Although there is now abundant literature on multicultural counselling, attention to multicultural competence issues has only recently surfaced in the supervision literature (Norton & Coleman, 2003). Supervision is an important learning context for examining the influence of culture in counselling relationships. In our model of Culture-Infused Counselling (Collins & Arthur, 2005b; Collins & Arthur, in press a; in press b), we have emphasised the importance of cultural influences on the working alliance between counsellors and clients. We have also argued that an examination of cultural influences on counselling relationships must go beyond counsellor–client dyads to include all roles in which counsellors are involved. This includes the roles associated with counsellor supervision. We believe that culture is an ever-present dynamic in the ways that client issues and interventions are conceptualised. Culture is also an ongoing influence in the supervisory relationship.

If we work from the premise that the central goal of supervision is to improve the welfare of clients through facilitating the responsiveness of professionals (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998), it follows that supervision must be concerned with promoting multicultural counselling competence (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Chen, 2001; Constantine, 1997; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997). The implication is that supervisors must also increase their level of competence for multicultural counselling supervision. Effective multicultural supervision holds the additional goals of enhancing the training experiences of supervisees and supporting more satisfying supervisory relationships (Constantine, 2003; Pope-Davis, Toporek, & Ortega-Villalobos, 2003).
The purpose of this chapter is to familiarise readers with the importance of incorporating cultural influences into the supervision process. First, we provide an overview of our model of Culture-Infused Counselling. Second, we develop a rationale for incorporating cultural auditing in counselling supervision. In doing so, we highlight the multicultural counselling competencies of both supervisors and supervisees, cultural expectations in supervision and ways for supervisors to increase competence in culture-infused counselling supervision. The chapter ends with a cultural auditing tool that is designed to promote discussion between supervisors and counsellors about the influences of culture in their work together.

Our Model of Culture-Infused Counselling

The emphasis on multicultural counselling supervision has emerged in response to the establishment of multicultural competence in counselling as a core mandate for professional practice. To understand the process and implications of multicultural supervision it is important to briefly overview the broader context of multicultural counselling generally.

A number of key authors have mapped out competencies for multicultural counselling over the past several decades. The most well-known documents were developed by members of the Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association (APA), specifically Arredondo and colleagues (1996) and Sue and colleagues (1992, 1999). Although the competencies have continued to evolve over time and have been applied in documents like the more recent APA (2002) Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists, the basic model has remained relatively stable over time. Three core categories have been identified as essential to the development of multicultural counselling competence: (a) awareness of one's own cultural assumptions, values and biases; (b) understanding of client world-views and perspectives and (c) implementation of interventions strategies and techniques that are appropriate to the cultural context of the client (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

Over the years there have been many criticisms of the current paradigm, based primarily on the following issues. First, the definition of what constitutes culture has evolved over time, and most writers now accept that other dimensions of personal cultural identity must be more fully integrated into the model (Arredondo & Perez, 2006; Weinrach & Thomas, 2002). The continued primacy of race and ethnicity in the current frameworks is problematic in reserving discussions about culture for certain clients, for example, in instances when there are visible differences between the counsellor and client. This focus fails to take into account the importance of other cultural factors such as gender, ability,
sexual orientation, age, socioeconomic status and so on, as well as the complexity of working with clients with multiple nondominant identities (Lowe & Mascher, 2001; Silverstein, 2006).

Second, while the most recent guidelines do incorporate other key areas of professional practice, including supervision, little effort has been made to clearly articulate how the current competencies models should be adapted to include these expanded areas of practice (Collins & Arthur, in press a). Our model maintains the self-awareness and awareness of client cultural identities as the first two core competency domains, but integrates the broader definition of culture and frames the specific competencies in a way that allows for easy expansion to other domains of practice, such as organisational consultation, counsellor education, supervision or social justice roles (Arthur & Collins, 2005a; Collins & Arthur, 2005b).

The third common criticism of the traditional models, and perhaps the most important in the context of the current discussion on supervision, is the argument that effective practice involves more than the application of appropriate intervention strategies and techniques (Collins & Arthur, in press a). We have proposed the concept of the working alliance to replace the earlier, narrower focus on interventions as the third core domain of cultural competency. The working alliance is a broader, pantheoretical construct that elevates the relationship between counsellor and client to its rightful place as one of the most significant predictors of counselling outcomes (Coleman, 2004; Roysircar, Hubbell, & Gard, 2003). It is in the context of the working alliance relationship between counsellor and client that counsellor self-awareness and awareness of the culture of the client(s) are manifest, negotiated and applied. For a more detailed rationale for our model of culture-infused counselling, see Collins and Arthur (in press a).

