

Old Dominion University

## ODU Digital Commons

---

Counseling & Human Services Theses & Dissertations

Counseling & Human Services

---

Summer 8-2022

# Broaching Race and Race-Related Issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees

Judith Wambui Preston

*Old Dominion University*, [judithpreston0@gmail.com](mailto:judithpreston0@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_etds)



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Counseling Psychology Commons](#), [Counselor Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Preston, Judith W.. "Broaching Race and Race-Related Issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees" (2022). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, Counseling & Human Services, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/3xmj-ts37  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs\\_etds/142](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/chs_etds/142)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Counseling & Human Services at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Counseling & Human Services Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

BROACHING RACE AND RACE-RELATED ISSUES: PHENOMENOLOGICAL INQUIRY  
OF DOCTORAL STUDENT SUPERVISORS OF COUNSELOR TRAINEES

by

Judith Wambui Preston  
B.A. October 1990, University of Nairobi  
M.A. June 1998, Ohio University  
M.S.Ed. May 2005, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty  
of Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

EDUCATION-COUNSELING

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

August 2022

Approved by:

Gulsah Kemer (Director)

Laura E. Smithers (Member)

Radha Horton-Parker (Member)

Connie T. Jones (Member)

## ABSTRACT

### BROACHING RACE AND RACE-RELATED ISSUES: PHENOMENOLOGICAL INQUIRY OF DOCTORAL STUDENT SUPERVISORS OF COUNSELOR TRAINEES

Judith Wambui Preston  
Old Dominion University, 2022  
Chair: Dr. Gulsah Kemer

Clinical supervision is a central building block in counseling that ensures client welfare, fosters supervisees' professional development, and facilitates the gatekeeping process of those entering the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). In addition to gatekeeping, the American Counseling Association (ACA; 2014) Code of Ethics mandates clinical supervisors to be aware of and address multiculturalism's role in the supervisory relationship. Because of this mandate, doctoral student supervisors of counselor trainees in CACREP-accredited programs are responsible for integrating multicultural considerations through broaching to ensure racially and culturally responsive counseling to clients from diverse backgrounds (Bayne & Branco, 2018; Jones et al., 2019). This phenomenological inquiry aimed to explore the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors of counselor trainees in CACREP-accredited programs broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision practice. The findings resulted in three themes: (a) the function of broaching, (b) supervisors' characteristics, and (c) counselor training programs. The study revealed doctoral student supervisors had insights into the importance of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision to cultivate a working alliance. However, they experienced barriers and challenges that included individual characteristics, lack of adequate training, and counselor training programs' critical consciousness. Supervisors also revealed insight into how these barriers and challenges were tied to the culture of white supremacy that upheld ideologies such as color blindness, the avoidance and resistance to the

integration of voices of marginalized populations, and the centering of race and power in counselor training programs. The study findings have practical and research implications for all stakeholders of counselor training programs.

*Keywords:* clinical supervision, multicultural competence, broaching, doctoral students, race, race-related issues, counselor education

Copyright, 2022, by Judith Wambui Preston, All Rights Reserved.

This dissertation is dedicated to my life partner Anthony, and my children Watiri and Mung'au who made sacrifices, encouraged, supported, and loved me throughout this process.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ubuntu: “I am what I am because of who we all are” (Zulu Philosophy)

There are many people who have contributed to the successful completion of this dissertation. I would like first to thank my committee members, Dr. Gulsah Kemer, Dr. Laura E. Smithers, Dr. Radha Horton-Parker, and Dr. Connie T. Jones, for their support, guidance, mentorship, and editing of this manuscript. The nurturing efforts of my chair deserve special recognition. Thank you for all your work in raising the bar and exemplifying excellence. Dr. Horton-Parker and Dr. Jude Austin, thank you for your support and mentorship. You often reminded me why I needed to be doing this. I am also grateful to the participants of this study. Without them, there would be no study. Thank you to my research team members, Nic Schmoyer, Tom Seguin, and Chelsea Hilliard, who showed up so we could honor the participants' stories. Thank you to the NBCC Foundation for a minority fellow doctoral fellowship that changed my life by giving me financial support, a new family and a space that supported my work with marginalized and underserved communities. Old Dominion University, thank you for the financial support that allowed me to earn this Ph.D. My ODU cohort, thank you for your friendship and support. This journey was memorable because of you. My NBCC cohort, thank you for being available for support, encouragement, and laughs. To my sister friends who checked on me often and rooted for me to get to the finish line, thank you. To my family in Kenya, Asanteni Sana, for being in my corner despite being miles away. To my children, Watiri and Mung'au, whom I love deeply, thank you for being my children and for teaching me how to be flexible. Lastly, I would like to thank my life partner, Anthony, who I love deeply. Thank you for supporting my ideas, including returning to school for a Ph.D. Thank you for loving me and for being my person.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	1
CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS.....	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	7
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	7
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.....	8
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	8
SUMMARY.....	10
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
CULTURALLY SUSTAINING PRACTICES.....	11
CRITICAL RACE THEORY.....	12
BROACHING.....	14
DOCTORAL STUDENT SUPERVISORS.....	20
SUMMARY.....	22
METHOD.....	23
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	23
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	23
PHENOMENOLOGICAL RESEARCH APPROACH.....	24
PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS.....	25
TRUSTWORTHINESS.....	26
SAMPLING AND PARTICIPANTS.....	27
RESEARCH TEAM REFLEXIVITY.....	29
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES.....	31
DATA ANALYSIS.....	33
SUMMARY.....	36
RESULTS.....	37
THEME 1: FUNCTION OF BROACHING.....	37
THEME 2: SUPERVISOR’S INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS.....	47
THEME 3: COUNSELING TRAINING PROGRAMS.....	52
ESSENCE.....	64
SUMMARY.....	65
DISCUSSION.....	66



	Page
INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS.....	67
THEME 1: FUNCTION OF BROACHING.....	67
THEME 2: SUPERVISOR’S INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS.....	72
THEME 3: COUNSELING TRAINING PROGRAMS.....	76
LIMITATIONS.....	80
IMPLICATIONS FOR SUPERVISION AND TRAINING PRACTICES.....	81
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	83
SUMMARY.....	84
REFERENCES.....	86
APPENDICES.....	94
A. INVITATION EMAIL.....	95
B. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.....	96
C. INFORMED CONSENT.....	97
D. CONTACT INFORMATION.....	100
E. SCHEDULING 60-MINUTE INTERVIEW EMAIL.....	101
F. 60 MINUTE-INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	102
G. TRANSCRIPT REVIEW EMAIL.....	104
H. SCHEDULING 15-30 MINUTE INTERVIEW EMAIL.....	105
I. 15-30 MINUTE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW.....	106
J. REVIEW OF THEMES EMAIL.....	107
VITA.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Demographic Information of the Participants.....29

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **Introduction**

In this chapter, I introduce the problem statement by first addressing the importance of multicultural competence in clinical supervision and how broaching race and race-related issues enhance culturally sustaining supervision practices. Next, I discuss the significance of studying doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision due to the significant role they play in influencing multicultural competence practices in supervisees. I also introduce the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of the study, Critical Race Theory and Continuum Broaching Behavior Model, the purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and future research and definitions. Finally, I conclude the chapter with a summary.

### **Problem Statement**

Clinical supervision is a central building block in counseling. It is defined as an evaluative supervisory relationship between a more senior and a junior member of the counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisors ensure client welfare, supervisee professional development, and facilitate gatekeeping of those entering the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Because of the importance of this role, the counseling profession posits clinical supervisors master responsibilities and behaviors that make sure supervisees are well prepared to effectively serve as counselors (Borders et al., 2014; Borders & Brown, 2006). One of the responsibilities includes multicultural competency practice. Multicultural competence is one tenet of ethical practice mandated by the American Counseling Association (ACA; 2014) Code of Ethics. Multicultural competence in clinical supervision includes supervisors acknowledging

and addressing multicultural and diversity issues, such as racial, ethnic, cultural heritage, social, economic status, age, gender, affectional orientation, religious and spiritual beliefs, physical, emotional, and mental dis/abilities in the supervisory relationship (Peters, 2017).

To effectively orient themselves to multicultural competence and culturally sustaining practice, clinical supervisors are called first to explore their attitudes, biases, and racial identity development, including reflection on their strengths and growth areas (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders et al., 2005, 2014; Dressel et al., 2007). In addition, clinical supervisors must also continuously seek additional training toward culturally sustaining supervision as lifelong ongoing learning (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Ratts et al., 2016). Furthermore, clinical supervisors are expected to acknowledge and discuss how social and political contexts are tied to larger systems, such as structural racism, privilege, microaggressions, and discrimination, and how they impact the supervisory relationship (Borders et al., 2014; King & Jones, 2019). Above all, clinical supervisors must integrate multicultural considerations, specifically broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision practice to ensure that supervisees can provide culturally sustaining counseling to clients from diverse backgrounds (Bayne & Branco, 2018; Jones et al., 2019).

Multiple reasons foster the urgency of clinical supervisors to make sure supervisees demonstrate multicultural competence in counseling. One of them is that statistics in the United States have indicated increased population numbers of racial and ethnic minority groups (Chang et al., 2009; Day-Vines et al., 2007). Additionally, according to the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2016), there has been an increase of up to 33% of the student body representing racial/ethnic minorities who identify as (non-White). Consequently, clients, supervisees, and supervisors have gradually become diverse, and it is

increasingly likely that supervision and counseling relationships will be cross-cultural and cross-racial (Jones et al., 2019). Yet, despite the general population, supervisees, and supervisors becoming increasingly more diverse, the counseling profession has remained predominantly White and female (Inman & DeBoer Kreider, 2013). In that case, supervisors and counselors must demonstrate multicultural competencies to meet the needs of diverse clients and prevent engaging in harmful counseling practices (Inman & Kreider, 2013).

Broaching race and race-related issues has been deemed an effective intervention clinical supervisors can utilize to teach and model multicultural competency skills to supervisees (King & Jones, 2019). In the literature, researchers have extensively examined broaching in counseling (Day-Vines et al., 2007). However, limited research has focused on doctoral student supervisors' broaching race and race-related issues with supervisees, hence the need for the current research study. Broaching, a term defined by Day-Vines (2007), is a behavior that demonstrates curiosity and openness about race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, social, economic status, and ability of the supervisee and their clients (Cook et al., 2020). In addition, broaching requires acknowledging how power dynamics play out in the supervisory relationship and how those dynamics also play out in the supervisee's counseling relationships (King & Jones, 2019).

Broaching in counseling and supervision has been deemed to have benefits that include deepening the supervisory relationship, increasing the likelihood of clients of color disclosing, and reducing attrition of clients of color, who have been reported to drop out of therapy after the first session by 40% (King & Jones, 2019). Furthermore, supervisees feel safe and illustrate the ability to demonstrate growth toward multicultural competence in counseling when supervisors have broached complex conversations, such as race and race-related issues (Chang et al., 2009; Estrada et al., 2004). In addition, broaching offers an opportunity for supervisors to model and

enhance behaviors that mirror culturally sustaining practices to their supervisees (Day-Vines et al., 2013). Dollarhide et al. (2021) add that supervisors must be open to viewing supervisees as unique individuals with lived experiences that are different from theirs. Altogether, it is safe to say that broaching race and race-related issues enhance multicultural competence in supervision, a fundamentally vital practice as clinical supervisors and supervisees prepare to work with an increasingly diverse population in the United States (King & Jones, 2019).

Despite broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision being critical to achieving multicultural competence, most clinical supervisors have found the behavior of initiating conversations about race and race-related issues to be a challenge (Day-Vines et al., 2007; 2018; White et al., 2016). Also, broaching race and race-related issues within cross-racial supervisory relationships has been deemed an avoided discussion, particularly by White supervisors (White-Davis et al., 2016). As a result, scholars have reported the avoidance of broaching race and race-related issues have negatively impacted the supervisory relationship (Chang et al., 2009). In addition to that, the supervisor's avoidance of these discussions has meant that supervisees were not afforded the opportunity to learn, practice, and demonstrate self-efficacy in providing culturally sustaining practice to clients from diverse backgrounds within the supervisory relationship (Bayne & Branco, 2018; Hird et al., 2004). In addition, supervisees of color have experienced the supervisory relationship as harmful. Also, clinical supervisors have given up gatekeeping responsibility by not checking and challenging supervisees' implicit biases (Hird et al., 2004). Lastly, avoiding talking about race and race-related issues in clinical supervision, especially by White supervisors, has led supervisors and supervisees to avoid broaching altogether (King & Jones, 2019; White-Davis et al., 2016). In summary, since counselors are predominantly White and female, while the general population is becoming more

diverse, clinical supervisors must demonstrate multicultural competencies to meet the needs of diverse populations (Inman & Kreider, 2013).

To further understand the challenges of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision, I utilized two conceptual frameworks and underpinnings: Critical Race Theory (CRT) and the Continuum Broaching Behavior Model (CBBM). The choice to utilize CRT as a framework was because it is complementary to identified research tradition of phenomenology, which assists in seeking an in-depth understanding of participants' essence and meaning of broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision (Moustakas, 1994). Additionally, CRT provides a valuable framework for understanding the hesitation to broach race-related issues and its ties to problems related to structural racism, power, privilege, oppression, bias, microaggressions, and racial trauma experienced by people of color (Haskins et al., 2013). In addition to that, CRT informs counselor education programs' need to enhance equitable and culturally responsive training (Haskins et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2020). CBBM, on the other hand, aids the study in understanding doctoral student supervisors' stages of development with broaching (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

## **Conceptual and Theoretical Underpinnings of the Study**

### ***Critical Race Theory***

CRT was developed in the 1980s by Kimberle Crenshaw in collaboration with Critical Law Scholars from American law schools (Bell, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 1993). CRT emerged in response to limitations in Critical legal studies that did not include how race and racism intersected with oppressive legal systems (Crenshaw, 1991). The scholars argued that even though Critical Theory opposed the belief that social, economic, and political structural systems were oppressive and not natural, the absence of inquiry into how race and racism

intersected with these systems missed the mark leading to the development of CRT (Crenshaw, 1991; Apple, 2019). CRT's relevancy has led to its utilization and application in other fields of scholarship, such as education. It has now been widely utilized in education and mental health (Singh et al., 2020). Additionally, counselor education programs have increasingly adopted CRT as a theoretical framework that guides training toward multicultural and social justice counseling and supervision (Haskins & Singh, 2015).

### ***The Continuum Broaching Behavior Model (CBBM)***

The CBBM has five styles of broaching and is identified as a tool for utilization by counselors, supervisors, and educators to understand their stage of development with broaching (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Day-Vines and colleagues also indicate that the model can measure multicultural competence. They describe the model as having five styles of broaching and offer prompts associated with each style. The five broaching styles on the continuum vary from the first style, *avoidant*, where a supervisor takes on a color-blind stance and ignores the existence of race and cultural differences, to the second style *isolating*, where a supervisor practices minimal broaching in a mechanical and obligatory manner. In the third style, *continuing/incongruent*, a supervisor broaches mechanically and stays on the surface, demonstrating a lack of adequate language to discuss racial and cultural factors (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

In contrast, the *integrated/congruent* supervisor broaches effectively by showing interest in these topics and supports supervisees with making a deeper understanding of their client's lived experiences. Lastly, the *infusing* style is where a supervisor embodies a commitment to cultural responsiveness and advocacy as a way of life. The continuum model as an intervention and tool will offer a path towards understanding levels of development with broaching, the



continuum nature of broaching, and effective broaching for counselors and supervisors (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

### **Purpose of this Study**

The purpose of this descriptive phenomenological study was to understand and describe the central phenomenon of doctoral clinical supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. The central phenomenon of broaching in clinical supervision is defined as broaching race and race-related issues. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first study on doctoral student supervisors' broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in CACREP-accredited programs.

### **Research Questions**

Following Moustakas's (1994) recommendations, I selected the central research questions within the chosen research tradition. The phrasing of questions is open-ended, of exploratory nature, and beginning with "what" or "how." I utilized the following questions with recommended terminology reflecting the study intentions and research agenda for this research study. The overarching research questions of the current study are:

1. What are the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs?
2. What contexts or situations have typically influenced or affected doctoral student supervisors' experiences with broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs?

## **Significance of the Study**

This study provides information on doctoral student supervisors and counselor training programs' insights on doctoral student supervisors' broaching race and race-related issues. Specifically, the obtained information sheds light on how CRT tenets influence broaching and how multicultural competency training leads to the culturally responsive practice of broaching difficult conversations, such as race and race-related issues. Thus, the results unveil gaps in counselor education training programs on issues related to broaching race and race-related issues (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Day-Vines et al., 2013). The study also reveals the developmental level of doctoral student supervisors with broaching complex discussions often deemed taboo. Finally, clinical supervisors, regardless of being doctoral students or faculty, can utilize the results of this study to inform their practice toward multicultural competency and culturally responsive clinical supervision practice.

## **Definition of Terms**

### ***Clinical Supervision***

Clinical supervision is a central building block in counseling. It is defined as an evaluative supervisory relationship between a more senior and a junior member of the counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisors ensure client welfare, supervisee professional development, and facilitate gatekeeping of those entering the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

### ***Multicultural competence***

Multicultural competence in clinical supervision entails supervisors acknowledging and addressing multicultural and diversity issues, such as racial, ethnic, cultural heritage, social,

economic status, age, gender, affectional orientation, religious and spiritual beliefs, physical, emotional, and mental dis/abilities in the supervisory relationship (Peters, 2017).

### ***Broaching***

Broaching is a behavior that demonstrates curiosity and openness about race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, social, economic status, and ability of the supervisee and their clients (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Cook et al., 2020).

### ***Race***

Race in the United States is a social construct (Cook & Helms, 1988). It is used to define one's membership in a racial group that remains consistent throughout one's lifetime and is also tied to skin color, physical features, language, socioracial systems, and social and political hierarchy (Carter & Johnson, 2019; Cook & Helms, 1988).

### ***Race-related Issues***

Race-related issues are ideologies such as racism that indicate racial superiority, accompanied by prejudice and discrimination in three domains (i.e., individual, institutional, and cultural), and continue to be synonymous with American life (Pieterse, 2018).

### ***Doctoral Student Supervisors***

Doctoral student supervisors are students enrolled in Counselor Education and Supervision CACREP-accredited programs who provide clinical supervision to counselors in training in practicum and internship in the same institution (CACREP, 2016).

