g., cognitive complexity, multiculturalism) is that the supervisor must be sufficiently advanced in that area to assist the supervisee with his or her own growth (Granello, 2000). The HMNID (Ancis & Ladany, 2001) addresses this concern with the recognition that only supervisors who are at least as far along as their supervisees in their own growth and development regarding multiculturalism can assist in this process. Thus, although there are four levels of relationship in the model, in practice, it can only be applied if the supervisory relationship is progressive (supervisor more advanced) or parallel-advanced (both supervisor and supervisee at exploration or integration phase).

The MCCs

The MCCs, developed by Sue et al. (1992) and endorsed by the American Counseling Association, serve as guidelines for inclusive and ethical practice. The competencies are grouped into three domains—knowledge, awareness, and skills—defining the counselor’s knowledge of different cultures and worldviews, exploring the counselor’s reflection on his or her own experiences and resulting attitudes and behaviors, and incorporating interventions into counseling with diverse clients, respectively. Counselors demonstrate multicultural competence by striving for adherence to the guidelines (Sue & Torino, 2005). Whaley and Davis (2007) defined *multicultural competence* as “a set of problem-solving skills” (p. 565). The skilled counselor can conceptualize the client as experiencing a dynamic process of maintaining tradition and adapting in response to interactions and events. The process affects client behaviors and thus needs to be integrated into assessment, diagnosis, and treatment. For example, a client whose family values intergenerational support may struggle with feelings of frustration and guilt and therefore experience subsequent challenges in familial relationships if he or she desires to attend college rather than secure a full-time job to financially support the family. Common to definitions of multicultural counseling competence are the components of awareness of attitudes and values, knowledge of culture, and the application of knowledge and skills.

Several critics have voiced concerns with the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992), including the difficulty in translating the abstract concepts described in the competencies into specific interventions to be used in the counseling session. Knapik and Miloti (2006) asserted that the competencies are difficult to teach, learn, and assess within counseling relationships. Weinrach and Thomas (2004) argued that the competencies inaccurately define culture as the only determinate of behavior, focus on deficits rather than strengths, and assume race/ethnicity as a primary clinical concern whenever a person of color seeks treatment. Despite the proposed limitations, the MCCs established the first guidelines for a counseling approach that incorporates the client’s identity into the helping relationship and have encouraged debate in the counseling profession, with the goal being to provide the most effective treatment for all clients.

An SMMS to Enhance Multicultural Competence

The SMMS integrates Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) and Ancis and Ladany's (2001) HMNID theory to provide the process for implementation, whereas the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992) provide the content. The first step in the SMMS is for the supervisor and supervisee to determine the specific domain of multicultural competency on which to focus. This decision takes into account the supervisee's phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001), the supervisee's clients, and which domain is most pressing (knowledge, skills, or awareness). A beneficial starting place for all supervisory pairs would be to read together the MCCs in a supervision session. The supervisor and supervisee could then identify a domain (such as knowledge) and/or a specific competency (such as knowledge of racial/ethnic identity development models) as a starting place.

Decisions about what to focus on in the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992) should be based on the supervisee's phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001) and made with the explicit intention of using the model to help move the supervisee to higher levels of multicultural functioning. Because the phases of the MIF are sequential and hierarchical, it is important to use interventions that assist supervisee movement into the next phase. For example, supervisees who are at the adaptation phase will need interventions directed at encouraging their own awareness, given that this ability is the essential component of incongruence, the second phase of the MIF. Because the adaptation phase is characterized by complacency, it is natural for supervisees to respond with resistance and denial when their current beliefs and ideas are challenged (Ancis & Ladany, 2001). In this model, supervision can be used to encourage supervisees in the process of challenging and evaluating their views as they encounter others, regardless of apparent similarities or differences. The goal is to use intentional processes to encourage supervisee development to the next phase, that of incongruence.

