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ABSTRACT

SUPERVISOR PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR MULTICULTURAL TRAINING NEEDS FOR WORKING WITH ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING SUPERVISEES

Hsin-Ya Tang
Old Dominion University, 2014
Director: Dr. Tim Grothaus

The counselor education and supervision profession has embraced the need to prepare multiculturally competent supervisors (American Counseling Association, 2005; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Inman & Ladany, 2014). However, literature dealing with training supervisors to work with linguistically diverse supervisees is limited and supervisors’ training needs for effectively supervising linguistically diverse supervisees are not yet clearly addressed. The aim of this qualitative study was to develop a theory which explained supervisors’ perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with English language learning supervisees. Constructivist grounded theory was utilized in this effort to analyze the data gathered from 10 supervisors who speak English as their first language and are providing clinical supervision in a CACREP program. Three superordinate themes as well as five themes and 17 subthemes were constructed and explained. The first superordinate theme, institutional level, had one theme emerge, which was institutional change. Institutional change involved two subthemes: improve infusion of competence with ELL in CACREP Standards and enhance advocacy for ELLs. The second superordinate theme that emerged was professional collaboration. One theme under this superordinate theme was enhanced collaboration. The third superordinate theme involved supervisor competence. The theme in this area included multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills. Multicultural
awareness involved six subthemes: awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs, recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences, recognize probable similarities, recognize power differential, recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence, and understand languages are not semantically equivalent. Multicultural knowledge involved three subthemes: have a framework or have evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees, distinguish levels of acculturation, and knowledge of ELL cultures. Multicultural skills had five subthemes emerge. These subthemes were navigate dual language relationships, employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs, assess communication styles and outcomes, supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners, and facilitate parallel process. Possible implications of this research and suggestions for future study were provided.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Research Problem

I am a doctoral student from Taiwan and I speak English as a third language. Since I arrived in the United States, I have encountered difficulties in supervision when I addressed linguistic differences. My supervisors have tried to encourage me by telling me I am doing well with English. However, their well-intended attempts to empower me have actually minimized the difficulties I have had. Inadvertently, they failed to validate my experiences. The awareness of language issues in supervision and my own supervision experiences intrigues me and motivates me to learn about multicultural supervision between supervisors who are first language English-speakers (FLES) and supervisees whose first language is not English.

English language learners (ELLs) constitute the fastest growing segment of the population in the United States (Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Uro & Barrio, 2013). In addition, international students are present in close to half of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Kok-Mun, 2006). Only a small number of these international students speak English as first language (Chin, 2002). While the literature has addressed the influence of linguistic differences on these students’ counseling self-efficacy and supervision outcomes and noted that linguistic differences can affect the process and outcome of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Moore,
2012; Nilsson, 2007), it has not yet adequately addressed the training supervisors need to successfully work with ELL students in counselor education and supervision programs.

Given that supervisors bear much of the responsibility for improving supervisees' cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills, supervisors must have a certain level of multicultural competence in order to facilitate discussions of cultural issues (Inman & Soheilian, 2010). FLES supervisors can be important resources for ELL supervisees in facing language issues, but few suggestions have emerged to guide FLES supervisors in managing linguistic differences. Therefore, there is a growing need for further research on the training needs of supervisors to enhance their awareness, knowledge and skills in order to provide effective supervision for ELL supervisees.

**Brief Summary of Relevant Literature**

The recognition that supervisors serve as not only trainers but also gatekeepers of the counseling profession has heightened the importance placed on the training of supervisors (American Counseling Association, 2005; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). For many years that supervisors did not receive formal training that specifically catered to the supervisory practice and they practiced supervision without formal training regarding the knowledge, skills, and methods of supervision (Aasheim, 2012). However, since the 1990s state licensing boards, credentialing bodies, professional organizations, and university training programs have started to concentrate more on supervisor training (Aasheim, 2012). For instance, the American Association of State Counseling Boards has
created an Approved Supervisor Model that states could adopt as their credentialing model (AASCB, 2011). Also, standards for supervisors have been recognized by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES, 1990). Moreover, CACREP (2009) requires that counselor education programs provide formal instruction in clinical supervision for doctoral students along with training of on-site supervisors.

The models of supervision that highlight the importance of multicultural interactions within supervision have gained increasing attention (Inman & Ladany, 2014). Researchers have proposed that multiculturally competent supervision brings a positive effect to multicultural counseling knowledge (Penn & Post, 2012), cultural empathy (Suthakaran, 2011), multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski, & Hess, 2006; Constantine, 2001), supervisory working alliance and satisfaction with supervision (Inman, 2006), and learning outcomes (Green & Dekkers, 2010). Responding to a call for training supervisors, multiple training guides, programs, and models pertinent to the area have emerged in the literature (Bradley & Whiting, 2001; Falendar & Shafranske, 2004; Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Hartwig-Moorhead, 2008; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998). However, these training guides, programs, and models rest on the assumption that by being attentive towards individual differences (e.g., the developmental level of
counselors) and equipping supervisors with skills to address the needs of counselors at different levels, adequate supervision will occur. Little attention has been given to methods of training multiculturally competent supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Constantine & Sue, 2007).

Despite the increasing attention given to strategies for addressing individual differences, there is relatively little research on strategies for addressing cultural differences between a counselor and a supervisor (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett, Borders, Crutchfield, Brotherton, & Curtis, 2001; Gonzalez, 1997). Gonzalez (1997) has developed a postmodern approach to multicultural clinical supervision and maintained that supervisors should attend to language usage and supervisees’ expression of strong affect in supervision. As proposed by Garrett et al. (2001), another model of multicultural supervision is the VISION model, which highlights supervisor’s awareness of their own culture and how this leaves an impact to the supervisees and the supervisory process. Ancis and Ladany (2010) introduced their HMNID model which dwells into the process of learning and offers a method for understanding the multicultural competence of both supervisors and the counselors with whom they work. Although Gonzalez (1997) pointed out that supervisors should attend to language issues, in these two more recent models (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett et al, 2001), culture refers to race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, socioeconomic status, age, religion, and the intersections of these factors. A notable omission is the acknowledgement of linguistic
differences. Given that researchers have suggested that supervisees may be of the opinion that their supervisors do not have enough multicultural sensitivity (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999), attending to linguistic differences within supervision may be helpful in responding to the ELL supervisees' needs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Yabusaki, 2010). More importantly, attending to language differences inside the scope of the supervisor-supervisee relationships seems to be an important way to engage in an egalitarian working alliance with the supervisees and engage in the advocacy on supervisees’ behalf in settings where they face misunderstanding or discrimination (Yabusaki, 2010). Overall, although the relevance of multicultural issues within supervision is rather clear, linguistic differences have generally not been addressed in the supervision literature. Thus, there is a clear need for examining linguistic differences in the research on supervisor learning experiences.

**Conceptual Framework**

Using a grounded theory methodology, this study examined FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs in the areas of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in order to successfully respond to linguistic differences in supervision. According to Hays and Singh (2012), the qualitative research entails exploring a phenomenon directly in the most comprehensive manner possible by talking with and/or observing the individuals affected by the phenomenon concerned. The cultural phenomena are investigated in a certain context and the researcher integrates the
participants' viewpoints into the researcher’s grasp of the phenomenon, the participants, and/or the context. The cultural phenomenon to be examined in this study was FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their multicultural supervision training needs in order to work effectively with ELL supervisees.

Qualitative research features several research traditions with the grounded theory being the most powerful (Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Grounded theory methodology comprises a set of systematic yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analyzing qualitative data for the purpose of developing a theory grounded in the data collected (Charmaz, 2006). Grounded theory is an effectual tool for developing new theories that specifically integrate a diversity of focus throughout the inquiry (Green, Creswell, Shope, & Clark, 2007). For this study, grounded theory was used to conceptualize and illustrate FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs for effectively working with ELL supervisees.

**Rationale for the Study**

Multiple factors suggest the possible benefit of this research for the field of counselor education and supervision. Most notably, the American Counseling Association (ACA) has identified the significance of multiculturalism, pluralism, and diversification in counseling (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). The inclusion of multicultural standards in the code of ethics calls for all counselors who
are guild members to meet the standards of multicultural competence when they deliver services (ACA, 2005).

Secondly, Constantine (1997) found that 70% of supervisees had been trained in multicultural counseling during their graduate studies, whereas only 30% of supervisors had received similar training in their programs. However, this study is 17 years old and there are no known current studies that indicate how many supervisors had received multicultural training.

Thirdly, most quantitative and qualitative studies have looked into the perceptions or experiences gained by supervisees in multicultural supervision. The findings from these studies have suggested that the supervisors have a primary role to play, which is to address cultural differences not only between the client and counselor but also between the supervisee and supervisor (Constantine, 1997; Constantine, 2001; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Duan & Rochlke, 2001; Hird et al., 2001; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Toporek et al., 2004). Even though supervisors are known to have the duty to address cultural differences, little research has been conducted to comprehend supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs for addressing cultural differences, especially with an emphasis on linguistic diversity. In addition, the existing literature on supervision training mainly explored into the perceptions of instructors, training directors, and program chairs in doctoral programs (Scott, Ingram, Vitanza, & Smith, 2000). Relatively few studies have examined supervisors’ perceptions of their supervisory performance and
supervision training (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006). Thus, although researchers have documented various approaches to training supervisors, the voices and needs of supervisors have received limited recognition. This gap in the literature illustrates the importance of understanding supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs in order to become culturally competent and increase their own ability to work with supervisees from diverse cultural groups.

Finally, Magnuson, Norem, Jones, McCrary, and Gentry (2008) suggested that supervisor training needs to be injected with a culturally-centered perspective. One vital component of learning and integrating a multicultural framework and developing multicultural competence in supervision is to have professional training that attends to these issues in an effective way (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Inman & Soheilian, 2010; Ober, Granello, & Henfield, 2009).

Professional literature dealing with training supervisors to work with ELL supervisees is limited and supervisors’ training needs for addressing linguistic differences are also not clearly identified. Therefore, there is a need for exploratory research to investigate this topic with the hope of generating ideas about the training needs of supervisors to help them have the awareness, knowledge, and skills necessary for working with ELL supervisees. The research questions for this study were designed to explore FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs for effectively working with ELL supervisees.
**Research Question**

The central question this study explored was the following: How do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? The sub-questions were (1) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (2) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (3) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees?

The sub-questions included the three domains of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills to reflect the wealth of literature which categorizes multicultural competence in this fashion (ACA, 2005; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). However, I did not assume that participants’ perceptions on multicultural training needs would be categorized only as multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. For example, the six domains of multicultural supervision competence proposed by Ancis and Ladany (2010) were also indicated by participants. I kept an open mind to the possibilities of other ways of categorizing the training needs of supervisors by utilizing multiple interview questions in order to gather participants’ perceptions.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered to enhance the conceptual framework for this study. These terms are defined according to how they were used for the purposes of this study.

**ELL**

In this study, ELL is the short form that refers to English language learners.

**ELL Supervisees**

In this study, ELL supervisees are classified as supervisees who are English language learners. That is, they consider a language other than English to be their first language.

**FLES**

In this study, FLES is the short form that refers to first language English speakers.

**FLES Supervisors**

In this study, FLES supervisors include faculty members and doctoral students in CACREP programs who are providing clinical supervision. In addition, they have to identify as using English as their first language.

**Grounded Theory**

Charmaz (2009) introduced a constructivist approach to the Grounded Theory (GT) through which a researcher “takes a middle ground between postmodernism and positivism, and offers accessible methods for taking qualitative research into the 21st century” (p. 510). Her method seems to use an inductive approach of the classic
methodology and also mirrors constructivism in the domain of social research. In this study, the constructivist frame for the GT methodology will be used to develop a model that explains FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs related to the multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills needed to successfully supervise ELL supervisees.

**Supervisor Multicultural Awareness**

In this study, supervisor multicultural awareness is described as supervisors’ understanding and comprehending not only in terms of their own knowledge, assumptions, attitudes, patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors throughout the pluralistic cultural identities, including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, language, and disability but also the knowledge, etc. of the supervisees and their clients.

**Supervisor Multicultural Knowledge**

In this study, supervisor multicultural knowledge embodies the (1) knowledge about multicultural counseling competence (MCC); (2) supervision theory that addresses multicultural issues; and (3) ethical issues in multicultural supervision.

**Supervisor Multicultural Skills**

In this study, supervisor multicultural skills denote the ability to create a multicultural supervisory working alliance and develop techniques and interventions that are culturally relevant to the practice of counseling and supervision.
Supervisor Training

In this study, supervisor training embodies (1) offering of knowledge connected to multicultural supervision; (2) developing and improving supervisor’s multicultural self-awareness and knowledge; (3) incorporating a theory and skills into an effective multicultural supervision practice, and (4) molding the identity of a multiculturally competent supervisor.

Overview of Methodology

Constructivist GT methodology (Charmaz, 2009; Charmaz, 2011) was used to gain an in-depth understanding of FLES supervisors’ responses. In order to understand FLES supervisors’ perspectives, participants consisted of FLES doctoral students and faculty members who are currently providing clinical supervision in CACREP accredited programs. Doctoral students were recruited through contact with doctoral level supervision course instructors or clinical coordinators at selected counselor education doctoral programs. Faculty members were recruited through contact with department chairs at selected counselor education programs.

To reduce researcher bias, the researcher employed a research team comprising of three other individuals. Member checking was involved via the exchanges of interview transcripts, analytical thoughts, and interpretations with participants in this study to make sure that the participants’ ideas were correctly represented. Finally, an independent auditor reviewed all documents in the audit trail. The auditor was willing to challenge
any potential biases that I might demonstrate, which increased this study's credibility and trustworthiness.

**Summary**

This chapter provided an overview of the research problem, a brief summary of the literature review, an examination of the rationale for the study, a statement of the research question, operationalized definitions of key terms, and an overview of the methodology. The next chapter will provide a more in-depth review of the available literature on multicultural supervision, supervisor training, and ELL supervisees. Chapter Three will present details on grounded theory methodology to be used in this study. Results of this study will be presented in Chapter Four and discussion of implications and limitations will be included in Chapter Five. Chapter Six will offer a manuscript to be submitted for publication.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to establish a rationale for this dissertation study, literature in several areas will be reviewed in this chapter. The first area of literature focuses on multicultural competence, especially in supervision. The second area of literature discusses the need for supervisor training. The third area provides an overview of English language learners in related fields as well as in counselor education and supervision.

Multicultural Competence

The field of counselor education and supervision is committed to promoting multicultural competence within the faculty and the student populations as well as within the practice of counseling and supervision (Grothaus, McAuliffe, Danner, & Doyle, 2013; Inman & Ladany, 2014; McAuliffe, 2013; Singh, Urbano, Haston, & McMahan, 2010; Toporek, Dodge, Tripp, & Alarcón, 2010). Multicultural competence is pivotal to counseling and supervision since our work with clients and supervisees is confined within the context of a given society and cultures (Grothaus at al., 2013). Two of the main reasons for developing multicultural competence in counseling and supervision are (1) Western philosophy-based values function as a basis of counselor education and supervision. Thus, the goals set in counseling and supervisory sessions might often rest upon Western outlook on mental health (Harris, 2012; McAuliffe, 2013; West-Olatunji, 2010); and (2) the implied goals and counseling or supervisory approaches might not be
useful and may even be detrimental to culturally diverse clients and supervisees whose worldviews and healing systems are dissimilar to the Western notions (Harris, 2012; McAuliffe, 2013; West-Olatunj, 2010). Owing to these concerns, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), a division of the American Counseling Association (ACA), developed multicultural counseling competencies (MCC; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992) and Arredondo et al. (1996) operationalized the multicultural counseling competencies.

According to Sue et al. (1992) and Arredondo et al. (1996), multicultural counseling competencies can be categorized into cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in working with clients who are culturally diverse. Proponents of the multicultural counseling competencies pointed out that they should be adopted by the ACA and its divisions, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), the American Psychological Association (APA), and a variety of other professional entities because these multicultural competencies have been identified as an important ingredient to supply culturally alert services and create positive service outcomes (Arredondo et al., 1996; Crook-Lyon, Presnell, Silva, Suyama, & Stickney, 2011; Magnuson et al., 2000; Ober et al., 2009; Sue et al, 1992). ACA has officially adopted the 1992 version of multicultural competencies (ACA, 2003). Additionally, APA has endorsed the multicultural guidelines for education and training, research, and practice (APA, 2003) and the 2009 CACREP standards have ruled out that all accredited
Counselor education programs include multicultural education in every course covering eight core subject areas (CACREP, 2009). These major advancements in the multicultural movement exhibit the mental health profession’s commitment to both multicultural competence and multicultural training.

Supervision is a critical component in counselor education programs for counselors to translate their cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills to culturally alert practice (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Ponterotto, 1997). Supervisors play an important role in developing counselors’ multicultural competence. In order to promote counselors’ multicultural competence, supervisors must have multicultural competence (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). Similar to counselors’ multicultural competencies, supervisors’ multicultural competencies can be defined as falling into three categories: cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). In the next section, multicultural competence in supervision is discussed.

**Multicultural Competence in Supervision**

Supervision is an important vehicle for counselor professional development in that it can influence clients’ welfare and supervisees’ competence (Ladany & Inman, 2012; Bradley, Ladany, Hendricks, Whiting, & Rhode, 2010). When supervisors foster growth in supervisees’ professional competencies, supervision has a supportive and education function (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Furthermore, supervisors monitor clients’ welfare. In this situation, supervision has a gatekeeping function (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013).
Due to the growing diversity of the U.S. population, the supervisory triad of client, supervisee, and supervisor will increasingly reflect differences in race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, disability, and language (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004). Research on multicultural competence that focuses upon the supervisory triad of client, supervisee, and supervisor can illuminate what works and does not work in multicultural supervision (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Frawley-O’Dea & Samat, 2001; Holloway, 1992; Holloway & Dunlap, 1989). To date, researchers have addressed the role of gender (Gatmon et al., 2001; Granello, 2003; Wester & Vogel, 2002); race, ethnicity, and racial identity development (Borders & Brown, 2005; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2003; Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Dressel, Consoli, Kim, & Atkinson, 2007; Hays & Chang, 2003); and sexual orientation (Gatmon et al., 2001; Pfohl, 2004) in supervision. Being able to attend to cultural issues in supervision is an important step in helping counselors to be able to do the same with their clients.

As clients, supervisees, and supervisors all contribute their own multicultural characteristics to the supervisory process (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995), supervisors shoulder three major responsibilities. The first responsibility is to identify how their own awareness, knowledge, and skills, along with their personal characteristics, and ways of connecting, interrelate with those of supervisees. Personal insight and growth experienced by the supervisors could determine supervisees’ insight
and growth during the supervisory process (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Constantine, 2001; Garrett, Borders, Crutchfield, Torres-Rivera, Brotherton, & Curtis, 2001; Magnuson, Norem, Jones, McCrary, & Gentry, 2000). Supervisors also help their supervisees in becoming more cognizant of how the supervisee’s awareness, knowledge, and skills, as well as their personal characteristics, and ways of connecting interact with clients in counseling sessions (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Ivey, D’Andrea, Ivey, & Simek-Morga, 2007; Magnuson et al., 2000; Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001). An additional responsibility of supervisors is to know how their awareness, knowledge, and skills, as well as their personal characteristics, and ways of connecting can affect the supervisee’s clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Magnuson et al., 2000). Although supervisors do not directly interact with clients, the way supervisors identify clients’ needs and situation will definitely influence the goals and process in counseling and supervision. Supervisors with multicultural competence are able to help supervisees develop multicultural competence to work with culturally diverse clients (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Magnuson et al., 2000).

Ancis and Ladany (2010) presented a comprehensive model of multicultural supervision competence named the Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development (HMNID). The HMNID gives supervisors a framework for understanding feelings, thoughts, and behaviors about themselves, their supervisees, and clients with various backgrounds. In addition, they identified six domains of multicultural supervision
competence: supervisor-focused personal development, supervisee-focused personal
development, conceptualization, interventions, process, and evaluation (Ancis & Ladany,
2010). These six domains of multicultural supervision competence, while similar, do not
appear to be completely congruent with the three major responsibilities of supervisors
mentioned above (i.e., awareness, knowledge, and skill). The domain of supervisor-
focused and supervisee-focused personal development reflects the understanding of both
parties’ own beliefs, biases, and cultural differences. The domain of conceptualization
refers to the reframing of the impact of individual and cultural factors on clients’ lives
and the impact of oppression on clients’ presenting concerns. The domain of
interventions depicts the flexibility and sensitivity required in supervisory work with
diverse populations. The domain of process entails encouraging respectful curiosity, open
communication, and flexible approaches within multicultural supervision. The domain of
evaluation includes promoting clients’ welfare, offering remedial assistance to
supervisees, and screening from the training programs, counseling settings, and state
licensure supervisors deemed incompetent (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

In the H MNID model, Ancis & Ladany (2010) acknowledged that only supervisors
who are at least as far along as their supervisees in their personal development in regard
of multiculturalism can assist supervisees by way of enhancing their personal
multicultural development. Supervisors may be hesitant to initiate cultural discussions
with their supervisees (Glosoff & Durham, 2010) perhaps for some or all of the following
reasons (a) depending on when supervisors receive their training, some may believe that
their supervisees are better prepared to get involved in discussions related to cultural
differences compared to themselves (Durham, 2002); (b) some supervisors do not see the
relevance and necessity of such discussion within the supervisory process (Gatmon et al.,
2001; Hays & Chang, 2003); (c) some supervisors are anxious about being labeled as
overly concerned with cultural differences (Gatmon et al., 2001); and (d) some
supervisors may not be confident enough to initiate such discussion effectively (Gatmon
et al., 2001). Similarly, various empirical studies have shown that when supervisors have
had few culturally diverse experiences and limited multicultural training, supervision that
focuses on promoting multicultural counselor competence might be ineffective
(Constantine & Sue, 2007; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Lawless, Gale, & Bacigalupe,
2001). This is perhaps explainable by the supervisor's cultural encapsulation and
inadequate culturally sensitive information being processed at both intrapersonal and
interpersonal levels (Killian, 2001; Sue & Sue, 2013).

The importance of supervisor multicultural competence has been recognized by
multiple researchers (Magnuson et al., 2000; Ober et al., 2009). Magnuson et al. (2000)
and Ober et al. (2009) indicated that diverse methods of training activities and diverse
evaluation of activities should be utilized in order to train multiculturally competent
supervisors. Counselor educators and supervisors are obligated to ensure training content
and process are appropriately preparing counselors to become multiculturally competent
and they are also obligated to ensure their own multicultural competence as supervisors (CACREP, 2009; Crook-Lyon, Presnell, Silva, Suyama, & Stickney, 2011; Magnuson et al., 2000; Ober et al., 2009). To develop counselors’ multicultural competence, supervisors need to be trained to become multiculturally competent in initiating discussions about cultural issues and to facilitate this learning process in supervision (Garrett et al., 2001; Magnuson et al., 2000; Ober et al., 2009).

Empirical studies have also been conducted to evaluate counselors’ multicultural competence. In these studies, attention was given more towards supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory experiences than towards supervisors’ perceptions (Kaduvettoor, O’Shaughnessy, Mori, Beverly III, Weatherford, & Ladany, 2009, Nilsson, 2007). According to Hays and Chang (2003), however, as there is power differential in favor of supervisors, it is the supervisors’ racial identity status that has a stronger role in shaping the interactions between supervisors and supervisees and in turn, between supervisees and clients. There appears to be a need for further research to include supervisors’ experiences and supervisors’ perceptions of multicultural supervision.

Still, other researchers have focused on both supervisors and supervisees. Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) and Bhat and Davis (2007) studied the relationship between racial identity interactions and the working alliance. They posited that when both supervisors and supervisees have shared belief systems (high racial identity levels) on various cultural issues, they have more tendencies to address these issues in
supervision. Furthermore, when supervisors have higher levels of racial consciousness than their supervisees, they are better prepared to broach these issues in supervision, thus providing an environment that is culturally alert (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Bhat & Davis, 2007). Killian (2001) also described similar concepts. Specifically, supervisors with similar cultural experiences as supervisees, or supervisors who hold an authentic interest in different cultures and value ecosystemic differences were regarded to be more likely to create a safer place where multicultural issues can further be elaborated in supervision.

Additionally, ACA Code of Ethics (2005) addressed the issue of multicultural competence in supervision. The ACA Code of Ethics (2005) included two subsections that attend to diversity in supervision. Subsection F.2.b stated, “Counseling supervisors are aware of and address the role of multiculturalism/diversity in the supervisory relationship.” Subsection F.4.b indicated, “When cultural, clinical, professional issues are crucial to the viability of the supervisory relationship, both parties make efforts to resolve differences.”