### ***Counselor Education and Supervision Program***

Counselor education and supervision programs prepare graduate students to be employed as counselors, counselor educators in college universities and mental health agencies, and counseling leadership in schools (CACREP, 2016).

## *Phenomenology*

Phenomenology is a philosophical method of inquiry-based on the premise that reality consists of objects and events as they are perceived or understood in human consciousness and not of anything independent of human consciousness (Moustakas, 1994; Hays & Singh, 2012).

### **Summary**

In this chapter, I introduced the qualitative phenomenological proposed research study that explored the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. In addition, I discussed the problem statement, the conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of the study, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the significance of the study. Lastly, I defined terms and ended with a summary.

In Chapter 2, I present the literature associated with the importance of engaging in culturally sustaining supervision, expand on conceptual and theoretical frameworks that include CRT and CBBM, and address multiple topics related to broaching. Lastly, I discuss the role of doctoral student supervisors in academic settings, then complete the chapter with a summary.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

In this chapter, I present the literature on the importance of multicultural competence in clinical supervision and how engaging in behaviors related to broaching race and race-related issues in supervisors enhances supervisees' multicultural competence skills. Next, I explain how Critical Race Theory enhances a deeper understanding of why supervisors must broach race and race-related issues in supervision and offer additional literature that describes experienced challenges related to broaching. I further discuss how the Continuum Broaching Behavior Model explains broaching is on a continuum and can measure supervisors' developmental stages with broaching. Additionally, I report on scholars' descriptions of doctoral student supervisors in academic settings and the nature of their training. Then, I provide information on the critical role the supervisory relationship plays in facilitating teaching broaching behavior as a culturally sustaining practice. Lastly, I conclude with a summary and introduce the contents of chapter three.

### Culturally Sustaining Practices in Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision has been central to the counseling profession from the beginning, but only recently has it become pronounced as a distinct field governed by its own set of practices (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders et al., 2014). Bernard & Goodyear (2019) define clinical supervision as an intervention in which a more seasoned counselor cultivates a relationship with a more junior counselor to monitor counseling skills, the quality of professional services, and the appropriateness for the profession. This gatekeeping role gives clinical supervisors tremendous power to shape the profession by either providing multicultural responsive supervision and counseling or harmful unresponsive practices towards racially and culturally marginalized

communities (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Therefore, doctoral student supervisors must engage in multiculturally competent supervision.

Multicultural competence in supervision is a morally and ethically required practice by the ACA Code of Ethics (2014). It is defined as the awareness and willingness to address supervision issues related to power, privilege, discrimination, racial and cultural identities, and the impact of these issues on said relationships (King & Jones, 2019). Other scholars have defined supervisors' multicultural competency skills as being open and curious about the worldview and cultural makeup of the supervisee and that of their clients (Chopra, 2013; Hays & Chang, 2003). Most importantly, the exploration of multicultural competence in supervisors is urgent considering that the U.S population has become more diverse, which increases the likelihood of cross-cultural and cross-racial supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervisors must avoid culturally unresponsive supervision in a working alliance in cross-racial supervision (Dollarhide et al., 2021). To help us understand why focusing on race and race-related issues in supervision is essential, we need first to examine how Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a paradigm is relevant for this study.

### **Critical Race Theory**

Critical Race Theory, or CRT is an academic and legal framework that denotes systemic and structural racism is embedded in all aspects of American, such as education, housing, justice system, employment, and healthcare, involving challenges with the ideologies of color blindness (Bell, 1995). CRT also calls for the eradication of racism through social and racial justice, as it challenges white supremacy and oppressive practices that deem the voices of marginalized and racial groups (Haskins & Singh, 2015). Following the civil rights movement as a response to limitations in Critical Theory's notion that society and institutions were "colorblind" in the 70s

and 80s, CRT was first developed by legal scholars, Derrick Bell, Kimberle Crenshaw, and Richard Delgado (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993)

There are six tenants of CRT and all of them could be informative for the current study as we understand the experiences and context of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues with counselor trainees. The first tenant of CRT indicates that racism is endemic and ingrained in the fabric of the United States (Bell, 1995). This tenant helps us understand how racism is most likely present in supervisory relationships and within counselor training programs. The second tenant is interest convergence, meaning racial equality only occurs when white interests are being considered (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993); suggesting that perhaps counselor training programs may engage in performative practices of supporting social justice and equity initiatives only when they gain favors through presenting commitment to diversity and inclusion. Specifying race as a social construct used to justify stratification and discrimination of people of color (Crenshaw, 1991), the third CRT tenant offer insights into how these stratifications impact supervisory relationships and counseling practices.

Presenting whiteness as property, through which the system gives privileges and resources to White individuals (Trahan & Lemberger, 2014), the fourth tenant could prompt us to consider the impact of privileged supervisors' interactions with marginalized supervisees and their use of privilege and power to either dismantle white supremacy or suppress voices of marginalized groups (Ortiz & Jani, 2010; Dixson & Anderson, 2018). The fifth CRT tenant denotes people of color have other identities that intersect with race (Crenshaw, 1991; Carbado et al., 2013), which gives us insights into how multiple marginalized identities increases the layers of discrimination, and how these could happen in both supervisory and counseling relationships (Mitchell & Butler, 2021). The sixth and the last tenant of CRT is counter-

narratives: stating that people of color have storylines that matter, this tenant challenges the myth of White people's storylines are the only viable storylines (Haskins & Singh, 2015). Helping us understand the importance of creating spaces in counselor training programs where the voices of marginalized groups in supervisory and counseling relationships can be heard (Bell, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic 1993), along with the other five, this tenant also provides us with a framework that calls for diversity in students and faculty in counselor training programs (Preston et al., 2020).

In brief, the main components of CRT as a theoretical framework inform the experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with counselor trainees by describing potential contexts within which these interactions occur.

### **Broaching**

Broaching is described as an attitude, behavior, and strategy adopted and continuously applied by counselors to address and examine cultural factors impacting a client's life (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Additionally, broaching has been defined as a strategy that indicates a willingness to be open, curious, and committed to learning about others (Jones et al., 2019). Recently, Jones and colleagues (2019) have made a case that broaching as an intervention can also be applied to the process of clinical supervision, where it not only enhances the supervisory relationship but also protects clients seen by the supervisee. To further understand broaching, let us first look at broaching in counseling.

### ***Broaching in Counseling***

There has been extensive research on effective practice and the benefits of broaching in the counseling relationship. For example, scholars have stipulated that due to the power differential in the counseling relationship, the counselor must take the initiative to broach as



clients may not know what is addressed in counseling and whether it is a safe place to address racial and cultural factors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Day-Vines et al., 2007). Other scholars have specified that to lay the groundwork for a trusting relationship in counseling, the best time to begin broaching is at the onset of the relationship in the first two sessions (Day-Vines et al., 2013). Additionally, Jones et al. (2019) has stated broaching racial and cultural identities in the counseling relationship was tied to several positive outcomes, such as clients deeming the counselor more credible and increased disclosure in session. Apart from that, clients also reported increased satisfaction in the counseling relationship and demonstrated a willingness to return for future sessions (Cook et al., 2020; Day-Vines., 2007).

Even so, other researchers found different results. In a phenomenological inquiry about Black counselors' experiences with broaching, participants reported that the broaching process was complex, and there were factors they took into consideration before broaching (Bayne & Branco, 2018). Black counselors considered differences, such as race and gender, as influential factors in their need for more time to assess and determine when and how to broach. In addition to that, they did not always feel that broaching had to be initiated at the beginning of the counseling relationship or that broaching was necessary for all client situations. In the same study, researchers added that counselors of color elected to be very intentional by first determining how the client's racial and cultural identities intersected with their own before broaching (Bayne & Branco, 2018). To sum up, this study indicated that perhaps broaching was more nuanced and complex, and counselors of color had to deeply reflect on the implications of broaching with White clients due to the intersections of race, racism, privilege, and discrimination. In conclusion, while broaching in counseling has had significant attention in research, broaching in supervision is an emerging body of inquiry.

### ***Broaching in Supervision***

Since broaching has been deemed an effective intervention in counseling relationships, researchers have indicated that the same behavior can be applied to the supervisory relationship (Cook et al., 2020; Jones et al., 2019). First, researchers have stated that clinical supervisors are expected to explore their racial identity development, examining explicit biases and growth areas (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). In addition to exploration, supervisors must seek additional personal and professional development to enhance culturally sustaining practices in clinical supervision (Jones et al., 2019). Scholars have also added that clinical supervisors are responsible for broaching discussions about racial and cultural factors that influence the supervisory relationship (King & Jones., 2019). More importantly, discussing more significant issues linked to the social-cultural and political contexts, such as structural racism, discrimination, privilege, social justice, and disenfranchisement of marginalized groups (Borders, 2014).

Consequently, in general, scholars have indicated supervisors' competency in facilitating supervisory tasks related to multicultural competency significantly impacted the quality of supervisory relationships (Colistra & Brown-Rice, 2011; Crockett & Hays, 2015). Furthermore, it was noted that supervisees' functioning improved when a supervisor demonstrated multicultural competence in supervision (Crockett & Hays, 2015; Inman & Kreider, 2013). When the supervisees' experienced the relationship positively, it increased self-awareness and insight and improved their cultural responsiveness skills (Borders, 2014). Other scholars found that when supervisors demonstrated ability in high levels of multicultural orientation, it encouraged self-disclosures of supervisees of color (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders, 2014). In addition to this, Crockett and Hays (2015) also supported the idea that when supervisors had a

solid commitment to multicultural competence and demonstrated their comfort with discussing racial and cultural factors, supervisees felt more confident in their counseling skills. Lastly, supervisors who broached offered supervisees a template of how they could engage in these same behaviors with their clients (Inman & Kreider, 2013). Altogether, when clinical supervisors showed culturally sustaining practices such as broaching race and race-related issues in a supervisory relationship, it significantly added to the professional and personal development of the supervisee. Despite evidence of benefits of broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision, supervisors indicated having difficulty with broaching.

### ***Difficulty with Broaching Behaviors***

While broaching, in general, has been deemed as challenging, broaching race and race-related issues in counseling and supervision has been noted as especially difficult to do (Day-Vines et al., 2018; Jones et al., 2019). According to King and Jones (2019), clinical supervisors often avoid broaching race-related discussions. One of the main reasons noted as a cause for difficulty broaching these issues was the discomfort of addressing topics that are experienced as taboo (Hird et al., 2004). King and Jones (2019) also identified barriers that included supervisors having difficulty making choices that involved developing a non-racist White identity and anti-racist stance.

In a study conducted with psychology and medicine professionals, White-Davis et al., (2016) studied cross-racial supervision dyads and shed more light on patterns of these interactions. The results showed that supervisors of color felt more comfortable broaching race more often than their White peers. In addition, participating supervisors reported feeling hindered from broaching race and racism due to feeling uncomfortable broaching these topics and perceiving themselves as lacking adequate multicultural skills to address these issues.

Additionally, in the same study, White supervisors tended to broach racial and cultural factors more with racial/ethnic minority supervisees than with White supervisees (White-Davis et al., 2016). Thus, researchers showed race was a factor that caused behavioral changes in the supervisory dyad and raised concerns that broaching was not occurring as often in same-race supervisory relationships (White-Davis et al., 2016). In conclusion, they noted that although a significant number of supervisors and supervisees across racial/ethnic groups (75.4%) reported wanting to address race, they ultimately abstained from broaching (White-Davis et al., 2016). Other scholars supported these findings by stating that because of these perceived barriers, supervisors and supervisees frequently avoided broaching altogether (Colistra & Brown-Rice, 2011; Dressel et al., 2007; King & Jones, 2019).

To sum up, researchers indicated significant consequences of silence on broaching race and race-related issues, such as stagnating the supervisory relationship and perpetuating possible hidden biases of supervisors and supervisees (Phillips et al., 2017). Additionally, it compromised the quality of cross-racial supervisory relationships (Hays & Chang, 2003). An additional consequence noted was supervisees receiving substandard multicultural supervision that had the potential to emerge as culturally unresponsive counselors (King & Jones, 2019). Altogether, broaching race and race-related issues continue to be a complex subject to address and indicates a gap between what is recommended as best practice and what happens in actual supervisory relationships (Borders et al., 2014). To further understand how behaviors related to broaching are developmental on a continuum and can help us measure multicultural competence, let us examine the Continuum Broaching Behavior Model (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

### ***The Continuum Broaching Behavior Model***

Day-Vines and colleagues developed the Continuum Broaching Behavior Model (CBBM) to spell out the different orientations' counselors present with when discussing their practice's race, ethnicity, and culture issues (Day-Vines et al., 2007). The model can be utilized to determine levels of multicultural competence in counseling. Later, scholars such as Jones et al. (2019) applied the same model to the provision of clinical supervisors.

The CBBM indicates that broaching is on a continuum, an ongoing conversation throughout the supervision process, and recommends that supervisors continuously demonstrate curiosity and openness about the supervisees' worldview (Jones et al., 2019). The model has five broaching styles: avoidant, isolating, continuing/incongruent, integrated/congruent, and infusing. The *avoidant* style applies to a supervisor who avoids addressing culture-related topics. This supervisor takes on the stance of color-blindness and does not initiate a conversation about cultural identities or the impact of how cultural identities intersect. The *isolating* style is when a supervisor addresses cultural identities and issues related to those identities on a surface level. For example, a supervisee may bring up a cultural consideration, and the supervisor acknowledges it but then deflects to an alternative discussion that feels less uncomfortable. The third style is *continuing/incongruent*. A supervisor with this style is curious about broaching racial and cultural identities but feels uncertain about doing it effectively. A barrier towards broaching for this supervisor is fear of not saying it the "right" way and fear of being offensive. Day-Vines and colleagues added that supervisors who gravitate towards these three styles should be encouraged to gain additional training to support their growth on the continuum (Day-Vines et al., 2020)

The broaching continuum's last two styles, *integrated/congruent* and *infusing*, are deemed the most effective styles (Day-Vines et al., 2007). The *integrated/congruent* style includes a

supervisor who effectively broaches race, ethnicity, and cultural issues and views this behavior as much more than a one-time event but an ongoing part of their supervision. They deem this way of functioning as part of their professional identity. The difference is that the *integrated/congruent* style is where the supervisor only utilizes this style in supervision sessions. In contrast, the *infusing* style supervisor goes beyond supervision and demonstrates a commitment to culturally sustaining practice in all areas, including supervision that includes social justice, advocacy, and equity for marginalized groups (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

In conclusion, Day-Vines and colleagues state that there is no right or wrong way of broaching and add that despite causing discomfort, broaching takes practice and is on a continuum. Supervisors are encouraged to remember that when supervisors continuously identify and utilize opportunities to broach racial, ethnic, and cultural factors, they are practicing from a culturally responsive lens and acknowledge the impact on the relationships between the supervisor, supervisee, and client. The participants of this study are doctoral student supervisors. It is essential to understand the training they receive and the opportunity to utilize the supervisory relationship as a vehicle for broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees. The CBBM will benefit this study by acting as a tool researchers will utilize to gauge the levels of broaching orientation in supervision.

### **Doctoral Student Supervisors in Counselor Education Programs**

In CACREP-accredited programs, doctoral student supervisors who supervise master's level supervisees are extensively trained to prepare them to enter the counseling profession beyond graduate school as clinical supervisors. During doctoral students' course of learning, these supervisors receive didactic, experiential, and highly structured training, including but not limited to classes in clinical supervision and multicultural perspectives in supervision. In

addition, doctoral student supervisors provide individual/triadic and group supervision to master's level supervisees for several semesters of the program while receiving supervision for their supervision practices (Fernando, 2013; Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Despite this critical role of doctoral supervisors in training, the research on the importance of doctoral student supervisors' broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees has been limited.

To give an example, one of the research studies found researchers focused on doctoral student supervisors who identified as international students and their perception of coping strategies used in supervision training in counselor education programs (Woo et al., 2015). Another study focused on doctoral student supervisors addressing vicarious grief and loss with their supervisees amid COVID 19 (Richmond et al., 2021). Along with that, researchers primarily focused on the gatekeeping role of doctoral student supervisors (Rapp et al., 2018). Therefore, doctoral student supervisors' discussions of race and race-related matters have not been an area of researchers' attention.

One consistent thread noted in all the studies was the importance of establishing and nurturing a supervisory relationship and working alliance with supervisees (Colistra & Brown-Rice, 2011; Inman & Kreider, 2013; Phillips et al., 2017). For the supervisory process to be effective, it requires supervisors' consistent attention to the supervisory relationship while intending to enhance a supervisee's counseling and multicultural competencies with their clients (Hird et al., 2004). Therefore, the supervisory relationship was consistently deemed as a significant opportunity where supervisors help the supervisee effectively learn how to broach race and race-related issues in counseling (Jones et al., 2019). This study also paid close attention

to the supervisory relationship by asking participants about its impact on broaching race and race-related issues in supervision.

### **Summary**

In this chapter, I discussed the literature that informs the importance of culturally sustaining practice in counseling and supervision and how these skills can be enhanced by engaging in broaching behavior. I introduced and discussed how CRT informs the study due to historical dynamics centered on race and racism in social, cultural, and educational domains in the United States. In addition to that, I examined multiple topics tied to broaching, including the CBBM. I also discussed the critical role doctoral student supervisors play in shaping multiculturally competent supervisees. Finally, I presented the significance research places on the supervisory relationship as a resource that can be utilized to teach broaching behaviors in supervision. In chapter three, I explain the methodological procedures used in this study.



## CHAPTER 3

### Method

In this chapter, I outline the methodological procedures used to explore broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. The chapter begins with an explanation of the purpose of the study and research questions, followed by the study's phenomenological methodological framework and philosophical assumptions. Then, I describe trustworthiness, sampling and participants, reflexivity, data collection, and data analysis procedures. Lastly, I conclude the chapter with a summary.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

In the current study, I aimed to explore the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in CACREP-accredited programs.

#### **Research Questions**

Following Moustakas's (1994) recommendations, selected central research questions stayed within the chosen research tradition. The phrasing of questions was open-ended, of exploratory nature, and began with "what" or "how." The phenomenon under study was broaching race and race-related issues, and the overarching research questions of the current study were:

1. What are the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs?
2. What contexts or situations have typically influenced or affected the doctoral student supervisors' experiences with broaching race and race-related issues in clinical

supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs?

### **Phenomenological Research Approach**

In this study, I used a qualitative descriptive phenomenology research design to explore and describe the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with practicum and internship supervisees in CACREP-accredited programs.