Using the SMMS in Supervision

An example of the SMMS applied to a specific supervisory relationship is presented in Table 1. In this example, the supervisor is attempting to help a supervisee gain an understanding of the potential school-family-community partnerships to enhance racial/ethnic minority students' academic achievement. After reading the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992), the supervisor has determined that the supervisee is at the adaptation phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001), given the student's perceptions of racial/ethnic minorities and their relationship with schools. Specifically, in this example, the supervisee has made statements that demonstrate a deeply held belief that racial/ethnic minority families and communities do not value education because of what she deems to be poor attendance at school events. In essence, the supervisee is blaming racial/ethnic minority families and community members without critically analyzing historical and current contextual factors

TABLE 1
A Synergistic Model of Multicultural Supervision—
Supervisee at Adaptation Phase of the Means of Interpersonal
Functioning Working on Knowledge Domain of the Multicultural
Counseling Competencies (MCCs)

Level of Bloom's Taxonomy	Sample Skill	Question Stem	Sample Question
Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show evidence that culturally appropriate community resources exist. • Demonstrate knowledge of the history behind the current relationships among schools, families, and communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What • When • Name • List • Define 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When did public education become available to all students? How might this affect how families interact with systems of public education? • List the addresses, phone numbers, and contact names of community resources that focus on meeting the needs of racial/ethnic minority students and their families. • What do you know about the historical factors that may affect the academic achievement of African American students? • List some examples of elements that must be in place for school–family–community partnerships to be successful.
Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate understanding of reasons for students' academic underachievement. • Predict school–family–community intervention consequences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize • Describe • Why • Paraphrase • Interpret 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe your agency's reputation among leaders of the Latino/Hispanic community. • Why do you think there is such a low turnout of Latino/Hispanic families at school events? • Paraphrase some African American parents' general perceptions of their experiences with your school. • What does the research say about the effectiveness of school–family–community partnerships when working with African American students?
Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate how this information could be used with students from this particular demographic group. • Construct an intervention plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply • Demonstrate • Construct • Interpret • Practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an intervention plan that demonstrates how school–family–community partnerships can meet the needs of your schools, families, and community members. • Pretend that I am a community member. Role-play how you would suggest that I participate in school–family–community partnerships.

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1 (Continued)
A Synergistic Model of Multicultural Supervision—
Supervisee at Adaptation Phase of the Means of Interpersonal
Functioning Working on Knowledge Domain of the Multicultural
Counseling Competencies (MCCs)

Level of Bloom's Taxonomy	Sample Skill	Question Stem	Sample Question
Application (Continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct a plan to recruit school personnel, parents, and community members to form a school–family–community partnership for this client.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze what components of counseling could be enhanced with this information. • Discuss how school–family–community partnerships could be used to improve performance in schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze • Classify • Compare • Contrast • Experiment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does your school's need to meet mandates set forth by the NCLB (2002) relate to the formation of school–family–community partnerships? • Compare and contrast the client's academic achievement before and after participating in school–family–community partnerships. • Analyze the relationship between the client's stage of sexual identity development and his or her reluctance to participate in school–family–community partnerships.
Synthesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how school–family–community partnerships fit with students' aspirations to enter college. • Create ways for school–family–community partnerships to fit with the overall mission of the school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create • Combine • Integrate • Design • Generalize • Hypothesize • Construct • Summarize 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the outcome be different if you established a partnership that did not include visits to university campuses? • How could school–family–community partnerships be used to promote and enhance the learning process for all students in the school? • Could students reach their goals without school–family–community partnerships?
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine how to evaluate the school–family–community partnerships' effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraise • Assess • Defend • Evaluate • Recommend • Critique 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the potential effectiveness of your plans for a school–family–community partnership with students, families, and community members. • What would you say to a counselor who is thinking of recommending school–family–community partnerships as a resource to schools, families, and members of the community?

Note. For the MCC knowledge domain, culturally skilled counselors have knowledge of family structures, hierarchies, values, and beliefs from various cultural perspectives. They are knowledgeable about the community in which a particular cultural group may reside and the resources in the community. Bloom's Taxonomy = Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives; NCLB = No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

that may contribute to lower attendance rates at school events. Until this belief is challenged, it will be difficult for the supervisory relationship to progress to more advanced phases of the MIF and heightened levels of multicultural counseling competency. The supervisor uses Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) as a framework to ask specific questions designed to challenge the supervisee's understanding of the potential for school-family-community partnerships to enhance racial/ethnic minority students' academic achievement. As the supervisory relationship progresses through the stages of Bloom's Taxonomy, the supervisor uses more cognitively complex questions and tasks to help the supervisee understand the relationship among schools, families, and communities. Once this has been achieved, the supervisor then assists the supervisee with the development of a school-family-community intervention plan.