Developing a culturally-sensitive working alliance involves: (1) agreement on the goals to be addressed through the relationship, (2) agreement on the tasks required to reach those goals and (3) a context of mutual respect and trust in the pursuit of those goals (Collins & Arthur, 2005a). Selection of appropriate interventions is only one component of the process of establishing and implementing an effective working alliance. The collaborative nature of the counselling working alliance highlights the importance not only of acquisition of appropriate strategies and techniques, but of their application only within the context of active negotiation about their cultural relevance for a particular client, with a particular cultural world-view, in a particular context, to address particular presenting concerns (Meissner, 2006).

*Culture-infused counselling* is defined as the ‘conscious and purposeful infusion of cultural awareness and sensitivity into all aspects of the counselling process and all other roles assumed by the counselling psychologist’
(Arthur & Collins, 2005b, p. 16). A core assumption of this model is that all humans are cultural beings whose world-views are affected by personal identity factors (e.g., family dynamics or personal experiences), cultural factors (e.g., ethnic heritage, gender, ability, sexual orientation, etc.), and contextual factors (e.g., social norms or historical context; Collins & Arthur, 2005b). Given this premise, we join other writers who argue that any encounter between counsellor and client, supervisor and supervisee, consultant and organisation, and so on is necessarily multicultural in nature.

In summary, our model of culture-infused counselling requires the development of specific competencies (attitudes, knowledge and skills) in three core domains (Collins & Arthur, 2005; in press a):

1. Counsellor self-awareness (which includes awareness of one’s personal cultural identities, of the differences between one’s identities and those of members of other dominant and nondominant groups, of the impact of culture on the theory and practice of counselling, of the personal and professional impact of the discrepancy between dominant and nondominant groups in society, and of one’s own level of multicultural counselling competence).

2. Awareness of the cultural world-view of the client(s) (which includes awareness of their cultural identities, of the relationship of personal cultural identity to health and well-being, and of the sociopolitical influences that impinge on the lives of nondominant populations).

3. A culturally-sensitive working alliance (which includes establishing trusting and respectful relationships with clients that take into account cultural identities, collaboration with clients to establish counselling goals that are responsive to salient dimensions of cultural identities, and collaboration with clients to establish counsellor and client tasks design to facilitate attainment of those goals).

Defining Culture-Infused Supervision

There are three ways that supervision has been characterised in the multicultural counselling literature. In the first perspective, the interplay of cultural forces between the counsellor/supervisee and the client is examined. From this perspective on supervision, the dynamics between counsellors and their clients are the central focus. The supervision process emphasises the best ways to support clients who present with diverse cultural identities. This view of supervision takes into consideration more traditional views of multicultural counselling in which the counsellor-client dyad is examined to enhance an effective therapeutic alliance. Supervision might entail discussions of client issues, presenting concerns and cultural implications of counselling approaches.
In the second perspective on supervision, the focus shifts to the cultural dynamics that exist between the counsellor/supervisee and the supervisor. An underlying assumption is that culture is a central force in the interpersonal process of supervision (Chen, 2001). From this perspective, supervision takes place within a multicultural relationship. Due to their personal life experiences and affiliations with different cultural groups or cultural identities, counsellors/supervisees and their supervisors hold different world-views. Multicultural supervision from this second perspective emphasises how to address and incorporate the diversity between counsellors/supervisees and their supervisors.

A third, and more dynamic perspective, takes into account the interplay of cultural forces that shape the professional relationships in the triadic process between clients, counsellors/supervisees and their supervisors. We argue that counselling supervision has to address the ways that culture is infused through the interactions among all three parties. We maintain that the central priority in supervision is to ensure the welfare of clients, and that most of the time in supervision is focused on the counsellor/supervisee and client dyad. However, addressing cultural influences in the counsellor/supervisee–supervisor relationship can not only facilitate a stronger supervisory process but also improve the delivery of multicultural counselling to clients. From this perspective, discussions of cultural influences in the supervisory relationship can be leveraged to consider how differing world-views impact counselling processes and goals (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). This helps to model to counsellors/supervisees the skill of reflective practice and opens up the scope of possible interpretations of client behaviour and appropriate interventions. Supervision from this culture-infused perspective is intended to promote collaboration and reciprocal learning between supervisors and counsellor/supervisees. It is through modelling open exploration of multiple perspectives that multicultural counselling competencies can be enhanced through supervision.