Descriptive Phenomenology, developed by Edmund Husserl (Moustakas, 1994), is both a philosophy and a research methodology rooted in psychology and education that allows for the in-depth exploration of participants' conscious experiences so researchers can describe and understand the phenomenon under study. Instead of investigating agreed-upon objective constructs, phenomenology's design teases out and arrives at a description of the universal nature of a particular phenomenon through emergent themes. Emergent themes develop when collected data is read and re-read and mined for statements, sorted and collapsed into themes, then grouped to form clusters of meaning (Moustakas, 1994).

The results that emerge from this process allow the researcher to construct the universal meaning of the event, situation, or experience through interpretations and arrive at a deeper understanding of the phenomenon's essence; in this study, broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees (Moustakas, 1994). In addition, the researcher brackets their biases and perspectives to avoid preconceived ideas of the phenomenon, where biases may originate from social and cultural factors uniquely associated with the researcher (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The phenomenological approach is a school of thought that rejects the notion of one truth, research traditions, and externally imposed methods (Moustakas, 1994). The approach aligns with the social constructivist philosophy that human beings construct knowledge through activities, interactions, and meanings they make from these experiences (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell & Poth, 2018). It is a suitable and appropriate approach for research studies where the focus is the unique lived experiences of individuals, the meaning-making of those experiences, and manifestation within the social-political context of their many roles (Moustakas, 1994). Furthermore, the methodology is an iterative process that seeks to understand a participant's point of view and present it in a rich, in-depth depiction of each participant's lived experience (Hays & Singh, 2012).

A descriptive phenomenological approach was best suited for this study. It addressed the primary research aim to describe and understand doctoral student supervisors' lived experiences with broaching race and race-related issues. The philosophical assumptions of qualitative studies that inform the study are discussed below.

### **Philosophical Assumptions**

The philosophical assumptions that originated in the 1930s writings of Husserl provide the foundation for phenomenological studies. These perspectives include investigators conducting research from a broader perspective than traditional empirical quantitative science and the suspension of all judgments about their perceptions or experiences about the phenomenon (Hays & Singh, 2012). Another perspective, *intentionality of consciousness*, indicates consciousness is always directed toward an object. In other words, it is how we look at something. For example., how doctoral student supervisors look at broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. And lastly, *the refusal of the subject-object dichotomy* states that

the reality of an object is only perceived within the meaning of an individual's experience (Moustakas, 1994).

### **Trustworthiness**

Trustworthiness in descriptive phenomenological qualitative research determines whether the research is rigorous, pointing out the strength of the research design and the appropriateness of the method to answer the questions (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). For this study, trustworthiness was noted in four categories: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

#### ***Credibility***

Prolonged engagement with data during the data collection, analysis, and interpretation demonstrated trustworthiness. The engagement established trust and confidence in the reviewed and revised data (Hays & Singh, 2012). Triangulation, in this case, the use of multiple researchers allowed the team to clarify and confirm existing and emergent themes and sought feedback from research committee members. Member checking, sending supervisors transcribed interviews for review and accuracy, was also utilized (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). Cross-checking data with supervisors supported the descriptions and interpretations and minimized researcher bias.

#### ***Transferability***

Purposive sampling, which means selecting participants that can answer the question, resulted in rich, thick descriptions of data within the context and setting described supervisors' experiences. The sampling was not deemed generalizable. However, the use of thick, rich descriptions is a way to ensure transferability or external validity (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

#### ***Dependability***

As the primary researcher, I established a thorough audit trail by securing and storing reflexive journals, recordings, transcriptions, and codebooks as evidence of the research protocols, process, reporting, and auditing (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). In addition to that, an external auditor, a faculty member, and a dissertation chair of this study with expertise in mixed methods and qualitative research studies was engaged to examine the process and outcome of the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The auditor was chosen because she was not included in the data collection and analysis process and had the necessary expertise to evaluate if the data supported the interpretations and findings.

### ***Confirmability***

The research team I included was aware of their positions and utilized a constructivist lens to understand the potential for co-creating knowledge and meaning with supervisors. These characteristics included current enrollment in a CACREP-accredited counselor education and supervision program at a university in the Southeastern United States (U.S.). Throughout the coding process, the research team utilized reflexive journals to help them remain aware of and bracket their preexisting and emerging biases and assumptions (Ravitch & Carl, 2021).

### **Sampling and Participants**

The institutional human subjects review board of the researcher's university approved the study in the Fall of 2021. Recruitment began a week after the approval. Recruitment included sending study invitation material via email to Graduate Program Directors of CACREP-accredited Counselor Education programs in the U.S., CESNET, and LinkedIn, a social media network (see Appendix A). Counselor Education programs, CESNET, and LinkedIn were chosen because there was a high likelihood that doctoral student supervisors would be accessible within those networks. I opted out of in-person interviews due to challenges related to the global

pandemic, and all the participants were interviewed via Zoom. I sent emails to Graduate program directors requesting the distribution of study requirement material to doctoral student supervisors. An invitation email was posted on CESNET and LinkedIn with details about the study and a request for students to complete a screening survey if they met the criteria for the study. The screening survey included basic demographic information about the supervisors (e.g., age, gender, race) and the criteria for the study.

Purposive sampling was utilized to ensure supervisors had training and direct supervision experience (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Wachter Morris & Wester, 2018). Participants met the criteria if they had (a) enrolled as a doctoral student in a CACREP-accredited Counselor Education and Supervision Program in the U.S., (b) had completed CACREP-required master's and/or doctoral-level didactic and experiential supervision courses, (c) were currently supervising or had supervised supervisees in practicum or internship in CACREP-accredited programs in the last one year (in the last three semesters), (d) and had supervised supervisees under supervision in practicum and/or internship for at least two semesters. Supervisors were recruited until there was no new information about the study topic, a process known as *saturation* (Wachter Morris & Wester, 2018).

According to Moustakas (1994), a phenomenological study should have three to 15 participants from heterogeneous groups to gather rich data to describe the phenomenon under study. In this study, a total of 15 supervisors completed the screening survey. However, two did not make it into the study. One did not show up for the first scheduled interview, and one responded to the invitation email to schedule an interview after the data collection process was completed. Thirteen supervisors with an age range of 25-50 years participated in the current study. Ten supervisors identified as female (76.9%), and three identified as male (23.08%). Eight

supervisors identified as White (61.5%), two identified as Black/African American (15.4%), two identified as Asian (15.4%), and one identified as none (7.7%). The supervisor who identified as having a nonracial identity was of international status. She indicated race was not a salient identity in her country, hence choosing the box marked as None. See Table 1 for detailed supervisor information. Supervisors resided in different parts of the country. They represented the Southeast ( $n = 7$ ), Northeast ( $n = 2$ ), Midwest ( $n = 1$ ), West ( $n = 2$ ), and not disclosed ( $n = 1$ ) regions of the U.S.

See Table 1 for detailed supervisor information.

**Table 1**

*Participant Demographic Information*

Name	Age	Gender	Race
Bianca	31	Female	Black/African American
Emily	25	Female	White
Emma	30	Female	White
Filomena	41	Female	None
Jacob	28	Male	White
James	38	Male	White
Joti	40	Female	Asian
Kiara	45	Female	Black/African American
Li	28	Female	Asian
Madison	32	Female	White
Olivia	29	Female	White
Robert	50	Male	White
Sabine	47	Female	White

*Note.* Names are pseudonyms

**Research Team Reflexivity**

The research team members consisted of a Black female, a White female, and two White males. The age range was 24-56 years old. The primary researcher was a doctoral candidate in a CACREP-accredited program and a Licensed professional counselor and Approved Clinical Supervisor. The other three research team members were first-year doctoral students in the same institution. Two members had previous experience conducting qualitative research, and one had clinical experience as a licensed professional counselor. Throughout the data analysis, reflexive journaling was utilized to help the researchers remain aware of and bracket their pre-existing and emerging biases and assumptions (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The team discussed positionality within the study. The primary researcher held primary assumptions that supervisors broaching race and race-related issues would be found to be a) difficult task, b) there was a link between training and competency in broaching, and c) the identified race of a supervisor impacted comfort in broaching. The White female research team member described held assumptions. One was the ease or challenge of broaching depended on one's comfort level with experience in broaching and one's positionality on knowledge, understanding, acceptance, and celebration of different people, including a difference in race between a supervisor and supervisee.

In addition, one White male stated held assumptions were broaching race and race-related issues was a) complex, b) inherently relational, and c) influenced by the identities of the supervisor and supervisee. The last member, a White male, described his assumptions as a) racial identity development was important for counselor trainees in ways they may not recognize yet, but that supervisor trainees would have to be aware of and assess for and differentially address, based on each student's developmental level, b) supervisor trainees would have had some training in assessing for racial identity development, and would have some familiarity with



recent literature on identity development in general, and specifically with broaching race in supervision and c) supervisor trainees would generally believe that broaching race in supervision relationships was beneficial and important because of this training and familiarity with the literature. To sum up, these assumptions were discussed in detail during the research team meetings.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

I conducted two interviews with the supervisors: a semi-structured individual interview and an unstructured follow-up interview using Zoom video conference software. The average length of time for the first interview was 35 minutes, with the range being 15-55 minutes, while the second interview was 14 minutes on average, with a range of 9-24 minutes. I contacted supervisors who met the study criteria via email within one week (see Appendix E) to schedule the 60-minute interview. Upon agreement on the date and time of the interview, I sent the supervisors a Zoom link for their interview.

I utilized the interview protocol (see Appendix F) that included verbal consent to conduct and record the interview. During interviews, I reflected on supervisors' experiences in their own words and probed for a detailed description. In addition to that, I clarified when necessary and verified their point of view. The interviews were transcribed by an online transcription service (i.e., TEMI, Inc). The transcripts were then checked for audio-to-text transcription accuracy.

After two weeks, I contacted the supervisors by sending a copy of the transcript (see Appendix G) for their review to address gaps in the data (e.g., misunderstandings, missing information, or unclear information), a process known as member checking. After a week, I sent another email to participants to schedule a 15-30-minute follow-up interview (see Appendix H). Ten participants declined a second interview by indicating the data on the transcript was

sufficient and had nothing else to add. Three supervisors agreed to and participated in a second interview (see Appendix I). Initially, I planned to conduct the 2<sup>nd</sup> interview via phone but determined a video interview was preferable to ensure secure recordings. Upon completing the second interview, participants were notified they would be emailed a copy of the transcript for review to address gaps in data, correct errors, or challenge interpretations (see Appendix J). Finally, after transcribing the interview, I emailed the transcripts and confirmed with supervisors they had nothing else to add to the data. Each participant was emailed a \$30 Amazon gift card as a token of appreciation for their time.

The first interview protocol consisted of eight main questions. Two of the questions contained a follow-up question. Interview questions included:

1. How do you define broaching in clinical supervision?
2. What relevance, if any, do you feel that broaching race and race-related issues have on your practice as a doctoral student-supervisor?
3. How do you find that you are most effective in working with supervisees who are racially different from you?
4. Tell me about a time when you successfully broached a race or race-related issue with a supervisee (a) What were the successes of this process?
5. Tell me about a time when you were challenged with broaching a race or race-related issues with a supervisee? (a) What were the challenges of this process?
6. What role has the supervisory relationship played in your experiences with broaching?
7. What experiences in your doctoral program, if any, facilitated your ability to broach race and race-related issues in supervision?

8. What experiences in your doctoral program, if any, inhibited your ability to broach race and race-related issues in supervision? The follow-up interview was unstructured and had no specific questions.

## **Data Analysis**

I conducted the analysis using a descriptive phenomenological approach. This analytical approach was appropriate for this phenomenological study (Moustakas, 1994). The descriptive phenomenological approach aimed to understand and clarify the meaning of a phenomenon for those experiencing it (Creswell & Poth, 2018). To meet this goal, the research team stayed as close to the supervisors' words and experiences as possible (Hays & Singh, 2012) while following the protocols outlined by Moustakas's (1994) modification of Van Kaam's (1959, 1966) analysis method. This analysis method allowed researchers to describe and interpret the data into codes and themes through eight steps:

### ***1. Horizontalization***

Horizontalization was the beginning of becoming familiar with the data by reading and re-reading the transcripts, reducing the data into relevant expressions related to the research questions, and giving equal value to all the supervisors' statements. I reviewed all the transcribed interviews verbatim and organized the data by labeling and organizing each transcript with participants' pseudonyms to protect their privacy. The audio interviews and transcripts were stored in a google drive. Next, I shared the google drive with the three research team members and assigned 3-to 4 transcripts per member. Members were instructed to read and re-read each transcript and give each statement an equal initial value. All the meetings were conducted via Zoom video conferencing.

### ***2. Reduction and Elimination***

Reduction and elimination involved the coding process, which required reducing and eliminating answers from the interviews to paragraphs that are non-repetitive and non-overlapping constituents representing each code. Individually, we systematically reviewed responses for each question per transcript. Then, we identified essential expressions that answered the question and generated initial codes. Expressions were considered essential if expressed explicitly in the complete transcription and were comparable if not explicitly expressed. Expressions not explicit, compatible, or deemed relevant to supervisors' experience were crossed out. Next, we lumped together all the codes generated from each question and developed the first draft of a coding book that consisted of all the codes generated from each transcript and lumped them together per question. Codes generated from each question were between 20 and 53. Five codes were outliers, and three were crossed out as they were not relevant to the interview questions.

### ***3. Thematize the Invariant Constituents***

Thematizing the invariant constituents meant clustering the initial codes of the experience of the phenomenon into themes. In this step, the team members met five times to review codes and begin the process of noting emerging themes. We systematically went through codes developed for each question and identified themes. Most of the questions had three to five emergent themes. Next created a code book that included a table that mapped out the process of collapsing emergent themes into three final themes of the lived experiences of the phenomenon. Each theme had two to five subthemes.

### ***4. Check the Themes Against the Data***

Throughout this process, the team checked the meaning units, meaning words, phrases, sentences, or paragraphs that described the phenomenon and their accompanying themes against

the complete record of research supervisors' transcripts. We determined whether they were compatible or expressed explicitly, and if not were deleted.

#### ***5. Create Individual Textural Descriptions***

A textural description is a narrative that explains participants' perception of a phenomenon. From this point on the primary researcher completed the rest of the steps of the data analysis. I reviewed the expressions or narratives identified by the research team as relevant to the research questions. I described narrations of supervisors' perception of the phenomenon or the "what" of the experience by using the verbatim excerpts from interviews.

#### ***6. Create Individual Structural Descriptions***

A structural description is a narrative that examines the emotional, social, and cultural connections between what supervisors said. In this step I used the individual textural descriptions and invariant imagination to construct and interpret for each individual the "how" of their emotional, social, and cultural perceptions of the phenomenon of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision.

#### ***7. Create Composite Individual Textural-Structural Description***

A composite textural-structural description is an integration of individual textural and structural descriptions or narratives into a comprehensive understanding about the phenomenon. In this step, I synthesized all the individual textural-structural descriptions into the meanings and essences of the experience.

#### ***8. Essence/Phenomenon***

In this step, from the individual textural-structural descriptions and quotes and themes, I developed a composite description of the meaning and essences of the experience representing the groups a whole.

Lastly, the external auditor was asked to review the data file and offer feedback as the last step. The auditor recommended 16 changes that included adding two new sub-themes, deleting a sub-theme, changing titles of both themes and sub-themes, re-arranging the order of themes, and adding additional quotes. In addition, adding a column indicating supervisors' international status and adding assumptions held by other research team members. I accepted 15 recommendations and rejected one that included adding supervisors' international status identity. I rejected this recommendation because supervisors were not asked about their international status in the demographic form. Some supervisors volunteered this information during the interview, but others did not, and I did not want to make assumptions about identity.

### **Summary**

This chapter provided detailed descriptions of the research approach, design, trustworthiness, reflexivity, and data collection and analysis procedures.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results

In this chapter, I present the study results that described doctoral student supervisors' lived experiences with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. Three main themes emerged from the analysis of interview data: (a) function of broaching, (b) supervisor's individual characteristics, and (c) counselor training programs. In addition, themes had two to five subthemes supporting and describing the phenomenon.

Notably, supervisors demonstrated insights into how broaching race and race-related issues cultivated a trusting supervisory relationship and how nurturing a trusting supervisory relationship also facilitated broaching. Reporting observations of the supervisee's attitude and response to broaching as well as examples to attempt cultivating self-awareness, supervisors also utilized modeling to teach client conceptualization and/or counseling work and foster multicultural competencies. Furthermore, supervisors demonstrated insight into their own individual characteristics and impact on broaching race and race-related issues. Also addressing how counselor training programs facilitated or deterred from broaching race and race-related issues, supervisors emphasized the interconnectedness between race, structural racism, and white supremacy in these experiences. Thick, rich descriptions illuminate the findings below.

#### **Theme 1: Function of Broaching**

The first theme described participants' insights into the function of broaching, including cultivating a supervisory relationship by ongoing acknowledgment and relevance of race and race-related issues in supervision. Three sub-themes supported and represented this phenomenon.

##### ***Subtheme 1: Broaching as an Element of Supervisory Relationship***

In this first subtheme, almost all the supervisors suggested that cultivating trust within the supervisory relationship was important. They also noted how broaching race and race-related issues in supervision was integral in cultivating trust within the relationship.

Acknowledging broaching race and race-related issues as a strategy to establish a safe and trusting supervisory relationship, supervisors noted broaching first and early in the relationship as their responsibility. To begin, Li, an Asian identifying supervisor, described how she broached race in the first session with other supervisees of color to build a connection and safety:

For example, we are both females, or we are a minority group in the world or something to really build that connection and also broaching the race so they can know there is a safe space to talk about that, and that's typically happened in the initial session.

Li also added that “as a person of color, that's a very important topic in my session.”

Emily, a White identifying supervisor, addressed broaching early within cross-racial dyads:

So, with my one supervisee, who was a black female, she and I had a conversation about our racial differences. Like for the very first time, we met, and I feel like that helped cultivate our relationship.

Olivia, a White identifying supervisor, went further and explained the importance of not just addressing racial differences at the beginning of the relationship but how they're interconnected to privilege and white supremacy:

I think that race is one of the most important topics that we should be broaching as supervisors, and particularly as a white supervisor. That's the first topic that I broach with my supervisees, regardless of their race. I talk about



mine and my relationship to whiteness, my relationship to privilege, and then the ways that I'm trying to use that privilege to dismantle white supremacy and things like that. I think it's good modeling for White supervisees.