Case Studies Illustrating the Application of the SMMS

In the following paragraphs, two case studies are provided to illustrate the application of the SMMS. The case studies are from experiences in supervision that the first (Case Study 1) and third (Case Study 2) authors have had and are written in the authors' words. In both case studies, pseudonyms are used for the supervisees; demographics and time lines have also been modified. Although the exact wording of responses has been altered, the essential meaning has been retained. Examples of levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) are highlighted in each case. The MCC (Sue et al., 1992) domain and the supervisee's MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001) phase are indicated at the beginning of the case study.

Case Study 1: MCC awareness domain, MIF phase of adaptation. Julia and I met for supervision as part of her practicum experience in mental health counseling. Julia was a Caucasian, heterosexual woman from a suburban home and entered a master's degree program in counseling 1 year after completing her undergraduate degree. As a counselor-in-training in an urban high school, she had the opportunity to interact with a diverse student population. Our supervision sessions consisted of reviewing both audiotapes of sessions and her session notes. To protect confidentiality, she did not include students' names or other identifying information in her notes. She did, however, include the gender and class rank of her clients. I asked her to include in her subsequent notes the race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and sexual identity of her clients (Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: knowledge).

We discussed ways she could gather the information from her clients and the intended benefit of increased empathy from this knowledge. During subsequent sessions, I asked Julia to review these various components of her client's identity with me and encouraged her to listen for additional cultural information, such as spirituality/religious practices, role of family, values, and so forth (Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: comprehension). Julia expressed surprise, because prior to my request, she had not been aware of the race/ethnicity or

socioeconomic status of her clients. She stated, "I haven't even thought about anything like that. I just thought, 'They're White' or 'They're Black,' and I didn't go any further." I suggested that Julia begin to conceptualize her clients in the context of their school and larger community, specifically their membership in privileged and oppressed groups (Bloom's Taxonomy level: application).

Initially, Julia struggled with this concept and expressed some discomfort with the idea of "privilege" existing within the school system. I initiated the discussion from a less threatening perspective on power and moved toward more personal and challenging contexts. We discussed the role of power in the school, from administration, teachers, and counselors to specific groups of students. Julia identified ways power was exerted by the staff in positive ways (e.g., setting expectations of students and maintaining safety and order). We then talked about ways power served to oppress. She shared her observations of power exerted by groups and individuals that limited others' experiences and rights, from lunchroom fights to graffiti on an exterior wall (Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: analysis). I observed that we had completed several supervision sessions without either of us acknowledging the complex identities of her clients, beyond gender and class rank. I asked both of us to reflect on reasons why we had not included this information in previous client conceptualizations and discussions (Bloom's Taxonomy level: analysis).

We discussed the power we both held as members of privileged groups within the school and community (both Caucasian and both counselors). One interesting observation we made was that as women, we were discussing female clients, and, quite often, we failed to explore any other components of the client's identity; we were operating as if our gender was a homogenous group (Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: synthesis). We came back to this discussion in a later session, and I shared with Julia my increased awareness of my assumptions. I asked her to reflect and share her learning (Bloom's Taxonomy level: evaluation). In particular, we discovered the importance of recognizing and moving beyond assumptions to knowledge of the other person, especially that person's experience as a member of a privileged or oppressed group.

The SMMS provided me with a guide for processing Julia's practicum experiences. In other words, rather than simply telling Julia that she did not understand the importance of race/ethnicity in the counseling relationship, I moved through a developmentally appropriate process with Julia. This process began at Julia's current understanding of culture and difference and prompted her increased awareness as a member of a privileged group. Both of us recognized that our membership in a privileged group allowed us to initially "ignore" components of clients' identity such as race/ethnicity and sexual identity, and the process prompted us to attend to these important variables. Additionally, I modeled the importance of continual development of awareness throughout a counselor's career.