The terms multicultural supervision and crosscultural supervision tend to be used interchangeably in much of the literature on supervision. However, Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995) distinguish them as follows. The term *multicultural supervision* ‘alludes to the study and practice of supervision in and for different cultures. Multicultural supervision would involve the study of different cultural patterns of supervision as pertaining to its content, process, and outcomes’ (p. 264). Crosscultural supervision refers to ‘supervision content, processes, and outcomes pertaining to the client–counsellor–supervisor triad in which at least one of the parties in the triadic relationship is culturally different from one or both of the other parties’ (p. 264). Constantine (2003) appears to blend these approaches: ‘Multicultural supervision competence is characterized...
by supervisors’ awareness, knowledge, and skills in addressing multicultural issues both within the context of supervision relationships and with regard to supervisees’ relationships with their clients’ (p. 384).

We prefer the term culture-infused counseling supervision and focus on how the cultural characteristics of the supervisor, supervisee and client triad are all relevant for counseling and supervision. An underlying assumption in culture-infused counseling supervision is that all counseling and supervision relationships are multicultural in nature (Norton & Coleman, 2003). Culture-infused counseling supervision emphasizes that culture permeates the supervisory relationship and the influences of that relationship on the multicultural counseling process. Both the supervisor and the counselor/supervisee bring their own personal cultural identities to the relationship. This is likely to result in diverse professional views, even though they may both have similar training within the helping professions.

Based on our model, culture-infused counseling supervision can be defined as the conscious and purposeful infusion of awareness of supervisor, counsellor/supervisee and client cultural identities into all aspects of the supervision process. From the perspective of supervisors’ multicultural competence, there are then three core components to the model:

1. supervisors’ awareness of their own cultural identities, including potential cultural biases and assumptions
2. supervisors’ awareness of the personal cultural identities of both the counsellor/supervisee(s) and the client(s) and
3. establishment of a supervisory relationship that reflects the mutuality, trust and active negotiation of goals and tasks for supervision that are core to a culturally sensitive working alliance.

In this case, the specific competencies required will build on the core competencies for culture-infused counseling but will include additional competencies required to establish and maintain an effective supervisory relationship that meets the specific needs of counsellors/supervisees from a range of cultural backgrounds. Some of those specific competencies will be explored in this chapter, along with suggestions for continued competency development.

**Competence for Culture-Infused Counselling Supervision**

There are several learning contexts that support the development of multicultural counseling competencies. Critical learning processes occur in courses on multicultural counseling and in the field during practicum supervision when counsellors-in-training work directly with clients. One overriding assumption in culture-infused counseling supervision is that
both the counsellor/supervisee and the supervisor have received prior training about cultural influences in counselling. Through exposure to curriculum, both parties enter the supervisory relationship in a state of readiness for exploring more about cultural factors in counselling practice (Stone, 1997). However, the extent to which prior training prepares either students or supervisors for crosscultural supervision is questionable, as reflected in the variety of approaches and divergent levels of cultural infusion within counsellor education curriculum (Arthur, 1998; Parham & Whitten, 2003).

Numerous studies have suggested that the curriculum of counsellor education programs does not adequately prepare graduates to work with clients from diverse cultural backgrounds (Arthur & Januszewski, 2001; Sue & Sue, 1999). Although strides have been made to integrate multicultural counselling curriculum, and many programs offer specialist courses, counsellor education programs tend to emphasise the self-awareness and knowledge domains of multicultural competence. Students in counsellor education programs benefit from supervision to help them translate concepts about multicultural counselling into skills for practice.

We view multicultural competence as an ongoing learning process and not an end result that is attainable through one program of study. Consequently, multicultural content should not be limited to counsellor education curriculum, and in particularly not to a single course within those programs. It needs to be integrated into continuing education and professional development programs (Parham & Whitten, 2003). To this end, we have developed a competency framework for use in professional development planning aimed at both preservice and postgraduate levels (Collins & Arthur, in press a).