Despite the ethical requirements and the predominance of research that advocates the need for supervisor multicultural competence, the standards set for supervisory training and performance are not clear about this need. Supervisory standards recognized by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009), indicated the minimum of a master’s degree in counseling or a related
profession as qualifications for supervisors but did not specifically mention the need to have multicultural supervisor training. In addition, the Standards for Counseling Supervisors (ACES, 1990) included 11 core areas of knowledge, competence, and personal traits which characterize effective supervisors. The ACES standards recognized that effective supervisors have an understanding of individual differences and the impact of these differences on supervision, but the acknowledgement does not specifically address cultural differences. The ACES' Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors (1995), moreover, did not pay attention to multicultural competence at all.

The apparent incongruence between the literature and research supporting supervisor multicultural competence with the lack of specific attention given to this topic by relevant standards suggests that further study of this topic could be valuable for the field of counseling supervision. In addition, given that supervisors are tasked with creating an environment where cultural differences can be addressed and supervisors' cultural identity has more power than supervisees' in shaping the supervisory relationship, training supervisors to be competent in broaching cultural issues is needed in counselor education and supervision field (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Hays & Chang, 2003; Inman & Kreider, 2013). This study aimed to assist in this area by exploring supervisors' perceptions of supervisor multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. Contributions to supervisor training models, programs, and curriculum from the existing literature will be discussed in the next section.
Supervisor Training

In spite of the fact that much attention has been given to supervision in the development of supervisees’ multicultural competence, this is not the case for supervisors’ development of multicultural competence (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). This paradoxical circumstance is one that the counseling field has to address (Milne & James, 2002).

The issue of training supervisors has only been emphasized in the past twenty-five years. It had been assumed that one’s experience as a counselor was sufficient to make him or her a competent supervisor (Baker, Exum, & Tyler, 2002). However, standards for supervisors have been clearly defined by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES, 1990). Both of the ACA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice (1995) and ACA’s latest (2005) Code of Ethics included a section on “Teaching, Training, and Supervision” (Section F). Supervision has been recognized as a discipline which is different from counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). The recognition that supervision has its own body of knowledge and skills has marked the training of supervisors as important. CACREP-accredited doctoral programs are required to offer content in supervision (CACREP, 2009). Moreover, CACREP (2009) also identified the training of on-site supervisors as a requirement for counselor education programs.
In response to the call for supervisor training and its importance, multiple supervisor training guides, programs, and models have assumed a place in the literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Bradley & Whiting, 2001; Falendar & Shafranske, 2004; Garrett et al., 2001; Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Hartwig-Moorhead, 2008; Inman & Ladany, 2014). Bradley and Whiting (2001) suggested that there are four main goals of supervision training: (1) to offer a theory or knowledge linked with supervisory functioning; (2) to develop supervisory skills; (3) to incorporate a theory and skills into an effective supervisory style, and (4) to mold the professional identity of the supervisor. However, this version of supervision training is 13 years old and sounds culturally invisible because it does not address multicultural competence.

Borders, Bernard, Dye, Fong, Henderson, and Nance (1991) presented a standardized curriculum for training supervisors which sheds light on three curriculum threads: self-awareness, theoretical and conceptual knowledge, and skills and techniques. Borders et al., (1991) also introduced seven core curriculum areas: models of supervision; counselor development; supervision methods and techniques; supervisory relationship; ethical, legal, and professional regulatory issues; evaluation; and executive (administrative) skills. This version of supervision training is 23 years old and also does not attend to multicultural issues.

Additionally, Borders and Brown (2005) named four curricular content areas for training supervisors: counselor development, supervision methods and techniques, the
supervisory relationship, and models of supervision. This version of supervision training is 9 years old and still does not pay attention to multicultural issues.

In addition to content in training, McMahon and Simons (2004) found that short-term training could result in increased supervision scores on post-tests and that gains were maintained over six months; however, Kavanagh et al. (2008) opined that limited benefit was attained from a brief supervision workshop. Crook-Lyon, Heppler, Leavitt and Fisher (2008) proposed that supervisory development scores had a connection with the amount of supervisory training and mentored supervision hours for novice supervisors. Yet, these studies did not indicate or focus on multicultural supervisor training.

Much of the information from the literature appears to be based upon the assumption that by paying attention to individual differences (e.g., the developmental level of counselors) and providing supervisors with skills to address the needs of counselors at different level, adequate supervision will occur (ACES, 1990; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Granello, 2000; Granello & Underfer-Babalis, 2004). Despite the increasing attention given to strategies for addressing individual differences, there is relatively little research on strategies for addressing cultural differences between a counselor and a supervisor. Various scholars presented models of supervision that focus on cultural issues within supervision (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett et al., 2001; Gonzalez, 1997). However, those models were not validated and empirical tested (Garrett et al., 2001; Gonzalez, 1997). According to Garrett et al. (2001), the VISION model of multicultural supervision
emphasized supervisor’s awareness of his or her own culture and how this affects supervisee and subsequently, the supervisory process. Ancis and Ladany (2010) presented the HMNID model which looks at the process of learning and supplies a method for understanding the multicultural competence of both supervisors and the counselors with whom they work. In the HMNID, culture is defined by one’s race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status, age, and religion, as well as their intersections (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). Although Gonzalez (1997) suggested that supervisors attend to language issues, more current authors (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett et al., 2001) did not see language factors as something that should be integrated into their models of multicultural supervision.

The extant models of multicultural supervision appear to have several limitations (1) to tend to focus primarily on race and ethnicity issues (Ancis & Ladany, 2010) but disregard language issues; (2) to tend to perceive culture differences as demographic variables instead of differences that can potentially interfere in the accurate understanding between a supervisor and counselor (Garrett et al., 2001); and (3) to tend to focus on the counselor’s learning experiences without weighing on supervisor learning experiences (Kaduvettoor, O’Shaughnessy, Mori, Beverly III, Weatherford, & Ladany, 2009). Thus, there is a clear need for researchers to also include cultural differences and supervisor learning experiences, e. g., supervisor perceptions regarding their ability to effectively work with supervisees when there are cultural and language differences. The
impact of supervisor training on supervisor multicultural competence, therefore, seems worthwhile of continued study. The study explored supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs in order to successfully work with ELL supervisees. It is possible that the results of this study could be applied more generally to the multicultural supervisory work in which a supervisor’s first language is different from a supervisee’s first language.

**English Language Learners in Related Fields**

The United States has a various demographic and linguistic compositions, offering both challenges and opportunities for the counselor education and supervision field (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The number of population groups regarded as English language learners (ELLs) continues to increase in the United States (Kanno & Cromley, 2013). U.S. Census Bureau (2010) revealed that, of the nation’s 308 million people, 50.5 million are represented by the Hispanic population, and 11.8 million Asian/Pacific Islander population. It is calculated that 76 percent of Hispanics and Asian/Pacific Islanders aged five years and older speak their mother tongue (other than English) at home (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). These population groups are labeled as English language learners, those with English as a second language, or those who have limited English proficiency (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES] 2009).

The increasingly large ELL population, combined with data proving that this population experiences higher academic and psychosocial level of difficulties (Biemiller & Boote, 2006; Carlo, August, McLaughlin, Snow, Dressler, & Lippman, 2004; Vacca &
Vacca, 2008), suggested that there are significant issues that vie for the attention of researchers, educators, and mental health professionals (Albers, Hoffman, & Allison, 2009). However, there is little attention paid to ELL population in counselor education literature (Albers, Hoffman, & Allison, 2009).

Much of the literature on ELLs is in education field. Current literature in the education field has touched on the influence of language differences on these students’ academic experiences (Newton, Padak, & Rasinski, 2008; Sibold, 2011; Slavin & Cheung, 2004; Téllez & Waxman, 2010), such as difficulties reading, understanding lectures, writing papers, and taking part in class discussions. Language issues are substantial, as language competency is a critical factor that can determine both self-concept and self-efficacy in work and study (Chen, 1999).

Given that ELLs constitute the fastest growing segment of the U.S. student population (Uro & Barrio, 2013), it is anticipated that the coverage of ELL-related issues in professional journals would represent the population and the complicated issues faced by the ELL population in this country. Although previous studies have examined general diversity-related research in the counselor education and supervision literature (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Constantine & Sue, 2007; Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2006; Ober, Granello, & Hanfield, 2009), no known comprehensive reviews or analyses have examined the extent to which counseling and other disciplines related to student services have addressed issues related to linguistic diversity. No known extant counseling studies have been
conducted to develop and assess supervisors’ awareness, knowledge, and skills to help ELL supervisees manage language differences (Albers, Hoffman, & Allison, 2009; Gonzalez, 1997; Killian, 2001), but multiple studies on instructional strategies to serve ELLs exist in the education field. These studies could inform supervisory work with ELL supervisees.

Tailoring to the exclusive needs of linguistically diverse students, an international organization, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), developed English as a second language standards (TESOL, 1997). The standards were formed based on three goals for ELL students at all age levels (1) to use English to communicate in various social settings, (2) to use English to achieve academically in all content areas, and (3) to use English in socially and culturally appropriate ways (TESOL, 1997, 2006). ELL students need to develop English language and literacy skills in content areas to reach the same level as their English-speaking peers. In an ideal world, content area instruction should foster a meaningful learning environment for English language development, whereas increasing English skills should offer the context for students to understand content areas (Amaral, Garrison, & Klentschy 2002; Fathman & Crowther, 2006). However, standards or goals for supervisors working with ELL supervisees have not been fully developed. As an educator, a supervisor is supposed to support supervisees’ professional development; as a gatekeeper, a supervisor is obligated to evaluate supervisees’ professional service with clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Without
specific standards and training for supervisors to respond to language issues, supervisors are challenged with developing useful content and process to help ELL supervisees.

Various strategies utilized to meet the needs of ELL students have been mentioned in the education literature. Teachers of ELL students should create classroom environments that encourage the development of general and content-specific academic language (Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2002). Teachers should also look at the language from a human development perspective and have appropriate expectations about language comprehension (Santau, Maerten-Rivera, & Huggins, 2011). Teachers should also put this knowledge to practice by offering multiple points of entry for students at various levels of English proficiency and providing multiple modes for students to demonstrate their learning (Santau, Maerten-Rivera, & Huggins, 2011).

Santau, Maerten-Rivera, and Huggins (2011) presented possible multicultural skills that may be adapted for supervisors in working with ELL supervisees, such as providing multiple modes for supervisees to display their counseling techniques. For example, if an ELL supervisee’s writing ability is better than speaking ability, supervisory work that engages the supervisee can focus on written responses prior to practicing counseling skills in a mock session. As another point, research on second language immersion programs exhibited that contextualized, content based instruction in English can improve the language proficiency of ELLs without affecting their learning in a negative way (Stoddart, Pinal, Latzke, & Canaday, 2002). Both of these studies indicated that it is
important for educators to know their students and be aware of their cultural background in order to provide students with meaningful lessons by giving them an opportunity to learn through the use of more adept teaching methods. Both sets of researchers suggested that these culturally responsive teaching methods would improve learning in both English and the subject area (Santau, Maerten-Rivera, & Huggins, 2011; Stoddart, Pinal, Latzke, & Canaday, 2002). The same may be true for the supervisory work with ELL supervisees. When supervisors recognize and use more adept teaching methods, they may create a more synergistic relationship between counselor professional development and language development. Additionally, when supervisors use supervisory knowledge and skills which are responsive to linguistic differences, they may not only help ELL supervisees enhance their opportunity to learn from supervision but also increase their ability to provide effective services for clients.

Multiple instructional frameworks offer instructional strategies that could improve ELLs' development of English (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Keiffer, & Rivera, 2006; Goldenberg, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2009). For example, ELLs may receive bilingual education that teaches ELLs not only academic content in the native language but also academic content in English (Goldenberg, 2008). These strategies have been hypothesized to develop students' English skills through a number of ways (1) giving a clear focus on language functions and forms for them; (2) increasing their exposure to academic texts, making the texts more understandable; (3) giving ELLs various
opportunities to correct their understanding and use of language; (4) helping them in learning about new language features and using these features for academic purposes; and (5) offering them practical measures for learning language on their own. Furthermore, researchers proposed that cognitive strategies improve ELLs’ ability to read and write texts in content areas (Anderson, 2002; Chamot & O’Mally, 1996; Vaughn & Klinger, 2004). One example of a cognitive strategy that could be used by ELLs who do not know the meaning of some vocabularies is the use of prefix and stem and contextual clues (Anderson, 2002). In order to employ cognitive strategies, ELL supervisees may need to receive instruction regarding how to use cognitive strategies such as this and supervisors may need to guide supervisees in choosing a cognitive strategy in a specific situation. For example, when supervisees do not know the meaning of specific word but they are familiar with the cultural context where the word is situated, it may be appropriate to employ context clues.

Because ELLs are learning academic content simultaneously with the learning of English in which the content is taught, most ELLs need more instruction than their English-speaking peers in order to perform well on high-stakes exams (Schleppegrell, 2009; Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). For example, they require guided practice in reading and forming interpretations about complex texts, conveying those interpretations in well-reasoned essays, and mastering writing conventions in English (August & Shanahan, 2006; Francis et al., 2006; Goldenberg, 2008; O’Day, 2009). Teaching cognitive
strategies to ELLs can help them obtain this practice and shorten the amount of
instruction that they need in order for them to succeed. For this study, the researcher
purposefully sought out supervisors’ perspectives about supervisory skills that may or
may not work for ELL supervisees.

Recent studies on science education have concentrated on hands-on, inquiry-based
science with ELL students and their conclusions are consistent (Lee, Deaktor, Hart,
Cuevas, & Enders, 2005; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007). They
suggested that hands-on activities through collaborative inquiry can boost authentic
communication about both knowledge and practice. Inquiry-based science encourages
students’ communication of their understanding in various formats, as shown in a related
study that used performance tests with ELL students (Shaw, Bunch, & Geaney, 2010).
The assessments collectively require students to take part in four formats including whole
class, small group, pair and individual and three communication modes namely
interpersonal, interpretive and presentational. This requirement may cause barriers for
ELLs as they attempt to demonstrate their scientific knowledge and skills. However, the
language used in performance assessments may also enable them to seize opportunities,
both in expanding the options for demonstrating their understanding and by promoting
the development of a wider repertoire of language skills than the idea of preparing
students for more traditional assessments as has been inculcated in classes (Shaw, Bunch,
& Geaney, 2010).
Lee and colleagues (2005, 2008) implemented a professional development intervention to promote science achievement among culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Both teachers and students are part of the intervention. Teachers were supported with professional development opportunities through a series of instructional workshops for enhancing their teaching practices and increasing positive beliefs on science and literacy with diverse student groups. Then, teachers applied their knowledge to encourage science and literacy achievement with their students. As the first year of implementation came to the end, teachers indicated more integrated conceptualizations of literacy in science instruction. Also, students demonstrated statistically significant gains on all measures of science and literacy adopted. The impact of the intervention on ELL student achievement as well as teacher change provides a promising finding that appear to support examining supervisor training about ELL supervisee professional development and supervisor multicultural competence.

Additionally, Stoddart et al., (2002) conducted a research on elementary school teachers of predominantly Latino/a ELL students. After a 5-week summer professional development program, the majority of teachers demonstrated a switch from a restricted view of the connections between inquiry-based science and English language development to a more relative attitude of seeing how both can be merged in a lesson. The results are in line with those of Hart and Lee (2003), who delved into the professional development of elementary school teachers catering to diverse students.
Both quantitative and qualitative results pointed to positive teachers' perceptions and practices. As teachers formulated a more comprehensive conceptualization of literacy in science instruction, they blended reading and writing in science instruction in a more systematic and extensive way and provided more effective linguistic scaffolding that helped improve students' understanding. Although these studies did not explicitly explore supervision and language differences, research indicating the value of attending to language differences within teacher-student relationships appears to provide indirect support for addressing language differences in supervision. These studies in science education may suggest that supervisors need opportunities to develop their own deep and complex understandings of language differences and recognize how language differences present opportunities and barriers. These studies may also reflect supervisors' need to engage in a discussion of linguistic differences within supervision to be able to foster supervisees' ability to initiate language discussion with clients (Hart & Lee, 2003; Lee, Deaktor, Enders, & Lambert, 2008; Lee, Deaktor, Hart, Cuevas, & Enders, 2005).

Additionally, the education research appears to indicate that supervisors may need to learn how to provide more effective linguistic scaffolding to promote ELL supervisees' understanding.

In summary, a review of the literature related to ELLs in the education field provides potential insights for developing effective strategies for instruction and professional development interventions to promote academic achievement of ELL students. However,
there is a lack of counseling literature addressing effective strategies for instruction and interventions to improve supervisors' multicultural competence in working with ELL supervisees. Building on the emerging literature in the education field, the next section will discuss multicultural competence with ELL supervisees in order to serve as a foundation to understand supervisors' training needs for working with ELL supervisees.

**Multicultural Competence with ELL Supervisees**

Even though current counseling graduates have received multicultural training in their graduate programs, research shows that many of them are not able to apply their knowledge to practice in their work with ELL population (Burnham, Mantero, & Hooper, 2009; Packer-Williams, Jay, & Evans, 2010). Burnham, Mantero, and Hooper (2009) examined the extent to which counseling students found that early field experience fostered multicultural sensitivity and awareness in their work with ELL students and teachers. In this study, counselors-in-training vented out their frustrations in dealing with language barriers and the misinformation about ELL students. Packer-Williams, Jay, and Evans (2010) examined the contextual factors influencing school counselors' decision to incorporate multicultural issues in their work. Results indicated school counselors do not integrate multicultural issues into their daily practice owing to the reported lack of skills and support as well as weak pre-service multicultural training.

As ELLs constitute the fastest growing population in the United States, the frequency with which supervisors' work with ELL supervisees has also increased. Furthermore,
given that CACREP standards advocate for counselor educators to be culturally competent when teaching and supervising students from diverse language backgrounds (CACREP, 2009), the apparent shortage of research examining supervision with ELL supervisees is disconcerting. If supervisors are to take a meaningful role in the counselor education field, more knowledge and guidance is needed in providing services for ELL supervisees.

Despite the scarcity of ELL-related issues researched and published in the counselor education and supervision field, a major reason that supervisors are tasked with managing language differences has been identified as the presence of international students in close to half of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Kok-Mun, 2006). In some instances, the linguistic differences are quite minor (e.g., a student from the U.S., Canada, or England). Yet in many circumstances, linguistic differences are substantial, especially since only few international students speak English as first language (Chin, 2002).

Although little research has been conducted to understand the skills and intervention to be used in working with supervisees who are linguistically diverse, researchers have noted that linguistic differences can affect the process and outcome of supervision (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). Bernard and Goodyear (2013) also indicated that linguistic differences would influence supervisory relationships and
supervision outcomes. However, multiple studies related to international students just
focused on general cultural differences instead of linguistically specific issues or
Nilsson & Dodds, 2006).

In several studies, Nilsson and her colleagues (Nilsson, 2007; Nilsson & Anderson,
2004; Nilsson & Dodds, 2006) have shed light on the influence of cultural differences on
international students' self-efficacy in counseling. Nilsson (2007) reported that academic
stress, academic self-efficacy, and international counselors’ perception of supervisors as
trustworthy and attractive, and expert predicted the frequency of cultural issues being
discussed in supervision and the supervisees’ perceptions of the importance of such
discussions. Results revealed that a quality supervisory relationship may be created
through cultural discussions between international supervisees and their supervisors.
However, this discussion may not occur unless international supervisees perceive their
supervisor as a trustworthy, attractive, and expert figure. Supervisors can not control how
supervisees perceive supervisors’ multicultural competence but supervisors may improve
their multicultural competence by receiving multicultural training. Rather than focusing
on supervisees’ perception of supervisors, therefore, this current study focused on
supervisors’ perception of their training needs.

Despite the scant attention has been paid to ELLs in supervision, studies related to
international students could lead to a recognition that, due to cultural discussions, ELL
Supervisees would be able to address language concerns and obtain support within supervision (Nilsson, 2007; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004; Nilsson & Dodds, 2006). The counseling literature on helping international supervisees manage possible cultural and language differences in counseling and supervision indicated that the establishment of strong supervisory working alliances seems important, as does the discussion of cultural issues in supervision (Nilsson & Anderson, 2004).

Supervisors also play a significant role in giving support to the development of supervisees’ counseling self-efficacy via modeling, social persuasion, and feedback (Larson, 1998). Nonetheless, these supervisory interventions are only effective if a supervisory working alliance has first been formed between supervisors and supervisees (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012). At the early stages of the acculturation process, international students may find it more difficult trying to develop an alliance with their supervisors, may feel more unsure about the nature of the supervisory relationships, and may face more role ambiguity than more acculturated students (Nilsson & Anderson, 2004; Nilsson & Dodds, 2006). Role ambiguity in supervision happens when supervisees do not really grasp what they are expected to do and how they should meet these expectations (Nilsson & Anderson, 2004; Nilsson & Dodds, 2006). Failure to tackle the cultural and linguistic differences may lead to unproductive supervisory relationships. Hence, various authors (Borders & Brown, 2005; Estrada et al., 2004; Garrett et al., 2001) accentuated the responsibility of the supervisor during the early stages of supervision to
begin discussions that are relevant to cultural differences and then embark further into the
discussions throughout supervisory relationships. Unfortunately, as pointed out by
researchers, this may not occur with adequate frequency (Falender & Shafranske, 2004).
The acknowledgement that initiating cultural discussions throughout supervision is vital
but supervisors fail to do so frequently may indicate that supervisors do not receive
enough multicultural training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013), and that linguistic differences
have been given little attention within supervision (Gonzalez, 1997). This may support
the purpose of the current study to explore FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their
multicultural training needs for supervising ELL supervisees.

Multiple researchers have shown that shared norms of language use could be an
important factor that is able to predict a positive and productive learning environment.
Nieto and Bode (2008) referred to Foster’s (1997) research, which showed how shared
norms of language use can be advantageous to African American children. Foster drew
an example whereby when an African American teacher interacted with African
American students and employed a preaching style of speaking to mentor the students,
the teacher gave the student a positive learning environment that seemed to be lacking in
other classrooms. The impact of shared norms of language use may be true to ELL
supervisees within supervision also. However, how FLES supervisors employ shared
norms of language use with ELL supervisee is not clearly identified yet. Ladany, Inman,
Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) found that supervisees who specifically received
directions from their supervisor to focus on racial issues during a case conceptualization task demonstrated better multicultural case conceptualization competence. The literature appears to indicate that the willingness and capability of supervisors to guide supervisees to focus on language concerns is possibly one of the most substantial interventions for multicultural supervision (Burkard, et al., 2006; Dressel, et al., 2007; Inman, 2006; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997).

Additionally, as noted by Bernard and Goodyear (2013), the multicultural discussion would not be comprehensive if supervisors do not also acknowledge possible issues that arise when the host country’s language is not the supervisees’ primary language. Banks (2006) and Gollnick and Chinn (2009) indicated that teachers may believe that treating all students the same way can prevent group discrimination, but it is a fact that the practice in itself is discriminatory by nature. In light of the work of Banks (2006) and Gollnick and Chinn (2009), a multiculturally competent supervisor for ELL supervisees is one who works with or on behalf of ELL supervisees, or within the broader social system, to provide supervision that attends to ELL supervisees’ needs. This study allowed FLES supervisors to explore their multicultural training needs for working with or working on behalf of ELL supervisees within supervision.

Although empirical studies on supervisor multicultural training is scant, multiple empirical studies exist to support the belief that supervisors need multicultural training to work with linguistically diverse supervisees (Constantine & Sue, 2007; Gatmon et al.,
perceived racial microaggressions by White supervisors were explored through a qualitative analysis of 10 Black doctoral supervisees. The result indicated that the impact of racial microaggressions was destructive to Black supervisees, the supervisory relationship, and, indirectly, to clients of color. Gatmon et al. (2001) dwelled into the pre-doctoral psychology interns' perceptions about cultural discussions in supervision, the supervisory working alliance, and satisfaction with supervision. Gatmon et al. established that interns who discussed similarities and differences about their ethnicity admitted that they formed a higher supervisory alliance with their supervisors. More specifically, they also discovered that supervisory alliance was linked with both the frequency and depth of discussions, feeling protected and satisfied with discussions, and an integration of cultural variables in internship training. Participants were aware that cultural discussions contributed to professional growth, validation, and increased safety and trust. Lawless, Gale, and Bacigalupe (2001) investigated dialogues on race, ethnicity, and culture in supervision through the use of conversation analysis. Lawless et al. (2001) indicated that cultural discussions normally do not have a clear beginning and also a specific order. Instead of creating an agenda for cultural discussions, Lawless et al. (2001) proposed that allowing cultural discussions in supervision to occur organically may be more helpful for supervisees, where they may feel less demoralized, thereby more keen to examine issues related to diversity. These studies may indicate that training supervisors to be able to
implement linguistically responsive conversations to be part of natural fabric in supervision is crucial.