Case Study 2: MCC knowledge domain, MIF phase of incongruence. To begin, I asked the supervisee, Stephanie, to list the client's demographic variables (e.g., African American, female, heterosexual, from a large family living in an urban area in the southern United States; Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: knowledge). The supervisee and I explored these variables more fully, discussing what is known, or thought to be known, about each of them, to further existing understanding and identify stereotypes. In bringing these stereotypes and ideas to the forefront, Stephanie seemed to experience unease, the hallmark of the incongruence phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Bloom's Taxonomy level: comprehension). With the incongruence heightened through discussion in supervision, the next step was to encourage Stephanie to act, the cornerstone of the movement toward the exploration phase. I suggested that Stephanie search formal resources (e.g., scholarly articles in counseling, psychology, sociology, and/or cultural studies journals) or informal resources (e.g., discussions with others) to more fully understand the demographic variables related to the client (Bloom's Taxonomy level: application). With an abundance of information, Stephanie began the process of determining how the specific components of each variable may or may not apply to the client. We discussed some of the information in supervision, but Stephanie was encouraged to speak with the client, and she subsequently processed her experience within our supervisory session.

Moving this discussion from supervision into the counseling relationship fostered the client's further understanding of these specific attributes in her life while simultaneously helping Stephanie and the client process these important topics. Through direct conversations with the client, Stephanie progressed further into the exploration phase of the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; e.g., rather than talking about stereotypes, the supervisee is doing something different) and into higher levels of cognitive complexity about multicultural knowledge (Bloom's Taxonomy [Bloom et al., 1956] level: analysis). With a better understanding of the component pieces of the client's life, Stephanie and I worked together (with input from the client, as applicable) to come to a new and better understanding of the client, with a rich and full case conceptualization that included the relevant components affecting the client's functioning (Bloom's Taxonomy level: synthesis). Stephanie and I discussed whether this process had produced a better understanding of the client and solicited feedback from the client through joint conversation about our conceptualization. Finally, Stephanie and I discussed whether the process had helped move her toward the exploration phase of the MIF from her previous phase of incongruence (Bloom's Taxonomy level: evaluation).

Implications of the SMMS for Counselor Education

The counseling profession has embraced the need to prepare multiculturally competent counselors, and providing multicultural supervision is essential to that endeavor. Nonetheless, more than 2 decades after

the first conceptual model of multicultural supervision was introduced, existing models continue to focus on simply describing the phenomenon or repeating the need for this type of supervision. Even if a practicing supervisor wished to engage in multicultural supervision, it might be difficult to implement on the basis of existing models. For example, Robinson et al. (2000) recommended that “a counselling supervisor can integrate multicultural theory into the psychodynamic model by emphasizing that identities are formed and embedded in individual, group, and universal experiences and individual, family, and cultural contexts” (p. 136). Although identity formation is an important concept, the application and implementation of that concept might be challenging, particularly to supervisors who have had little training in supervision or multicultural counseling or to university or on-site supervisors who have multiple demands on their schedules and inadequate time to prepare for supervision.

We have outlined a model to guide supervisors as they help their supervisees enhance their multicultural counselor competence in developmentally appropriate ways. The three of us use this model in our own supervision and have presented the model to practicing supervisors at state and national conferences. We have found that the HMNID (Ancis & Ladany, 2001) provides an easily understood mechanism to discuss supervisee multicultural understanding. In addition, the intuitive nature of Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) appeals to supervisors, and the practical nature of the Taxonomy has been met with enthusiasm by supervisors who often feel at a loss for specific interventions that encourage supervisee development, particularly in the area of multicultural counselor competence. Finally, by providing a process through which the multicultural content can be delivered, the SMMS attends to some of the significant concerns that have been voiced about the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992)—namely, that they are difficult to operationalize and apply (Knapik & Miloti, 2006).

We envision the use of this model in multiple contexts in the counseling curriculum. Within practicum and internship classes, instructors and supervisors could use this model with their students, providing them a road map for how they will actually learn to implement the MCCs (Sue et al., 1992). In other words, students who are taught the MCCs would then be taught how they will be supervised using this model to apply the competencies. Students would learn that the MCCs are something that they are expected not only to memorize but also to apply and that there is a specific and deliberate process to help them become multiculturally competent counselors. Initially, instructors and supervisors would have to help students monitor their own growth and development through the process, but, with some practice, students might be able to discuss their own multicultural development in the language of the model. The second author uses this concept with her students, and it is not uncommon for a student to say something like “I am stuck at the analysis stage—I can’t seem to figure out how to bring it all together for synthesis.” Counselors-in-training are able to monitor their own multicultural development through a metacognitive process, thereby

taking control and ownership of their own development as multiculturally competent counselors.