Similarly, Bianca, a Black identifying supervisor, explained cultivating a trusting relationship required broaching early, addressing racial differences, and setting the stage for open discussion:

Particularly as a marginalized supervisor with marginalized identities. Um, if I'm working with students, any student, but particularly if we're talking about race, working with White students, um, and what their perspective or, you know, preconceptions of working with a Black woman might be as a supervisor, uh, any discord that may happen, as a result of, you know, things like white fragility, those are conversations that, are best had openly.

Supervisors also emphasized that broaching regularly as an ongoing conversation enhanced the supervisory relationship. Olivia explained frequently broaching to improve safety in the relationship, particularly when the supervisory relationship was cross-racial:

So, it's that the conversation is initiated in the first or second meeting, and then throughout the relationship, I come back to this, particularly with my supervisees of color. I'm trying to introduce that topic pretty frequently. I find that by revisiting the conversation, again and again, I learn so much about them. They trust me with things.

Similarly, Emily also deemed broaching as an ongoing conversation: "I think it's the beginning of session, but then also the very beginning of supervision, but then also throughout our time together as well."

Despite multiple supervisors indicating the value of broaching early in the relationship, some supervisors felt differently. Filomena, a none race identifying supervisor, explained that she felt uncomfortable broaching in the first session; thus, she preferred to broach in the second or third session:

That's why in the beginning, it's harder for me to broach. You know, we are advised to broach as from the first, session, and somehow, it's always hard for me, I feel that I'm uncomfortable because I don't know you. But in cases where nothing is addressed in relation to the racial differences, I prefer broaching in the second or third session so that the person has had time to get to know me a little bit more, and maybe they will feel more comfortable to be vulnerable to share their truth or how they feel with our differences.

Furthermore, supervisors also noted the importance of paying attention to sharing power to facilitate collaboration and build trust and safety as they broached. James, a White identifying supervisor stated that “I approach it from that perspective, of it's not with a hierarchical stance, like a kind of a hierarchical approach, I am incredibly collaborative.” Likewise, Jacob also explained that broaching enhanced collaboration, comfort, and mutuality: “this is a space where we can explore and maybe even make mistakes together and learn from each other. In the same way.”

Bianca added that broaching enhanced honesty and collaboration: “I think that it's being candid with them about our differences and really inviting them to share their experience of me in the session, in our supervision sessions.” Sabine, a White identifying supervisor also gave an example of how she broached by asking questions and demonstrating humility: “If I do or say something that offends you, please tell me, or if there's something you feel I should know that I

don't, please tell me. You know, you need to educate me a little bit also.” Olivia provided insight into the need for supervisors to invest in the supervisory relationship by continuous engagement in broaching race and race-related issues. Olivia stated that “I've also found that for supervisees where the relationship isn't as strong, often what's needed is more broaching and more investment in the relational side of things before the supervision growth can start to happen.”

To sustain consistency with broaching in supervision, Madison, a White identifying supervisor explained a formal first session process where she presented expectations related to broaching within the supervisory relationship in her disclosure statement:

I do think that beginning, like setting up supervision, I do like to have some kind of broaching conversation in the beginning of setting up supervision. I also have a statement in my disclosure form about like, we're going to have these kinds of conversations and they might be uncomfortable. And they're important and here's why, so I have it kind of set up in the document and then in my, like verbal talking about from the beginning and so often I find that that is helpful to just say that like this is on the table, and then I find that it's easier at least for supervisees to bring things up and like, as they become relevant in the future.

### ***Subtheme 2: Observing Supervisee's Attitude and Response to Broaching***

Subtheme two was representative of how supervisees' attitudes and responses to broaching race and race-related issues impacted the experiences of doctoral student supervisors. As they described challenging attitudes and responses of White supervisees, supervisors highlighted engaging in behaviors that indicated avoidance and resistance toward engaging broaching race-related issues.

Jacob, a White identifying supervisor described observations of White supervisees' discomfort and avoidance to go deeper with broaching:

...and so, for many White supervisees, there's a lot of discomfort that I noticed for them in me even bringing it up, let alone for them trying to broach in session with their clients. Some supervisees I've worked with have tried to use race as a cover to not go deeper and talk about race-related issues.

Jacob explained that he believed these supervisees had these difficulties as a result of endorsing the myth of color-blindness:

As for my White supervisees, because I think for White supervisees, that's part of like the myth of whiteness is we don't see race, we don't talk about race, and therefore it's not an issue if we just ignore it. It's kind of that color-blind ideology.

Further detailing Jacob's perspectives, Joti, an Asian identifying supervisor described her White supervisees as disinterested in discussions related to race and race-related issues:

So definitely like coming from an ethnic minority, I feel that you know, it's very much prevalent. I've seen that like working with majority students [White] that it might not impact them, or they just don't want to speak about it. You know, they're respectful when I bring race issues, but it just seems that it's not so much of importance to them, if that makes sense."

Olivia went further and expressed concerns about the impact of school counselor trainees not broaching with their students of color. Olivia stated:

They're White practicum students working in schools, and then they've got these students of color who are coming in and, like, they're not thinking about

race at all. So, if I don't broach that with them, they don't start to think that way like, unless they're getting prompted externally from either doc student supervisors, faculty supervisors, or group supervision.

### ***Subtheme 3: Cultivating Supervisee's Self-Awareness***

Subtheme three illustrated, through broaching, supervisors' attempts to enhance supervisees' self-awareness and intrapersonal growth, as they tried to decrease the risk of harmful counseling. Robert a White identifying supervisor explained utilizing exploratory questions on the intersectionality of supervisees' identities as well as cultural and racial differences in the supervisory relationship:

I believe one approach for effectiveness is to ask them and broach it with them. What does their culture mean to them? How has it led them to perhaps choosing this profession of counseling? How might our cultures be perceived to be similar? How might they, uh, perceive to be different? I sort of also use an educational component about the influence that race would be part of it, but gender and age and also how are components typically factored in our decision making. At the least, they influence it, and some are well aware of it, and some are not.

Similarly, Jacob also described his approach with exploratory questions: "let's bring it into the space. What does that mean for you? What does that mean for you to work with a supervisee or with a supervisor who identifies as White in that space? what am I bringing in? What, maybe what perceptions am I bringing into the situation? What do I need to change? Filomena explained opening the space up to allow supervisee to explore their perspective: "so

how I'm going to throw out there something that I see different than you, without, stating what is right. And what is wrong cause there's no right and wrong. There's just difference.”

***Subtheme 4: Broaching for Client Conceptualization and/or Counseling work***

Subtheme four illustrated supervisors' use of broaching as they assisted supervisees conceptualize their clients. Specifically, supervisors described the urgency and relevance of training supervisees on broaching race and race-related issues in supervision, helping them develop skills to broach with clients, and cultivating culturally and racially responsive counseling, particularly with clients of color. Kiara, a Black identifying supervisor stated that:

Well, I think the relevance is evident in today's society. As you know, what's been going on in terms of the tension between the races and everything that happened with former president and George Floyd and all that. And so, because race has been brought to the forefront of America, of just, you know, national television and crime and things that's been happening. We have to be able to talk about these topics with our supervisees, so that they can talk about it with their clients, because it's gonna come up, its gonna come up, especially when you're dealing with those who are directly affected by it, like those in the African American community and other persons of color, uh, and other, you know, marginalized populations it's gonna come up. And so, they have to be prepared to deal with that and talk about it.

Supervisors identified and described modeling broaching skills as the vehicle for supervisees' client conceptualization skill development to occur. Oliva stated that, “modeling like how you can talk about topics of race and racism with your clients because we're doing it here in supervision.” Similarly, Emma, a White identifying supervisor voiced the same

sentiments: “Okay, but in addition to that, it's also modeling. Where if I'm showing my supervisee how to broach a conversation surrounding race, my hope is that I'm modeling a conversation that they may have with their clients.” Bianca added how she modeled intersectional identity development by stating, “modeling what it is to think about your privileged identities, not just your marginalized identities.” Emily stressed its relevance by saying:

I think it's relevant cause we have to bring it up in supervision. Um, as a way of modeling what bringing that up in a session with clients would look like for them.

Filomena also described how modeling broaching enhanced not only the supervisory relationship but also supervisee's clinical skills:

Broaching race and race-related issues in supervision helped my relationship with the supervisee, and I also believe helped the supervisee in their clinical work as they practiced broaching within supervision.

In the same way, Emily highlighted the relevance and interconnectedness of modeling and parallel process between supervisee's supervision and counseling: “I think it's relevant cause we have to bring it up in supervision. Um, as a way of modeling what bringing that up in a session with clients would look like for them.”

Supervisors also described examples for the development of specific skills for client conceptualization and/or counseling work. Jacob explained how he utilized exploratory questions to expand supervisees' knowledge of race-related issues such as medical racism: “let's talk about the diagnosis to get started. Let's talk about how diagnosis, in general, has been weaponized

against communities of color.” In the same way, Emma described an experience that addressed the issue related to racism in medical establishments:

So, we, my supervisee and I were discussing how her clients view her in the hospital setting, where she was providing counseling services. And through that conversation, we also spoke about how her clients were treated differently based on their race in the hospital. And so, we spoke about how, a black female is viewed as like complaining about pain as if they're not in pain, they're just complaining about it. Whereas, like a White female, it may be taken more seriously where they're like, this person is really in pain. And so, we looked at, we spoke about the differences in how she had seen clients treated in the counseling room, like physicians came in and nurses. We talked about how like, if two women walk into the ER with the exact same presenting problem, one's White, one's Black, the White woman would seem entitled, and the Black woman would be dismissed.

Furthermore, Bianca gave an example of how she expanded a supervisees' worldview regarding interactions in a cross-racial counseling relationship:

Another broaching experience that was successful was with a White man, supervisee who was working with a Black woman client, and she used the N-word in session, and he was concerned about how to, what to do in that situation. Um, and so we talked about his concern, you know, with hearing the word and feeling like there needed to be an intervention when the client said it in passing. It just was a component of the story and how it became central to his conceptualization of the client issue when it wasn't central to what the client



was talking about. So really, unpacking his discomfort with hearing the word or feeling like you needed to intervene or over-identify with the client after that was also a successful broaching conversation.

## **Theme 2: Supervisor's Individual Characteristics**

Theme two described individual characteristics that impacted broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. Supervisors particularly illustrated insights about their own worldview, expectations, comfort, and levels of critical consciousness, and how they facilitated or hindered broaching race and race-related issues in supervision practice.

### ***Subtheme 1: Supervisors' Own Worldview, Expectations, Challenges, and Comfort with Broaching***

Supervisors identified their own worldview based on social location. For example, Bianca described expectations related to supervisees who shared her race: “supervisees of color in general, I have, an expectation or a bias if you will, that they're going, that there would be more likely to understand the relevance of race.” Supervisors also described challenges related to feelings of failure in a supervisor role. Emma described a frustrating experience that included inability to foster insight into privilege that included race and gender and as a result feeling like a failure. Emma stated:

So, I was challenged when my supervisee and I were of the same race. We both are White. My supervisee is a White male, and I'm a White female. And so, it was very challenging for me to get to bring my supervisee to the point where he could see that he had these privileges based on being a White person. But also based on being a White male so the intersectionality of gender and race, but also just race in general, being a White person in the privileges that

come with that in the US. And it was going over his head. He couldn't grasp what I was trying to bring into the conversation. And to me, it was very challenging because I wanted to validate his experience so that he did not shut down or feel like I was disregarding what he was sharing. But at the same time, I wanted to teach him that this is how society generally views White males. And there's often all of these privileges that come with being a white male that you may not be aware of. And he was like, well, I haven't seen any of those privileges. And it's like, I just, it was really challenging. And I failed. I feel like I failed. Like I did not facilitate the conversation correctly. So, it was very challenging for me.

Joti also described feeling challenged when working with White supervisees, and the impact of not connecting due to racial differences that caused feelings of inadequacy in her supervisor role. Consequently, Joti questioned legitimacy of professional identity. Joti stated:

Like I said, with the white folks, I just felt challenged. I mean, it just seemed they were not understanding or, you know, ready to understand my point of view. So, I just felt like a fool, didn't feel validated, didn't feel like, well, I'm adequate, or I'm capable of doing this. Just double judged myself that, well, this is probably not the right profession for me because people are having difficulty understanding where I'm coming from, so yeah.

Supervisors described other challenges with broaching that included levels of comfort with broaching race and race-related issues. Bianca expressed some discomfort when broaching with White supervisees, as she felt uncertain about how they would react: "I'm a little less

comfortable, um, not uncomfortable, but less comfortable broaching with, uh, White supervisees, because I'm not always sure how they will react to that conversation.”

Li explained that she was more comfortable broaching and working with supervisees who had similar cultural identities to her: “you definitely feel more comfortable working with supervisees who share a similar background with you. Because the whole culture is similar. You share the similar values or something.” Additionally, Olivia illustrated insight into growth by broaching race and race-related issues, where she was also self-conscious with her own growth since she was experiencing moments of discomfort:

I feel like I've really grown in my ability to broach, there are still gonna be these moments that feel very uncomfortable for me to broach. And it tends to be when I'm in the privileged position that I feel uncomfortable.

To add to the discussion, supervisors expressed fears of “doing it wrong.” Filomena stated that “I feel for the relationship, because although I believe that by broaching it will support the relationship, but I feel that I might say it in the wrong way or not being sensitive about something.” Similarly, Olivia said, “Sometimes trying to do it right actually gets in the way of doing it well and being more authentically engaged and vulnerable in the process.”

Lastly, Bianca described unique challenges that included navigating the ambiguity of power in the broaching process. On the one hand, she had power as a supervisor, on the other hand, lacking power as a supervisor of color:

It's tricky because that is, that's important, you know, consideration of nuance in that I do have power as the supervisor, but I may not have power, I may not have institutional power, you know, with the supervisee um, and I'm not sure necessarily how I navigate that other than to get support. Um, well, one to

broach our differences, or similarities in identity, and to talk openly about that, but if there are, but how I deal with it, aside from that, I'm not sure.

### ***Subtheme 2: Supervisors' Critical Consciousness***

Subtheme two was representative of how some supervisors demonstrated critical consciousness as part of their developmental processes. Supervisors described insights into how race and race-related issues were tied to broader contexts, including structural systems upheld by White supremacy. Olivia highlighted the value of normalizing conversations about privilege despite experiencing discomfort:

Normalizing talking about ways that you might be privileged or acknowledging ways it could be really uncomfortable for, I think white people experience a lot of discomfort and guilt around race and then that can become resistance and like avoidance.

Similarly, James, described the value of acknowledgment and bringing up privilege, especially in cross-racial supervisory relationships: "I have all of the privilege and so when I go to, bring this up or, have a conversation or approach a supervisee that might present racially different than me I think about that in the context of, I have a lot of privilege right. I come in as a White cisgender heterosexual male" Similarly, Olivia demonstrated insight into how privilege played out in her supervisory relationships as she paid attention to power dynamics:

And I try to be attentive to the way that, like, as supervisor, I have a lot of power in that relationship. So then, when we add in these other axes of marginalization, then that can really exacerbate a power differential and put someone who's in a power-down position in a really tricky spot.

Madison added another dimension to critical consciousness by integrating bigger systems that included race-related issues:

How I conceptualize, it is kind of like the broader picture. So, race being, you know, White or Asian American or whatever, and then the race-related issues are kind of all the systems around it. Like systemic oppression or microaggressions or those sorts of things that are related to the person's race, which could be determined quite neutrally. I don't think that it is ever that in itself is maybe neutral. And then the race-related issues. These kinds of bigger systemic, wider things, maybe cultural things like language, all of those sorts of things.

Similarly, Olivia also discussed structural systems of power in her program that felt oppressive and risky to challenge:

There are these structures in place, and you want to challenge and dismantle them. And you're also aware of the ways in which you are at risk because of those structures then. And it feels weirdly selfish to protect your position, but also, like you, can't do anything if you're not in this, it's weird. It's so challenging.

To add to that, Emma acknowledged insight into privileges related to whiteness: "and then also being a White person in the, in the counseling room, being a White supervisor is a position of power. And then also, being a White female, which is like counseling, is dominated by White females and so being the dominant identity in our profession." Emma also acknowledged how structural systems foster White and female dominance among school counselors:

And we talk about that often in school counseling, which, you know, that's my specialty area, my focus is school counseling. Like the world of school counselors is so dominated by white females. Well, the world of K-12 education system, White females.

Finally, Emily indicated that broaching was essential and necessary in all supervisory relationships: “broaching is important, no matter the background of my supervisee, because it's still gonna affect the work that they're doing with clients.”

### **Theme 3: Counseling Training Programs**

The third theme highlighted supervisors’ experiences with functioning within counseling training programs and insight into how certain aspects of the programs facilitated or hindered the professional and personal growth of both doctoral student supervisors and master’s level supervisees. Five sub-themes that supported this phenomenon were emergent from these experiences.

#### ***Subtheme 1: Didactic Training in Doctoral Programs***

Subtheme one described supervisors’ experiences with their didactic training (e.g., lectures, presentations, discussions), included both adequate and inadequate aspects. To begin, supervisors described effective didactic training in their doctoral programs when topics related to race and race-related issues were infused in the curriculum, resulting in supervisors feeling well prepared in their supervisory role. Olivia explained that her program made sure broaching race and race-related issues were central in training as it was well-infused into the curriculum: “I think that our program does a decent job of living up to like infusing justice throughout the curriculum, which then I think just provides a lot of growth opportunities, and a lot of

opportunities to talk about these differences, the way that culture infects things, race, gender, et cetera.”

Emily added that she was offered language related to broaching race that helped her gain skills she never learned in her master’s program:

I think being given like some language and like specific tips regarding how to do that and when has been really important, even like the didactic training in class, was really important because broaching race in counseling was not something that I learned in my master's program.

Kiara expanded on the value of being exposed to broaching in other classes beyond the supervision class:

Um, I think broaching for me really came up in my doctoral program when I took the ethics and multicultural courses. That's when the topic was originally introduced to me, cuz I had, before that I had never really heard of the term, and then, from there, I think just me going through my program myself and sharpening my supervisory skills by going through this doctoral program that then helped me in turn, bring that new knowledge into the supervisory relationship, to where I would purposely bring up topics like this.

Similarly, Li explained she learned about broaching in a cultural issues class: “I don't exactly remember when I was a student, but I can see and really learn broaching and practice broaching when I study cultural issues in the class.” She also further explained gaining a deeper understanding of broaching in her role as a co-teacher:

I really feel I got more like in deeply understanding about broaching through last year, when I co-taught a multicultural class of master's students, really

learning from the professor and how she invited a guest speaker, how we discuss about that, like this semester in a counseling practicum class.