According to Nelson, Oliver, and Capps (2006), supervisors' perception of their supervision training may be a critical factor towards becoming competent supervisors because they respond to a particular situation based on their perceptions. Nelson, Oliver, and Capps (2006) explored the perceptions of 13 doctoral students on their supervision training experiences. Six major themes were evolved: learning, supervisee growth, individual uniqueness, reflection, connections, and putting it all together. While the Nelson et al. study did examine supervisor perceptions of training needs, it did not specifically investigate multicultural issues. Interestingly, this study also found that supervisors-in-training all in all reported that they saw “people as people” and preferred to focus on the individual differences rather than cultural differences such as ethnicity or race in the supervisory process. This result may indicate that supervisor multicultural training is not successfully included in the supervisor training experiences.

Based on the HMNID multicultural supervision model presented by Ancis and Ladany (2010), supervisors and supervisees progress through stages of thoughts and feelings towards their own cultural identity and behaviors. The developmental stages include adaptation, incongruence, exploration, and integration. Since those participants in the study presented by Nelson, Oliver, and Capps (2006) do not consider cultural differences, they may be at the level of adaptation in which individuals have minimal
awareness of oppression, according to the HMNID model (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). The lack of attention to culture by supervisors in the Nelson study would appear to further validate the need to explore this important issue.

Additionally, DeKruyf and Pehrsson (2011) studied school counseling site supervisors regarding the amount of time spent in supervision training and their supervisory self-efficacy. The result indicated that a slightly positive relationship was noted between the hours of supervision training and perceived self-efficacy regarding supervision. This study suggested that more training in supervision (40 hours) predicts a consistently higher sense of supervisor self-efficacy than less training (fewer than 40 hours) predicts. However, this study just focused on supervisor training and self-efficacy in general but did not focus on multicultural supervisor training and multicultural competence specifically. The results did not include an analysis of the multicultural training supervisors received and how supervisors perceived their multicultural competence for working with culturally diverse supervisees. The current grounded theory study examined how FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding multicultural competence in working with ELL supervisees. This study allowed FLES supervisors to further reflect upon their training needs in the realms of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in order to effectively respond to linguistic differences within supervision.
Researchers have also looked into supervisors’ perceptions of the supervisory training they receive and the training that they believe they need (Crook-Lyon, Presnell, Silva, Suyama, & Stickney, 2011; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006); however, there is still a dearth of literature that analyzes supervisors’ perception of multicultural supervisor training experiences and needs with regards to ELL supervisees. Additionally, Ladany and Muse-Burke (2001) indicated that one reason for carrying out supervision research is to have a better understanding of the supervision process. This dissertation study developed out of a perceived need to fill a gap in the literature in understanding the process of becoming a multiculturally competent supervisor from the point of view of doctoral students and faculty members who are currently providing clinical supervision. This study furthered the research on supervisors’ perceptions of multicultural training they receive and believe they need in order to effectively work with ELL supervisees.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided a summary of the literature regarding multicultural supervision. Topics identified have included multicultural competence, multicultural competence in supervision, supervisor training, English language learners in related fields, and multicultural competence with ELL supervisees.

The acknowledgement that supervisors respond to a particular situation based on how they perceive it supports the premise that supervisors’ perception of supervisor
training may be an important factor in successful supervisory training (Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006). Several researchers have affirmed the importance of supervisors’ perception and have offered recognition of supervisors’ perception of training they receive (Crook-Lyon, Presnell, Silva, Suyama, & Stickney, 2011; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006). However, no known studies have offered a comprehensive understanding of supervisors’ multicultural training needs in general or specifically with regards to linguistic differences.

The purpose of this study was to assess FLES supervisors’ perceptions of training needs for working with ELL supervisees. Specifically, these training needs refer to multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills when working with ELL supervisees. The next chapter will provide details regarding the method of inquiry, protection of human subjects, data collection, transcription and analysis and methods of evaluating rigor.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examined FLES supervisors' perception of their training needs for effectively supervising ELL counselors in training. This was done in an attempt to determine what multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills - if any - FLES supervisors may need from the training programs. The research methodology incorporated a grounded theory approach seeking ways to identify and analyze FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs in the domains of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. The theory generated by data may be used to inform the training for FLES supervisors to respond to linguistic differences.

Rationale for Using Qualitative Methodology

It is deemed appropriate to utilize a qualitative approach to this study due to (a) the lack of previous research on this topic; (b) the specific questions of interest (e.g. the central question of this study was, how do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees?); (c) the need for theory development; and (d) my developing constructivist worldview. This research was crafted within a constructivist paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 2001) and used grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2011; Glaser & Strauss, 1967, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 2008).
Brief Description of Grounded Theory

The methodology established as grounded theory (GT) was first developed by Glaser and Strauss who worked together in 1967 to compose *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Glaser and Strauss built upon their perspectives from a number of educational and theoretical backgrounds. Strauss received influence from interactionism and pragmatism through the University of Chicago’s tradition of qualitative research, and Glaser was influenced by the empirical roots he found at Columbia University. Despite the clash of worldviews, Glaser and Strauss collaborated to blend flexibility and structure cohesively into the GT methodology (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Through GT, researchers have the objective to produce substantive theory steeped in the data, instead of in a preconceived theory (unless the goal is to extend the pre-existing theory; Strauss & Corbin, 2008).

In brief, some of the hallmarks of GT include a constant comparative method of data analysis, two specific levels of coding, and theoretical sampling. These features will be revisited more explicitly in the next paragraphs.

In a constant comparative method, data are examined in a non-linear process at all stages from data collection through both analysis and interpretation. This may comprise of comparisons drawn within and across participants, points in time, incidents, and categories (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006).

The coding levels in GT include the initial and focused coding; these entail the
process of breaking the data into pieces (initial coding) and building and clarifying a
category by checking on all the data covered and its variations (focused coding) to inform
the theory (Charmaz, 1983). Theoretical sampling is about compiling new data and going
back to the data (which may include participants, scenes, events, or documents) for the
purpose of refining the emerging theory (Charmaz, 2011; Charmaz, 2012; Jones et al.,
2006).

The work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) was thought to be revolutionary due to the
fact that they defied the conception that qualitative research suffers from insufficiently
rigorous methods and systematic processes, connected data collection and data analysis
stages of research, showed the capacity of qualitative research to create a theory, and
bridged the existing gaps between theory and research (Charmaz, 2000). However, the
wide-range of perspectives between the researchers broadened with time and the
developing nature of the GT methodology. Their differences propelled both to launch
into differing research paths - Strauss eventually joining Corbin to define GT procedures
more clearly (Strauss & Corbin, 2008), and Glaser (1992) becoming critical of what he
interpreted as the prescriptive nature of Strauss and Corbin’s approach. Despite their
opposing perspectives, the work of Glaser, Strauss, and Corbin have been viewed by
Charmaz (2000) as positivistic with “objectivist underpinnings” (p. 510), Glaser being on
the track of traditional positivism and Strauss and Corbin (2008) being more post-
positivist in their approach.
Charmaz (2009) proposed a constructivist approach to GT and contended that a constructivist approach to GT supports the need for flexibility in lieu of prescription, the importance of focusing on meaning to improve interpretability, and the possibility to employ GT methodology without adopting a positivist worldview. Charmaz (2011) seems to assume that the interaction between the researcher and participants builds the data and the meanings identified by the researcher. A constructivist frame for the GT methodology is seen compatible with this study. For one, as an ELL supervisee who participated in the supervision process, I feel my own learning process was mutually constructed with my supervisors. As a supervisor who provided supervision for supervisees, I feel that knowledge was mutually constructed through our experiences. Together, we are constantly reflecting on and constructing meanings from all of these experiences.

In the current study, interviews with FLES supervisors were analyzed to develop a theory that explains supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs related to the multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees. Using this approach, the study included a narrative describing the cultural concepts and categories of a general background on the participants (including data on nationality, gender, and age), as well as multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. The research conclusions attempted to “construct interpretive narratives from their data and try to capture the complexity of the phenomenon under study,” as is required of
effective qualitative researchers (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 103).

**Researchable Problem**

According to Strauss and Corbin (2008), multiple sources of researchable problems exist to inform topic selection including requesting suggestions, following up on professional or collegial remarks, personal and professional experiences, and literature reviews. Additionally, Gay and Airasian (2008) opined that topic selection should lead to new understanding of important aspects of a topic. My personal and professional experiences with language differences and multicultural supervision as well as the lack of the research in this area served as the impetus for choosing this research problem. This study could be significant to counselor educator and supervision programs because it focused on training supervisors in being culturally responsive to supervising ELL supervisees.

**Research Question**

Since the purpose of this research was to examine FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs regarding multicultural competence in working with ELL supervisees, the central question of this study was the following: How do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? The sub-questions were (1) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (2) What are FLES
supervisors' perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (3) What are FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees?

I defined multicultural competence as consisting of three interrelated areas including multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills because this appeared to be the conceptualization well accepted in the multicultural competence literature (ACA, 2005; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). However, I did not assume that participants' perceptions regarding multicultural training needs would be categorized only as multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills. For example, aspects of the six domains of multicultural supervision competence proposed by Ancis and Ladany (2010) were also indicated by participants. In order to explore and include supervisors' diverse perceptions of their multicultural training needs, the interview questions not only focused on multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills but also addressed more general and open questions.

Role of the Researcher

The role that the researcher plays in a constructivist GT study is reflexive and interactive. By working with a reflexive grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006), the researcher is aware of the fact that the data analysis and conclusions are both
interpretations flavored by the researcher's perspectives. Constructivist GT theory also recognizes the interactive nature of researchers and participants (Charmaz, 2009; Charmaz, 2011). Charmaz (2009) referred to the researcher as a "variable in the research process itself" (p. 128). As a qualitative researcher involved in my first constructivist GT study, I wanted to stay attached to the data and to approach this study with sufficient amount of structure (Fassinger, 2005). On the other hand, I struggled with the conflict to stay true to the constructivist approach that has molded this study from the beginning, and to let the core story and developing theory emerge from the interactive constructions between myself and the participants. Although Strauss and Corbin (2008) provided a structured approach to GT research, guidelines like this may be considered "didactic and prescriptive rather than emergent and interactive" (Charmaz, 2000, p. 524). Charmaz (2000) mentioned that "by taking GT methods as prescriptive scientific rules" we risk moving towards objectivism and positivism, and thereby risk abandoning the role of context as a fraction of the research process (p. 524).

In order to find a balance between structure and flexibility, Strauss and Corbin (2008) are referred to for clear guidance on how analytic processes can be approached systematically, but I purposefully compared their approach with that from Charmaz (2006), making me able to step out of an inflexible, procedural box. The need to find a balanced approach to GT methodology is not uncommon. For example, Fassinger (2005) stated that "the extent to which GT researchers actually use all aspects of axial coding as
outlined by Strauss and Corbin is variable” (p. 161), and although she adheres with Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) procedures, she does not rigidly do so to every structure. Creswell (2007) noted that some aspects of Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) process (e.g., the conditional/consequential matrix) are scarce in GT research, especially research conducted within a constructivist frame. Strauss and Corbin themselves stated that “it would be unrealistic to assume or even suggest that researchers will use every procedure described in this book” and that their methods provide a “smorgasbord table from which [researchers] can choose, reject, and ignore according to their own ‘tastes’” (1998, pp. 8-9).

Researcher Assumptions and Biases

In this study, I engaged in the role of researcher. Given that I am also an English language learner, several resulting biases need to be acknowledged. Let me first briefly describe my own experiences.

To begin with, I need to acknowledge my own background in supervision: I had been supervised in Taiwan for more than six years and I also provided supervision for counselors-in-training in various universities in Taiwan. My supervisors and supervisees were all Chinese-Taiwanese and we spoke Mandarin Chinese, which is my first language. I did not have formal supervision training until I took Introduction to Supervision and Advanced Supervision in the Counseling Ph.D. program at my university. I have provided supervision for FLES counselors for two years and I have been supervised by
FLES supervisors for two years. English is the first language for each of my supervisors and most of my supervisees but it is my third language.

Since I arrived in the United States, I have encountered difficulties in supervision when I addressed language barriers with my supervisors. My supervisors have tried to encourage me and empower me. However, I perceived their well-intended attempts to encourage me by telling me I am doing well with English as minimizing the difficulties I was having. In short, my particular background impacted my lens of supervision; this study would not have looked the same if the researcher had a background that differed from my own.

I readily acknowledge that I began the research process with the belief that FLES supervisors are not adequately prepared to work with ELL supervisees and the preconception that helping ELL supervisees successfully navigate linguistic differences is an important part of supervision. In this study, I not only viewed linguistic differences as potential barriers that prevent counselors and supervisors from mutual understanding and accomplishing the goals and duties of supervision, but also viewed linguistic differences as potential opportunities for counselors and supervisors to share diverse frames of reference. This may be considered a bias because even though language differences can affect the process and outcome of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004), supervisors’ training needs for effectively supervising
ELL supervisees have not yet been documented. My understanding was inexorably tied to my developmental growth as an ELL supervisee. That is exactly why this study was approached from a constructivist frame - we constructed meaning through our work together via processes that are not yet adequately understood.

I expected my biases to affect the research questions and interpretation of the results. For example, at the time of the interviews, I am simultaneously an English language learner and a supervisee and a supervisor-in-training. I have not spoken English as my first language, and thus I may be more likely to identify with supervisees whom are supervised by FLES supervisors in the interview process. Therefore, I utilized various methods to increase researcher sensitivity in order to keep my biases "in check."

**Researcher Sensitivity**

The reflexive nature of constructivist GT actively places the researcher directly within the research process (Charmaz, 2008b; Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008). According to Charmaz (2008b), the researcher is immersed within the research process rather than staying keeping distant from the process. As noted by Demerath (2006), “qualitative researchers...often...have to actively give up control if they are truly going to get close to the local or emic point of view” (p. 102). I surrendered the traditional definitions of objectivity (which is in line with the constructivist approach that frames this study) as a substitute for a deeper understanding of a dynamic process. By doing so, I might best represent the voices and experiences of myself and the participants, as along
with the meaning that we created together.

In qualitative research, the primary goal is to take a close look at the research beliefs and judgments (Glesne, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Thus, I put aside the traditional definitions of objectivity and adopted researcher sensitivity. Strauss and Corbin (2008) further made their comment on this, “Sensitivity is required to perceive the subtle nuances and meanings in data and to recognize the connections between concepts” (p. 32). Sensitivity marks itself as a researcher’s ability to stay open and conscious of details and meanings emerging from the data. Previous readings and experiences relevant to the area being investigated could induce such sensitivity. I drew upon the extensive reading I have done on multicultural supervision and English language learners as well as my experiences as an ELL supervisee and a supervisor to remain open and sensitive to participants’ perceptions and responses. Also, I placed myself inside the data in a way that embedded the narrative of the participants in the final research outcome.

In addition to stating my bias at the onset of this investigation, I adopted the strategies which included keeping a reflexive journal, use of research team and an independent auditor, and member checking in order to keep my sensitivity grounded from the beginning to the end of this study.

**Reflexive Journal**

Spall (1998) viewed the reflexive journal as a record of the researcher’s perceptions and reactions throughout the data collection and analysis. Accordingly, I kept
a detailed journal comprised of ideas, activities, perceptions, critical events, and reactions pertaining to this study in any way possible. According to Charmaz (2011), I also included raw data in the reflexive journal and this strategy has to be continued, as the journal became more complicated and analytical in order to sustain the presence of the participants' voices and meaning in the theoretical outcome. Charmaz (2006) highlighted the importance of a reflexive standpoint that provides information on how the researcher carries out the research, in relation to the participants, and how their voices are presented in the study.

**Research Team**

The researcher can assemble a culturally diverse research team and elicit their feedback during the analysis, interpretation, and validation phases (Green et al., 2007). To help minimize researcher bias, I assembled a culturally diverse research team of three other persons. The members of the research team were recruited from among the doctoral students in Counselor Education and Supervision program at Old Dominion University who have taken the class in qualitative research methods required by the program. One is 31 year-old female who identifies herself as Caucasian/Hispanic American. She is a Licensed Associate Counselor (New Jersey), National Certified Counselor (NCC), and Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS). She has received 30 hours of supervision training and has provided supervision for 2 years and 4 months. Currently, she is not providing supervision but previously she provided supervision 5 hours a week. She speaks
American English as her first language with limited Spanish proficiency. Another is 39 year-old male who identifies himself as African American. He is a National Certified Counselor (NCC). He has received 64 hours of supervision training and has provided supervision for 2 years. Currently, he is not providing supervision but previously he provided supervision 5 hours a week. He speaks American English as his first language but does not speak a second language. He can read Hebrew and Greek though. The other is 47 year-old female who identifies herself as White American. Her National Certified Counselor (NCC) application is in progress. She has received 90 hours of supervision training and has provided supervision for 3 years. Currently, she is providing supervision 3 hours a week. She speaks American English as her first language and she is also very familiar with British and Asian forms of English. She has learned French since age 5 and she is mostly fluent in speaking and reading French. She has also learned German since age 13 and has beyond basic proficiency in German. She is not fluent in speaking German but can read it with occasional dictionary use.

Each of them were oriented to the study and trained to perform the tasks requested of them through a completion of a descriptive data questionnaire (See Appendix A), a review of the dissertation proposal, a detailed review of their responsibilities, and an exploration of perspectives and/or biases regarding the dissertation topic. I gathered descriptive data from the research team members through emailing each member descriptive data questionnaire in order to understand their background and perspectives in
a social context. In addition, I went over the coding process and we practiced by coding a small written passage to verify that the research team and I were approaching the task in the same fashion. The research team training took place at Old Dominion University and/or via Skype.

The members of the research team did not take any part in the data collection process or interview transcription. They offered feedback on the development and revision of the interview protocols. They also individually conducted line-by-line coding of all responses from participants involved in the first round interview. The research team met with me for consensus coding based upon items that each research team member constructed. Additionally, they conducted focused coding individually and met with me in order to complete the consensus coding regarding the codes developed from this stage of data analysis. For coding the second round interview, the research team employed the same procedure as that in the first round interview. Finally, the research team helped remind each member of individual biases, which increased trustworthiness.

**Independent Auditor**

Another strategy that was adopted is to invite an independent auditor to review the collection of evidence used throughout the research process (Hays & Singh, 2012). The independent auditor appointed is a faculty member in the Counselor Education and Supervision program (but not a member of the dissertation committee) who has finished a class in qualitative research methods. This independent auditor reviewed the data to
identify themes and categories independent of the research team and my decisions in order to validate that the results were grounded within the data.

I gathered descriptive data from the independent auditor through emailing him descriptive data questionnaire in order to understand his background and perspectives in a social context. The independent auditor is 29 year-old male who identifies himself as Caucasian American. He is a Licensed Professional Counselor (Illinois) and National Certified Counselor (NCC). He has received 60 credit hours of supervision training and has provided supervision for almost 4 years. He provides supervision 3 hours a week. English is his first language and he is excellent in using it orally and in writing. He took French during middle school and high school, but he does not remember much of it and can barely say anything in French. He can understand a small portion of French in writing and while listening. He also can recognize a few common phrases and words in Spanish when spoken and in writing. However, he thinks to say he really knows anything about the language is a stretch.

Member Checking

Member checking entails sharing interview summaries, analytical thoughts, and interpretations with participants in this study to ensure that their ideas are correctly represented (Glesne, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 2008). Using member checking, participants seized the opportunity to clarify their experiences and pinpoint any misinterpretations with regards to their perceptions and experiences.
I scheduled a follow-up interview after the coding of the first round interviews was completed. The follow-up interview is a form of member checking to verify the accuracy of the themes constructed by the research team and me and to ask follow-up and clarifying questions. All 10 participants were able to participate in the follow-up interview.

**Research Plan**

In order to investigate how FLES supervisors perceive their training needs for working with ELL supervisees, constructivist GT procedures were used. Before this study began, I obtained approval to pursue this investigation from the dissertation committee. A formal protocol that outlined the proposed investigation was submitted to the Human Subjects Committee at Old Dominion University and permission was requested to conduct the study as exempt from review by the university Institutional Research Board (IRB). Once granted approval, I began the proposed study by selecting potential participants.

**Sampling Procedures**

The need for sampling specific data sources continued until each category was saturated to make way for concepts and categories to emerge in the data analysis stage (Cutcliff, 2000; Higginbottom, 2004). A purposeful sampling technique was employed to recruit participants for this study. Purposeful sampling was viewed as the measure of selecting participants for a certain reason in order to develop the emergent theory
(Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Charmaz, 2006). Since the purpose of the current study was to develop a theory that explains supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs related to multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in working with ELL supervisees, participants included individuals who were currently providing clinical supervision to counselors.

Cutcliff (2000) suggested that the selection of participants is an essential part of the emerging hypothesis/hypotheses and the sample size is a function in theoretical completeness. Theoretical sampling steered the recruitment of participants in this study and the process was governed by the emerging theory. Therefore, the actual sample size and selection were reliant on the point at which theoretical saturation took place.

I stopped data collection when there were no new properties of the theoretical themes emerged. I ended up having 10 participants. The process involved constant comparison and involved spending a significant amount of time placing myself within the data: re-reading transcripts and memos, re-listening to audiotapes, writing new memos, and discussing with research team members. The research team and I went through the initial codes and we saturated the properties of the theoretical theme.

**Specific Participant Selection Procedures**

The purpose of the study was to explore FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs for working with ELL supervisees. The first criterion for participant selection was that supervisors who identify themselves as first language English-speaking
speakers. The second criterion for participant selection was that supervisors who are currently providing clinical supervision in CACREP accredited programs. Participants consisted of FLES doctoral students and faculty members who were providing clinical supervision in CACREP programs. Doctoral students and faculty members in CACREP accredited programs were selected because CACREP (2009) has required that counselor education programs provide formal instruction in clinical supervision and multicultural education for students. Individuals who both had and had not actually provided clinical supervision to an ELL supervisee were chosen because they might have differing perspectives. The results of the current study could inform counselor education programs about a range of supervisors’ perspectives on this topic. Participants who had received supervisor multicultural training in class but had not experienced applying this knowledge into their work with ELL supervisees might think of specific training needs. Participants who had had experience working with ELL supervisees might also have perceptions about specific training needs that were informed by their experiences.

The results of the current study could inform counselor education programs of supervisors’ training needs. In addition, the data might inform counselor educators of content and process to be infused in supervisor multicultural training regarding working with ELL supervisees, bridging the gap between knowledge and practice.

After participants agreed to take part in this study, the schedule for an initial individual interview with each participant was arranged. Prior to the initial interview, I
discussed the possible risks and benefits of participating in this study and made a request that participants read and sign an informed consent form (see Appendix B).

**Gaining Entry**

Before participants were selected, gaining access to research or archival sites by seeking the approval of gatekeepers was necessary (Creswell, 2007). Thus, I contacted doctoral level supervision course instructors or clinical coordinators and department chairs in CACREP programs at the selected 64 universities to identify participants and obtain email addresses for potential participants. About half of the 64 universities were selected based on the network of the researcher, the committee chair, and one of the committee members; about other half of the 64 universities were selected randomly according to the CACREP website. An instruction letter (See Appendix C) was submitted to supervision course instructors or clinical coordinators and department chairs, asking them to send the instruction letter to potential participants.

**Measures to Ensure Participant Confidentiality and Safety**

To make sure that confidentiality was intact, pseudonyms were used to conceal the identity of the participants. Moreover, pseudonyms were applied to all notes, audiotapes interviews, and transcripts. As the data collection and analysis were complete, participants were updated on the study progress and they were offered a full report of the results upon written request. The signed consent forms, audiotapes and any other materials related to this study would be stored in a secure and confidential lockbox. All
audiotapes would be destroyed five years after the study was completed. The signed consent forms and other documents pertinent to this study would also be destroyed five years after the completion of this study. Furthermore, the identity of all participants was protected as their names were all in pseudonyms.

**Discussion of IRB Application and Review**

An exemption from review by the Old Dominion University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was requested from the Darden College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee and was obtained prior to conducting the study. All participants then completed an informed consent form prior to participating in the research study and were able to withdraw from the research study at any time without consequence. I have completed human subjects training and I transcribed all audio tapes of interviews.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection procedures used in this study included: (a) descriptive data questionnaire; (b) first round interviews; and (c) second round interviews.