The SMMS also provides a framework for the discussion of diversity and identities within the supervisory relationship. Supervisors and supervisees can assess their own phase of development according to the MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2001) and discuss their own journeys toward multicultural understanding and awareness. Again, the provision of an explicit model provides a starting place for important discussions between the supervisor and supervisee. Supervisees at the adaptation phase in the HMNID (Ancis & Ladany, 2001), for example, may benefit from a discussion of their cultural journey, whether they believe the phase is an accurate assessment of their competency, and, most important, what will be done in supervision to help move them forward. The selection of a specific MCC (Sue et al., 1992) for emphasis within supervision (e.g., understanding the impact of race/ethnicity and culture on a person's development, career choices, presentation and expression of disorder, and behaviors) opens yet another door for important discussion and can be a learning opportunity for both members of the supervisory dyad. Finally, when both members of the dyad fully understand the model, they can develop goals and plans to enhance multicultural counselor competence. Rather than the supervisor making the decisions about how to work through to higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956), this can be a shared task. Supervisees who understand the model and believe in the ultimate goal of enhanced multicultural counselor competence can share more fully in their own professional development.

Although the SMMS was developed to assist supervisors with multicultural supervision, it is applicable to a variety of curricular activities. For example, students could use the model to analyze case studies in career counseling, diagnosis, or any other counseling course. By teaching the model and then applying it to all case studies, supervisors demonstrate that multicultural counselor competence applies to all clients, not just those who are culturally or racially/ethnically diverse.

The SMMS is intended to provide direction and specific interventions for supervisors to help increase their supervisees' multicultural counselor competence. When the model is shared with supervisees, it allows them to be full participants in their own journey toward multicultural counselor competence. As such, the model becomes a mechanism to share power within the supervisory relationship, and shared power and decision making are important components of all multicultural counseling.

There are, of course, several limitations to the model. The SMMS has yet to be empirically tested as a model for increasing multicultural counselor competence in supervisees and for improving the supervisory working alliance. Recommendations for research include comparing perceptions of multicultural counselor competence, as rated by the supervisee, supervisor, or clients, before and after this model is imple-

mented. Alternatively, comparisons of outcomes between this model and other models of multicultural supervision would be an important contribution. Finally, it would be important to determine whether the SMMS enhances the discussion of multicultural issues in general, encourages both supervisors and supervisees to attend to multicultural issues in their relationship, gives supervisors a framework that allows them to feel comfortable addressing multicultural issues, and keeps the topic of diversity at the forefront of supervision.

As with all training models, the SMMS requires the supervisor to be at least as advanced as the supervisee in the training area, which in this case is multicultural counselor competence. Supervisors must have the ability, the desire, and the commitment to assist supervisees as they develop their multicultural counseling competencies. Clearly, not all supervisors will be sufficiently cognitively advanced nor sufficiently motivated to engage in these interventions. For those who are willing and able to engage, the SMMS offers a starting place.

References

- Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2001). A multicultural framework for counselor supervision. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (pp. 63–90). Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.
- Benack, S. (1988). Relativistic thought: A cognitive basis for empathy in counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27*, 216–232.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Pearson.
- Birk, J. M., & Mahalik, J. R. (1996). The influence of trainee conceptual level, trainee anxiety, and supervision evaluation on counselor developmental level. *The Clinical Supervisor, 14*, 123–137.
- Blocher, D. H. (1983). Towards a cognitive-developmental approach to counseling supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 27–34.
- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, F. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Borders, L. D. (2001). Counseling supervision: A deliberate educational process. In D. C. Locke, J. E. Myers, & E. L. Herr (Eds.), *The handbook of counseling* (pp. 417–432). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Buhrke, R. A. (1989). Incorporating lesbian and gay issues into counselor training: A resource guide. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*, 77–80.
- Carney, C. G., & Kahn, K. B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 111–119.
- Constantine, M. G. (2001). Multiculturally-focused counseling supervision: Its relationship to trainees' multicultural self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*, 87–98.
- Constantine, M. G. (2003). Multicultural competence in supervision: Issues, processes and outcomes. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. K. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies in counseling and psychology* (pp. 383–391). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Constantine, M. G., Warren, A. K., & Miville, M. L. (2005). White racial identity dyadic interactions in supervision: Implications for supervisees' multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 490–496.
- Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 132–141.