James also stated that an advanced multicultural counseling class was instrumental in expanding his perspectives on differences: “an advanced class on, I think it's called social, cultural dimensions or something similar to the multicultural class.” Likewise, Kiara added that class and group discussions and films related to broaching were helpful, further explaining:

I want to say, we kind of it was more of like a discussion question. Where we talked openly in class about it, and he might have showed us some films or something About it, you know, to see it in practice. And I want to say we did, there was a practice component to that cause I remember us breaking out into groups prior and doing things.

On the contrary, supervisors discussed aspects of didactic training in their doctoral programs that hindered their capacity to broach race-related issues. Lack of training in the program structure was identified as a hindrance to the skill development of supervisors. For example, Emma stated that there was no formal training on broaching in her program:

But there was never like a formal lesson on how to broach race. And I feel like it's really important to say that there was no formal assignment on how to broach race in supervision. There were no models that we looked at specifically on broaching race in supervision. We always heard like, oh, you should broach race in supervision, but there was no one really saying like, this is how to successfully do it.



Supervisors also noted a lack of commitment toward students' learning how to broach. For example, Sabine stated that "it is not being brought up in class, not being taught specifically in class." Emma also reported patterns of faculty avoiding broaching:

Okay. I've heard, and I've read, about the benefits of broaching race and supervision. We've spoken about how it's something that everyone should do as a supervisor, but we didn't. To me, we didn't really talk about it.

Emma added how challenging it was for supervisors to model broaching skills in supervision with supervisees they did not observe in their instructors:

It's something that I really feel like it's oh you should, we hear in the program, you need to broach race in supervision, even, you know, even in the master's program, you need to broach race with your clients, but like how, how do I do that? And what does that look like if there's no model to or steps as to how. Can someone please model, and can an instructor please model what this looks like because there wasn't even, like, I'm thinking back to throughout the Ph.D. program, there wasn't even like a role play where an instructor modeled how to broach race.

Filomena, who identified with international status, also described how lack of training in broaching compounded acculturation difficulties due to limited understanding of the context of race and race-related issues in the U.S.:

So, I was curious to learn, but at the same time, sometimes you learn by sharing the difference because this is how we do it. How do you do it here? Okay. So, is it okay to do it here? Because in the beginning, when I started supervising supervisees, uh, this was a huge challenge for me.

Supervisors identified solutions to the lack of adequate didactic training. For example, Sabine believed teaching broaching “should start as early as skills class.” To support Sabine’s call for training broaching early on in counselor training, Bianca also called for training that included practical and application-based support:

Provide me some insight into how other people have worked through those things, or give me some sort of, um, information or tools for intervention in that case.

Almost responding to this call, Oliva offered an example for how her program focused on didactic training of broaching by using a model to concretely illustrate practice of how to use it with clients and supervisees:

We use the respectful model from I think it's Borders et al., 2007. You know, we give that to every client when they come in and ask them to read it over, and our students are instructed to invite them to share, okay, two or three identities. So, we're like instructing them to broach from the beginning. And therefore, doc students are being instructed, you need to be doing the exact same thing. We need to at least frame the beginning conversation the same way because we're trying to give them a really concrete example.

### ***Subtheme 2: Supervision of Supervision (Experiential/Practical Training)***

The second subtheme addressed supervisors’ experiences with learning through supervision of supervision, experiential or practical training on supervision. Supervisors discussed how experiential pedagogy facilitated their safety to practice, make mistakes, and try again. For example, Jacob stated that, “I've had a lot of really solid experiences of supervision of supervision, at the beginning of my program. That really helped prepare me to engage in that

process. And I took on additional supervision. I love supervision.” Similarly, Joti explained how group supervision and discussions with peers and faculty were very helpful:

The group supervision course was very helpful for me to process with friends and professors, and also individual supervision with my faculty, like with my chair, was just definitely very helpful in understanding and getting more dynamics and perspective into it.

Olivia stated her program was committed to students’ learning and integrated broaching into the process of supervision of supervision, where she learned how to broach in general:

And so, our faculty model got with us and kind of okay, in our clinical supervision class, I think there's two classes dedicated to just being taught the broaching process and how you do it with a supervisee and how you help them translate that to do it with their clients, which is really cool. Um, and then we receive so much supervision as doc students as well. We get supervision of our supervision.

Emily also described how supervision of supervision practice enhanced her supervisory skills: “so my experience with my peers has been, um, very much a part of this learning. Um, I think being able to talk with each other about our experiences with different supervisees, watching their sessions, seeing how other people things do, I'm able to, um, to learn how maybe things I'd want to apply, but then also just when we're conceptualizing different supervises and clients and things like that has played a role, in my learning.” Madison also reported feeling prepared through experiential practice: “yeah. I think that the program overall has prepared me well for it. Like, it's been a conversation from my multicultural class to like supervision class and then into like the supervision practicum.”

### *Subtheme 3: Faculty and Supervisors of Supervisors*

The third subtheme regarding supervisors' experiences with broaching race and race-related issues was about how the faculty taught and/or supervised them. Supervisors demonstrated insights into how faculty facilitated and hindered their capacity to learn how to broach race and race-related topics. Pointing out certain attitudes and behaviors that facilitated broaching, Olivia shared that a particular faculty member effectively practiced faculty scaffolding:

I have a really good relationship with one of our faculty members, who is a Black woman, a school counselor, and we have great conversations about race and racism. I know that she's intentionally broaching that with me. So that we could have those conversations. And I really found that helpful in my own development I found that it really stretched my thinking and helped me, I felt like I at least had a pretty decent awareness of how race and racism shows up in everything, and we need to be aware of that.

Jacob also reported a positive experience with a faculty member who specialized in topics related to race and race-related issues:

Having that faculty member that the first couple of semesters so helpful, she does identify as a White woman. But she really specializes in talking about broaching, talking about race and race-related issues specifically.

On the other hand, some of the other supervisors described faculty attitudes and behaviors that hindered their learning of broaching skills. The most frequently reported faculty behavior was avoidance of broaching race and race-related issues. For example, Sabine talked about a professor who never broached race and race-related issues: “the professor is an older

man, and I value him very highly. He's my supervisor, actually my personal one, but this is not something he devils in." Filomena described her experience as lacking and mostly paid lip service. Even though her faculty/supervisor expressed value in broaching, they never broached with Filomena about their differences:

So, I was also taught about the importance of broaching and who was advising that to me to do with my supervisees and clients never broached my racial and ethnic, and cultural differences between us.

Olivia shared that some faculty members not only avoided broaching race and race-related issues, but also had difficulty confronting students who had said harmful things to other students:

I think that there are certain faculty who are very direct, others who take a softer developmental approach, and there are strengths to both approaches. Um, but, but I've found not as much in supervision, but there are times where students are in the class, they're in their developmental process, and they say something kind of harmful and they'll receive a gentle correction rather than a direct.

Another supervisor described student-led learning and broaching, where faculty were not disruptive which was not necessarily something positive. Expressing dismay, Bianca stated that, "student-led effort primarily. Um, so my program they're supportive in that they encourage it to be done. They're supportive because they're not disruptive, right. Necessarily. Um, but they don't offer anything. Okay. Don't necessarily offer anything." In a sense faculty were acting as bystanders instead of responsively engaging and supporting student-led learning.

Lastly, Bianca, described an experience where a supervisee undermined her authority and decided not to work with her. When she sought guidance from faculty, she did not receive the support she had hoped:

I was experiencing a challenge with a particular supervisee that was, in my opinion, related to having challenges, taking direction from a Black woman, and just being, um, obstinate to the supervision process and the supervisor not understanding how that could happen because I'm the one with power. And so, thinking that it might be something else happening, or, you know, not being receptive to my assessment of the supervisory interaction and the role that race and gender played in that experience.

When asked what she would have liked to see the supervisor do, she stated:

One way would've been to just have acknowledge that the dynamics of sociopolitical power don't go away because I happen to be the person who is considered an authority in this space. The other thing that they could have done if they had that knowledge was provide me some insight into how other people have worked through those things or given me some sort of, um, information or tools for intervention in that case. Uh, and then the third thing that they could have done is they could have empowered me to continue having those conversations with that student, knowing that they would support, you know, me through those conversations. Um, but the response that I received was to not have those conversations with her.

#### ***Subtheme 4: Doctoral Cohorts***

The fourth subtheme highlighted supervisors' cohorts involving student-led learning and support, resulting in growth and skill development. Emma attributed her growth to her ability to broach in peer-led discussions:

I would say the number one contributor from our counseling program from the Ph.D. program has been the class classroom discussions throughout all of our courses, but the peer really like the peer discussions, not even discussions that our instructors have brought up but us as a group, the eight of us, I feel like have brought up so many really rich conversations regarding race and supervision.

Olivia described an experience where she reached out to a person of color cohort member and offered support by acknowledging her racial identity:

And I found that when I'm working with students of color in our program, I recently had an interaction with a student who was like, you were the first person to ask me what it's been like to be the only Black student in my cohort. And just having someone acknowledge that was an experience that she was having was really meaningful for her. It helped her feel more connected to the program as a whole cause it was like, so we're not just ignoring that I am the only black person in a room and we're talking about race, and everyone's looking at me, but like, no one's acknowledging that this thing is happening.

#### ***Subtheme 5: Institutional and Programmatic Critical Consciousness***

The fifth subtheme called attention to supervisors' experiences with their programs' critical consciousness; a general awareness of systems of privilege and oppression and understanding of how those systems function within contexts of institutions. Discussing

behaviors and attitudes within programs that supported conversations about race, ethnicity, culture, and social justice issues, supervisors particularly talked about how programs responded to the 2020 racial equity and social justice protests.

Jacob described the impact of the protests: “the protests, black lives matter, the police murders, and brutality, it did affect the way that we engaged in stuff as a program.” Jacob also added that his program created space for communal broaching and processing about current events:

Let's redirect and have the conversation as a program. Yeah. Let's redirect and talk. We had a little of program meetings where students could kind of bring up consensus. So, I think that was more so where the attention and awareness was directed at the time.

While Jacob’s program supported conversations related to protests in 2020, Bianca’s program supported broaching during this time but offered no support or strategies:

so the university, while it's supportive and it's like, yes, broach, it didn't necessarily offer any concrete strategies or support to do it. They're encouraging of it in that they're like, sure, do it, you know, do it, and maybe even after 2020, when everyone started to want to be more conscientious about equity and justice, then they were like, oh, and this is, you know, something that you should be doing as a part of your practice. Um, but most of it has been independent learning and independent style.

Like Bianca, Kiara’s program avoided conversations regarding the ongoing wave of civil unrest in the U.S., triggered by the murder of George Floyd during his arrest:



When all of this stuff came, I about, um, you know, with the George Floyd stuff, and it was like stage front center and the media we were waiting on our school to issue, uh, some kind of statement against this. Number one, they delayed the statement, number two, when they did come on and say something, it was, it wasn't what we anticipated them to say. And then also what it, what made it difficult to even talk about, I guess, within our classes.

Kiara discussed further and added:

I don't think we really got to talk about it. Like you knew the tension was there. But we didn't really discuss it in our class. Like, I may have talked about it amongst my friends or my colleagues, but we didn't discuss it in class. And like, everybody, it was like everybody was walking on pins and needles around that time. Nobody, they didn't dare bring it up. Cause they didn't want that to then take over the class or the topic that they had to talk about it.

Supervisors also described other experiences where programs lacked adequate critical consciousness. They identified underlying systemic issues of white supremacy upheld by avoidance, politeness, and comfortability with maintaining the status quo. For example, Bianca explained how her university was hesitant to address internal experiences with students and policies of institutional racism:

Things that are obvious, like we can talk about institutional racism when it comes to education in general, but when we make those connections to how that is playing a role in our experience in this program in real-time, then it's, a little, less explicit there's a, a standing on the sidelines when it comes to that, but a lot of performative discussion about oppression and, practices of

systemic oppression of racism explicitly. Um, but as long as it doesn't bear any implications on the program itself.

Olivia highlighted challenges related to the lack of diversity in predominantly white institutions (PWIs): “I wanna talk about culture. And also, there are no other Black students in your cohorts. So, I'm broaching this with you, but institutionally we've admitted you to a program that is creating the problem.”

Supervisors also emphasized the need to infuse broaching race and race-related issues from the individual to the program level. To support this idea, Jacob stated that, “until we bring it into everything. And we don't have that feeling of discomfort, that feeling in our stomachs when we're bringing it up; we're not doing enough.”

### **Essence**

The integration of the results represented a synthesis of the essence of doctoral student supervisors' experiences with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship from CACREP-accredited programs. The essence is presented in the following description.

Doctoral student supervisors described broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with complex and multifaceted experiences. Illustrating insights into the importance of broaching race and race-related issues to cultivate a supervisory relationship and to facilitate the development of culturally responsive supervisees, supervisors demonstrated commitment to broaching despite experiencing certain dyadic challenges, such as supervisee attitudes and responses and their own developmental processes. Supervisors also identified facilitative and hindrance factors that influenced their growth and development as supervisors. Particularly identifying counselor training programs as significant players in their development, supervisors

described considerable barriers involving attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and actions endorsed by faculty and supervisors as well as institutions that upheld and enforced the power of white supremacy. As a result, it reportedly prevented further inroads to broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs.

### **Summary**

Thirteen doctoral student supervisors described their lived experiences with broaching race and race-related issues with supervisees in internship and practicum from CACREP-accredited programs. Three themes were developed to demonstrate components that impacted their experiences, including the function of broaching, intrapersonal factors, and counseling training programs.

## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion

In this chapter, I will first discuss major findings from this qualitative phenomenological study, aimed at discovering the essence of doctoral student supervisors' broaching experiences with race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. Then, I offer practical and research implications that could be utilized via the obtained findings. Finally, I conclude the chapter by discussing the study's limitations and a summary.

In the current study, supervisors' lived experiences revealed three main themes with subthemes. Theme 1 was Function of Broaching, represented by the subthemes of (1) broaching as an element of the supervisory relationship, (2) observing supervisees' attitude and response to broaching, (3) cultivating supervisees' self-awareness, and (4) broaching for client conceptualization and/or counseling work. Theme 2 was Supervisor's Individual Characteristics, embodied via two subthemes: (1) supervisors' own worldview, expectations, challenges, and comfort with broaching, and (2) supervisors' critical consciousness. Finally, Theme 3 was Counselor Training Programs discussed through the subthemes of (1) didactic training in doctoral programs, (2) supervision of supervision (experiential/practical) training, (3) faculty and supervisors of supervisors, (4) doctoral cohorts, and (5) institutional and programmatic critical consciousness. Findings of the Theme 3 were particularly critical since up to 60% of the participants reported lack of or inadequate didactic training in broaching race and race-related issues in supervision in their counselor training programs. All three themes collectively addressed the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related

issues in supervision with supervisees as well as contexts or situations that typically influenced or affected these experiences.

### **Interpretation of Findings**

Doctoral student supervisors play a significant role in the development of multiculturally competent practices of counselor trainees/supervisees. Supervisors are also ethically mandated by the American Counseling Association (2014) Code of Ethics and encouraged by the Best Practices in Clinical Supervision (Borders et al., 2014) to acknowledge and address multicultural and diversity issues in supervision. To meet this goal, supervisors broach topics, such as race and race-related issues, by modeling behaviors mirroring culturally sustaining practices (Day-Vines et al., 2007). In the current study, while doctoral student supervisors understood the importance of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees, each of the three themes identified factors that influenced, facilitated, and prevented the process of broaching. Each theme appeared as a prominent factor shaping supervisors' journey with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision.

#### **Theme 1: Function of Broaching**

Supervisors agreed that broaching race and race-related issues was an element of the supervisory relationship. As a result of broaching, supervisors established trust, safety, and a connection with their supervisees within the supervisory relationships. Supervisors also emphasized exploring broader worldviews and discussing topics linked to racial, social, and cultural contexts and how they impacted both privileged and marginalized identities in the relationship. An interesting finding included some supervisors attributing broaching as the foundation of a supervisory relationship, while others indicated cultivating the relationship was what came first. Despite these nuanced differences, these findings were congruent with previous

studies that pointed to dialogues about race and cultural context as a vital factor in building rapport in the relationship (White-Davis et al., 2016) and the need for supervisors to address diversity issues and power differentials in supervision (Borders, 2014). Similarly, King and Jones (2019) also noted broaching race, ethnicity, and other cultural factors sparked growth towards cultural responsiveness, enhanced client care, and strengthened the supervisory relationship. Additionally, these findings also aligned with the sixth tenet of CRT on counter-narratives of people of color adding value to the spaces that often-lacked diverse storylines (Bell, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 1993; Preston et al., 2020). Telling us that broaching race and race-related issues in supervision is an integral component of building a supervisory relationship, the findings also validate counter-narratives about people of color, facilitate addressing racial, cultural, and social contexts, and enhance multicultural competencies all involved stakeholders.

Another finding highlighted integral strategies that facilitated the relationship's comfort, mutuality, and collaboration. Supervisors stressed it was the supervisors' responsibility to broach race and race-related issues as an invitation to discuss racial differences. Some supervisors suggested broaching within the first session and/or early in the relationship to normalize broaching behavior. This finding was consistent with previous research findings that pointed out broaching early in the relationship cultivated a working alliance (Day-Vines et al., 2007; King & Jones, 2019). However, not all supervisors endorsed broaching early in the relationship, as they reported needing more time to get to know the supervisee. Some of the supervisors suggested broaching in the second or third session. This finding was congruent with a study focused on broaching by counselors of color (Bayne & Branco, 2016). Even though Bayne and Branco's study was not focused on supervisors, it provided insights into possible thought processes of counselors or supervisors in their decision to broach within the first session or wait until they felt

comfortable with the task. Bayne and Branco added that counselors of color did not experience broaching as necessary in the first session because they first needed to assess specific components, such as client identity and session dynamics, before making intentional broaching statements. However, supervisors in this current study did not give specific details beyond wanting to get to know the supervisee better. These findings suggest that broaching race and race-related issues early in the relationship signaled to the supervisee an invitation to have these discussions. In addition, supervisors had some flexibility to assess the best time to broach.