**Descriptive Data Questionnaire**

Before conducting the first round interview, I gathered descriptive data from participants through emailing each participant a descriptive data questionnaire (See Appendix A). Participants were instructed to complete a descriptive questionnaire consisting of questions such as: race/ethnicity, gender, identity in a CACREP program (doctoral student or faculty member), number of years providing supervision, number of
years providing supervision for supervisees in a CACREP program, languages, and languages in order of acquisition. After completing the questionnaire, each participant was instructed to email it back to me. This questionnaire helped identify some of the supervisory experiences and the characteristics of each participant.

**Interviews**

The purpose of the interviews was to target and explore participants’ perceptions of the concepts and categories identified in the study. Following a constructivist GT approach, the questions and topics were re-examined by the researcher after the primary data analysis of the first two interviews. Based on the first two interviews, it was determined that the questions in my interview protocol were appropriate enough to engage the participants to generate rich data. In order to accurately capture the rich answers of the participants and the meanings they ascribed to their experiences, I conducted individual semi-structured interviews that lasted approximately 25-40 minutes in length. The interviews were conducted face-to-face or via Skype and were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The initial interview protocol consisted of 10 questions, but allowed for follow-up questions (see Appendix D).

To allow for follow up and exploration of emergent themes from the data analysis of the first round interviews, the second round interviews were conducted. The main content of the second round interview consisted of comments, discussion, and questions about the first round interview we had had together. The second interview protocol consisted of
two questions (see Appendix E). The second round interviews lasted approximately 10-25 minutes in length.

After the consensus themes were constructed, I emailed each participant the structure of superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes and the figure of the emergent theory. Then I scheduled a follow-up interview in person or on Skype or by phone with each participant to perform member checks in order to confirm the accuracy of the information gathered and the themes interpreted.

I was able to speak with all 10 participants. Two interviews were conducted face-to-face, one interview was conducted via Skype, and seven interviews were conducted by phone. I started with discussing the superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes constructed by the research team and me. I asked if the participants agreed with the interpretation and if they would make any changes. All participants agreed with the superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes even if they did not discuss all the themes during their interview. Several participants offered examples and elaborations during this process. For example, when I spoke with one participant who said he applied what he learned from ELL supervisees to the supervision with FLES supervisees, he gave me an example of this application. Another participant mentioned that he also would like to highlight languages are not semantically equivalent although he did not talk about it during the first round interview.

All of the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The possible benefit of
transcribing these recordings myself was that it involved close observation of data by means of doing careful listening repetitiously and this was an important first step in the data analysis (Bailey, 2008).

**Data Analysis**

This section describes the data analysis procedures that the research team and I adopted in this study. Many contemporary grounded theorists perceive data analysis as a constructive process (Charmaz, 2008a). GT inductively builds a substantive theory by coding individual actions and events to form conceptual categories that further lead to theory development (Harry, Sturges, & Klingner, 2005).

Data analysis in the grounded theory emerges in four phases (a) qualitative coding, (b) memo-writing, (c) theoretical sampling, and (d) theory reconstruction (Charmaz, 2006). Coding breaks the data up into components or properties and it defines the actions that are in support of the data (Charmaz, 2012). Memo-writing enables the researcher to contemplate, question, and explain what the researcher sees as happening in the data (Charmaz, 2012). Through theoretical sampling, the researcher compiles data to develop and refine theoretical categories until no new properties of categories emerge (Thornberg & Charmaz, 2011). Finally, theory reconstruction synthesized the categories developed in the previous phases to explain the data gathered (Charmaz, 2006). This study executed the initial line-by-line coding and focused coding and theoretical sampling procedures to look into relationships among ideas in order to generate connections of ideas and
concepts with the development of the theory embedded in the data.

**Qualitative coding.** Qualitative coding is perceived as the process of defining the data and it stands as the first step in data analysis (Charmaz, 2006). The researcher goes beyond concrete statements to the interpretive analysis of the data by sub-dividing the data into segments, naming them in brief terms, and ascribing an analytic handle to develop abstract ideas used to construe each data segment. To put in other words, the researcher breaks up the data into smaller segments and names the segments with simpler terms; in turn, that term will be used to analyze that segment. Coding describes what is happening and why it takes place and relates the data collection with a theory development that explains the data (Charmaz, 2006).

GT coding is naturally inductive, comparative, interactive, iterative, and deductive (Charmaz, 2012). Charmaz (2006) stated earlier that GT coding is noted in at least two phases (a) an initial phase where the researcher names each word, line, or segment; and (b) a focused, more selective phase where the researcher sorts, synthesizes, and organizes large amounts of data using the most remarkable or frequent initial codes. For the purpose of this study, initial line-by-line coding and focused coding were employed.

**Initial line-by-line coding.** At the initial phase, researchers will read the data carefully and remain exposed to potential theoretical directions according to the manner in which the data are read (Charmaz, 1983; Charmaz, 2006). Charmaz (2012) proposed further that GT coding involves a close coding of statements, actions, events, and
documents. Grounded theorists may perform the coding line by-line, paragraph-by-paragraph, incident-by-incident, or story-by-story. Charmaz (2012) then suggested line-by-line coding for interview data. This type of coding requires each line of data to be labeled (Charmaz, 2006; Charmaz, 2012).

In this study, line-by-line coding was useful to help me engage with the data and start conceptualizing the data (Charmaz, 2006; Charmaz, 2012). The research team and I were involved in semi-structured research team meetings to employ consensus coding and simultaneous data collection and analysis, which enhanced trustworthiness (Hays & Singh, 2012). As the initial line-by-line coding phase took place, each member of the research team was given copies of the first three interview transcripts and they were individually engaged in initial line-by-line coding. We then met after the third interview to further engage in consensus coding. Then two research member were given copies of three more interview transcripts and another was given a copy of one more interview and each of us engaged in initial line-by-line coding. I met with each of them after they finished their coding. Then all research team members and I met after the tenth interview to start the consensus coding. Once consensus was reached, the research team members and I engaged in constant comparison, where the codes found in each subsequent set of interviews were compared to those found in the first set. Once saturation was achieved, the research team and I created a codebook collaboratively. Next, we moved on to focused coding.
**Focused coding.** During this phase, researchers will take the codes developed from the initial phase and apply them to a great amount of data (Charmaz, 1983; Charmaz, 2006). Focused coding propels the researcher to develop categories rather than merely labeling topics (Charmaz, 1983). According to Charmaz (1983), categories may be obtained either from the participants’ natural language or from the researcher’s analytic tendency. Focused codes stem from constant comparison, and by comparing the data with these codes, it helps to refine the codes (Charmaz, 2006). Having developed the set of focused codes, the researcher may make use of the knowledge of the literature to clarify and alter the codes and to sensitize themselves to ways in which the emerging analysis can be explored (Charmaz, 1983).

During focused coding, the research team and I refined individually the initial codes and started to conduct data synthesis. The research team and I then met and collectively performed the consensus coding to refine the codebooks. Codebooks are a set of codes, definitions, and examples used as a guide to help delve into the data. The process of developing codebooks may involve continuous revision of definitions as the research team and I have clearer understanding of the data (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2011). Data-driven codes were used to construct the codebook for this study (Boyatzis, 1998). Boyatzis (1998) indicated that data-driven codes involve five steps to create codes for a codebook in an inductive manner: (1) lessen the amount of raw information; (2) identify sub-sample themes; (3) compare themes across sub-samples; (4)
create codes; and (5) ascertain the reliability of codes. The first step in developing data-driven codes was to decide on how raw information can be reduced into smaller units, like categories or themes. Line-by-line coding was employed in this work. The process that was followed in developing the data-driven codes entailed identifying themes within sub-samples. The team members and I identified themes from various interviews. Then the research team and I utilized the information gained through identifying and comparing participants' interviews to establish a way to capture their perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. Through this process, we determined if any code required expansion or whether or not a new code had to be formed. The final step adopted in developing these data-driven codes lied in determining the reliability of the codes in order to start the analysis process. We were aware of our starting points and the shifting positions that we assumed as this study moved from one stage to another. By making constant comparison, the research team and I revisited the data collected to further refine the codes. I took part as well in member checking to ensure that the research team and I captured the meaning conveyed by the participants in the interview.

In order to discover relationships between categories developed during focused coding, the research team and I met and tried to connect the focused codes. We utilized consensus coding to convert the focus codes into larger, more substantive theoretical codes that led to theoretical development. The research team and I worked together in
finalizing the codebooks, while making constant comparison with the data taken from the interviews to ensure that the final codebooks contained the meaning that the participants intended to deliver in the data collections. For better refinement of the codes, I engaged in memo-writing throughout the coding process.

**Memo-writing.** To write memos, researchers need to elaborate and probe into their ideas with regards to the data and the coded categories (Charmaz, 2006; Charmaz, 2012). Memo-writing is an important step in grounded theory analysis because it links the analytic framework that coding provides with the ideas that are advanced in writing the first draft of the analysis (Charmaz, 1983). According to Charmaz (1983), memo-writing starts from the first interview and then works throughout the research process. Memos record the researcher’s thoughts, capture the comparisons drawn and the connections made, and crystalize questions and direction for the research to continue. Writing memos makes room for the researcher to place questions developed during coding process into the analytic context (Charmaz, 1983).

For the purpose of this study, I employed memo-writing throughout the research process. The early memos shaped the aspects of the data collection that took place and enabled me to make an initial assessment about which ideas could be expanded. I evaluated the codes that best represented my observations in the data. Using the memos, the research team and I applied these codes to conceptual categories for developing the analytic framework. Once these categories were established, any following codes were
handled as potential categories. Memo-writing provided sources to be compared with the materials gathered in the following steps and it directed data collection and coding. Consequently, I took a step back from data collection and initial coding to make my way to another conceptual step in the data analysis. For further refining the categories, the research team and I performed the theoretical sampling.

**Theoretical sampling.** According to Charmaz (2006), memo-writing is directly linked with theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling seeks to develop the emerging theory (Charmaz, 1983). As an inductive technique, theoretical sampling serves to be an example for the inductive logic of the GT approach (Charmaz, 1983). Theoretical sampling functions to develop the properties of the categories until we come to a point called saturation (i.e., no new properties emerge; Thornberg & Charmaz, 2011). The researcher saturates the properties of category, instead of the data, and afterwards sort and/or diagram the categories to bring together the emerging theory (Charmaz, 2012). There are several purposes of theoretical sampling and they are for the data collection to fill out, saturate, and exhaust the categories.

To engage in the theoretical sampling, the research team and I coded the data and compared these codes with one another and also looked into the initial codes and the emerging categories. I got more and more into composing conceptual memos as the research team and I continued making new comparisons, which began to be tailored to our categories. If the categories were not saturated, additional data might be collected
from previous or new participants. The adoption of theoretical sampling allowed us to build full and robust categories and defined clearly the relationships among categories.

The categories appeared to be saturated after seven interviews. Analysis of the final three interviews did not yield any new themes or subthemes. The research team and I embarked on the grounded theory sorting, which gave logic to the organization of our analysis and a method to create and refine the theoretical links. Thus, comparisons could be drawn between categories. The research team and I also made use of the Post-it® notes to diagram the categories, which provided a visual representation of the categories and the connections involved. These strategies helped in the refinement of the categories and further led to theory development.

**Theory development.** Interpretive theory encompasses imaginative understanding of the phenomenon under focus (Charmaz, 2006). Constructivist grounded theorists wish to explain how and why participants build meanings and actions in some given situations (Charmaz, 2006). The constructivist GT approach goes beyond exploring how participants see their situations (Charmaz, 2011). Constructivists try to answer the questions of how, when, and to what extent a studied experience is weaved into larger and hidden positions, networks, situations, and relationships (Charmaz, 2011). Theory development is about stopping the flow of the experience under investigation and segregating the experiences. In this study, the research team and I looked at the experiences from various perspectives, examined the context in which the participants
worked and tried to delve into their training needs, make comparisons, and construct ideas. Once we analyzed the data through coding, made connections with the data to forge relationships between the categories, the research team and I next constructed a theory grounded in the data and influenced by the perspectives of the research team to explicate how FLES supervisors make meanings of their training needs for effectively supervising ELL supervisees.

**Verification Procedures**

**Credibility**

Following Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Denzin (1978), credibility is based on how well the researcher’s representation of the data fits with the participants’ perspectives. Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Strauss and Corbin (1998) have made a list of some strategies that can be adopted to establish the credibility of the emerging findings. The strategies can be in the form of checking if the transcripts are accurate, prolonging the engagement, and member checking. The transcripts’ accuracy was checked by me against the tape recorded interview, and the transcribed information was compared to make sure the data were recorded word by word. Member checking is the stage when participants are asked for feedback on the emerging hypothesis to assess if the finding accurately and completely speaks for their experience. To fulfill this requirement, as the interviewing progressed, participants were asked specific questions about training needs. During the second round interviews, the participants were asked for feedback on the structure of
superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes and the figure of the emergent theory constructed by the research team and me. Also, the research team and I saturated the categories with data and then sorted the categories in order for the emerging theory to be integrated. In addition, an independent auditor reviewed the data to identify themes and categories and to validate that the results were embedded in the data. The decisions on categories were also evaluated by an independent auditor with regards to theoretical rationale and logic. Categories were required to achieve adequate saturation (i.e., no new properties emerge) to be regarded as theoretical (Charmaz, 2012).

An audit trail is another way where credibility can be established. Bowen (2009) proposed that an audit trail throughout the data analysis can improve the clarity of qualitative research. For this study, an independent auditor, who was asked to go through the audit trail that had been created, and I met on a regular basis during the data analysis. The independent auditor reviewed the theoretical ideas supported by the data. This auditor assisted in outlining the themes and categories in the data.

**Dependability**

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), dependability and credibility makes an important relationship where one cannot exist without the other. Dependability is obtained when research decisions can be referred back to the data and are documented with logic and reliability. This was assessed in an auditing process by a faculty member, other than my chair, who was given the transcripts and theoretical memos to ascertain if
my decisions were plausible and traceable back to the data. Moreover, I wrote and went through my own theoretical memos and reflective journal to evaluate bias that might occur during data analysis and theory development. It was important that the interpretations were derived from the data and from participants’ narrations.

**Transferability**

Transferability refers to the possible usefulness of the results and theory in elaborating on the underlying process identified in the substantive theory for a similar group of individuals (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). Theoretical sampling is required to obtain a varied, yet full, understanding of the process and increase the chance for transferability. In the GT, analytic generalizability contrary to statistical generalizability serves an indication of the usefulness of the results. It was set in the goal of this study that the results could be applicable to other studies with almost the same contexts. Constant comparisons across the data and theoretical sampling of data helped assure that the results were characterized by a sound theory, empirical basis, and a possibility that it is transferable (Glaser, 1998).

**Confirmability**

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), confirmability applies when the data and the interpretations that emerge out of the data are actually derived from the data and are not simply the outcome of researcher’s biased views. Methods used in this study which advocated confirmability were member checking, theoretical memos, and the reflection
journals, use of consensus coding and category construction by a research team, as well as an audit conducted by a faculty member other than my chair.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of GT and the methods that would be used to complete this GT study. After listing the research questions and examining researcher sensitivity, the protection of human subjects, data collection, transcription and analysis and methods of evaluating rigor were also described.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The aim of this qualitative study was to develop a theory which explained first language English-speaking supervisors' perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. Constructivist grounded theory was utilized in this effort to analyze the data gathered from 10 FLES supervisors. The results of this study may help inform the design of supervisor training in CACREP programs that prepares multiculturally competent counselor educators and supervisors.

The central research question that guided this inquiry was: How do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? The sub-questions were (1) What are FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (2) What are FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (3) What are FLES supervisors' perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? In remaining sections of this chapter, I will briefly review the data collection and analysis procedures, present descriptions of the participants, and the themes that emerged from the data.

Review of Data Collection and Analysis
I utilized the qualitative questionnaire and individual interviews guided by the protocol (Appendix D and Appendix E) with FLES supervisors as the methods for data collection. FLES supervisors answered questions about their professional, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds on the qualitative questionnaire before scheduling the first-round interview. During the first-round interview, participants and I had conversations pertaining to their perceptions of multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. Participants also further explained their responses to the qualitative questionnaire if needed. I interviewed 10 FLES supervisors individually first and then conducted follow-up interviews with each of them. I kept gathering data until no new properties of the categories constructed by the research team emerged (Thornberg & Charmaz, 2011) and stopped data collection when the categories in the data became repetitive.

The research team consisted of three counseling doctoral students. Each member of the research team was given copies of the first three interview transcripts and they individually engaged in initial line-by-line coding. We then met after the third interview to further engage in consensus coding. Then two research members were given copies of three more interview transcripts and another was given a copy of one more interview and each of us engaged in initial line-by-line coding. In this fashion, after all of us reviewing the first three transcripts, each additional transcript was analyzed by me and at least one other member of the research team. I met with each of them after they finished their
coding. Then all research team members and I met after the tenth interview for consensus coding based upon items that each research team member constructed. Once consensus was reached, the research team members and I engaged in constant comparison. Through constant comparison, the research team and I revisited the data collected to further refine the codes. Additionally, we conducted focused coding individually prior to meeting in order to complete the consensus coding regarding the codes developed from this stage of data analysis. For coding the second round interview, the research team and I followed the same procedure as that in the first round interview. The research team and I began memo writing and shared the memos with each other from the very start of this study. Memo-writing offered us time and space to interact with the data and codes in alternative perspectives. Finally, an independent auditor was provided with all raw and coded data, and emerging versions of codes and the theory. The auditor also was given early versions of this chapter and the next chapter, which outlined study findings. The independent auditor and I discussed concerns and insights and reviewed audit trail materials throughout the data analysis and interpretation process. As a qualitative researcher, I gained confidence in the interaction and interpretation of the data because I adopted the strategies of keeping a reflexive journal, use of a research team and an independent auditor, and member checking in order to keep my sensitivity grounded from the beginning to the end of this study.

However, the research team and I were also challenged because we had small
numbers of participants, consisting of 10 FLES supervisors. Considering the validity of qualitative research, as Silverman (1985) stated, a critical reader may be “forced to ponder whether the researcher has selected only those fragments of data which support his argument” (p. 140). A solution to this concern was to count the number of individual participants who mentioned a particular theme (Namey, Guest, Thairu, & Johnson, 2008; Silverman, 2011). Qualitative researchers were often expected to account for the validity of findings by reporting numbers. However, there were no absolute ways to determine the numbers of participants required to refer to a perspective for it to be validated (Pyett, 2003). Greenwood and Levin (2007) pointed out that individual cases have “immense power to alter theories” because viable theories cannot sustain exceptions and any individual case that contradicts a general social theory “thereby invalidates that theory and requires that a new theory be developed to take account of it” (p. 67). It seems to me that for an individual case, or a small number of cases, to provide insights represented reflexivity, which is important in constructivist grounded theory development.

For this study, I attempted to construct a theory that explains FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. The idea of this study was to be relevant both to theory-building and to participants’ perceptions in addressing their training needs. With this in mind, the research team and I choose the criteria of needing responses from at least two participants for a concept to be included as a theme or subtheme.
As the initial codes were explored further, congruent codes were selected to construct main themes. The main themes were examined to determine if they could be categorized into subthemes, which fit as subsets of the themes. The main themes were also examined to look for superordinate themes, which summarized clusters of main themes and subthemes. The data were interpreted as a hierarchy of three levels of themes including: superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

**Participant Professional, Cultural, and Linguistic Backgrounds**

The participants included 10 FLES supervisors. Table 1 displays the professional, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds for each of the participants. Pseudonyms are used in place of their actual names. Of the 10 participants, four were males and six were females. The four males all identified themselves as Caucasian American. Of the six females, two were African-American, one was Caucasian-American, one was Filipino-American, and two were Multiracial-American. The ages of the participants ranged from 28-44, with a mean age of 35.8 years old. The participants’ licenses and certifications included Licensed School Counselor (LSC), Nationally Certified Counselor (NCC), Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC), School Counseling Certification, Resident in Counseling for LPC, Licensed Professional Counselor Supervisor (LPC-S), Certified School Counselor (CSC), Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor (LCPC), Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS), Post Master’s Certificate in Marriage and Family Therapy, and Post Master’s Certificate in Clinical Community Counseling.
Regarding their work/educational status, eight of the participants were doctoral students and two were faculty members. The number of years they provided supervision ranged from 1-12. The number of years they provided supervision in a CACREP program also ranged from 1-12. There was variation in the type and length of supervision training for each participant. There were seven participants who could identify approximate number of hours of supervision training they received. The hours ranged from 50 to 300. Three participants could not specifically identify the number of hours of supervision training they received. However, one of them had one course in a master’s program, one course in a doctoral program, and several professional development workshops; another had two courses in a doctoral program and several professional development workshops; and the other took three graduate credit hours and had approximate 25 hours of supervision of supervision. Average number of hours of supervision they provided per week ranged from 1-12. The languages they speak, understand, or read, their perceptions of the level of fluency in each language, and their languages in order of acquisition also varied.

Table 1

*Participant Backgrounds and Relationship with the Researcher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>License/Certification</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Supervisory Experience</th>
<th>Supervisory Experience in a CACREP Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 001</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.5yr</td>
<td>1.5yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 002</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>LSC, NCC</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2.5yr</td>
<td>2.5yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 003</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NCC, LPC</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12yr</td>
<td>12yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 004</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Resident in Counseling for LPC, School Counseling Certification</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1.5yr</td>
<td>1.5yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 005</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>School Counseling K-12</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 006</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>LPC-S, NCC, CSC</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4yr</td>
<td>3yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 007</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NCC, Resident in Counseling for LPC</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5yr</td>
<td>4yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 008</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NCC, LCPC, LPC</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3yr</td>
<td>1.5yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 009</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2yr</td>
<td>2yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 010</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>LPC, ACS, Post Master's Certificate in Marriage and Family Therapy, Post Master's Certificate in Clinical Community Counseling</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4yr</td>
<td>3yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For the Race column: AA= African American, CA=Caucasian American, FA=Filipino American, MA=Multiracial American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Supervision Training</th>
<th>Average Hours of Supervision Per Week</th>
<th>Language Acquisition &amp; Perceptions of Fluency</th>
<th>Length of Relationship with Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 001</td>
<td>9 credit hours of coursework, roughly 75 hours of supervision</td>
<td>5hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), French (low reading comprehension and low conversational speaking/reading abilities), Spanish (Very low conversational/reading ability)</td>
<td>2yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 002</td>
<td>50hr</td>
<td>2hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), Spanish (not at all fluent, low reading comprehension and low conversational speaking/understanding abilities)</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>100hr</td>
<td>12hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), Spanish (understanding few words and phrases), German (understanding few words and phrases), French (understanding few words and phrases)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>66hr</td>
<td>6hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>90hr</td>
<td>3hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), French (ok in writing, understanding, speaking), Italian (poor in speaking, writing, understanding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), Spanish (speaking minimal Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>one course in a master's program, one course in a doctoral program, several professional development workshops</td>
<td>3 to licensure supervisees; one practicum class per week of 6 students</td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>2 courses, numerous professional workshops</td>
<td>1hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent), Tagalog (understand some, speak, a little), Spanish (understand little), Japanese (understand little)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>300hr</td>
<td>12hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met 2 times in professional conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>300hr</td>
<td>3hr</td>
<td>English (native language, fully fluent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>3 graduate credit hours, approximately 25 hours of supervision of supervision</td>
<td>2-4hr</td>
<td>English (first language, fluent in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding), Spanish (native language, advanced in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

In this section, three superordinate themes as well as five themes and 17 subthemes are explained and represented here with quotes from participants. The research
team and I determined that there were three superordinate themes including institutional level, professional collaboration, and supervisor competence. Table 2 provides an outline of the superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes of the theory with indications of how many participants endorsed a theme and/or a subtheme.

Table 2

Outline of the Superordinate Themes, Themes, and Subthemes and Level of Endorsement of Subthemes or Themes by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of participants endorsing theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Number of participants endorsing subtheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level</td>
<td>Institutional Change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Improve infusion of competence with ELL in the CACREP Standards</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance advocacy for ELLs in counseling programs and supervision training</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Collaboration</td>
<td>Enhanced collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Competence</td>
<td>Multicultural Awareness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences

Recognize probable similarities

Recognize power differential

Recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence

Understand languages are not semantically equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Competence</th>
<th>Multicultural Knowledge</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguish levels of acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of ELL cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Competence</th>
<th>Multicultural Skills</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Navigate dual language relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superordinate Theme One: Supervisor Training Needs Related to Institutional Level

This superordinate theme of supervisor training needs at the institutional level refers to supervisor training needs that involved the CACREP Standards, CACREP programs, and supervisor training. This superordinate theme included a theme and two subthemes that were discussed by participants. Figure 1 presents the theme and subthemes.
Institutional Change. All 10 participants spoke about institutional change. Institutional change refers to statements the participants made about their training needs that involved the CACREP Standards, CACREP programs, and supervisor training. There were two subthemes which included improve infusion of competence with ELL in the CACREP Standards and enhance advocacy for ELLs.