- D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1997). Multicultural counseling supervision: Central issues, theoretical considerations, and practical strategies. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 290–309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (1994). Critical thinking: Why we must transform our teaching. *Journal of Developmental Education*, *18*, 34–35.
- 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*, 147–158.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *29*, 102–113.
- Gonzalez, R. C. (1997). Postmodern supervision: A multicultural perspective. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 350–386). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Granello, D. H. (1996). Gender and power in the supervisory dyad. *Clinical Supervisor*, *14*, 53–67.
- Granello, D. H. (2000). Encouraging the cognitive development of supervisees: Using Bloom's Taxonomy in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *40*, 31–46.
- Granello, D. H. (2002). Assessing the cognitive development of counseling students: Changes in epistemological assumptions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *41*, 279–293.
- Granello, D. H., & Underfer-Babalis, J. (2004). Supervision of group work: A model to increase supervisee cognitive complexity. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, *29*, 159–173.
- Hays, D. G., & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *43*, 134–145.
- Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effect of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *12*, 153–164.
- Hill, P. W., & McGaw, B. (1981). Testing the simplex assumption underlying Bloom's Taxonomy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *18*, 92–101.
- Hird, J. S., Cavalieri, C. E., Dulko, J. P., Felice, A. A. D., & Ho, T. A. (2001). Visions and realities: Supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *29*, 114–130.
- Jennings, L., & Skovholt, T. M. (1999). The cognitive, emotional, and relational characteristics of master therapists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*, 3–11.
- Knapik, M. T., & Miloti, A. S. (2006). Conceptualizations of competence and culture: Taking up the postmodern interest in social interaction. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *28*, 375–387.
- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *36*, 284–304.
- Ladany, N., Inman, A. G., Constantine, M. G., & Hofheinz, E. W. (1997). Supervisee multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competence as functions of supervisee racial identity and supervisor focus. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *44*, 284–293.
- Leong, F., & Wagner, N. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *34*, 131–145.
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *10*, 3–42.
- Martinez, R. P., & Holloway, E. L. (1997). The supervision relationship in multicultural training. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 324–349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Marzano, R. J., & Kendall, J. S. (2006). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mayer, R. E. (2002). A step toward redesigning Bloom's Taxonomy. *PsycCRITIQUES*, 47, 551-553.
- Miville, M. L., Rosa, D., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Building multicultural competence in clinical supervision. In M. G. Constantine & D. W. Sue (Eds.), *Strategies for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings* (pp. 192-211). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Nelson, M. L., & Holloway, E. (1999). Supervision and gender issues. In M. Carroll & E. Holloway (Eds.), *Counseling supervision in context* (pp. 23-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Peterson, F. K. (1991). Issues of race and ethnicity in supervision: Emphasizing who you are, not what you know. *Clinical Supervision*, 9, 15-31.
- Pfohl, A. (2004). The intersection of personal and professional identity: The heterosexual supervisor's role in fostering the growth of sexual minority supervisees. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 23, 139-164.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Nielson, D. (1995). Examining multicultural competencies of graduate students in psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26, 322-329.
- Robinson, B., Bradley, L. J., & Hendricks, C. B. (2000). Multicultural counseling supervision: A four-step model toward competency. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 22, 131-141.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Ronnestad, M. H. (1992). Themes in therapist and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 505-515.
- Stoltenberg, C. D. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The Counselor Complexity Model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 59-65.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists: A developmental approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Crethar, H. C. (1994). Changes in supervision as counselors and therapists gain experience: A review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25, 416-449.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Sue, D. W., & Torino, G. C. (2005). Racial-cultural competence: Awareness, knowledge, and skills. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling: Vol. 2: Training and practice* (pp. 3-18). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Weinrach, S. G., & Thomas, K. R. (2004). The AMCD Multicultural Counseling Competencies: A critically flawed initiative. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 26, 81-93.
- Whaley, A. L., & Davis, K. E. (2007). Cultural competence and evidence-based practice in mental health services: A complementary perspective. *American Psychologist*, 62, 563-574.