Another finding indicated that supervisors were required to broach frequently by treating broaching as an ongoing conversation throughout the relationship. In particular, supervisors stressed that more broaching behaviors were recommended if the supervisory relationship was strained. This finding was also parallel to King and Jones's (2019) findings with the continuum of broaching in the counseling relationship to practice increasing skill and growth of the relationship. Furthermore, to enhance collaboration and the supervisory relationship, supervisors in this study also paid attention to power differentials and shared their power with their supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders, 2014). These findings also supported the supervision scholars' previous presentations (e.g., Day-Vines et al., 2007). These findings indicate that broaching race and race-related issues on a continuum allowed further discussions, practice, and enhanced collaboration and growth in the relationship. Also, the tension in a supervisory relationship may benefit from more broaching behaviors that were recommended.

Supervisors in the current study also emphasized their preparation for supervision as an important aspect of their broaching practices. They noted that having a structured first session that included a disclosure statement and clear expectations related to broaching within the supervisory relationship ensured consistency in providing supervision. These findings agreed

with the importance of procedural tasks in the first supervisory session (Borders & Brown, 2006). Borders and Brown stressed first impressions were essential, and behaviors presented in the first session set the tone for the rest of the supervisory relationship. This finding indicated that preparation for broaching race and race-related issues gave the supervisor a guide on broaching behaviors, particularly topics such as race deemed taboo, and set the stage for the rest of the supervisory relationship.

Supervisors answered research questions 1 and 2 by demonstrating commitment towards broaching race and race-related issues in supervision, and describing experiences related to barriers with observed supervisee attitudes and responses to broaching. At least four supervisors indicated White supervisees engaged in attitudes and behaviors that showed patterns of discomfort and avoided dialogues related to race and race-related issues. Supervisees also exhibited resistance by not engaging in meaningful ways within the supervisory relationship. For example, many of those supervisees kept these conversations shallow and did not indicate any interest in the discussions of race and White privilege as a function of their resistance. Also in these interactions, supervisors thought the reasons for White supervisees' attitudes and behaviors were an endorsement of the myth of color-blindness. These findings were in line with a previous report on such supervisee behaviors falling within the avoidant style of the CBBM, which spells out different orientations' counselors present with when discussing race, ethnicity, and culture-related issues in their practices (Day-Vines et al., 2007). According to CBBM, counselors demonstrating avoidant behaviors minimize racial differences and exhibit a lack of awareness, resistance, and defensiveness. Similarly, supervisors in the current study also described White supervisees with the avoidant broaching style as falling within low levels of racial identity development and functioning by demonstrating obliviousness to their own racial identity and



color-blindness toward race. Similarly, these experiences also aligned with several CRT tenants, first of which is racism being an endemic and deeply embedded in individuals and structural systems that uphold race as color blind (Bell, 1995; Carbado et al., 2013). As a result, these behavior patterns may force individuals to directly or indirectly engage in behaviors that fuel racism in supervision and counseling practices.

Complementarily, to mitigate these attitudes and responses of supervisees, supervisors felt compelled to utilize strategies to cultivate self-awareness and intrapersonal growth of supervisees to decrease harmful counseling. For example, aligning with the CRT principle calling for the dismantling color-blind ideologies that uphold structural racism and white supremacy (Bell, 1995), supervisors utilized exploratory questions on the intersectionality of supervisees' identities and cultural and racial differences in the supervisory relationship.

Supervisors also described use of modeling broaching behaviors to assist with the parallel process and the conceptualization of clients. Specifically, supervisors described the urgency and relevance of training supervisees on how to broach race and race-related issues in supervision to facilitate skill development toward becoming culturally and racially responsive counselors. Similarly, Inman and Kreider (2013) also reported that supervisors' modeling culturally appropriate dialogues and interventions facilitated supervisee development and competence in multicultural responsive counseling. Other supervision scholars also indicated that modeling skills that included engaging in discussions related to race, culture, and ethnicity positively enhanced multicultural counseling skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders & Brown, 2006). These findings indicated that doctoral student supervisors were motivated to engage in gatekeeping practices that enhanced supervisees' self-awareness of race and race-

related issues. Additionally, modeling broaching behaviors as the path towards training supervisees' development towards culturally responsive counselors.

In sum, theme one's findings revealed that supervisors' broaching race and race-related issues early and frequently in supervision was an integral component of building a trusting and collaborative supervisory relationship within which supervisors' model broaching behaviors and facilitate supervisee development and competence in multiculturally responsive counseling.

### **Theme 2: Supervisor's Individual Characteristics**

The second theme's findings particularly addressed research question 2 and focused on supervisors' own individual characteristics and their impact on broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees. Supervisors notably illustrated insights about their own worldview, expectations, challenges, comfort with broaching, and levels of critical consciousness and how these intrapersonal factors facilitated or hindered broaching race and race-related issues in supervision practice.

The first finding was related to supervisors' insights and awareness of their own social location that informed their worldview and expectations. For example, a Black identifying supervisor described a worldview that included belief supervisees who shared her race were likely to understand the relevance of race in supervision. This finding was congruent with previous studies that indicated comfort broaching in same race supervisory relationships (White-Davis et al., 2016).

Supervisors also reported being challenged by their own feelings of failure in their supervisor role when broaching did not go the way they had hoped. They particularly described feelings of failure due to difficulty fostering insight into race and gender privileges of White cis-gender supervisees and problems connecting due to racial differences. These findings were also

consistent with a previous study that reported supervisors' potential experiences of competence crisis, resulting in feelings of insecurity and anxiety when: (1) challenged by supervisees, (2) there were identity differences, and (3) the supervisor was in the early stages of supervisor development (Gazzola et al., 2013).

On the other hand, most supervisors of color indicated feeling more comfortable broaching race and race-related issues with supervisees of color. In contrast, supervisors of color expressed discomfort broaching race and race-related issues with White supervisees due to fear of not knowing how they would react and the ambiguous power dynamics. For example, a Black identifying supervisor described challenges navigating the ambiguity of power in a broaching process, where the supervisor had power as a supervisor but lacked power as a supervisor of color. Supervisors' fear of White supervisees' reactions when race and race-related issues were discussed was in alignment with the CRT tenant that states race as a social construct that centers and prioritizes feelings of those identified as White (Crenshaw, 1991). Also, hesitation to broach with White supervisees for fear of their reaction, indicted power dynamics related to race continue to be a significant barrier to broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. In addition, parallel to previous findings indicated broaching race as a taboo subject came with discomfort as the task was performed (King & Jones, 2019; Day-Vines et al., 2007). Also, these findings indicted supervisors in the current study also experienced challenges broaching race and race-related issues in cross-racial supervisory relationships.

In contrast, White supervisors in this study described discomfort in broaching with supervisees of color for fear of saying the wrong thing, "doing it wrong," or not being sensitive enough. Similarly, King and Jones (2019) also identified similar barriers that included supervisors having difficulty making choices that involved developing a non-racist White

identity and anti-racist stance. These patterns of behavior were also in alignment with another CRT tenant; whiteness as property, which indicates being a White supervisor or counselor comes with power and privilege (Trahan & Lemberger, 2014). As a result, having discussions about power dynamics appeared to be difficult for the supervisors as it highlighted these privileges.

Supervisors in this study also illustrated cultural humility by noting that despite the discomfort, they broached anyway. This finding was in line with Kemer et al. (2014), who found expert supervisors focused on the interpersonal process to address challenging interactions with supervisees. Supervisors also added they broached within same-race dyads, despite experiencing resistance from supervisees. These findings were comparable to previous results that reported barriers to broaching race and race-related issues in a cross-racial relationship as discomfort, fear of how the other person would respond, fear of offending, and lack of training (White-Davis et al., 2016). Similarly, White-Davis et al. also found that supervisors felt more comfortable broaching within same-race dyads when compared to cross-racial dyads. In White-Davis et al.'s (2016) study, White supervisors broached more in cross-racial dyads than same race dyads and avoided broaching race in supervision. Differently, in this study, White supervisors appeared to feel more comfortable broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. This difference in broaching behaviors may be related to self-selection of supervisors (in the current study) who felt comfortable with broaching, and increased emphases and integration of multicultural competencies into supervision and counseling practices in our field for the last ten years. Additionally, the timing of this study was conducted post the Black Lives Matter movement, where the political climate called out for White individuals to adopt anti-racist attitudes and identities. In brief, both supervisors of color and White supervisors in this study experienced some level of discomfort with broaching race and race-related issues in cross-racial as well as

same-race supervisory relationships. This finding suggests that discomfort is a natural part of broaching race and race-related issues, potentially contributing to the much-needed stretching for personal and professional growth of both supervision parties.

Another finding in the second theme was related to supervisors' demonstration of critical consciousness as part of their developmental processes. Participants described how race and race-related issues were tied to broader contexts, including structural systems upheld by white supremacy. One of the supervisors highlighted the value of normalizing conversations about privilege despite experiencing discomfort. White supervisors in this study appeared to hold high levels of racial identity development by reflecting on their positions of power and privilege and the impact these identities had on the supervisees with marginalized identities. These findings were in line with scholars' statements on clinical supervisors being expected to explore their racial identity development as they examine their implicit and explicit biases and growth areas (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

Supervisors described insights into critical consciousness as part of their intrapersonal makeup while emphasizing the need for normalization of conversations related to race and race-related issues in supervision even when it felt uncomfortable to broach. In the same vein, supervisors demonstrated knowledge of the interconnectedness of race and race-related issues with broader contexts, including stratified structural systems that favored privileged groups while oppressing racialized and marginalized groups. These findings and attitudes aligned with CRT tenants, where despite historical dynamics that defined race and racism as taboo topics, it was also important to engage in activities facilitate dismantling structural racism, such as engaging in discussions related to race and race-related issues (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993; Haskins & Singh, 2015). Additionally, the characteristics of supervisors in the current study was parallel to

supervisors deemed to have expert level functioning (Kemer et al., 2014). In sum, theme two answered research question two by describing how personal characteristics of supervisors influenced broaching race and race-related issues in supervision.

### **Theme 3: Counseling Training Programs**

Emergent findings from theme three answered research question 2 and identified counselor training programs as significant players in the facilitation and hindrance of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. Supervisors identified several factors within counselor training programs, such as didactic and experiential training in doctoral programs and inferences to inadequately trained master's level trainees, with significant implications for broaching race and race-related issues. Other identified critical factors included faculty, doctoral cohorts, and institutional and programmatic critical consciousness. Some of the supervisors described positive experiences with classes centered on multicultural competencies and practice of broaching skills in class (e.g., role-plays). In contrast, 60 % of the supervisors reported feeling lost regarding broaching race and race-related issues due to a lack of knowledge of language application and lack of modeling practical skills. Findings related to lack of or inadequate didactic training was parallel to another CRT tenant; racism and ideologies affirming colorblindness are structurally embedded in institutions (Bell, 1995). The result of these ideologies may influence faculty in counselor training programs not place value on the topics related to salient identities of people of color as well as the race and race-related issues (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993). Additionally, findings were also in line with Dollarhide et al.'s (2013) findings reporting the importance of addressing multicultural concerns in supervision; if not adequately covered, it was likely to impact the supervision training of doctoral student supervisors significantly. These findings were surprising given that doctoral programs have

access to tools that could be infused into the curriculum to support students with broaching skills, such as the Continuous Broaching Behavior Model (Day-Vines 2007), and CRT that facilitates understanding the context within which broaching race and race-related issues occur.

Another finding was the significant impact of experiential and practical learning on supervisors' development and self-efficacy in broaching race and race-related issues. Supervisors described the process of learning by doing, facilitating their practice. For example, one supervisor reported supervision of supervision allowed her to practice broaching, make mistakes, and try again safely. Another supervisor described learning broaching skills in layers, multicultural classes, supervision classes, and supervised practicum. In contrast, one other supervisor attributed learning how to broach from peers in the supervision of supervision group. These findings were similar to another study that noted practice with broaching built confidence and self-efficacy in a supervisor's broaching skills (Jones et al., 2019).

Furthermore, they suggested that faculty and supervisors of supervisors needed to model broaching skills, facilitate the practice, and encourage peer feedback during experiential, practical learning. This finding indicates that supervisors need training in broaching behaviors in didactic and experiential/practical training to facilitate self-efficacy in broaching race and race-related issues in supervision. In addition, faculty need to utilize available resources such as the Continuous Broaching Behavior Model to train supervisors in broaching behaviors in supervision.

Attitudes and behaviors of faculty and supervisors of supervisors were other findings that supported the counselor training programs theme. Supervisors indicated faculty that embraced and integrated topics related to race and race-related issues and acted as mentors enhanced supervisors' skill development. These findings were consistent with previous research centered

on faculty's didactic and experiential training and practice as instrumental toward doctoral student learning, development, and self-efficacy (Jones et al., 2019; Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). In contrast, supervisors also reported barriers because faculty avoided topics related to race and race-related issues in didactic and experiential learning. For example, supervisors described avoidance that extended to how class discussions were managed, such as students saying harmful statements towards other students and not being confronted or re-directed. These avoidance behaviors aligned with previously noted CRT tenant of whiteness as property where faculty exercise power and privilege by determining what subjects will be given attention (Singh et al., 2020; Carbado et al., 2013). Additionally, these findings indicated that faculty who engaged in avoidance behaviors, such as not including topics related to race and race-related issues in the curriculum or avoiding these discussions in class, were not meeting mandated standards of training multiculturally responsive supervisors and counselors. Instead, these faculty were perpetuating racist behaviors that included decentering topics related to racialized and marginalized groups and upholding white supremacy.

Another component related to counseling programs was supervisors' doctoral cohorts that were reported as instrumental in developing multiculturally responsive supervisors. Supervisors described learning about race and race-related issues from their peers, especially cohort members of color, during supervision training and outside the program. Supervisors also described limitations to diversity in their cohorts. For example, one supervisor explained learning from one Black peer's experiences with the program's ignorance of her unique experiences as a student of color. These findings were congruent with Preston et al.'s (2020) study identifying recruitment of doctoral students from diverse backgrounds and experiences and creating diversity in doctoral cohorts as two critical components of high-quality doctoral programs in counselor education and



supervision. This finding suggests that recruiting students from diverse backgrounds and experiences in counselor training programs mirrored the population in the U.S and added diverse experiences into the classrooms.

Supervisors also discussed institutional and programmatic critical consciousness as part of their discussions. Influencing their experiences with broaching race and race-related issues, supervisors indicated their counselor training program's critical consciousness with a general awareness of intersections of power, privilege, and oppression and an understanding of how these systems function within contexts of institutions. In particular, supervisors referenced mixed responses from their programs to the 2020 racial equity and social justice protests. Some counselor training programs responded by engaging responsively and supported doctoral student supervisors with spaces to discuss what was happening. Other programs either stayed silent, on the sidelines, or engaged in performative discussions about systemic oppression of racism and sustained the status quo by ensuring these discussions did not affect the program itself. Findings related to programs engaging in performative discussions was in alignment with the CRT tenant, interest convergence that racialized and marginalized groups achieve equal rights only when white groups can also benefit. In this case, supervisors alluded to the fact that their educational institutions presented as being culturally responsive to protect their image (Delgado & Stefancic, 1993). Additionally, programs that endorsed attitudes hindering broaching race and race-related issues aligned with CRT's tenant that structural racism and white supremacy are deeply embedded in all institutions including educational institutions (Carbado et al., 2013; Ortiz & Jani, 2010). Most importantly, supervisors preferred programs that demonstrated critical consciousness toward being open to discussing issues related to: race and how race intersected with structural racism, the oppression of racialized and marginalized communities; and the

commitment to a facilitation of non-racist educational institutions. These findings aligned with findings that indicated forging a diverse and inclusive learning community included having faculty and students with diverse cultural backgrounds and ideological thought as part of the program (Preston et al., 2020).

To conclude the findings indicated supervisors' lived experiences included motivation to broach race and race-related issues in supervision with counselor trainees to facilitate multiculturally responsive counselors but experienced both personal and structural problematic barriers towards meeting this goal. In a sense, these barriers presented as deeply embedded and supported by white supremacy. N. Schmoyer, a research team member (personal communication, April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2022) stated that white supremacy was like nails in a house; invisible, with a strong hold on the whole structure and difficult to dismantle.

### **Limitations**

This study aimed to explore the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in internship and practicum in CACREP-accredited programs. As in all other studies, there were several limitations of this study that warrant discussion. First, despite the research team's intention to perform a rigorous inquiry, there were common threats to validity in qualitative research (Creswell & Poth 2018), such as the researcher's bias and reactivity, that could have had a potential influence at several stages in the study. The research team attempted to establish trustworthiness by bracketing biases, maintaining reflexivity journals, and using consensus coding to mitigate this threat. Additionally, the study involved a relatively small sample size (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). Therefore, the findings may not be fully transferable (i.e., generalizable) to other doctoral student supervisors.

Second, the primary investigator was acquainted with three participants before the study. This level of familiarity may have enhanced bias towards the content of their interviews. Third, the study missed an opportunity to ask about supervisors' international status in the demographic form. Even though some of the supervisors disclosed their international status during the interviews and described how this status intersected with broaching race and race-related issues, it was deemed inappropriate to include this status in the table of participants. However, participants' experiences were included in the results and discussion. Fourth, the study did not have participants that identified as Latina or Indigenous American. These racial groups' voices could have added unique perspectives to the study. Finally, the geographical location of supervisors was limited. Seven out of 13 participants came from counseling programs in the Southeast region of the U.S.. Two came from the Northeast, one from the Midwest, two from the West, and one did not identify a location. A larger geographical location could have been preferred through a larger sample size.

### **Implications for Supervision and Training Practices**

This study adds to the research body of knowledge related to doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. The study also adds to the pedagogy of broaching in general.

#### ***Doctoral Student Supervisors***

Doctoral student supervisors could benefit from the findings by increasing their knowledge about the implications of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees. First, doctoral supervisors may understand that broaching was an element of the supervisory relationship that resulted in establishing trust, safety, rapport, mutuality,

collaboration, and connection within the supervisory relationship. They may also think about broaching early in the relationship to normalize discussions about race and race-related issues and guide supervisees on what to expect in the supervisory relationship. Additionally, supervisors may frequently broach as an ongoing discussion, facilitating practice and enhancing the connection to supervisees. Supervision preparation was described as a best practice (Borders, 2014). Supervisors may pay special attention to preparing and improving professionalism in the supervisory relationship. Creating disclosure statements and discussing plans to broach race and race-related issues early on could support consistency in skill development and facilitate modeling expectations of the relationship.

Furthermore, this study may increase understanding that effective learning occurs when the practice of skills occurs. Supervisors should model broaching behaviors related to conversations about race and race-related issues for their supervisees' skill development. Supervisees cannot learn how to broach if they don't see their supervisor' broaching practice. Modeling culturally appropriate dialogues and interventions could facilitate supervisee development and competence in multicultural responsive counseling. Similarly, supervisors may utilize their supervision of supervision training to practice their broaching skills.