Improve infusion of competence with ELL in the CACREP Standards. Nine participants spoke about their training needs that involved the CACREP Standards. For example, participant 001 specifically talked about how he desires change at the institutional level. He stated,

Perhaps that takes change at the institutional level because that's a component of CACREP, that's not a requirement. Multiculturalism is and maybe somebody somewhere thinks that that's assumed, but it's not. Most of our textbooks on multiculturalism don't talk necessarily about English language supervision. It may touch upon English language clients but not really indepthly, in my opinion. So maybe infusing it even into the CACREP guidelines.

Participant 003 also stated,
I think that needs to be something that's acknowledged (by the CACREP standards), working with supervisees for whom English is not their first or primary language. I think that's a critical need.

Participant 004 acknowledged the lack of multicultural supervisor training regarding the work with ELL supervisees and desired amending the CACREP standards to include competence in working with ELLs. He stated,

I believe that it's definitely not covered in our training right now, so I think pointing it out as another area of just getting cultural competence is important.

Also, participant 008 said,

I think a training specifically speaking in addressing linguistics would be helpful and just the differences in what happens when ideas are translated. I just think it's really important and I think that we probably don't currently talk about it enough.

Participant 007 talked about her desire to include working with ELL supervisees as a supervisor training component and specifically talked about her need for a guideline or reminder. She said,

I think a protocol might be helpful... Maybe adding in there, if they're English language learners, these are some questions you should ask or
things to keep in mind. If they’re English language learners, I think that would be helpful—maybe, you know, just reminders.

Participant 008 talked about her supervisory experiences with ELL supervisees and the reason why she needs the supervisor training related to working with ELL supervisees. She stated,

I had supervisees that English was not their language tongue. I noticed that it did take certain additional steps for me to understand that there was a need to have more broaching conversations around the culture. I think sometimes if we don’t have specific trainings it can be mistaken that English language learners don’t have the same level of competency as people that might have English as their native tongue because some things are lost in translation.

Additionally, participant 003 not only recognized the importance of including competence in working with ELL supervisees in supervisor multicultural training but also became an advocate to encourage his colleagues to include ELL issues when teaching supervision class. He stated,

I’m interested in it so I do it and I try to get my colleagues to do it. But to make sure that we’re all doing it across all supervision training, I think, is really important.
Participant 005 talked about adding supervisor training related to working with ELL supervisees and stated,

I don’t know very many international counselor educators. I mean, when you graduate with them, that is one, but I think, like I said, there’s going to be more and more. I hope they don’t wait for you all to really get into the field of counselor education before they decide to do something about teaching everybody about English language learners. At that point, I don’t want to say it’s too late, it’s never too late but you want to do as much as you can while you can still do it. I really think that’s something that needs to be added to the curricula of CACREP programs, definitely.

This participant also would like to make competence with ELL supervisees a CACREP requirement.

I think this English language learner piece is missing. I think this is something that they (the CACREP Standards) really need to focus on and discuss and really see that here’s an area that we haven’t really talked about and what are we going to do for our field in terms of helping our counselors help English language learners? What are we going to do for our field in terms of getting English language learners in our field and teaching them—things like that? I think it’s an area that’s missing and yeah, I hope CACREP reads your study ‘cause they need it.
Enhance advocacy for ELLs in counseling programs and supervision training.

All 10 participants spoke about their training needs related to counseling programs and supervision training. For example, participant 003 talked about growing programs with international students and recruiting more ELLs to CACREP programs. He said,

I'm now Program Coordinator of our program here at [university name here] and so I'm excited for the opportunity to really grow our program internationally, to create more systems or structures to really support international students so that we can have these kinds of conversations and really expand what does it mean to be counseling.

Participant 003 also said that CACREP programs need to reflect the diverse populations of the U.S. He stated,

This may be a little provocative, but I'd even go so far as to say it's something that is critical for us to do so that we're living multiculturally rather than just writing about it or talking about it, that our programs reflect what that ethic is. I know for me and the program here we've started to look at recruiting specifically English language learners into our program.

This participant later talked about building a program where ELLs can not only survive but also thrive. He said, "setting up systems to support them throughout so that we can build a program where English language learners are not only excited to go, encouraged
to go, but will also thrive once they're here.” Participant 010, as a doctoral student, echoed the sentiments to build a more diverse program and stated,

I wish our program was, to be perfectly honest, more diverse so that I could have that experience… In regard to clinical supervision, what I think would be really exciting about that possibility, is you would really get a chance to be exposed to their cultural background and their lense of how they view working with clients. I think sometimes we miss out on that because we have such a homogenous population of students.

Participant 001 mentioned that ELLs may not be defined as a specific multicultural population but counselor educators and supervisors in CACREP programs need to initiate this discussion in order to keep supervisors-in-training informed of the ELL population. This participant said,

My guess is there's an awful lot of CACREP master's programs and doctoral programs where that term is not ever discussed… unless they happen to have a good international student population… Within my master's program, we talked about multiculturalism certainly, but there's no way we talked about ELL or ESL, not at all… Just that exposure, that awareness, I think you have to start there.

Participants also considered varied training modalities in CACREP programs. For example, participant 005 stated,
I think we need a refresher and I think that needs to be part of either Intro. to Supervision or... In Intro. to Supervision, we talk about supervision models, but at least in Advanced Supervision, we need to have that refresher on different cultures and things like that.

Participant 008 considered a specific supervisor multicultural training course as her need and said, “I think having at least a course or some other exposure within my PhD program...(would be helpful).”

Participant 001 was forming his thoughts about training modalities in the interview and said,

I think that (ELL training) could be a component as well as the cultural piece. What would that look like and how would it be different from a multicultural course, which is where, for the most part, we explore working with and accepting different cultural perspectives, including English language learners, if it's a good course. What would a specialized course, in supervision for ELLs, what would that look like? What would that focus on? Would it be multicultural two, like the second phase of that? It's hard for me to conceive right now what would be the components that would be involved in such a course. Maybe "course" isn't even the right way to think about it. How do we incorporate it more in all courses?
Maybe that's it. Maybe it's as simple as making stronger efforts to infuse, just like we are supposed to infuse multicultural issues within all courses. Participant 004 also considered incorporating ELL issues into every course. Participant 004 stated, "I just think it (ELL) should be a part of incorporating it into what we already learn."

Participant 002 stated,

Practice and then, like I said, if it comes up or making it come up in our group supervision, in our internship class where we receive supervision—just thinking about bringing those issues to the forefront.

Participant 001 wished that CACREP programs could develop elective courses related to a second language. He said,

(Linguistic diversity training) It'd probably fit better in a doctoral program because we have the opportunity to take more electives. I would love to see it (language course) provided and available.

Participant 010 also stated,

I think if you do not try to learn a second language, it's really hard to comprehend, to know how overwhelming that entire process can be. If you're trying to do that plus learning or be in a master's program as a counselor, that could just be extremely difficult. I don't think people value that and I think doing something along those lines to get supervisors out of
their comfort zone to be able to have that experience would at least give
them more empathy to begin with.

Participants also desired diverse training methods in regards to supervising ELL
populations. Participant 006 stated, "I think just offering the material and having open
discussion and conversation about it." Participant 002 and Participant 003 talked about
live demonstration, videotapes, and role-plays. Participant 002 stated,

Back in our supervision class, we did some role-plays with each other, so I
think something where there are opportunities to encounter the potential
challenges that would come up with an English language learning
supervisee.

Participant 003 said,

We're bringing in either videos or case examples or if we happen to have
students who are willing to volunteer to come in and to do those kinds of
role plays, also real plays, like what other tools can you use to start to
build in understanding the connection to somebody without assuming that
they'll know exactly what you're saying all the time, without assuming that
you understand exactly what they're saying all the time and be able to
build that connection. I think it's critical to have that as part of the learning
process.

Participant 010 talked about immersion and stated,
It's just when you think of I know that the ACA is trying to expand in terms of having more programs in different countries and I think that would be... I think they might do this but they might have exchange programs. I wish we could do more of that as a program to have students spend part of their... I know this would be logistically hard to do, but have students spend part of their time here for their internships and vice versa—have our students go over there for their internships. I just think that would be a really an exciting option.

Five participants perceived experiential learning inclusion by CACREP programs as their need. Participant 003 attributed his learning to continuing exposure and stated, “Between two people, I think it's better experienced rather than read about.” Participant 001 also talked about learning from ELLs as opposed to about ELLs and said,

I need to have more English language learner supervisees and have those experiences and see how they go and then hopefully get feedback from them to learn from them how I can improve and change things.

Participant 010 did mention, “I feel like right now I have very little confidence because I have not really worked with many people who fit that category (ELL),” and Participant 005 attributed her confidence and competence in working with ELL supervisees. She stated,
Now, because I've known [ELL people's names here] for two years now and we did have a lot of interactions, so I feel better than if I would end up with a supervisee who didn’t speak language as their first language... Just that experience and that exposure to somebody whose first language is not English, I think would be really helpful.

Participant 004 also touched on exposure to the ELL population and talked about developing an ear for language. He said,

I guess something I realized is you develop an ear for languages. You really, frankly, get used to just what you hear and you end up gaining an ear for it. It just depends on what you're exposed to.

Participant 004 later talked about learning by doing. He stated,

My comfort level is increased by doing whatever it is. It’s one thing to learn about something in a classroom and learn about any topic area or anything in supervision... I think it’s just the same way with developing counseling supervising skills as well as just cultural competence proficiency.

Two participants spoke about their training needs which involved continuing education. For example, participant 002 talked about attending professional continuing education and responded,
Like cultural immersion type experiences, so maybe attending international conferences where there’s an opportunity to spend more time with people who don’t have English as their first language... I think for me, I try to attend conferences pretty frequently.

Participant 007 also said, “Like, you know, if there’s a workshop or something. Exposure I think is always important.”

**Superordinate Theme Two: Supervisor Training Needs Related to Professional Collaboration**

This superordinate theme of supervisor training needs related to professional collaboration refers to supervisor training needs that involved support and consultation. This superordinate theme included a theme that was discussed by participants. Figure 2 presents the theme.
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*Figure 2. Theme for supervisor training needs related to professional collaboration*

**Enhanced Collaboration.** Three participants spoke about enhanced collaboration as a theme. Enhanced collaboration refers to statements the participants made about their
training needs that involved debriefing with people and benefiting from working as a team. For example, participant 003 stated,

I have to say it's helped me tremendously to have a partner that I can go to to say, "Can I talk to you about this? Is this me? Is this something that you've experienced," to kind of talk about those insecurities that maybe I have about working with English language learners. It's been really great having someone to normalize that with and process that with... I think to have someone to consult with or to... and more than just someone to teach me the information but someone to maybe supervise... If I didn't have that, that's what I would want. I would want someone to be able to collaborate, like to mentor me or to answer my questions or to normalize what it is that I'm doing... A supportive community makes a big difference. That's made more of a difference than any workshop I've gone to because that's just one time.

Participant 008 also talked about her needs related to peer debriefing and stated,

I feel like things that could always enhance my confidence on supervision are... having other discussions with my peers around...really, I feel like that last piece is really the assessing of what I'm doing in my own supervision practice—that would be helpful—just bringing myself to mind—bringing awareness to what I'm currently doing...
Participant 005 worked as a school counselor before and talked about benefitting from working as a team. She responded, “In a school system, you have a team, you have support, but in a supervisor relationship, it’s just the two of you in there or three if it’s a triad.”

Superordinate Theme Three: Supervisor Training Needs Related to Supervisor Competence

This superordinate theme of supervisor training needs related to supervisor competence refers to supervisor training needs that involved multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. This superordinate theme included three themes and 14 subthemes that were discussed by participants. Figure 3 presents the themes and subthemes.
Supervisor Competence

Multicultural Awareness
- Awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELL
- Recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences
- Recognize probable similarities
- Recognize power differential
- Recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence
- Understand languages are not semantically equivalent

Multicultural Knowledge
- Distinguish levels of acculturation
- Knowledge of ELL cultures

Multicultural Skills
- Navigate dual language relationships
- Employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs
- Assess communication styles and outcomes
- Supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners
- Facilitate parallel process
Figure 3. Themes and subthemes for supervisor training needs related to supervisor competence

**Multicultural Awareness.** Nine participants spoke about multicultural awareness as a theme. Multicultural awareness refers to statements the participants made about their training needs related to developing their own cultural awareness. There were six subthemes which included awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELL, recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences, recognize probable similarities, recognize power differential, recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence, and understand languages are not semantically equivalent.

**Awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs.** Three participants spoke about their awareness of the need for increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs. For example, participant 003 stated,

- Our profession is expanding so rapidly. Our population is changing so much in the United States. Mental health and mental wellness is just really important across the globe more so than ever. I really think it's time that we really pay a lot of attention to this kind of thing.

Participant 005 also stated,

- [Content cut]
I think it’s like by 2020 or 2050—something like that, English language learners will be the majority in this country. It’s like within the next few years that English language learners will be the majority in this country. Just by doing the math, if English language learners are going to be the majority in this country, that means there’s going to be more English language learners entering the counseling profession meaning we’re going to be supervising and teaching more English language learners in the counseling field. So we really need to get ahead of the ball.

Participant 007 also talked about the demographic statistics and said,

I think they said by 2050, the majority’s not going to be white people… And then, people are still migrating here from all over the world not even including the undocumented immigrants that I’m now learning about… There’s more and more people who are going to be English language learners in this country and we don’t have a national language. Most of us speak English, but we don’t have a national language. I’m hoping that foreign languages don’t die out here.

In addition, participant 007 also addressed her training need related to global awareness and said, “Interviewing someone from a different country or counselor from a different country. Yeah, because we have to be globally aware.”
Recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences.

Four participants spoke about recognizing challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences. For example, participant 001 stated,

Obviously, that presents certain challenges and because I'm not fluent in, really, any other language than English, that would present some challenges... It's hard for me sometimes I think, to realize how much of that is part of my everyday language... Being aware of the language that I use, the metaphors that I use, is a challenge.

Participant 002 also said,

Sometimes, I guess, I think about considering how my own understanding of language might impact my work as a supervisor... I think it means trying to just be aware of when I'm being insensitive to language differences and if I do find those moments where I'm being insensitive to language differences, then figuring out why and what's blocking me and then thinking about how that affects supervision work.

Participant 010 also talked about ELL issues and said,

I would worry about am I missing things because I don’t understand entirely the culture they come from, nor do I speak—I’m assuming—with Spanish speaking, then that would be different, but if they’re another language that I don’t speak, I would be very worried about not connecting.
Aside from challenges presented by linguistic differences, participant 003 talked about opportunities presented by linguistic differences and said,

Because there's not that shared or we don't assume that there's that shared meaning between us as different language speakers, it makes it easier for us to explore, "What do we have in common? What are we sharing?" … It's an opportunity for me to get to know my supervisees so much better and in that also get to know myself so much better.

**Recognize probable similarities.** Three participants spoke about recognizing probable similarities. For example, Participant 005 talked about acknowledging commonalities and stated, “I’m all about finding similarities and commonalities and I think there are commonalities in every culture, I believe. We just have to take the time to look for it.” Also, participant 007 addressed connection and empowerment and responded, “Everyone had something different to say, but they just felt connected and they felt empowered because they weren’t the only ones experiencing like these.” In addition, participant 009 talked about how shared experiences impact supervisory relationships. She stated,

I think it’s the fact that I’m an immigrant and they realize that a lot of their stories are also my story because they will call me even though they have another supervisor in-between us who is not an immigrant. They would call me and tell me that this is what’s going on. It’s because I know the
experience of how hard it can really be. I think that’s how supervision really happens for us.

*Recognize power differential.* Eight participants spoke about recognizing the power differential inherent in supervision. For example, participant 001 said,

I think I bear the majority of the responsibility. It's not to say that the English language learner doesn't have responsibility for themselves as well to speak up. But, again, because there's a power dynamic difference there, they are student/supervisee and I am supervisor/boss, et cetera, whoever has the more power has the more responsibility, in my opinion.

Participant 002 also said,

I believe that it is my responsibility as a supervisor to do the necessary work to address any of those potential barriers, to address language as a barrier. That's my responsibility there to take care of that, to figure how to make that work...because of the power differential.

Participant 004 also stated,

English is my first language. I just take it for granted that I know it and I understand it, but they’re learning a second language, which is a feat in and of itself... All the same words but depending on where you come from they sound a lot different. I do feel a certain level of responsibility to be
able to understand deviations from the English that I know. I guess I fear not being able to do that...

Participant 007 talked about recognizing ELL supervisees would listen to FLES as authority and said,

If they see you as an authority, they’ll listen to you, so maybe in the beginning be more authoritative to establish the boundaries, but then throughout come on in more middle ground encouraging them up. I might start encouraging them earlier on than I would...

Participant 009 also stated,

I have to also understand that there are some things that are just very different in terms of the respect for the person in authority… Sometimes I think when I tell them something to do, they will do it… They are also very much wanting to do their way, but they’ll wait for me to tell them to do it.

Some participants talked about use of stereotypes that portray ELLs as inferior. They considered from the perspective of power differential that the power of these stereotypes should not be underestimated, as these stereotypes would influence supervisory relationships. Participant 005 said,

Another thing, too, that gets under my skin is when people assume that people who are not native English speakers are not as smart… so if they get someone whose first language is not English, they may treat that
person differently as if they can’t catch up. As if it’s not a linguistic misunderstanding but an intellectual understanding. Again, that can impede the relationship as well.

Participant 006 also said,

There’s different linguistics to be concerned about and just generalizing an entire population based on their culture is inappropriate and oftentimes it’s a major barrier as well for them (FLES supervisors).

Participant 007 also said,

Growing up first generation American, sometimes I might feel that I understand English as a second language more than I actually do. If I am like that, then I might not ask as many questions, or I might assume things. That goes to anything, but especially English as a second language... Just to humble myself more and understand that even though I understand to an extent, I don’t have the experience because it’s not me.

Recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence. Two participants spoke about recognizing the cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence. For example, participant 007 mentioned that ELL supervisees have higher level of cognitive complexity and stated,

I feel that people with multiple intersecting identities like us, especially first generation American or even people coming from a different
culture—I don’t know, maybe I’m biased—I feel like we’re better able to relate to different types of people. So that’s actually an advantage, I think, of English language learners... The intersection in understanding because you have to go between roles and in that, you see things from different perspectives. I think the cognitive complexity in English language learners or people from different cultures is higher.”

In addition, participant 001 also thought FLES supervisors do not have enough cognitive complexity and need to work on that. He said,

> We're supposed to be comfortable with ambiguity… We're supposed to be cognitively complex as counselors and supervisors and counselor educators... We have multicultural counseling and supervision and, oh, we've got cognitive complexities. Oh, we've got these different pieces that if we tied them together on a regular basis and said, "This is why. Here's an example of why you need to be cognitively complex, why you need to be a post-conventional thinker, why you need to be comfortable with ambiguity," because of all these issues. Even as educators, we especially, I think, need to have that perspective.

*Understand languages are not semantically equivalent.* Three participants spoke about understanding languages are not semantically equivalent.

For example, participant 007 stated,
Because each language itself exhibits cultural values and sometimes that
doesn’t translate a lot. I know there’s a lot of phrases in Tagalog that don’t
translate in English so when I hear it, I ask my parents, “What is that?” My
parents are just like, “Umm, umm…” trying to explain to me, but then it’s
hard to explain because it doesn’t translate. With English as a second
language, you’re not just learning…when you learn a language, you’re not
just learning the language, you’re learning the culture. If there’s nothing to
compare it to in that culture, then how do you translate different things in
different cultures if there’s no word for it?

Participant 009 also stated,

I think they’re very good for a perspective that is different from ours in
terms of and different from mine, let me say, in that I think that one of the
things we have to do is try to show them that we don’t, I think as English
speaking supervisors, I think we don’t allow them to be able to say things
‘cause some things are not transferable when you translate it.

**Multicultural Knowledge.** Seven participants spoke about multicultural
knowledge as a theme. Multicultural knowledge refers to statements the participants
made about their training needs related to developing their cultural knowledge. There
were three subthemes which included: have a framework or evidence-based knowledge to
work with ELL supervisees, distinguish levels of acculturation, and knowledge of ELL cultures.

**Have a framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees.**

Four participants spoke about having a framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees. For example, participant 006 talked about evidence-based knowledge and stated, “Be able to read the literature and see what the literature suggests are best ways to work with supervisees and just to be able to be aware of the importance.”

Participant 002 also responded,

I think finding out about current research would be helpful—anything that helps us understand the needs of English language learners in supervision from a research perspective.

Participant 010 also said,

I think I would need a learning curve and I would have to do some research which probably there isn’t much out there, but I’m pulling on research about working with like research having to do with broaching and working with people or supervisees of different racial or ethnic backgrounds in general. I’d probably have to look into things with English as a second language learner ‘cause I really don’t have much information on that in supervision right now... If there were any research, that would
be helpful. Hopefully, when your dissertation is finished I would be looking at that.

Participant 007 also stated, “I have no idea if there’s any supervision models out there or if there’s any tips because all the tips in my head are just from my experience.” Participant 010 also responded,

I would probably have to look at that field if I were going to supervise someone to understand learning styles, or current strategies of how you could work with someone... I’m thinking too about the multicultural counseling division in ACA. I’m wondering what information they might have about this subject. ACES—like that would maybe a place to turn to.

**Distinguish levels of acculturation.** Four participants spoke about distinguishing the levels of acculturation of the ELL supervisees. For example, participant 003 talked about his training needs related to assessing ELL supervisees’ language proficiency and stated, “I’m trying to think what other challenges. Sometimes depending on where they are in their language learning.”

Participant 005 also stated,

Some English language learners may understand some of our little idioms that we may say—some little things that we may say and some of them don’t. If my supervisee needed more explanation or something or if she really needed me to talk slower—things like that.
Participant 007 also responded, “Just because they speak English well, just remind them that they’re still from different cultures so be mindful of that—they might not fully understand everything you’re saying.”

Participant 004 indicating recognizing that ELLs who grew up in the U.S. may have more cultural exposure and recognizing that international ELLs may be making a bigger cultural transition,

Somebody who’s an English second language learner who grew up speaking Spanish in the house and learned English as he was going through schools here versus if I had a supervisee who came into the program and this was the first year here and they spoke English and they’re from a different country. There’s lots of differences right there, mostly cultural based.

As a first generation American, participant 007 also stated,

Some people speak English well, but there still might be some confusion as to meaning. I grew up speaking English, but just because of my culture and I was raised in my parents’ house, there are some things in English I just don’t understand. I feel like this is the third reality I live in. I live in this country, I was born here, but I was raised in these two different cultures, whereas where I am now, I don’t fully understand either culture.
**Knowledge of ELL cultures.** Four participants spoke about knowledge of ELL cultures. For example, participant 001 talked about recognizing that culture is embedded in each person’s perspective and also the need to recognize culture’s pervasive influence on each of us. He said, “As the supervisee is willing to share about their life, their culture, I think it would be part of my responsibility is to do some learning about that culture.”

Participant 007 also said, “If I have an English language learner student, I might look up their culture and see how it is.”

Participant 009 responded,

> I think a lot of their ethics, morals, and values lie in that culture and I think we have to recognize as supervisors, what that means to them and how that affects them… I think once we understand in training how it affects in people and how it looks and not only the attitude or the behaviors, but how it really has every part of them, I think it’s very different. So I think training in every part of that would be helpful.

Participant 010 also stated,

> I would want to know what language it is that they speak, that is their first language. Before I started working with them, I would do research about…like some languages, it’s so opposite to how English is structured… So I’d want to at least know some of the basics about the language and the culture where the language is from.
Multicultural Skills. Ten participants spoke about multicultural skills as a theme. Multicultural skills refer to statements the participants made about their training needs related to developing their own skills. There were five subthemes which included navigate dual language relationships, employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs, assess communication styles and outcomes, supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners, and facilitate parallel process

Navigate dual language relationships. Seven participants spoke about navigating dual language relationships. For example, participant 003 talked about the importance of not minimizing ELL perceived linguistic difficulties and stated,

Early on I might say something like, "Oh, no, I understand you perfectly. Your English is fine." What I would do is then fill in the meaning myself that I thought my supervisee was trying to communicate, which didn't help the supervisee. It didn't help the relationship. I learned over the time to just be comfortable in that time of, "No, I don't understand. Could you say it again," and struggling and asking for clarification and those kinds of things.

Participant 004 was my peer in the doctoral program. I showed an instructional video constructed by another colleague and me in a multicultural class a year ago in order to demonstrate how to supervise ELL supervisees. Participant 004 was also in that class. He reflected on the instructional video and said,
One thing I learned to do from you in watching your video... My one take-away was don’t just appease somebody who feels like they’re trying to learn the language. Don’t just tell them, “Oh, you’re great, you’re great, you’re great!”

Three participants addressed linguistic diversity from different levels. One level is between clients and counselors and the other is between supervisees and supervisors.

Participant 005 talked about linguistic diversity between clients and counselors. She said,

If the client says something and the counselor and trainee don’t understand it, but don’t speak up and say they don’t understand, even giving them the training to advocate for themselves and say, “I’m not sure what you mean by that. Could you explain it?”

Participant 003 talked about linguistic dynamics between supervisors and supervisees. He said,

Sometimes I wonder with English language learners if there’s more that they...if we’re communicating on the same level, we’re kind of getting that same thing but they’re challenging me when they don’t understand things. That’s discussions I’ll often have with folks in supervision but then with English language learners I think I tend to have that discussion a little more and a little more often.

Participant 008 talked about linguistic dynamics from different levels and stated,
There were a lot of moments within supervision where I had to take on the teacher role and clarify what the cultural view might have been of the family and bridging that between what the English language learner might have been perceiving the linguistics around what the family was saying.

Some participants talked about inviting ELLs' use of their first languages. Participant 003 stated,

I'd like to give the opportunity to say, "What would it sound like in your language? Tell me how you would have said it if you were at home? What would that look like? Give me that passion. Give me that excitement," all of those kinds of pieces... to get us away from the notion that the only way we can communicate with clients is through language and shared language, that there's a lot more nuance communication that goes on that's really important to the counseling sessions.

Participant 009 also said,

Like whatever they want to say in their language, do, or whatever. Then I say, "Tell me what it is." So then they'll tell me what it is and after that we're able to say how they could say it acceptable to the client so the client does not see it as derogatory or discriminatory or something that's offensive.
In addition to inviting ELLs’ use of their first languages, participants also talked about inviting a more comfortable format to communicate. Participant 009 talked about writing and said,

Let them know if they’re more comfortable writing some things or if they want to say it in their language first and then whatever is comfortable for them, that will make the relationship stronger, I would allow.

In addition, participants also talked about considering personal word, phrase, and metaphor usage. Participant 001 addressed his need for “knowing how to phrase certain things, what words to use” when communicating with ELL supervisees. Participant 009 also talked about doing a translation with ELL supervisees and said,

It’s the passion that they bring that evokes their language and they struggle to be able to say that in a terminology that’s acceptable to us here in America. I think allowing them to do that in a safe place, even though it may not be “appropriate” English or AP style or whatever, but at least let them be able to say it somewhere safely and then help them, show them how to write it in a more acceptable way... Let them run with it and see what works best for them.

Employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs. Six participants spoke about employing multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs. For example, participant 008 talked about broaching and stated,
I perceived some of the linguistic differences around having to transfer as far as language and then just talking in supervision about cultural norms and how they might differ from the culture or what the family was doing. I think that that conversation probably happens with broaching culture with all my supervisees—that’s probably the similarity.

Participant 004 talked about patience and being non-judgmental. He said, “I think the other really important piece, too, is making sure when you establish it, having patience and opening communications, making sure it’s a judgment-free area where it’s not a supervisee or the supervisor’s—no one’s fault.”

Participant 009 talked about building relationships,

I think that it’s important that supervisors keep the idea of joining and aligning with our supervisees very clear with them, and that we develop a relationship that’s trusting so that supervisees who are English language learners are able to feel comfortable enough to bring those questions to supervision to process and to enhance the idea of that change happening under that supervision umbrella, if that makes sense.

Participant 008 talked about asking clarifying questions and broaching. She said, Make sure that I was clear on what the cultural lense my supervisees like how they view their own professional counseling identity and how they are working to grow within the profession. I think I might maintain what I’m
currently doing, but also explore and do some more questioning around language and just really be clear on if they are an English learner speaking person, 'cause I don’t think that I ask that now, so maybe just inquiring around that and broaching around language might be something new that I could do.

Participant 008 talked about modeling and said, “I just think it’s important for modeling that we follow that in supervision for that client, so actually, I was either able to model what needs to happen in the community or within whatever setting they’re providing counseling services.” Participant 009 also said, “I do it with role modeling like when they reach a really difficult part in a case, I will tell them, “Come and tell me. I’m the client, tell me what it is you want to do and what you want to say that you think is acceptable.”

Assess communication styles and outcomes. Three participants spoke about assessing communication styles and outcomes. For example, participant 004 talked about evaluating communication between FLES supervisors and ELL supervisees and stated,

I think my biggest concern would be say, for example, if there were such a large communication barrier where we both couldn’t understand each other, I don’t particularly know how to go about it if the communication barrier was that strong.

Participant 008 also said,
I always wonder and try to leave room for assessment of supervision so I can assure that if I’m not hitting the mark, or people don’t understand certain aspects of supervision... I think I’m always questioning how I can assess supervision to ensure that what I’m perceiving is happening and what I’m perceiving as support feels like support to my supervisees or English language learners.

Participant 010 also responded, “I would do more check-ins like supervision outcome measures of some sort to make sure they were still feeling like they were getting what they needed from supervision, particularly because of the language difference.”

**Supervisors and Supervisees are both teachers and learners.** Three participants mentioned that supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners. For example, participant 001 stated,

Letting the supervisee teach me about their culture... Just being open to switching that role maybe around. Not that I'm going to become the supervisee, but I'm going to become the student so you have expert knowledge of being an English language learner that I do not have so you get to teach me what that's like and what we need to do different.

Participant 003 also said,
I have colleagues for whom working with English language learners they see it as a challenge and they see it as more of a burden. I think they see themselves as having to teach so much more in that environment. I really see the opposite... What I learn from someone that is an English language learner really has relevance to then working later with native English speakers.

Participant 006 also responded, “Could they understand me and if not, what would we need to do to make it successful for them? I would have to consult with them.”

Facilitate parallel process. Two participants spoke about facilitating parallel process. For example, participant 002 stated, “Especially once it became clear to both of us that that was what we needed to do. I was learning how to do it as well—how to help her in that way as well, so I was being patient with her and trying to be patient with myself.” Participant 008 said,

I enjoy staying aware of my own biases and values and keeping the door open for broaching for what might be perceived as my own value beliefs and how I can have this parallel experience with the supervisee of either understanding how things are viewed by different cultures due to language and linguistics.

Summary
This chapter presented the description of each participant and the resulting themes from the analysis of the data from the participants, using quotes from the participants to highlight the superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes. The descriptions of the participants were presented in order to give context to the themes that emerged. In the following chapter, these results will be discussed.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The counselor education and supervision profession has embraced the need to prepare multiculturally competent supervisors (American Counseling Association, 2005; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Inman & Ladany, 2014). Providing supervisor multicultural training is essential to that endeavor but limited attention has been paid to training multiculturally competent supervisors (Aasheim, 2012; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Constantine & Sue, 2007). Counselor education and supervision literature dealing with training supervisors to work with ELL supervisees is also limited. As a result, supervisors’ training needs for supervising linguistically diverse supervisees has not been clearly addressed. Therefore, the research questions for this study were designed to explore FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs for effectively working with ELL supervisees.

The central question for this study was: How do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? The sub-questions were: (1) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (2) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (3) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with
regards to the multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? Data were collected in two rounds of interviews. The 10 participants interviewed self-identified as first language English-speakers who were providing clinical supervision in a CACREP program.

Using a constructivist grounded theory research methodology, the research team and I constructed three superordinate themes, five themes and 17 subthemes from the data concerning FLES supervisors’ multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. The first two superordinate themes were not associated with the original sub-questions but the third superordinate theme reflected these sub-questions.

This first superordinate theme of supervisor training needs was institutional level and included a theme of institutional change and two subthemes: improve infusion of competence with ELL in CACREP Standards and enhance advocacy for ELLs in counseling programs and supervision training. This second superordinate theme of supervisor training needs was professional collaboration and involved one theme: enhanced collaboration. The third superordinate theme, supervisor competence, had three themes emerge and included multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills. Six subthemes were associated with the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees: awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELL, recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences, recognize probable similarities, recognize power differential, recognize
cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence, and understand
languages are not semantically equivalent. Three subthemes were associated with
multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees: have a
framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees, distinguish
levels of acculturation, and knowledge of ELL cultures. Five subthemes were associated
with multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees: navigate dual
language relationships, employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs,
assess communication styles and outcomes, supervisors and supervisees are both teachers
and learners, and facilitate parallel process.

The themes and findings from the data gathered will be briefly summarized and
compared to the existing professional literature. Subsequently, the components of the
emergent theory as well as the proposed relationships among each theme will be
presented. Finally, some limitations of the study, implications for the field and
suggestions for future research will be presented.

**Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development**

I chose to use the Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development
(HMNID) formulated by Ancis and Ladany (2010) to examine the participants’
multicultural awareness. I will briefly discuss the HMNID model and then explain the
reason why I chose to utilize this model, especially the phases of Means of Interpersonal
Functioning (MIF), in the discussion.
Ancis and Ladany (2010) developed their model of nonoppressive interpersonal development in order to offer supervisors a heuristic model to understand the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of themselves, their supervisees, and clients across demographic variables. Ancis and Ladany did not consider language as an aspect of cultural identities but in my study linguistic differences were seen as a part of cultural differences. Ancis and Ladany also posited that for each demographic variable, individuals progress through phases of Means of Interpersonal Functioning (MIF). MIF represented thoughts, feelings and behaviors based on one’s identification with a particular demographic variable. For Ancis and Ladany, people have the ability to developmentally progress through four phases of MIF: adaptation, incongruence, exploration, and integration. See Figure 4 to see how Ancis and Ladany (2010) defined each phase.

**Figure 4.** Four phases of MIF
Ancis and Ladany’s (2010) rubric articulating phases of MIF development is seen as a viable framework for measuring and improving supervisors’ multicultural competence (Corey, Haynes, Moulton, & Muratori, 2010). MIF development specifically attends to multicultural self-awareness but does not address multicultural knowledge and skills. However, building multicultural self-awareness is the first step and fundamental component for becoming multicultural competent (Robinson, Bradley, & Hendricks, 2000; Sue & Sue, 2008). In addition to comparing the findings in my study to the literature, I consider it important to point out participants’ MIF development because participants’ perceptions of their multicultural training needs would be influenced by their phase or level of multicultural self-awareness.

The context and textural descriptions in chapter four presented the FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. There were three superordinate themes of multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees that captured the essence of the data: institutional level, professional collaboration, and supervisor competence. Throughout the discussion below, the concept of four phases of MIF will be considered by examining how the themes constructed in this study relate to Ancis and Ladany’s MIF phases. In the following section, themes that emerged from the data are explained hierarchically.

**Institutional Level**
A summary of the training needs related to the first superordinate theme, institutional level related to possible supervisor MIF developmental phases is presented here.

**Institutional Change**

**Improve infusion of competence with ELL in the CACREP Standards.** Nine out of 10 participants acknowledged a lack of formal multicultural supervision training in general. Specifically, they noted the omission of linguistic differences as a multicultural factor and recognized the importance of including multicultural competence for working with ELLs as a CACREP requirement. Additionally, one of the participants expressed a desire for the CACREP Standards to require that supervisors have a protocol for working with ELLs.

The participants were aware of the limitations of the CACREP Standards and supervisor training they received regarding working with ELL supervisees. The participants' statements would appear to endorse the benefit of enhanced MIF development in FLES supervisors because the participants believed making competence with ELL supervisees as a CACREP requirement is important for them to increase awareness, knowledge, and skills for the work with ELL supervisees. Moreover, the participants recognized oppressive occurrences (e.g., recognizing omission of linguistic differences in the multiculturalism literature and models) that would likely impede attention to linguistic issues. They also would like to immerse themselves in learning
about ELL issues. Those features could be associated with the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Meanwhile in the education profession, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) have developed English as a second language standards (TESOL, 1997) to advocate for ELL students. The purpose of TESOL standards are help ELL students at all age groups develop English language and literacy skills in content areas to achieve the same level of language proficiency as their English-speaking peers. The findings in my study, however, appeared to indicate that the participants did not consider that Standard English should be the only goal achieved in supervision with ELL supervisees but that, they as supervisors, would like to learn to navigate linguistic differences. The participants did not adopt the FLES language entitlement and assimilation perspective on language (McAuliffe, Grothaus, & Gomez, 2012). That is, the participants did not consider English acquisition as one-way process which involved ELL supervisees acquiring English and abandoning their first languages. Instead, the participants would like to learn to facilitate the English language acquisition process for their supervisees. For example, FLES supervisors might collaborate with ELL supervisees to see what ELLs’ needs are in terms of English language acquisition and provide necessary assistance for them. The participants expressed that supervisors play an important role in facilitating the learning environment. They acknowledged that explicit recognition of the need to prepare FLES supervisors for working with ELL supervisees in
the CACREP Standards would be a step in the right direction, particularly if it includes a change to CACREP programs to include ELL competence that ensures that supervisors are adequately trained to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse supervisees.

Enhance advocacy for ELLs in counseling programs and supervisor training.

The participants talked about constructing systems to support ELLs; recruiting more ELLs to CACREP programs; utilizing varied content, methods, and modalities for training supervisors to be competent with ELLs, supporting the value of experiential learning with ELLs being included in CACREP programs; and looking to professional counseling associations for continuing education regarding linguistic diversity. These features appear to be associated with the third and fourth stages of MIF, encompassing exploration and integration (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

One of the participants used his privileges as Program Coordinator at a university to promote educational equity for ELL students. He worked toward changing infrastructures of counselor education programs within which he worked. For example, he would like to grow the program by recruiting ELLs and set up support systems for ELLs once they enter the program. According to Ancis and Ladany (2010), these features belong to the fourth stage of MIF, the integration phase, because of his commitment to advocacy and his action for social justice.
Multiple participants wondered about the training content, process, methods, and modalities involved in effective supervision with ELLs. While they did not currently have proficiency in supervising with ELLs, they hoped to explore what it meant to be an ELL and sought out "encounter-like events" (e.g., recruiting more ELLs to CACREP programs or/and needing experiential learning inclusion by CACREP programs). These participants' experiences and desires appeared to correspond with the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

The performance and language demands of counseling practice augment the challenges for ELL supervisees (Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). FLES supervisors in this study would like CACREP programs to be designed to support the performance and language demands expected of ELLs. Consequently, FLES supervisors would like professional training opportunities to supplement their own understanding of ELL issues and assist with their mastery of supervisory interventions to assist ELL supervisees' professional development as counselors.

With regards to professional development in this area, CACREP programs may approach the issue of training FLES supervisors about ELL supervisees in one of three modalities. Consistent with the NCATE Standards (2007) and the statements from Ballantyne, Sanderman, and Levy (2008), the participants in my study would like for CACREP programs to either offer stand-alone classes focusing on the needs of ELL supervisees or create and implement an ELL-infused curriculum in which supervisor
educators incorporate materials of relevance to ELL issues into the courses across the curriculum (or a combination of these approaches). However, it may be impractical to develop stand-alone classes only focusing on ELL issues given how many courses that are required to be covered in a CACREP program. Incorporating materials of relevance to ELL issues into the courses across the curriculum may be a more effective way to train supervisors to effectively work with ELL supervisees in a CACREP program.

Two participants reported attending professional continuing education as a means of meeting their needs for more training in working with ELLs. These participants' actions resonated with the results of multiple studies (Hart & Lee (2003; Lee et al., 2005, 2008; Stoddart et al., 2002). These studies involved professional development interventions and programs for teachers. Those professional development opportunities included a series of workshops designed to invite educators to increase positive beliefs about science and literacy with diverse student groups and improving teacher attitudes regarding merging science and literacy in teaching. The results indicated that teachers reported being able to better integrate conceptualizations of literacy in their science instruction with culturally and linguistically diverse students. This is congruent with the findings of my study which indicated supervisors' needs for continuing education about ELL supervisees' professional development in order to effectively work with ELL supervisees. Yet research on ELL issues in counselor education and supervision field is
scant and this dissertation study is preliminary. There is a clear need for further study to support long-term and continuous supervisor development in regards to ELL competence.

**Professional Collaboration**

A summary of the training needs related to the professional collaboration superordinate theme will be presented here in order to compare the supervisor MIF development to the existing literature.

**Enhanced Collaboration**

Three of the participants emphasized debriefing with people and benefitting from working as a team. These participants would look to peers, other helping professionals, and individuals not in the field of counseling for debriefing or consultation and would actively engage in self-exploration. These features are associated with the third stage of MIF, the exploration stage (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

In the education field, learning communities are recognized in the literature as a powerful network for improving the quality of teaching (Buck, Mast, Ehlers, & Franklin, 2005; Fulton & Britton, 2011; Hord, 2009; Mindich & Lieberman, 2012). Learning communities are groups of teachers that share and critically examine their teaching in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-oriented, and growth-promoting way to mutually enhance teacher and student learning (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006). The findings in my study also indicated that FLES supervisors desire collaboration. The learning communities model could be adapted to incorporate the needs
of ELLs and their supervisors by inviting individuals with expertise in ELL issues. Such individuals might include bilingual certified teachers, other bilingual educators, or personnel working with ELLs.

**Supervisor Competence**

A summary of the training needs related to the third superordinate theme, supervisor competence, is presented here in order to compare the supervisor MIF development to the existing literature.

**Multicultural Awareness**

**Awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs.** Three participants addressed the need for global awareness, noting the phenomenon of people migrating from all over the world to the U.S. The participants voiced that our society is growing increasingly multicultural and thought that supervisors need to reflect the ethics of this multicultural society. That is, the participants would like to apply the ethical principles of beneficence and respect for ELL supervisees in a multiculturally competent manner. The participants in this study considered their own role in maintaining the oppressive environment and expressed their enthusiasm and eagerness to improve multicultural awareness and insight. These features belong to the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

The three participants’ awareness of the increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs was echoed in the literature. ELLs constitute one of the fastest growing populations
in the U.S. (Uro & Barrio, 2013). Linguistic diversity is a key demographic feature of this country. It is critical to consider how best to prepare FLES supervisors since supervisors are increasingly likely to have ELL supervisees. To date, there has been relatively little attention paid to the competence supervisors ought to possess in order to meet ELL supervisees’ needs and provide effective supervision for ELLs.

**Recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences.**

Four participants spoke about the challenges regarding ELL issues they faced and enjoying the exploration of divergent meanings of language with ELLs. Three out of four addressed the challenges presented by linguistic differences. They considered linguistic differences as a barrier because they had to be aware of their own word usage and individualistic worldviews. However, the other participant considered linguistic similarity as a barrier because he thought he and his FLES supervisees might assume they had shared meanings of words when this was not the case. He especially enjoyed the opportunities presented by linguistic diversity because he could explore what ELL supervisees really meant without his assumptions getting in the way. All four participants would like to attend to linguistic issues in supervision and also to actively engage with ELL supervisees to facilitate their own multicultural awareness. This feature is associated with the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Consistent with the current literature (Harrison, 2007), most participants strongly identified with a problem orientation to language, where a lack of English proficiency
constitutes a significant difficulty to participating in supervision and providing counseling services. However, one of the participants supported a resource orientation to language. He highlighted the benefits of linguistic diversity and claimed that linguistic diversity he experienced with ELL supervisees helped him communicate and empathize with FLES supervisees. Training supervisors to counter the language-as-problem orientation and promote the bridge-building value of language might be a good direction for counselor education and supervision training.

**Recognize probable similarities.** Three participants emphasized acknowledging commonalities of empowerment. That is, participants noted that ELL supervisees might be empowered by similarities with FLES supervisors. Two out of three mentioned that they found it empowering to ELL supervisees when FLES supervisors could look for shared experiences and understanding with ELL supervisees. The other participant just acknowledged the prevalence of differences among all people. She thought the fact that everyone is unique is a shared truth and this shared truth connects everyone. All three participants seemed relatively open to exploring alternative conceptualizations of supervisory relationships with ELL supervisees. This attitude appears to be related to the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Much of the multicultural counseling literature emphasized cultural differences (Constantine, 1997; Constantine, 2001; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Duan & Rochlke, 2001; Hird et al., 2001; Leong & Wagner, 1994; Toporek et al., 2004). Although being
aware of the differences between cultural groups is a key to building awareness and
knowledge, overemphasis of these differences can create barriers to developing rapport
among cultural groups. Hipolito-Delgado (2014) conducted research to understand what
experiences inspired white counselors to become allies to communities of color and
proposed that identifying shared values and life experiences with communities of color
was one of the significant events. Consistent with Hipolito-Delgado’s research, the
findings of my study echoed that identifying commonalities may help FLES supervisors
build rapport and empathy with ELL supervisees.

Recognize power differential. Eight participants mentioned that FLES supervisors should bear much of the responsibility for improving supervisees’
professional development as counselors and recognize that ELLs would likely listen to
FLES as authorities. In addition, they seemed to advocate for avoiding the use of
stereotypes that portray ELLs as inferior and being aware of the power differential
between FLES supervisors and ELL supervisees. The participants actively explored what
it meant to be a member of SPG in supervisory relationships and considered the resulting
privileges (e.g., advantages associated with the supervisor role). In regards to linguistic
diversity, the participants also considered their own role in perpetuating an oppressive
environment. For example, seven participants felt a certain level of responsibility to be
able to understand deviations from the English that they know and/or work with linguistic
differences yet they were aware that they often took speaking English for granted and
therefore they feared not being able to accurately emphasize with and supervise ELL supervisees. According to Ancis and Ladany (2010), the features mentioned above are related to the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase.

Earlier studies conducted more than 10 years ago (Gatmon et al., 2001; Hays & Chang, 2003) highlighted the low frequency of broaching cultural differences within supervision, most of the participants in my study, however, noted the relevance and necessity of initiating cultural and linguistic discussions within the supervisory process. This difference appeared to echo the statements made by Durham (2002). Durham proposed that depending on when supervisors receive their training, some may be reluctant to broach cultural differences because they believe that their supervisees are better prepared to get involved in these discussions compared to themselves. Eight out of 10 participants in my study were doctoral students who were receiving supervisor training in a CACREP program. The fact that most of them addressed the relevance and necessity of broaching within supervision may indicate that current supervisor training has placed more emphasis on multicultural issues compared to the supervisor training provided 10 years ago. Also, the participants in this study were not overly concerned with cultural differences. Instead, they appeared willing to take the responsibility for navigating the cultural and linguistic differences between supervisors and supervisees. This finding was different from the finding presented by Gatmon et al. (2001) but most
participants in my study were still not confident enough to initiate such discussion effectively, which is similar to the finding reported by Gatmon et al. (2001).

Most of the participants did not appear to view power dynamics as a function of MIF development. Instead, the participants considered power differential as its own multicultural issue. They also appeared to believe that ELL supervisees may take supervisors' lead on whether or not to explore linguistic or other multicultural issues further because ELL supervisees' culture of origin may prevent them from challenging the authority of supervisors.