Finally, White supervisors may be diligent in being aware of their positions of power and privilege and how they intersected with the oppression of marginalized groups while staying aware of white supremacy in the U.S. that maintains the ideology of color-blindness. Attempts to increase understanding of these ideologies may lead to behaviors and attitudes that include resistance and avoidance to broaching race and race-related issues. Paying attention to and discussing these aspects in supervision may enhance the supervisory relationship and fulfill the supervisor role responsibilities, including gatekeeping and facilitating supervisee growth toward

becoming multiculturally responsive supervisees and counselors. Supervisors may also note that discomfort with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision, especially in cross-racial relationships, is a natural part of the process. Nevertheless, supervisors need to continue to broach and keep practicing to ease the discomfort.

### ***Counselor Educators and Counselor Training Programs***

Counselor educators individually could be informed by the findings in understanding how behaviors and attitudes associated with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision and counseling generally impact their students. Counselor educators could further reflect on their practices, particularly the potential patterns of avoiding these conversations, to understand their negative impacts on the students, especially students of color. If they have not done so already, counselor educators may also consider integrating broaching skills into their course preps and curriculums for didactic and experiential counselor and supervisor training.

Complementarily, counselor training program faculty may reflect on and observe how their own patterns of remaining silent bystanders amid racial tension may potentially foster racism, inequity, and exclusion of students of color. The training program faculty may discuss how these strategies may be upholding white supremacy ideologies and endorsing whiteness as being superior to minority races and cultures. Counseling training programs and faculty may also consider deepening their orientation and critical consciousness that may be instrumental in dismantling white supremacy ideologies to better serve all of their students from diverse backgrounds.

### **Implications for Future Research**

Researchers could utilize the current study's findings to inform future research efforts. First, researchers may examine the counselor educators' lived experiences with broaching race

and race-related issues. More specifically, such a study could examine supervisor faculty of supervisors' attitudes and behaviors toward broaching, explore their racial identity development, consider ways they integrate broaching into their curriculum, and how they utilize didactic and experiential training in their classes to develop the awareness and skills needed for broaching race and race-related issues in their classes. Considering the institutional influences, such a study or another one with counselor educators may explore how their institutions facilitate and/or hinder their capacity to teach effectively and model broaching race and race-related issues in their classes and supervision. Additionally, researchers may also study the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues specifically within their cohorts and/or in supervision-of-supervision. Such an effort may also have a specific focus on the impact of cohorts on doctoral supervisors' racial identity development.

### **Summary**

In this qualitative phenomenological study, I aimed to discover the essence of the doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship from CACREP-accredited programs. The findings resulted in three themes: the function of broaching, supervisors' individual characteristics, and counselor training programs and how they impacted the function of broaching race and race-related issues. The study revealed that doctoral student supervisors had insights into the importance of broaching race and race-related issues in supervision to cultivate trust, safety, rapport, confirmability, mutuality, collaboration, and connection within the supervisory relationship to enhance culturally responsive broaching skills. Furthermore, supervisors identified barriers to broaching race and race-related issues to their own characteristics, inadequate didactic and experiential training, and programmatic critical

consciousness. Supervisors also revealed insight into how these barriers were tied to the culture of white supremacy, which resists the integration of racial and cultural minority groups' narratives, and how it upholds privilege, inequity, and oppression based on race. The study findings have practical as well as research implications for all stakeholders of counselor training programs.

## References

- American Counseling Association. (2014). American Counseling Association code of ethics. *Alexandria, VA: Author.*
- Apple MW. (2019). Critical education, critical theory, and the critical scholar/activist. *Educational Policy, 33*(7), 1171-1179. doi:[10.1177/0895904818810529](https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904818810529)
- Bayne, H. B., & Branco, S. F. (2018). A Phenomenological inquiry into counselor of color broaching experiences. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 96*(1), 75-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12179>
- Bell, D. (1995). Who's afraid of critical race theory? *University of Illinois Law Review, 4*, 893–910.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Borders, L. D. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Another step in delineating effective supervision practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 68*(2), 151-162.  
<https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.151>
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2006). *The new handbook of counseling supervision* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Routledge.
- Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *Clinical Supervisor, 33*(1), 26-44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2014.905225>



- Brooks, T. P., & Babel, K. H. (2022). Race Matters: Managing Racial Tension when Teaching Multicultural Competence. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 15*(1). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps/vol15/iss1/1>
- Carbado, D. W., Crenshaw, K. W., Mays, V. M., & Tomlinson, B. (2013). INTERSECTIONALITY: Mapping the movements of a theory 1. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 10*(2), 303-312. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000349>
- Carter, R. T., & Johnson, V. E. (2019). Racial identity statuses: Applications to practice. *Practice Innovations, 4*(1), 42-58. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pri0000082>
- Chang, Catherine Y., Hays, Danica G., Milliken, Tammi F. (2009). Addressing social justice issues in supervision: A call for client and professional advocacy. *Clinical Supervisor, 28*(1), 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325220902855144>
- Chopra, T. (2013). All supervision is multicultural: A review of literature on the need for multicultural supervision in counseling: *Psychological Studies, 58*(3), 335-338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-013-0206-x>
- Colistra, A., & Brown-Rice, K. (2011). When the rubber hits the road: Applying multicultural competencies in cross-cultural supervision. Retrieved from [https://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas11Article\\_43.pdf](https://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas11Article_43.pdf)
- Cook, D. A., & Helms, J. E. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*(3), 268-274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.35.3.268>
- Cook, R. M., Jones, C. T., & Welfare, L. E. (2020). Supervisor cultural humility predicts intentional nondisclosure by post-master's counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 59*(2), 160-167. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12173>

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2016) CACREP  
2016 Standards, Alexandria, VA Author

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence  
against Women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299. doi:10.2307/1229039

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among  
five approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage.

Crockett, S., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The influence of supervisor multicultural competence on the  
supervisory working alliance, supervisee counseling self-efficacy, and supervisee  
satisfaction with supervision: A mediation model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*,  
54(4), 258-273. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.1025>

Day-Vines, N. L., Brooker Ammah, B., Steen, S., & Arnold, K. M. (2018). Getting comfortable  
with discomfort: Preparing counselor trainees to broach racial, ethnic, and cultural factors  
with clients during counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*,  
40(2), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-017-9308-9>

Day-Vines, N. L., Bryan, J., & Griffin, D. (2013). The broaching attitudes and behavior survey  
(BABS): An exploratory assessment of its dimensionality. *Journal of Multicultural  
Counseling & Development*, 41(4). 210-223. [https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-  
1912.2013.00037.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2013.00037.x)

Day-Vines, N. L., Cluxton-Keller, F., Agorsor, C., Gubara, S., & Otabil, N. A. A. (2020). The  
multidimensional model of broaching behavior. *Journal of Counseling & Development*  
98(1). 107-118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12304>

Day-Vines, N. L., Wood, S. M., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Homan, A., Dotson-Blake, K., &  
Douglas, M. J. (2007). Broaching the subject of race, ethnicity, and culture during the

- counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 85(4), 401-409.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00608.x>
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1993). Critical Race Theory: An Annotated Bibliography. *Virginia Law Review*, 79(2), 461–516. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1073418>
- Dixson, A. D., & Anderson, C. R. (2018). Where are we? Critical race theory in education 20 years later. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(1), 121-131.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2017.1403194>
- Dixson A. D. (2018). “What’s Going On?”: A critical race theory perspective on Black Lives Matter and activism in education. *Urban Education*, 53(2), 231-247.  
<https://doi:10.1177/0042085917747115>
- Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & Moss, J. M. (2013). Professional identity development of counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 52(2), 137-150. <http://doi-org.proxy.lib.odu/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00034>
- Dollarhide, C. T., Hale, S. C., & Stone-Sabali, S. (2021). A new model for social justice supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 99(1), 104-113.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12358>
- Dressel, J. L., Consoli, A. J., Kim, B. S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful multicultural supervisory behaviors: A Delphi poll. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 35(1), 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2007.tb00049.x>
- Estrada, D., Frame, M. W., & Williams, C. B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 32(1), 307-319.

- Fernando, D. M. (2013). Supervision by doctoral students: A study of supervisee satisfaction and self-efficacy, and comparison with faculty supervision outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 32*(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/0.1080/07325223.2013.778673>
- Gazzola, N., Stefano, J., Thériault, A., & Audet, C. T. (2013). Learning to be supervisors: A qualitative investigation of difficulties experienced by supervisors-in-training. *The clinical supervisor, 32*(1), 15-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2013.778678>
- Haskins, N. H., & Singh, A. (2015). Critical race theory and counselor education pedagogy: Creating equitable training. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 54*(4), 288-301. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12027>
- Haskins, N., Whitfield-Williams, M., Shillingford, M. A., Singh, A., Moxley, R., & Ofauni, C. (2013). The experiences of Black master's counseling students: A phenomenological inquiry. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 52*(3), 162-178. <http://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00035.x>
- Hays, D. G & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*(2), 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01837.x>
- Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. Guilford Press.
- Hird, J. S., Tao, K. W., & Gloria, A. M. (2004). Examining supervisors' multicultural competence in racially similar and different supervision dyads. *The Clinical Supervisor 23*(2), 107-122. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v23n02\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v23n02_07)
- Inman, A. G., & DeBoer Kreider, E. (2013). Multicultural competence: Psychotherapy practice and supervision. *Psychotherapy, 50*(3), 346-350. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032029>

- Jones, C. T., Welfare, L. E., Melchior, S., & Cash, R. M. (2019). Broaching as a strategy for intercultural understanding in clinical supervision. *The Clinical supervisor, 38*(1), 1-16. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1560384>
- Kemer, G., Borders, L. D., & Willse, J. (2014). Cognitions of expert supervisors in academe: A concept mapping approach. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 53*(1), 2-18. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.odu.edu/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00045.x>
- King, K. M., & Jones, K. (2019). An autoethnography of broaching in supervision: Joining supervisee and supervisor perspectives on addressing identity, power, and difference. *The Clinical Supervisor, 38*(1), 17-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1525597>
- Mitchell, M. D., & Butler, S. K. (2021). Acknowledging intersectional identity in supervision: The multicultural integrated supervision model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 49*(2), 101-115. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12209>
- Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage
- Ortiz, L., & Jani, J. (2010). Critical Race Theory: A transformational model for teaching diversity. *Journal of Social Work Education, 46*(2), 175-193. <https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2010.200900070>
- Peters, H. C. (2017). Multicultural complexity: An intersectional lens for clinical supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 39*(2), 176-187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10447-017-9290-2>
- Phillips, J. C., Parent, M. C., Dozier, V. C., & Jackson, P. L. (2017). Depth of discussion of multicultural identities in supervision and supervisory outcomes. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 30*(2), 188-210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2016.1169995>

- Pieterse, A. I. (2018). Attending to racial trauma in clinical supervision: Enhancing client and supervisee outcomes. *The clinical Supervisor*, 37(1), 204-220.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1443304>
- Preston, J., Trepal, H., Morgan, A., Jacques, J., Smith, J. D., & Field, T. A. (2020). Components of a high-quality doctoral program in counselor education and supervision. *Professional Counselor*, 10(4), 453-471. <https://doi.org/10.15241/jp.10.4.453>
- Rapp, M. C., Moody, S. J., & Steward, L. A. (2018). Becoming a gatekeeper: Recommendations for preparing doctoral students in counselor education. *Professional Counselor*, 8(2), 190-199. <https://doi.org/10.15241/mcr.8.2.190>
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 44(1), 28-48.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035>
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2021). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Sage.
- Richmond, S. G., Samuels, A. M., & Crunk, A. E. (2021). Vicarious grief in supervision: Considerations for doctoral student supervising counselors-in-training. *Professional counselor*, 11(2), 161-172. <http://doi.org/10.15241/sgr.11.2.161>
- Singh, A. A., Appling, B., & Trepal, H. (2020). Using the multicultural and social justice counseling competencies to decolonize counseling practice: The important roles of theory, power, and action. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 98(3), 261-271.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12321>

- Taylor, E., Gillborn, D., & Landson-Billings, G. (2009). *Foundations of critical theory in education*. Routledge.
- Trahan, D. P., & Lemberger, M. E. (2014). Critical race theory as a decisional framework for the ethical counseling of African American clients. *Counseling and Values, 59*(1), 112-124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.2014.00045.x>
- Watcher Morris, C. A., & Wester, K. L. (Eds.). (2018). *Making research relevant: Applied research designs for the mental health practitioner*. Routledge.
- White-Davis, T., Stein, E., & Karasz, A. (2016). The elephant in the room: Dialogues about race within cross-cultural supervisor relationships. *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine, 51*(4), 345-356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091217416659271>
- Woo, H., Jang, Y. J., & Henfield, M. S. (2015). International doctoral students in counselor education: Coping strategies in supervision training. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 43*(4), 288-304. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12022>

## **Appendices**

The contents of Appendices include:

Appendices A: (Invitation Email)

Appendices B (Demographic Information)

Appendices C (Informed Consent)

Appendices D (Contact Information)

Appendices E (Scheduling 60-Minute Interview Email)

Appendices F (60 Minute-Interview Protocol)

Appendices G (Transcript Review Email)

Appendices H (Scheduling 15-30-Minute Interview Email)

Appendices I (15-30 Minute Follow-Up Interview)

Appendices J (Review of Themes Email)



## Appendices A

### INVITATION E-MAIL TO THE STUDY

Dear Prospective Research Participant,

My name is Judith Wambui Preston. I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education and Supervision program at Old Dominion University. I am looking for potential participants for my qualitative phenomenological research study, titled as “Broaching Race and Race-Related Issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees.”

The focus of this study is to understand the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in practicum and internship in CACREP-accredited programs. Studies have shown that race and race-related issues are sensitive subjects that are often avoided, informing the need for and significance of this study. We understand that you may be one of the supervisors that feels this discomfort with broaching, and we validate your experience. We want you to know that if you choose to participate you will be making a significant contribution in helping us understand your experiences. Your participation will aid in results that will significantly add knowledge and insight to the counseling profession and counselor education programs about broaching.

To participate in this study, you must:

- (a) Be enrolled as a doctoral student in a CACREP-accredited Counselor Education and Supervision Program in the United States,
- (b) Have completed CACREP-required master’s and/or doctoral-level didactic and experiential supervision courses
- (c) Be currently supervising or have supervised supervisees in practicum or internship in CACREP-accredited programs in the last one year, (in the last three semesters)
- (d) Have supervised supervisees under supervision in practicum and/or internship for at least two semesters

Participation involves completing a consent form, a demographic form, a 60-minute interview via Zoom, and a follow-up 15-30-minute phone interview. Both interviews will be recorded.

I am aware I am asking for a time commitment. I hope that the study subject is informative for you and will lead to reflections, catharsis, and increased awareness that you could utilize in your practices.

This study has been approved by the Old Dominion University Review Board (ODU IRB Approval #) and is under the direction of my dissertation chair, Dr. Gulsah Kemer. If you need more information about the study, please feel free to contact me at [jpres005@odu.edu](mailto:jpres005@odu.edu).

Thank you for considering my request.

Judith Wambui Preston, M.S.Ed., LPC, NCC, ACS, CSAC  
Doctoral Candidate  
Old Dominion University

## Appendices B

### DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

1. Name
2. Age
3. Gender
4. Race
  - a. American Indian and Alaskan Native
  - b. Asian
  - c. Black and African American
  - d. Hispanic and Latino American
  - e. Middle Eastern and North African
  - f. Multi-Racial
  - g. Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander
  - h. White
  - i. Other
5. Are you a recent graduate of a CACREP-accredited counselor education doctoral program within the last 6 months? **or** Are you enrolled as a doctoral student in a CACREP-accredited Counselor Education and Supervision Program in the United States?  
**Yes or No**
6. Have you completed CACREP-required master's supervision course (i.e., a didactic supervision course)? **Yes or No**
7. Have you completed CACREP-required doctoral-level supervision courses (i.e., a didactic supervision course, an experiential course that involves your supervised supervision practice)? **Yes or No**
8. Are you currently supervising or have supervised supervisees in practicum or internship in a CACREP-accredited program in the last one year? **Yes or No**
9. Have you completed supervised supervision of supervisees in practicum and/or internship for at least two semesters? **Yes or No**

If a participant answers **No** to any of these questions, they will be thanked for their time and informed they do not meet criteria for the study. Those that meet criteria will be directed to the consent form (see Appendix C)

## Appendices C

### Informed Consent

#### OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

**PROJECT TITLE:** Broaching Race and Race-Related Issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this form is to give you information that may affect your decision whether to say YES or NO to participation in this research study, and to record the consent of those who say YES. The title of this study is “Broaching Race and Race-Related issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees.” and will be conducted remotely by the primary investigator under the supervision of her dissertation chair from Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA.

#### **RESEARCHERS**

**Primary Investigator:** Judith Wambui Preston, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Counseling and Human Services, College of Education and Professional Studies

**Dissertation Chair:** Dr. Gulsah Kemer, Ph.D., Department of Counseling and Human Services, College of Education and Professional Studies

#### **DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY**

Several studies have been conducted looking into the subject of broaching race and race-related issues in counseling, however, studies related to the same topic in supervision have been limited. Of those that have inquired about broaching in supervision, none of them have examined the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision with supervisees in internship and practicum in CACREP-accredited programs. This research study will seek to understand the perceptions and lived experiences of these supervisors.

If you decide to participate, then, you will join a study involving research of the lived experiences of doctoral student supervisors broaching racial and cultural factors. If you say YES, then your participation will include a 60-minute virtual interview and a 15-30-minute phone follow up interview within 2-3 weeks of the first interview. The first approximate time for the first interview will be the first week of December 2021. Approximately 10-16 doctoral students will be participating in this study.

#### **EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA**

Participants who are under 18; not enrolled as a doctoral student in a CACREP-accredited Counselor Education and Supervision Program; not completed CACREP-required master’s and/or doctoral-level supervision courses (i.e., a didactic supervision course, an experiential course involves your supervised supervision practice); and not completed supervised supervision of supervisees in practicum and/or internship for at least two semesters.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS**

**RISKS:** There are some risks of participating in this study such as emotional triggers related to racial trauma. Additionally, as with any research, there is some possibility that you may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified.