**Recognize cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence.** Two participants talked about the value of increasing the level of cognitive complexity of FLES supervisors. One of the participants, as a first generation American, was aware of ELLs' strengths and said that ELLs have higher cognitive complexity due to in-between roles. That is, this participant recognized ELL supervisees have multiple intersecting identities so that they can see things from diverse frames of reference and develop a higher level of cognitive complexity. The feature of active exploration of what it means to be a member of the first generation American and ELLs is at the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

The other participant thought that he as a FLES supervisor could demonstrate limited integrative complexity when it comes to conceptualizing ELL supervisees within a multicultural framework. According to Constantine and Ladany (2000), integrative
complexity refers to the ability to differentiate and integrate when conceptualizing ELL supervisees. In addition, this participant thought that he was less likely to accurately empathize with ELL supervisees who were at a higher MIF. This participant’s awareness about this concern is relevant to the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

A conceptual article reviewed the use of a peer consultation model with a diverse group of supervisors to enhance supervisor cognitive development. Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, and Moorhead (2008) believed that the peer consultation model of supervision is one method to help supervisors at all developmental levels to increase their own cognitive complexity. Additionally, multiple empirical studies focused on cognitive development of college students and counselors (Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2003; Ishii, Gilbride, & Stensrud, 2009). Endicott, Bock, and Narvaez (2003) conducted a quantitative study to examine college students’ intercultural development, moral judgment, and multicultural experiences. They found college students’ moral judgment and intercultural development are related to depth and breadth of multicultural experiences. Their findings supported the notion that individuals with more and deeper multicultural experiences would have a more complex repertoire of cultural schemas and that they would be leaning more towards post-conventional and ethnorelative thinking due to cognitive flexibility. In addition, Ishii, Gilbride, and Stensrud (2009) analyzed the reflection journals of 15 students who participated in a one-week cultural immersion trip
to New Mexico. They conducted a qualitative research to examine students’ multicultural competence and found students experience cognitive dissonant reactions and progress toward cognitive complexity. Although Ishii et al. did not conceptualize multicultural competence in the fashion of awareness, knowledge, and skills, they used multicultural counseling literature to support their claim that cognitive complexity is an important component of multicultural competence. Consistent with the findings of Ishii et al. (2009), two participants in my study noticed that ELLs experienced cognitive dissonant reactions related to cognitive complexity because ELLs were bicultural or polycultural. These participants also echoed the findings presented by Endicott et al. (2003) because they would like to enhance their level of cognitive complexity in order to work more effectively with ELL supervisees. To promote supervisors’ cognitive complexity development, counselor education and supervision programs may offer supervisors-in-training and/or faculty members peer consultation and/or prolonged engagement with ELLs, such as a cultural immersion experience.

**Understand languages are not semantically equivalent.** Three participants spoke about understanding that all concepts and terms do not translate exactly. These participants also considered the privileges and advantages associated with FLES language entitlement. This awareness appears to be congruent with Ancis and Landany’s (2010) third stage of MIF, the exploration phase.
The findings from this study posited that ELLs who participated in supervision where supervisors speak English as their only language have no other choice but to speak English. This circumstance, according to Jayasuriya (1997), was a form of partial assimilation where the cultural and linguistic differences are not celebrated based on the meaning of multiculturalism. In this sense, FLES supervisors may need to understand ELLs might not enjoy the same level of freedom of expression regarding language use as other aspects of cultural expression.

**Multicultural Knowledge**

Have a framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees. Four participants urged FLES supervisors to be knowledgeable about supervision theories and evidence-based knowledge regarding working with ELL supervisees. The participants talked about personal experiences with discrimination that led to an awareness of oppression and a reflection about their previously held beliefs. They would like to address linguistic diversity in supervision but they were not aware of a specific framework to work with ELL supervisees. These features are associated with the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

The findings from my study appeared to support multiple researchers’ efforts to develop supervisory training guides, programs, and models (Bradley & Whiting, 2001; Falendar & Shafranske, 2004; Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, Hartwig-Moorhead, 2008; Stoltenberg, McNeill, Delworth, 1998). However, those
training guides, programs, and models did not focus on multicultural competence in general or attending to linguistic diversity specifically (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Constantine & Sue, 2007). Hence, developing training guides or models that prepare supervisors demonstrate both the appreciation of how different linguistic practices may shape interpretive processes and the knowledge of how to utilize this interpretive process to help ELLs with counseling clients is an essential step to meet FLES supervisors’ training needs.

**Distinguish levels of acculturation.** Three participants suggested that FLES supervisors need to recognize that language learning is a process. Similar to the findings in the education field (Santau & Maerten-Rivera, & Huggins, 2011), the participants also looked at language from a human development perspective and desired to have reasonable expectations about language comprehension. They put this knowledge into practice by offering multiple points of entry for ELL supervisees who were at different levels of English proficiency and providing multiple modes for ELL supervisees in supervision. For example, the participants recognized that some ELL supervisees may understand more English idioms but the others may not. The participants understood that some supervisees needed more explanation or needed FLES supervisors to speak more slowly. The participants initiated discussion about ELL supervisees’ language learning process but were at a loss as to how to follow through or intervene. Those are common features in the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).
The views summarized above that were expressed by the participants point toward the potential value of using a development perspective and instructional scaffolding about language learning in supervision with ELL supervisees. Scaffolding is an important concept from Vygotsky’s learning theory (Vygotsky, 1978). According to Vygotsky, there is a zone of proximal development between the actual developmental level where individuals can independently solve a problem and the potential developmental level where individuals can solve a problem under guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. In order to meet ELLs where they are in terms of language learning and appropriately scaffold ELL supervisees’ language proficiency, FLES supervisors need to know ELLs’ levels of language proficiency and then may need to apply varied types of instructional scaffolding, including: modeling, bridging, contextualization, building schema, re-presenting text, and developing metacognition (Walqui, 2010). Anderson (2003) indicated that the use of prefix and stem and contextual clues might be beneficial for ELLs to expand their vocabularies. For example, when ELL supervisees do not know the meaning of specific word but they are familiar with the cultural context where the word is situated, FLES supervisors may employ context clues to guide ELL supervisees.

In addition, two participants talked about recognizing that ELLs who have been in the U.S. for an extended time probably have more extensive cultural exposure to the U.S. mainstream and that international ELLs may experience more of a cultural transition. The
participants experienced events that led them to question their previously held beliefs and led them to have conscious incongruence, dissonance, and some awareness. Both participants also witnessed direct or indirectly discriminatory events through their association with ELLs. As a result, they could no longer ignore the reality of oppression. Those are common features in the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Acculturation has been defined as a process of an individual’s socialization into a different group’s ways, so an individual adopts varied facets of a different culture, such as manners, speech patterns, dress, and values (McAuliffe, Kim, & Park, 2012). The concept of scaffolding also could be applied to this case. FLES supervisors need to understand where ELL supervisees are in terms of the process of socialization into the U.S., so that they can scaffold cultural learning for ELL supervisees at different levels of understanding of the U.S. culture. For example, FLES supervisors could give U.S. ELLs opportunities to verbalize, clarify, and extend their own knowledge of the U.S. culture and help them participate in more complex cultural discussions. The scaffolding would provide appropriate assistance for U.S. ELLs to grow professionally as counselors and promote a deeper level of acculturation. In regards to international ELLs who come to the U.S. for a short period, FLES supervisors may need to take on more of a teacher role to draw on ELLs’ resources to supplement their cultural knowledge, discover something new, and organize their thoughts and actions.
**Knowledge of ELL cultures.** Four participants talked about recognizing that culture is embedded in one’s perspective and recognizing culture’s pervasiveness. The participants engaged in active exploration about what it might mean to be an ELL and were relatively open to exploring varied conceptualizations with ELL supervisees. Those features are related to the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase.

These participants viewed ELL cultures as a positive resource and an enriching source of knowledge for supervision. The most obvious benefit of having two or more different cultures’ knowledge relates to the ability to communicate with a wider group of people. Learning about ELL cultures of origin may also lead to increasing cognitive complexity. Having knowledge of different cultures allows FLES supervisors to traverse a multicultural terrain and experience diverse frames of references. In this sense, learning about ELL cultures is a process that is essential to progressing beyond having one’s perceptions shaped by a single culture while at the same time it raises cultural relativism, which promotes cognitive complexity (Granello et al., 2008).

**Multicultural Skills**

**Navigate dual language relationships.** Seven participants talked about a plethora of needs for effectively working with ELL supervisees, including: not minimizing ELLs’ perceived language difficulty; inviting use of ELLs’ first languages; inviting a more comfortable format to communicate; considering personal word, phrase, and metaphor usage; and FLES supervisors arranging for a translation with ELLs. Two out of the seven
had worries and/or guilt because they were aware of linguistic diversity but did not know how to effectively work with it. This feature is associated with the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010). Four out of seven gave examples of how to not minimize ELL perceived linguistic difficulties, how to invite use of ELL supervisees’ first language and finding a comfortable format to communicate, and how FLES supervisors could do a translation with ELL supervisees. They had an ability to accurately empathize with ELL supervisees’ feelings and needs for language usage and were likely to be adept at facilitating ELL supervisees’ linguistic and professional development. This feature is related to the fourth stage of MIF, the integration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Inviting the use of ELLs’ first languages was similar to the shared norms of language use indicated by researchers in the education field. Nieto and Bode (2008) referred to Foster’s (1997) research, which showed how shared norms of language use could predict a positive and productive learning environment. Foster gave an example whereby when a teacher employed a preaching style of speaking to mentor African American students, the teacher gave the students a comfortable learning environment that seemed to be lacking in other classrooms. The impact of shared norms of language use may to be true for ELL supervisees within supervision also.

Inviting ELLs’ to use a more comfortable format to communicate seemed to be consistent to a multicultural skill presented by Santau, Maerten-Rivera, and Huggins
The participants in this study were able to provide multiple modes for supervisees to display their counseling techniques. For example, one of the participants said when an ELL supervisee was more comfortable with writing than speaking, supervisory work that engaged the supervisee would focus on written responses prior to practicing counseling skills. The participant created a more synergistic relationship between counselor professional development and language development and the ELL supervisee learned through the use of a more adept format.

The intervention of arranging for a translation with ELL supervisees was similar to an instructional strategy presented by multiple researchers (Francis, Rivera, Lesaux, Keiffer, & Rivera, 2006; Goldenberg, 2008; Schleppegrell, 2009). This intervention involved validating ELL supervisees' eager for freedom of expression and helping them in communicating with clients. For example, one of the participants had her ELL supervisee demonstrate what he or she would like to do and gave her ELL supervisee various opportunities to correct their understanding and use of language. In this case, the participant not only adopted the intervention of arranging for a translation with her ELL supervisee but also employed the strategies of hands-on activities and collaborative inquiry as indicated by Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, and Gallagher (2007).

**Employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising of ELLs.** Learning how to initiate multicultural discussions specifically related to linguistic differences, build rapport, and model for ELL supervisees were perceived training needs for seven of the
participants. In addition, the participants were familiar with current multicultural skills and they gave examples of how to utilize these skills in supervision with ELLs. For example, they would develop a supervisory relationship where ELL supervisees feel safe enough to ask clarifying questions and supervisors would model what could happen in counseling sessions. The participants actively engaged in facilitating ELL supervisees’ multicultural awareness and engaged in self-exploration themselves. The features are associated with the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Multiple researchers proposed that supervisors may not initiate the cultural discussions with their supervisees and indicated various reasons for such reluctance. (Durham, 2002; Gatmon et al., 2001; Glosoff & Durham, 2010; Hays & Chang, 2003). The findings in my study were different from the previous researchers’ findings. The participants in this study recognized the importance of initiating the cultural and linguistic discussions and they believed that they bear much of the responsibility for initiating the discussions due to power differential within supervision. Therefore, the participants were not hesitant to broach cultural and linguistic differences with ELL supervisees. Instead, they would like to be adequately trained to enhance their skill in initiating these discussions.

Earlier studies showed that many counseling graduates have a hard time applying their knowledge to practice in their work with ELL population owing to the reported lack of skills and support as well as limited multicultural training (Burnham, Mantero, &
Hooper, 2009; Packer-Williams, Jay, & Evans, 2010). However, the findings in my study pointed out that the participants are able to incorporate multicultural issues in their work to some degree and integrate multiple multicultural counseling skills into their work with ELL supervisees. Although the participants tried to employ a number of practical multicultural skills they learned from the multicultural training they received, they expressed the eagerness and thirst for the multicultural skills specifically related to navigating linguistic differences in an effort to provide effective supervision for ELL supervisees who need to develop professionally and linguistically.

Assess communication styles and outcomes. Three participants talked about the importance of evaluating communication between FLES supervisors and ELL supervisees. They indicated that they would like to work through language barriers but they did not know how to do it. Those features are related to the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

A problem-focused view of linguistic diversity led to the assessment of communication styles and outcomes where language proficiency is commonly evaluated in relation to a specific standard for English (Clyne, 2005). Participants were aware through their own experiences that there might be problems in communicative activities with ELLs due to either ELL lack of English proficiency or because of other ascribed linguistic differences such as accents or speech styles. However, this problem-focused view was not totally adopted by participants. They were acutely aware that
communication barriers were mutual, so they mounted the challenges of assessing communication styles and outcomes in supervision with ELLs.

**Supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners.** Three participants talked about being open to fluid roles to allow themselves to learn from ELL supervisees in addition to teaching them. One of the participants was able to apply what he learned from ELL supervisees to FLES supervisees and was able to discuss and process differences and similarities with ELL supervisees. Those features are related to the fourth stage of MIF, the integration phase. The other participants were open to exploring ELL supervisees' culture and were willing to consult with ELL supervisees how to successfully work with linguistic diversity. Those features are associated with the third stage of MIF, the exploration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Participants believed that limited English proficiency was not associated with a form of intellectual disability, which in turn inspired participants to learn from ELL supervisees in terms of their cultures, including linguistic diversity. However, only one out of 10 participants talked about applying what he learned from ELL supervisees to the supervisory work with FLES supervisees. The conceptualization and implementation of linguistic diversity as a resource for FLES supervisors was a less influential discourse in my findings than the problem-focused perspective.

**Facilitate Parallel Process.** Two participants spoke about facilitating parallel process in supervision. One of the participants found he learned how to work with ELL
supervisees while ELL supervisees were learning how to counsel clients in the U.S. and he tried to be patient with himself and with the ELL supervisee. This participant began to explore his own personal background and worldviews but found the examination of personal beliefs uncomfortable. Therefore, he finally matched this ELL supervisee with a linguistically and culturally similar supervisor. Based on Ancis and Ladany (2010), this feature is associated with the second stage of MIF, the incongruence phase. The other participant was able to explore her own personal backgrounds and values and utilized this parallel process to facilitate ELL supervisees MIF development. This feature is associated with the fourth stage of MIF, the integration phase (Ancis & Ladany, 2010).

Tracey, Bludworth, and Glidden-Tracey (2012) conducted a research study to examine parallel process in the interactions of 17 therapy/supervision triads (i.e., supervisor, therapist/trainee, and client). Their study supported the existence of bidirectional parallel processes at the level of interpersonal interaction. Consistent with the results proposed by Tracey, Bludworth, and Glidden-Tracey (2012), the findings from my study appeared to indicate the similarity between ELL supervisees’ situations with clients and FLES supervisors’ situations with ELLs. Therefore, counselor education and supervision programs may want to train supervisors to address the similarity of ELL supervisees’ multicultural skills to FLES supervisors’ multicultural skills by increasing supervisors’ ability in facilitating parallel process.

Overview of the Emergent Theory
This discussion ends with an overview connecting all of the superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes explaining how FLES supervisors perceive their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. The emergent theory is represented in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Theory of FLES Supervisor Perceptions of their Training Needs for Working with ELL Supervisees
As depicted by the box enclosing the diagram in Figure 5, the interactions constructed in this theory occur in the context of five CACREP programs because the participants were doctoral students and faculty members providing clinical supervision in CACREP programs. The theory proposes that a CACREP program is an educational environment where FLES supervisors receive supervisor training and also recognize their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees. The three superordinate themes, five themes, and 17 subthemes constructed in this study produced the emergent theory that explains how FLES supervisors perceive their training needs. The three superordinate themes included the institutional level, professional collaboration, and supervisor competence. The first theme, institutional change, was at the institutional level. Participants were nearly unanimous in believing that the CACREP standards and counseling programs need to infuse expectations and training for successfully working with the growing population of ELL. The second theme, enhanced collaboration, was included in the professional collaboration. The third to fifth themes, multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills were conceptualized prior to beginning the study and originally presented as three sub-questions, were embedded in the supervisor competence superordinate theme as the components needed for effectiveness in supervision of ELL supervisees.
The emergent theory postulates that participants' training needs for working with ELL supervisees are interpreted as an interactive relationship among institutional level factors -- including institutional change, professional collaboration -- which includes enhanced collaboration, and supervisor competence involving multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural skills. Each of the domains identified by the superordinate themes influence and interact with the other two domains. The institutional change and enhanced collaboration can be used to guide the enhancement of FLES supervisors' multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. For example, inclusion of experiential learning in CACREP programs would be beneficial for FLES supervisors to learn from ELL supervisees opposed to about them. Also, enhanced collaboration might provide a network for FLES supervisors to share and assess their supervisory work with ELL supervisees. In addition, the FLES supervisors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills can also encourage enhanced collaboration and this may lead to new understandings of ELLs and ideas for helpful institutional changes that may be needed. Additionally, the institutional change factors can impact supervisors’ desire for enhanced collaboration through providing ELL training workshops where FLES supervisors and ELLs can interact with each other.

Given the findings in this study, it appears that FLES supervisors perceived that the CACREP Standards and programs could play an important role in advocating for ELL supervisees at the institutional level. In addition, the CACREP programs could meet
FLES multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees. By improving multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills about ELL issues and by collaborating with learning communities, FLES supervisors believed that they would be better prepared to meet the needs of ELL population.

Limitations

Limitations for this study include researcher bias and inexperience and participant bias. As an English language learner, I have been in the process of acculturating to mainstream U.S. cultures. I found I was leaning more toward a positive interpretation of participants' responses than my FLES research team members were. My bias was coming from the fact that I chose to be assimilated into this culture through minimizing many of my own feelings. I elicited the assistance of three research team members and an independent auditor to help with the data analysis and to construct more interpretations based upon authentic participants' voices throughout the research process. Another bias is my varied familiarity and association with different participants. I attempted to minimize this limitation by discussing my biases with my research team members and addressing my relational history with each participant in the beginning of chapter four. Another bias is my lack of experience with qualitative research. In order to address this bias, I have taken an Advanced Qualitative course and used several sources to develop my research methods, procedures, and data analysis. I also have a faculty mentor who is an expert in qualitative research methods. Another bias is my belief in the effectiveness of the
CACREP Standards and CACREP programs. As a result of this bias, my questions related to institutional level were CACREP-focused and limited institutional level training needs were found in my study.

Participant bias is another limitation of my study. As with all qualitative research that depends on self-report through interviews, social desirability could play a key role in the findings from my study. FLES supervisors might have minimized their struggles with ELL supervisees. There were few negative perceptions mentioned about ELLs but there were many concerns about how to work with ELLs, so there might be a potential that participants held back because they were aware that I (the researcher) was an English language learner. The effect of this bias may have been stronger among participants that I knew for a while and among those participants I recruited for this study. Another possible area of bias is that the participants in this study could already have been more multiculturally competent than those who did not see the need for training for working with ELL supervisees. The lack of negative perceptions of ELLs could also have occurred because the people that agreed to participate had a higher level of multicultural competence and cognitive complexity than those who declined.

Even though my study has limitations, the findings are still relevant, add to the existing literature, and have implications for the field. There are several areas of research that can extend this research as well. The next section discusses the implication of this research and ideas for further study.
Implications and Further Research

Implications

The findings of my study may give insights to counselor education and supervision programs as they design and evaluate programs to prepare multiculturally competent supervisors. Varying the layers of supervisor training content, methods, and modalities in the programs to match supervisors’ needs seemed beneficial; however, it is important to assess the FLES supervisors’ needs and accurately match the training with supervisors’ needs. Given the variation in each participant’s needs regarding training content, methods, and modalities, the findings support the attention being paid to supervisors’ MIF because varied layers of training may be needed for supervisors at different stages of MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Granello et al., 2008). It also seems important to thoroughly assess which training content, methods, and modalities would be most helpful to improve each of the three categories of multicultural competence, including awareness, knowledge, and skills for supervisors working with ELL supervisees. Counselor education and supervision programs should also invest in experiential learning opportunities that give FLES supervisors opportunities to learn from ELLs opposed to about them since experiential learning seemed to be such a significant aspect of the needs expressed by the participants. In addition, it may be fruitful to offer training on the use of scaffolding in dealing with linguistic diversity.
The majority of the participants would like the CACREP Standards to explicitly recognize the need to prepare FLES supervisors for working with ELL supervisees. Currently, CACREP is addressing changes in the training standards and the second draft of the 2016 CACREP Standards is available for public comment (CACREP, 2014). Reviewing the draft of the 2016 CACREP Standards, the section of supervisor qualifications still does not address multicultural supervisor training. However, the findings from my study pointed out that multiple participants desired CACREP programs to provide them with multicultural training content, methods, and modalities; overall, they felt they were not equipped to supervise ELL supervisees.

Given that some of the participants found benefits with professional collaboration, it is recommended that learning communities be utilized for FLES supervisors to enhance supervisor multicultural competence development in their work with ELL supervisees. The concept of professional learning community consists of “a shared mission, vision and values; collective inquiry, collaborative teams; an orientation toward action and willingness to experiment; commitment to continuous improvement; and a focus on results” (Dufour & Eaker, 1998, p. 45). Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) reviewed research on the design of high quality professional development for ELL students’ teachers and they found one of the most successful frameworks for effective professional learning among these teachers is professional learning community. Consistent with studies in the education field, the participants in my study also desired
these professional development opportunities that are ongoing, ELL issue specific, and collaborative. It also would be valuable to consider including peer consultation as a way to engage FLES supervisors to enhance their multicultural competence in their work with ELL supervisees (Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Moorhead, 2008).

Given that the participants talked about their needs for additional professional literature and continuing education on this topic and the fact that ELLs constitute one of the fast growing populations in the U.S. (Uro & Barrio, 2013), it seemed important that counselor educators and supervisors be adequately prepared for ELL issues via training offered by counselor education and supervision programs and counseling associations. Since research on ELL issues in counselor education and supervision field is scant, it appeared that there is a clear need for more researchers to conduct research in regards to ELL competence.

**Future Research**

Since this study was conducted with participants providing clinical supervision in CACREP programs, it would be beneficial to examine the perspectives of participants of other counselor education and supervision programs. Additionally, since this study was conducted with only 10 participants, extending research on this topic to include a larger sample of FLES supervisors appears to be merited.
Given the unmet multicultural training needs of FLES supervisors, creating and evaluating a training program to help FLES supervisors gain the multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills which participants identified in this study could improve our knowledge and practice in this area. To evaluate and determine the level of supervisor multicultural competence in working with ELL supervisees, development of an instrument to measure this would be beneficial. In addition, an examination of how experiential learning (e.g., through immersion experiences) impacts the MIF development or cognitive complexity of FLES supervisors could enhance future training efforts.

While the participants talked about setting up a system and growing a program where ELLs could not only survive but also thrive, it is still unknown what factors could contribute to ELLs' academic and professional success and what factors might become barriers to success across counselor education and supervision programs. Studies comparing ELLs that participate in each counselor education and supervision program could be conducted to examine the effectiveness of teaching, supervision, and services.

Lastly, since the participants discussed their need for professional collaboration, examining the impact of collaborating with learning communities and the effectiveness of learning communities would also be important for future research.

Future research that examines the effectiveness of training FLES supervisors to work with ELL supervisees is merited and may illuminate the social justice issues
involved as well as the learning communities, awareness, knowledge, and skills needed to effectively supervise and counsel the growing ELL population.

**Conclusion**

While the recognition that supervisors serve as trainers and gatekeepers in the counseling profession has heightened the importance placed on the training of supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; American Counseling Association, 2005), little attention has been paid to methods of training multiculturally competent supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Constantine & Sue, 2007). This constructivist grounded theory study gave voice to FLES supervisors who were providing clinical supervision in a CACREP program and sought to understand their multicultural training needs for working with ELL supervisees.
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English language learners (ELLs) constitute the fastest growing segment of the population in the United States (Kanno & Cromley, 2013; Uro & Barrio, 2013). In addition, international students are present in close to half of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Kok-Mun, 2006). Only a small number of these international students speak English as first language (Chin, 2002). While the literature has noted the influence of linguistic differences on these students’ counseling self-efficacy and supervision outcomes (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Moore, 2012; Nilsson, 2007), supervisor training needs for their work with ELL supervisees has not been adequately addressed.

In order to facilitate the enhancement of supervisees’ cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills, supervisors need to both exhibit and expect multicultural competence (Inman & Soheilian, 2010). Supervisors who are native or first language English speakers (FLES) can be important resources for ELL supervisees in successfully navigating language differences yet few suggestions have emerged to guide FLES supervisors in managing linguistic diversity in supervision.

**Brief Summary of Relevant Literature**

The recognition that supervisors serve as not only trainers but also gatekeepers of the counseling profession has heightened the emphasis on effectively training supervisors
Since the 1990s, the professional literature, state licensing boards, credentialing bodies, professional organizations, and university training programs have amplified the attention given to supervisor training (Aasheim, 2012). For instance, the American Association of State Counseling Boards has created an Approved Supervisor Model that states could adopt as their credentialing model (AASCB, 2011). Also, CACREP (2009) standards require the provision of supervision training for site supervisors and doctoral students.