**BENEFITS:** There are no direct benefits to participating in this research. However, your participation will contribute to the expansion of the counseling supervision literature and increased understanding of doctoral clinical supervisors broaching race and race-related issues in clinical supervision, potentially informing changes in counselor education teaching practices in regard to this topic. You may also benefit from your own reflections with increased awareness of your practices.

**COSTS AND PAYMENTS**

The researchers will present you with a \$15 gift card upon completion of the first interview and another \$15 gift card upon completion of the second interview as a token of appreciation for your participation in the study.

**NEW INFORMATION**

If the researchers find new information during this study that would reasonably change your decision about participating, then they will give it to you.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

All information collected in this study will be kept strictly confidential, except those that may be required by law. If any publication results from this research, you will only be identified by a pseudonym, and other information that could reveal your identity will be disguised. The data will be kept in a computer with two-authentication access and can be accessed only by the researchers.

**WITHDRAWAL PRIVILEGE**

You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any of your data that has been collected be destroyed unless it is in a de-identifiable state.

**COMPENSATION FOR ILLNESS AND INJURY**

If you say YES, then your consent in this document does not waive any of your legal rights. However, in the event of harm or distress arising from this study, neither Old Dominion University nor the researchers can give you any money, insurance coverage, free medical care, or any other compensation for such injury. In the event that you suffer injury as a result of participation in any research project, you may contact Judith Wambui Preston at [jpres005@odu.edu](mailto:jpres005@odu.edu), Dr. Gulsah Kemer at [gkemer@odu.edu](mailto:gkemer@odu.edu), Dr. John Baaki (the Chair of the DCEPS Human Subjects Review Committee at Old Dominion University) at [jbaaki@odu.edu](mailto:jbaaki@odu.edu), or the Old Dominion University Office of Research at 757-683-3460 will be glad to review the matter with you.

**VOLUNTARY CONSENT**

By signing this form, you are saying several things. You are saying that you have read this form or have had it read to you, that you are satisfied that you understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researcher should have answered any questions you may have had about the research. If you have any questions later on, then the researchers should be able to answer them. Please contact Judith Wambui Preston at [jpres005@odu.edu](mailto:jpres005@odu.edu). If at any time you feel pressured to participate, or if you have any questions about your rights or this form, then you should call Dr. Adam Rubenstein, Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance at 757-683-3686 or Danielle Faulkner, Research Compliance Coordinator at 757-683-4636 or Danielle Dady, Senior Research Compliance Coordinator at 757-683-5451 or the Old Dominion University Office of Research, at 757-683-3460.

And importantly, by signing below, you are telling the researcher YES, that you agree to participate in this study. The researcher should give you a copy of this form for your records.

<b>Subject's Printed Name &amp; Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Parent / Legally Authorized Representative's Printed Name &amp; Signature (If applicable)</b>	<b>Date</b>

INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT

I certify that I have explained to this subject the nature and purpose of this research, including benefits, risks, costs, and any experimental procedures. I have described the rights and protections afforded to human subjects and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice this subject into participating. I am aware of my obligations under state and federal laws and promise compliance. I have answered the subject's questions and have encouraged him/her/them to ask additional questions at any time during this study. I have witnessed the above signature(s) on this consent form.

<b>Investigator's Printed Name &amp; Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
--	-------------

## Appendices D

### Contact Information

Dear Participant,

Please provide your contact information for us to contact you to schedule your interviews, and to provide you with the opportunity to review and revise the transcripts of your interviews. Your contact information will not be used for any other purpose except for said reasons. Your contact information will be stored in a secure location until the completion of the study and will then be destroyed. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Warm Regards,

Judith Wambui. Preston  
Doctoral Candidate | Researcher  
Old Dominion University

## Appendices E

### Scheduling 60-Minute Interview Email

Dear Participant,

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study. I am writing to determine your availability so we can schedule our first 60-minute interview. Please let me know your availability.

Monday to Saturday

10:00 am – 11:00 am

11:00 am -12:00 pm

12:00 pm – 1:00 pm

1:00 pm – 2:00 pm

Warm Regards,

Judith Wambui. Preston  
Doctoral Candidate | Researcher  
Old Dominion University

## Appendices F

### 60-Minute Interview Protocol

Date & Time:

Interviewee:

Interviewer:

#### **Opening Script:**

The purpose of this study is to understand your lived experiences with broaching race and race-related issues in supervision with supervisees in internship or practicum in CACREP-accredited programs. The purpose of today's initial interview is to gather information about your definition of broaching, what role broaching plays in your clinical supervision practice, your perceptions of success and challenges with broaching, and how your doctoral program has facilitated or inhibited your capacity to broach in supervision. There are seven present open-ended questions that we will discuss. I will also ask you follow up questions as needed. Today's interview will last for approximately one hour and will be recorded for transcription purposes. To maintain your confidentiality, once it is transcribed, the recording will be deleted. Do you consent to being recorded? (Researcher will obtain verbal consent and will proceed after participant has verbalized consent by saying yes to the question.)

#### **Interview Questions**

The interviews will comprise of 8 semi-structured interview questions:

1. How do you define broaching in clinical supervision?
2. What relevance, if any, do you feel that broaching race and race-related issues has on your practice as a doctoral student supervisor?
3. How do you find that you are most effective working with supervisees who are racially different from you?
4. Tell me about a time when you successfully broached a race or race-related issue with a supervisee.
  - a. What were the successes of this process?
5. Tell me about a time when you were challenged with broaching a race or race-related issue with a supervisee.
  - a. What were the challenges of this process?
6. What role has the supervisory relationship played in your experiences with broaching?
7. What experiences in your doctoral program, if any, facilitated your ability to broach race and race-related issues in supervision?
8. What experiences in your doctoral program, if any, inhibited your ability to broach race and race-related issues in supervision?



**Closing Script:**

Thank you for your time and participation in today's interview. I want to reassure you that the information you shared will only be accessible by my research team. I will provide you with a transcription of today's interview via email for your review. Once you receive it, if you do not feel that your responses were accurate, please feel free to correct them. You will be contacted in 2-3 weeks for a follow up interview that will allow you to discuss any follow up questions or comments you may have. If at any time you have questions or concerns about your participation, please contact me.

## **Appendices G**

### **Transcript Review Email**

Dear Participant,

Thank you for completing the 60-minute interview. Please see attached the transcript for your review. Please jot down any questions or additional information that you would like to include in the final transcript, and we will discuss it at our follow up 30-minute interview.

Thank you very much for your time and contribution to this study.

Warm Regards,

Judith Wambui Preston  
Doctoral Candidate | Researcher  
Old Dominion University

## Appendices H

### Scheduling 15-30-Minute Interview Email

Dear, Participant,

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study. I am writing to determine your availability so we can schedule our 15-30-minute follow-up phone interview. Please let me know your availability.

Monday to Saturday

10:00 am- 10:30 am

11:00 am -11:30 am

12:00 pm-12:30 pm

1:00 pm-1:30 pm

Warm Regards,

Judith Wambui Preston  
Doctoral Candidate | Researcher  
Old Dominion University

## Appendices I

### 15-30-Minute Follow-Up Interview Protocol

Date & Time:

Interviewee:

Interviewer:

#### **Opening Statement:**

The purpose of this follow-up unstructured interview is to find out if you have any follow up questions or comments that you would like to clarify or add to the study. Today's interview will last for approximately 15-30 minutes and will be recorded for transcription purposes. To maintain your confidentiality, once it is transcribed the recording will be deleted. Do you consent to being interviewed and being recorded? (The researcher will confirm verbal consent when participant says yes to the question. Once verbal consent has been granted, the interview will begin.)

#### **Closing Statement:**

Thank you for your time and participation in today's interview. I want to reassure you that the information you shared will only be accessible by my research team. I will provide you with a transcription of today's interview via email for your review. Once you receive it, if you do not feel that your responses were accurate, please feel free to correct them. You will be notified once the results of the study are available should you be interested in reading it. If at any time you have questions or concerns about your participation, please contact the researcher.

## **Appendices J**

### **Review of Themes Email**

Dear Participant,

The research team has completed the data analysis of the study and would like you to review emergent themes for clarification and rectification of what was reported as either accurate or inaccurate. Please provide us with a response within a week.

Once again, thank you very much. for your participation in this study.

Warm Regards,

Judith Wambui Preston  
Doctoral Candidate | Researcher  
Old Dominion University

**Judith Wambui Preston**  
Judithpreston0@gmail.com| Phone: (757) 818-5905

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

---

### **EDUCATION**

---

**Ph.D. Counselor Education and Supervision,**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (CACREP-accredited)  
August 2022

**M.S. Ed., Education**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (CACREP-accredited)  
May 2005  
*Concentration: Clinical Mental health*

**M.A., International Studies**  
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio  
June 1998  
*Concentration: African Studies*

**B.A., Bachelor of Arts**  
University of Nairobi, (Nairobi, Kenya)  
October 1990  
*Concentration: Literature and Sociology*

---

### **LICENSING AND CERTIFICATIONS**

---

2010-Present Licensed Professional Counselor (VA) (LPC) # 0701004803  
2019-Present Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) # 3420  
2006-Present National Certified Counselor (NCC) # 208413  
2006-Present Certified Substance Abuse Counselor (CSAC) # 0710102208

---

### **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

---

Old Dominion University  
**Clinical Assistant Professor**  
Counseling and Human Services  
2022-Present

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA  
**Graduate and Research Assistant**  
2018-2021

Centered Counseling Services, LLC-Chesapeake VA  
**Counselor/Owner of Practice**  
2017-Present

Norfolk State University, Norfolk, VA  
**Counselor/Clinical Supervisor**  
 2016-2019

Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters (CHKD), Norfolk, VA  
**Clinical Mental Health Counselor**  
 2015-2017

Chesapeake Integrated Behavioral Healthcare, Chesapeake, VA  
**Senior Licensed Clinician**  
 2013-2016

Chesapeake Integrated Behavioral Healthcare, Chesapeake, VA  
**Licensed Clinician II**  
 2011-2013

Institute for Family-Centered Services, Chesapeake, VA  
**Family-Centered Specialist**  
 2005-2010

---

## **ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE**

---

Fall 2021 Counseling 634: **Advanced Counseling & Psychotherapy Techniques**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Summer 2021 Counseling 670: **Introduction to Supervision in Counseling**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Summer 2021 Human Services 343: **Human Services: Methods**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Summer 2021 Human Services 448: **Interventions/Advocacy with Children**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Summer 2021 Human Services 339: **Interpersonal Relations (Section 1)**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Summer 2021 Human Services 339: **Interpersonal Relations (Section 2)**  
 (Web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk Virginia

Spring 2021 Counseling 667: **Internship in Clinical Mental health Counseling**  
 (web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Spring 2021 Human Services: 468 **Internship Human Services**  
 (web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Spring, 2021 Career and Advising Resource Center: **Career & Academic Advising**  
 (In-person & web-based) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Spring 2021 Human Services 346 **Diversity Issues in Human Services**  
(web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Spring 2021 Human Services: 346 **Diversity Issues in Human Services**  
(web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Fall 2020 Human Services 346: **Diversity Issues in Human Services**  
(web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Fall 2020 Human Services 491: **Family Guidance**  
(web-based; co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Summer 2020 Human Services 339: **Interpersonal Relations**  
(web-based; co-instructor: session 2) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Summer 2020-Human Services 339: **Interpersonal Relations**  
(web-based; co-instructor: session 1) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Spring 2020-Human Services 447: **Introduction to Substance Abuse**  
(In-person, instructor of record) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Fall 2019-Human Services 339: **Interpersonal Relations**  
(In-Person, co-instructor) Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

---

## RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

---

### Publications in Peer Review Journals

Shuntay, T., Winfield, C., **Preston, J.**, Wilkerson, A., Shorter, I., (2021). A qualitative examination of the preparedness of African American pastors to address issues of addiction. *Journal of Human Service Education*, 40(1), 32-47.

Johnson, K.F., Gantt, A. C., **Preston, J. W.**, & Suggs, B. G., Cannedy, M., (2021). School counseling interns' lived experiences addressing social determinants of health. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, 3(3), Article 7.

Horton-Parker, J. R., **Preston, J. W.**, (2021). Dual pandemics: Helping Black doctoral students thrive amid Covid-19 and racism. *Special Interdisciplinary Issue of Journal of Human Services Education*, 40(2), 147-160.

### Book Chapters

**Preston, J. W.** (2020). Life after After Graduation. In J. A. Austin & J. T. Austin (Eds.), *Surviving and thriving in your counseling program* ( pp. 88-90). American Counseling Association.

### Publications in Newsletters

Horton-Parker, J. R., **Preston, J. W.**, (2021 January). New Year's Resolutions: Making a Case for Self-Kindness. *Human Services Today*, 2(1), 22-24.



Horton-Parker, J. R., **Preston, J. W.**, (2020 November). Coming up for air; Advocating for doctoral students amid a pandemic. *Human Services Today*, 1(3), 31-33.

### Research Lab

Member: Equity Research Lab <https://rampages.us/equityresearch/>

---

## PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

---

### Peer-Reviewed International, National, and Regional Presentations

**Preston, J. Wambui.** Gulsah Kemer (June 2022). *Broaching Race and Race-Related Issues: Phenomenological Inquiry of Doctoral Student Supervisors of Counselor Trainees.* International Interdisciplinary Conference on Clinical Supervision.

Horton-Parker, J.R. **Preston, J. Wambui.** (May 2021). *COVID, Racism, & Many Roles: Ph.D. Students of Color, Thrive!* Presentation at the Association for Humanistic Counseling National Conference, (virtual)

**Preston, J. Wambui.** (2021, April). *Strategies: Broaching Cultural Identities in Clinical Supervision.* CMHC and School Counseling Site Supervisors

**Preston, J. Wambui.** (2020, February). *Taking care of the caretaker: Supervisors as role models.* Presentation at the Virginia Assoc for Counselor Education & Supervision Graduate Student Conference, Norfolk, Virginia.

**Preston, J. Wambui.** (2020, February). *The beginning stage of supervision: Creating a safe place for the supervisee.* Presentation at the Virginia Assoc for Counselor Education & Supervision Graduate Student Conference, Norfolk, Virginia.

**Preston, J. Wambui.** Horton-Parker, J. R. (2020, November). Co-teaching in counselor education: effectively preparing future instructors. Presentation at the Virginia Counselors Association, Yorktown, Virginia (virtual)

**Preston, J. Wambui.** Crawley-Pegram, A., Simmons, S., & Goode, S. (2019, June). *The impact of trauma on African American college students.* Presentation at the Virginia College Counseling Center Conference, Norfolk, Virginia

**Preston, J. Wambui.** (2020). *Tele-mental health in counseling: Benefits, risks, and practice guidelines.* NARACES Conference in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania [accepted, conference canceled]

---

## OTHER PRESENTATIONS AND WORKSHOPS

---

“Culturally Sustaining Research”

Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston** and Erin Swanson  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA March 2021

“Validity, Ethics and Feminist Inquiry”

Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston**, Alex Gantt, and Erin Swanson  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA February 2021

“Be Kind to Yourself: Taking Care of Your Mind, Body, and Spirit”  
Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA October 2020

“Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)”  
Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston** and T. Briana  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA July 2020

“The effectiveness of Program of Assertive Community Treatment (PACT) at Chesapeake Integrated Behavioral Healthcare (CIBH)”  
Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA June 2020

“Telehealth in Counseling”  
Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA February 2020

“Enhancing Self-Reflection in Clinical Supervision; A Constructivist Approach”  
Presented by **J. Wambui. Preston**  
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA December 2019

---

## **PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS**

---

### **Current Member**

Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ)  
Virginia Counselor Association (VCA)  
American Counseling Association (ACA)  
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)  
Association of Counseling Sexology and Sexual Wellness (ACSSW)  
Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SACES)  
Virginia Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (VACES)  
The Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD)  
Chi Sigma Iota International Honor Society in Counseling; Old Dominion University Chapter Omega Delta (CSI)

---

## **PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE**

---

National Board of Counseling for Certified Counselors Foundation. Volunteer reviewer of awardees for the 2022-2023 NBCC Minority Fellowship Program (January-February 2022)

Darden College of Education and Professional Studies; Department of Counseling and Human Services. Search Committee Member (2020-2021)

Darden College of Education and Professional Studies; Faculty Diversity and Inclusion Committee  
Old Dominion University. Student representative-2019-present.

Counselors for Social Justice, Old Dominion University chapter.  
Member of Action Committee 2020-2021.

Virginia Association for Counselor Education & Supervision Graduate Student Conference, Norfolk, Virginia. VACES 2020 Conference Proposal Reviewer

Chi Sigma Iota International Honor Society in Counseling: Old Dominion University  
Awards Committee Co-Chair 2020-present

757 Hampton Roads Black Therapists; Member (2019-Present). Consultation Group. Providing support and mentorship for Black Therapists.

---

## **TRAINING**

---

2020 Telehealth for Mental Health Professionals: PESI 2-day Distance Therapy Training  
2018 Mindfulness & Supervision: Enhancing Counselor Awareness, Effectiveness & Acceptance”  
Regent University, School of Psychology and Counseling  
2018 Campus Safety and Violence Prevention Forum. Department of Criminal Justice Services,  
2017 EMDR Training Part 1 & 2; Waves Psychotherapy  
2017 National Screening, Brief Intervention & Referrals to Treatment; ATTC:  
Addiction Technology Transfer Center Network  
2017 Recognizing and Responding to Suicide Risk: Essential Skills for Clinicians. American  
Association of Suicidality  
2017 FEMA: Campus Emergencies Prevention, Response, and Recovery; Management and Planning  
Level  
2014 Certificate of Clinical Supervision of Virginia

---

## **HONORS AND AWARD**

---

2022 Dr. Jane S. Bray DCEPS Student of the Year Award [Outstanding Graduate Student]  
2021 Nominated for ODU John R. Broderick Diversity Champion Award; Student (Spring)  
2021 Nominated for Dr. Jane S. Bray DCEPS Student of the Year Award  
[Outstanding Graduate Student]  
2021-2022 NBCC Minority Fellowship Program Fellow; Doctoral Mental Health Counseling  
(\$20,000)  
2018 Certificate of Excellence; Professional Development Training, Norfolk State University  
2017 Extra Mile Award: Norfolk State University  
2013 Team Member of the Year Award: Community Services Board  
2012 Team Member of the Month Award: Community Services Board  
2012 Team Member of the Month Nominee: Community Services Board  
2011 Team Member of the Month Award: Community Services Board  
2010 Starfish Award: The Institute for Family-Centered Services  
2008 Starfish Award: The Institute for Family-Centered Services  
2007 Family-Centered Specialist of the Year