The models of supervision that highlight the importance of multicultural interactions within supervision have gained increasing attention (Inman & Ladany, 2014). Researchers have proposed that multiculturally competent supervision enhances multicultural counseling knowledge (Penn & Post, 2012), cultural empathy (Suthakaran, 2011), multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Burkard, Johnson, Madson, Pruitt, Contreras-Tadych, Kozlowski, & Hess, 2006; Constantine, 2001), supervisory working alliance and satisfaction with supervision (Inman, 2006), and learning outcomes (Green & Dekkers, 2010). Responding to a call for training supervisors, multiple training guides, programs, and models have emerged in the literature (Bradley & Whiting, 2001; Falendar & Shafranske, 2004; Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, Hartwig-Moorhead, 2008; Stoltenberg, McNeill, Delworth, 1998). However, these training guides, programs, and models assume that adequate supervision will occur by being attentive towards individual differences (e.g., the developmental level of counselors) and
equipping supervisors with skills to address the needs of counselors at different levels.

Little attention has been given to methods of training multiculturally competent supervisors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Constantine & Sue, 2007).

Despite the increasing attention given to strategies for addressing individual differences, there is relatively little research on strategies for addressing cultural differences between a counselor and a supervisor (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett, Borders, Crutchfield, Brotherton, & Curtis, 2001; Gonzalez, 1997). Gonzalez (1997) has developed a postmodern approach to multicultural clinical supervision and maintained that supervisors should attend to language usage and supervisees’ expression of strong affect in supervision. As proposed by Garrett et al. (2001), the VISION model highlights supervisor’s awareness of their own culture and how this impacts the supervisees and the supervisory process. Ancis and Ladany’s (2010) HMNID model offers a framework for understanding the multicultural competence of both supervisors and the counselors with whom they work. Although Gonzalez (1997) pointed out that supervisors should attend to language issues, in these two more recent models (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Garrett et al, 2001), culture refers to race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, socioeconomic status, age, religion, and the intersections of these factors. Despite the assertions in the literature that attending to linguistic differences within supervision may be helpful in responding to the ELL supervisees’ needs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Yabusaki, 2010), a notable omission in these models is the acknowledgement of
linguistic differences. In addition, attending to language differences in the supervisor-supervisee relationships appears to be both an important way to build an egalitarian working alliance with supervisees and also a foundation for engaging in advocacy for and with the supervisee when they face misunderstanding or discrimination (Yabusaki, 2010). There is a clear need for examining supervisor training needs for working with linguistic diversity.

The central research question for this study was: How do FLES supervisors perceive their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? The sub-questions were (1) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural awareness needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (2) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural knowledge needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees? (3) What are FLES supervisors’ perceptions of their training needs with regards to the multicultural skills needed to effectively supervise ELL supervisees?

Method

Constructivist grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2009; Charmaz, 2011) was used to gain an in-depth understanding of FLES supervisors’ responses. Participants consisted of 10 FLES doctoral students and faculty members who are currently providing clinical supervision in CACREP accredited programs. Doctoral students were recruited
through contact with doctoral level supervision course instructors or clinical coordinators at selected counselor education doctoral programs and faculty members were recruited through contact with department chairs.

Participants were interviewed individually regarding their previous supervisory experiences with ELL supervisees and/or their assumptions about supervising ELL supervisees and their perceptions of supervision training needs in order to successfully work with ELL supervisees. The research team utilized initial line-by-line coding, focused coding, and theoretical sampling procedures to examine relationships among ideas and to generate connections of ideas and concepts in order to develop a theory of supervisor multicultural training needs (Charmaz, 2006, 2011). Subsequently, the researcher conducted a second round of individual interviews to clarify participants' responses and allow participants to provide feedback for the first individual interview data analysis. The researcher used strategies of making constant comparisons and applying theoretical sampling.

To reduce researcher bias, the researcher employed a research team comprising of three other individuals. Member checking was involved via the exchanges of interview transcripts, analytical thoughts, and interpretations with participants in this study to make sure that participants' ideas were correctly represented. Finally, an independent auditor reviewed all documents in the audit trail.

The data were interpreted as a hierarchy of three levels of themes including:
superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes. The research team and the researcher used the criteria of having responses from at least two participants for a concept to be included as a theme or subtheme (Namey, Guest, Thairu, & Johnson, 2008; Silverman, 2011). As the initial codes were explored further, congruent codes were selected to construct main themes. The main themes were examined to determine if they could be categorized into subthemes, which fit as subsets of the themes. The main themes were also examined to look for superordinate themes, which summarized clusters of main themes and subthemes. The data were interpreted as a hierarchy of three levels of themes including:

superordinate themes, themes, and subthemes (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

Results

The three superordinate themes, five themes, and 17 subthemes constructed in this study produced the emergent theory that explains how FLES supervisors perceive their training needs for working with ELL supervisees. The emergent theory is represented in Figure 1.

As depicted by the box enclosing the diagram in Figure 1, the interactions constructed in this theory occur in the context of multiple CACREP programs because the participants were doctoral students and faculty members providing clinical supervision in a CACREP program. The theory proposes that a CACREP program is an educational environment where FLES supervisors receive supervisor training and also
recognize their training needs regarding the multicultural competence needed to
effectively supervise ELL supervisees.

Superordinate Theme One: Institutional Level

The superordinate theme related to the institutional level refers to supervisor training
needs that involved CACREP Standards, CACREP programs, and supervisor training.
This superordinate theme included a theme and two subthemes that were discussed by
participants.

Institutional Change. All 10 participants spoke about institutional change. There
were two subthemes which included improve infusion of competence with ELL in
CACREP Standards and enhance advocacy for ELLs in counseling program and
supervision training.

Nine participants spoke about improving infusion of competence with ELL in CACREP
Standards. For example, participant 001 stated,

Perhaps that takes change at the institutional level because that's a
component of CACREP, that's not a requirement. Multiculturalism is and
may be somebody somewhere thinks that that's assumed, but it's not. Most
of our textbooks on multiculturalism don't talk necessarily about English
language supervision. It may touch upon English language clients but not
really indepthly, in my opinion. So maybe infusing it even into the
CACREP guidelines.
10 participants spoke about enhancing advocacy for ELLs in counseling program and supervisor training. For example, participant 003 stated,

I'm now Program Coordinator of our program here at [university name here] and so I'm excited for the opportunity to really grow our program internationally, to create more systems or structures to really support international students so that we can have these kinds of conversations and really expand what does it mean to be counseling. This may be a little provocative, but I'd even go so far as to say it's something that is critical for us to do so that we're living multiculturally rather than just writing about it or talking about it, that our programs reflect what that ethic is. I know for me and the program here we've started to look at recruiting specifically English language learners into our program.

This participant later talked about building a program where ELLs can not only survive but also thrive. He said, “setting up systems to support them throughout so that we can build a program where English language learners are not only excited to go, encouraged to go, but will also thrive once they're here.”

**Superordinate Theme Two: Professional Collaboration**

The superordinate theme of supervisor training needs related to professional collaboration refers to supervisor training needs that involved support and consultation.
Enhanced Collaboration. Three participants spoke about enhanced collaboration, which refers to statements the participants made about their training needs that involved debriefing with people and benefiting from working as a team. For example, participant 008 stated,

I feel like things that could always enhance my confidence on supervision are... having other discussions with my peers around...really, I feel like that last piece is really the assessing of what I’m doing in my own supervision practice—that would be helpful—just bringing myself to mind—bringing awareness to what I’m currently doing...

Superordinate Theme Three: Supervisor Competence

This superordinate theme of supervisor training needs related to supervisor competence refers to supervisor training needs that involved multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. This superordinate theme included three themes and 14 subthemes.

Multicultural Awareness. Nine participants spoke about multicultural awareness as a theme. Multicultural awareness refers to statements the participants made about their training needs related to developing their own awareness. There were six subthemes which included awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELL, recognize challenges and opportunities presented by linguistic differences, recognize probable similarities, recognize power differential, recognize cognitive complexity required for
bicultral (or polycultural) competence, and understand languages are not semantically equivalent.

Three participants spoke about awareness of increasing numbers and diversity of ELLs. For example, participant 007 said,

I think they said by 2050, the majority's not going to be white people...
And then, people are still migrating here from all over the world not even including the undocumented immigrants that I'm now learning about...
There's more and more people who are going to be English language learners in this country and we don't have a national language. Most of us speak English, but we don't have a national language. I'm hoping that foreign languages don't die out here.

Four participants spoke about recognizing challenges presented by linguistic differences.

For example, participant 010 said,

I would worry about am I missing things because I don't understand entirely the culture they come from, nor do I speak—l'm assuming—with Spanish speaking, then that would be different, but if they're another language that I don't speak, I would be very worried about not connecting.

Aside from challenges presented by linguistic differences, participant 003 talked about opportunities presented by linguistic differences and said,
Because there's not that shared or we don't assume that there's that shared meaning between us as different language speakers, it makes it easier for us to explore, "What do we have in common? What are we sharing?" …

It's an opportunity for me to get to know my supervisees so much better and in that also get to know myself so much better.

Three participants spoke about recognizing probable similarities. For example, participant 005 talked about acknowledging commonalities and stated, “I’m all about finding similarities and commonalities and I think there are commonalities in every culture, I believe. We just have to take the time to look for it.”

Eight participants spoke about recognizing power differential. For example, participant 002 said,

I believe that it is my responsibility as a supervisor to do the necessary work to address any of those potential barriers, to address language as a barrier. That’s my responsibility there to take care of that, to figure how to make that work...because of the power differential.

Two participants spoke about recognizing cognitive complexity required for bicultural (or polycultural) competence. For example, participant 001 thought FLES supervisors do not have enough cognitive complexity and need to work on that. He said,
We're supposed to be comfortable with ambiguity... We're supposed to be cognitively complex as counselors and supervisors and counselor educators... We have multicultural counseling and supervision and, oh, we've got cognitive complexities. Oh, we've got these different pieces that if we tied them together on a regular basis and said, "This is why. Here's an example of why you need to be cognitively complex, why you need to be a post-conventional thinker, why you need to be comfortable with ambiguity," because of all these issues. Even as educators, we especially, I think, need to have that perspective.

Three participants spoke about understanding languages are not semantically equivalent. For example, participant 009 stated,

I think they're very good for a perspective that is different from ours in terms of and different from mine, let me say, in that I think that one of the things we have to do is try to show them that we don't, I think as English speaking supervisors, I think we don't allow them to be able to say things 'cause some things are not transferable when you translate it.

**Multicultural Knowledge.** Seven participants spoke about multicultural knowledge as a theme. Multicultural knowledge refers to statements the participants made about their training needs related to developing their own knowledge. There were three subthemes which included: have a framework or
evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees, distinguish levels of acculturation, and knowledge of ELL cultures.

Four participants spoke about having a framework or evidence-based knowledge to work with ELL supervisees. For example, participant 006 stated, “Be able to read the literature and see what the literature suggests are best ways to work with supervisees and just to be able to be aware of the importance.”

Four participants spoke about distinguishing levels of acculturation. For example, participant 004 indicating recognizing that ELLs who grew up in the U.S. may have more cultural exposure and recognizing that international ELLs may be making a bigger cultural transition,

Somebody who’s an English second language learner who grew up speaking Spanish in the house and learned English as he was going through schools here versus if I had a supervisee who came into the program and this was the first year here and they spoke English and they’re from a different country. There’s lots of differences right there, mostly cultural based.

Four participants spoke about knowledge of ELL cultures. For example, participant 009 responded,

I think a lot of their ethics, morals and values lie in that culture and I think we have to recognize as supervisors, what that means to them and how that
affects them... I think once we understand in training how it affects in people and how it looks and not only the attitude or the behaviors, but how it really has every part of them, I think it’s very different. So I think training in every part of that would be helpful.

**Multicultural Skills.** Ten participants spoke about multicultural skills as a theme.

Multicultural skills refer to statements the participants made about their training needs related to developing their own skills. There were five subthemes which included navigate dual language relationships, employ multicultural counseling skills in supervising ELLs, assess communication styles and outcomes, supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners, and facilitate parallel process.

Seven participants spoke about navigating dual language relationships. For example, participant 009 talked about inviting ELLs’ first languages and said,

> Like whatever they want to say in their language, do, or whatever. Then I say, “Tell me what it is.” So then they’ll tell me what it is and after that we’re able to say how they could say it acceptable to the client so the client does not see it as derogatory or discriminatory or something that’s offensive.

This participant 009 also talked about inviting a more comfortable format to communicate and said,
Let them know if they’re more comfortable writing some things or if they
want to say it in their language first and then whatever is comfortable for
them, that will make the relationship stronger, I would allow.

Six participants spoke about employing multicultural counseling skills in supervising
ELLs. For example, participant 008 said,

Make sure that I was clear on what the cultural lens my supervisees like
how they view their own professional counseling identity and how they are
working to grow within the profession. I think I might maintain what I’m
currently doing, but also explore and do some more questioning around
language and just really be clear on if they are an English learner speaking
person, ‘cause I don’t think that I ask that now, so maybe just inquiring
around that and broaching around language might be something new that I
could do.

Three participants spoke about assessing communication styles and outcomes. For
example, participant 008 said,

I always wonder and try to leave room for assessment of supervision so I
can assure that if I’m not hitting the mark, or people don’t understand
certain aspects of supervision... I think I’m always questioning how I can
assess supervision to ensure that what I’m perceiving is happening and
what I'm perceiving as support feels like support to my supervisees or English language learners.

Three participants reflected that supervisors and supervisees are both teachers and learners. For example, participant 006 responded, “Could they understand me and if not, what would we need to do to make it successful for them? I would have to consult with them.”

Two participants spoke about facilitating parallel process. For example, participant 002 stated, “Especially once it became clear to both of us that that was what we needed to do. I was learning how to do it as well—how to help her in that way as well, so I was being patient with her and trying to be patient with myself.”

**Discussion**

The researchers chose to use the Heuristic Model of Nonoppressive Interpersonal Development (HMNID) formulated by Ancis and Ladany (2010) to examine the participants’ multicultural awareness. The researchers will briefly discuss the HMNID model and then explain the reason why the researchers chose to utilize this model, especially the phases of Means of Interpersonal Functioning (MIF), in the discussion.

Ancis and Ladany (2010) developed their model of nonoppressive interpersonal development in order to offer supervisors a heuristic model to understand the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of themselves, their supervisees, and clients across demographic variables. Ancis and Ladany posited that for each demographic variable, individuals
progress through phases of Means of Interpersonal Functioning (MIF). MIF represented thoughts, feelings and behaviors based on one’s identification with a particular demographic variable. For Ancis and Ladany, people have the ability to developmentally progress through four phases of MIF: adaption, incongruence, exploration, and integration.

Given the variation in each participant’s needs regarding training content, methods, and modalities, the findings support the attention being paid to supervisors’ MIF because varied layers of training may be needed for supervisors at different stages of MIF (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Granello et al., 2008). It is important to assess the FLES supervisors’ needs and accurately match the training with supervisors’ needs. Content refers to what is covered in supervisor training, methods refer to the techniques used in supervisor training, and modalities refer to in which way supervisor training courses are designed. It seems important to thoroughly assess which training content, methods, and modalities would be most helpful to improve each of the three categories of multicultural competence, including awareness, knowledge, and skills for supervisors working with ELL supervisees. Counselor education and supervision programs should also invest in experiential learning opportunities that give FLES supervisors opportunities to learn from ELLs since experiential learning seemed to be such a significant aspect of the needs of the participants. Endicott, Bock, and Narvaez (2003) conducted a quantitative study to examine college students’ intercultural development, moral judgment, and multicultural
experiences. They found college students’ moral judgment and intercultural development are related to depth and breadth of multicultural experiences. Their findings supported the notion that individuals with more and deeper multicultural experiences would have a more complex repertoire of cultural schemas and that they would be leaning more towards post-conventional and ethnorelative thinking due to cognitive flexibility. The participants in this study echoed the findings presented by Endicott et al. (2003) because they would like to enhance their level of cognitive complexity in order to work more effectively with ELL supervisees.

The majority of the participants would like the CACREP Standards to explicitly recognize the need to prepare FLES supervisors for working with ELL supervisees. Reviewing the draft of the 2016 CACREP Standards, the section of supervisor qualifications still does not address multicultural supervisor training. However, the findings from this study pointed out that multiple participants desired CACREP programs to provide them with multicultural training content, methods, and modalities; overall, they felt they were not equipped to supervise ELL supervisees.

Given that some of the participants found benefits with professional collaboration, it is recommended that learning communities be considered for FLES supervisors to enhance supervisor multicultural competence development in their work with ELL supervisees. The concept of professional learning community consists of “a shared mission, vision and values; collective inquiry, collaborative teams; an orientation toward
action and willingness to experiment; commitment to continuous improvement; and a focus on results” (Dufour & Eaker, 1998, p. 45). Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) reviewed research on the design of high quality professional development for ELL students’ teachers and they found one of the most successful frameworks for effective professional learning among these teachers is professional learning community.

Consistent with studies in the education field, the participants in this study also desired for these professional development opportunities that are ongoing, ELL issue specific, and collaborative. It also would be valuable to consider including peer consultation and networking with potential resources as a way to engage FLES supervisors to enhance their multicultural competence in their work with ELL supervisees (Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Moorhead, 2008; Grothaus, Stone, Upton, & Anderson, 2014).

Given that the participants talked about their needs for additional professional literature and continuing education on this topic and given the fact that ELLs constitute one of the fast growing populations in the U.S. (Uro & Barrio, 2013), it seemed important that counselor educators and supervisors are adequately prepared for effectively working with ELL supervisees in counselor education and supervision training programs and through professional development opportunities offered by counseling associations. Since research on ELL issues in counselor education and supervision field is scant, it appeared that there is a clear need for more research regarding the competencies needed for
working with ELL supervisees. Future research that examines the effectiveness of
training FLES supervisors to work with ELL supervisees appears merited.
Figure 1. Theory of FLES Supervisor Perceptions of their Training Needs for Working with ELL Supervisees
References for Chapter Six


Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*


practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.


doi:10.1080/08952833


Suthakaran, V. (2011). Using analogies to enhance self-awareness and cultural empathy:


References


doi:10.1177/1525822X10388468


Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35, 51-64.


Schleppegrell, M. J. (2009). Language in academic subject areas and classroom instruction: What is academic language and how can we teach it? Paper presented
at workshop on *The role of language in school learning* sponsored by The

English learners on science performance assessments: The SALD framework.

*Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47* (8), 909-928.

acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language
learners-A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC:
Alliance for Excellent Education.


Silverman, D. (2011) *Interpreting qualitative data: A guide to the principles of

strategies for social justice change: A grounded theory of what works in the


*Educational Leadership, 61*, 52-57.


APPENDIX A

Descriptive Data Questionnaire

Age: _______  Race/Ethnicity: _______________________  Gender: ____________

Please list your counseling (or psychology or social work) licenses and certifications:

Are you a doctoral student or faculty member in a CACREP program? ____________

Number of years you have provided supervision (total) ______________

Number of years you have provided supervision in a CACREP counseling program ____

Approximate number of hours of supervision training you have received ______________

Average number of hours of supervision you provide per week ______________

Please list all languages you speak, understand, or read (and share your perception of your level of fluency in each):

If you speak, read, etc. more than one language, please list all of your languages in order of acquisition (your native language first):

Thank you for your participation!
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent

Title: Supervisor perceptions of their multicultural training needs for working with English language learning supervisees

Introduction: My name is Hsin-Ya Tang. I am currently pursuing my doctoral degree at Old Dominion University and I am the primary investigator in this study. This study will be supervised by Dr. Tim Grothaus, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, ACS, a faculty member in the Department of Counseling and Human Services. This form is intended to provide you with information to decide if you would or would not like to participate in this study.

Description of the Study: I am inviting you to participate because you have been identified as a faculty member or doctoral student in a CACREP counseling program and you are currently providing clinical supervision. The purpose of this study is to explore FLES (First language English-speaking) supervisors’ perceptions of training needs for working with ELL (English language learning) supervisees. If you agree to participate, you will participate in two interviews. The two interviews will be conducted face-to-face or via Skype. The initial interview will last approximately 25-40 minutes in length. The second interview will last approximately 10-25 minutes in length. All audiotapes will be destroyed five years after completion of this study.

Potential Risks of Discomfort: Due to the nature of this study, there are no identifiable risks to participants. All aspects of participation are voluntary and you as a participant can choose to conclude the interview at any point. If you would like to discuss these concerns and any other potential discomforts, you may contact my chair, Dr. Tim Grothaus, the current IRB chair at ODU, Dr. Theodore Remley, or myself. Below is the contact information for Dr. Tim Grothaus, Dr. Theodore Remley, and me.

Tim Grothaus, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, ACS
Associate Professor, Counseling Graduate Program Director
Counseling and Human Services Department
Old Dominion University
Education Building, Room 110
Norfolk, VA 23529 (757) 683-3007 tgrothau@odu.edu

Theodore P. Remley, Jr., JD, PhD, LPC, NCC
Chair, Human Subjects Review Committee
Darden College of Education
Potential Benefits to You or Others: The results of this study could be used to enhance the process of multicultural training for supervisors to successfully work with ELL supervisees.

Alternative Procedures: There are no alternative procedures. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw consent and terminate participation at any point without consequence.

Protection of Confidentiality: Your name and all affiliations will be kept confidential at all times. Pseudonyms will be given for participants. The researcher will transcribe all audiotapes and all tapes will be destroyed five years after the completion of the study. The signed consent forms, audiotapes, interview transcripts, and any other materials related to this study will be maintained in a secure and confidential lockbox and kept by Hsin-Ya Tang, the primary investigator and destroyed five years after the completion of the study.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. Throughout the interviews, you have the right to answer or not answer any questions. Even if you decide to participate and withdraw later, any comments you made will not be used in the study and will be destroyed.

Institution Review Board Approval: This study has been deemed exempt from IRB review by the Human Subjects Review Committee of the Darden College of Education. Approval #201401099

Signatures: If you agree to take part in the study, please sign the consent form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Participant Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Introduction Letter

Dear supervisors,

My name is Hsin-Ya Tang and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Human Services at Old Dominion University. I am writing to request your participation in my dissertation research study. I will be exploring how supervisors who are first language English-speakers perceive their training needs in order to effectively supervise English language learning supervisees. Very little research has been done in this area so I hope that my study will contribute useful insights to the profession and will be enlightening to both supervisors and counselor educators. I would appreciate if you would consider agreeing to be a participant for my study.

In order to be considered a participant for the purposes of this study, you must meet both of the following two criteria:

- English is your native or first language; and
- You are currently providing clinical supervision in a CACREP accredited program.

I am planning to interview each participant twice, either in person or via Skype. If you agree to participate in this study, the time commitment required will be approximately 35-65 minutes for both interviews. The confidential interviews will be conducted at a location and time of your choosing.

If you have any questions and/or if you are willing to take part in this study, please contact me at htang001@odu.edu or 757-672-3203 to schedule your first interview.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Hsin-Ya Tang, M.Ed
Doctoral Candidate
Old Dominion University
(757) 672-3203 htang001@odu.edu

Tim Grothaus, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, ACS - Dissertation Committee Chair
Associate Professor and Counseling Graduate Program Director
Old Dominion University (757) 683-3007 tgrothau@odu.edu
APPENDIX D

Initial Interview Questions

1. Would you please share the experiences you’ve had in your life with English language learners?
2. Could you please describe the multicultural supervision training in which you have participated?
3. Could you describe your supervisory experiences with English language learning supervisees, if any?
4. What are your beliefs or ideas regarding working with English language learning supervisees?
5. What concerns or questions might you have about your ability to effectively supervise English language learning supervisees?
6. What might enhance your level of confidence regarding your ability to successfully work with English language learning supervisees?
7. Do you believe specific training for working with English language learning supervisees is worthwhile or necessary?
8. What preparation, if any, for working with English language learning supervisees would you recommend be included for training supervisors in CACREP programs? How much of this training would you personally wish to have?
9. If you know you will be working with a new supervisee who is an English language learner in the near future, how, if at all, would you change your usual supervisory content and process?
10. Any final thoughts regarding working with English language learning supervisees you would like to share with me?
APPENDIX E

Second Round Interview Questions

1. Can you please review the summary of the data analysis and discuss whether the themes developed from the first round interview were interpreted in a manner congruent with your experiences?
2. Would you please share any additional thoughts, comments, or questions regarding working with English language learning supervisees that come to mind?
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