Supervision practices can support cultural learning during counsellor education programs or through ongoing professional practice in the workplace. However, it is of concern that supervisors may not have received education about either multicultural counselling or supervision practices. Without deliberate attempts to improve their multicultural counselling competencies through professional development, some supervisors may lack foundation competencies essential to effective culture-infused counselling supervision (Berkel, Constantine, & Olson, 2007; Bernard, 1992; Parham & Whitten, 2003). Additional training about the supervision of multicultural counselling is crucial (Cary & Marques, 2007).

An integral part of culture-infused counselling supervision is constant assessment of the boundaries of the counsellor/supervisee's multicultural counselling competence (Chen, 2001). However, we are advocating that more attention needs to be paid to the boundaries of supervisors' capacity for multicultural counselling. A main concern is whether supervisors are...
held to the same standard in recognizing and limiting their professional practice to areas where they have sufficient background knowledge and experience. Falender and Shafranske (2007) expressed concerns about the lack of attention to culture and the lack of cultural competence of supervisors as an important area for attention in the practice of clinical supervision.

The first core domain of culture-infused counseling supervision is counselor self-awareness. This domain forms a foundation for cultural understanding of others and for the development of a culturally sensitive working alliance. One key factor in supervision is the level of cultural identity development of the supervisor (Norton & Coleman, 2003). As in the counseling relationship, it will be difficult for supervisors to facilitate development of student cultural identity beyond the level that they have themselves attained (Constantine, Warren, & Milville, 2005; MacDougall & Arthur, 2001). This holds true whether the emphasis of supervision is placed on the needs of clients, or whether the emphasis is placed on cultural dynamics that operate in the supervisory relationship.

Supervisor-supervisee interpersonal interaction dynamics have been explored for the potential impacts of cultural identity mismatches on the supervision relationship and outcomes for clients (Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995). Ideally, the negotiation of cultural differences between counsellors/supervisees and their supervisors strengthens their working relationship. Within the supervisory relationship, discussion of issues of world-view, power and salient cultural dimensions such as gender, sexual orientation and ethnic affiliation may be leveraged to deepen the supervisory relationship and, ultimately, enhance multicultural counseling competencies. A consistent finding in the literature on supervisory relationships is that trust in supervisory working alliance is an essential prerequisite for counsellors/supervisees to engage in discussion about cultural issues (Nilsson, 2007).

Conversely, lack of attention to cultural dynamics that matter to students in supervision may lead to greater defensiveness, misunderstandings and invisible and unspoken barriers of power differences in supervisory relationships. The supervision of lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered counsellors/supervisees, for example, may be compromised if supervisors are uninformed about identity development, or supervisors are unwilling to encourage supervisees to integrate their personal experiences into their professional identity (Messinger, 2007). Religion and spirituality is another area often overlooked in preparing students for multicultural counseling, and supervisors require related competencies (Berkel et al., 2007). Failing to attend directly to these and other cultural factors in supervision may also perpetuate the marginalization of cultural factors in the counsellor/supervisee's work with clients (Estrada, Frame, & Williams, 2004).
Barriers to Infusing Culture into Supervision Practices

In addition to the level of supervisor and supervisee competence, there are other barriers to effectively infusing culture into supervision practices. To a large degree, these barriers reflect cultural biases and assumptions on the part of either supervisors or supervisees that have not been adequately addressed, a reminder again about the importance of self-awareness on the part of the supervisor.

Even though counsellors/supervisees and their supervisors may have been exposed to multicultural counselling concepts in their training programs, it should not be assumed that either member of the supervision dyad necessarily embraces multiculturalism as a positive or desirable direction in their professional practice (Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998). Opponents to the multicultural counselling movement have challenged the need for such an approach in counselling (Pedersen, 1991). It is conceivable that some counsellors/supervisees have higher levels of interest and expertise in examining cultural influences in supervision than their supervisors, or vice versa (Constantine, 1997; D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Priest, 1994).

As instructors, we have experienced this issue with some students who resist the expectation to examine their personal level of competency for professional practice, as well as with the instructors and field supervisors with whom they work. This situation has prompted discussions with our colleagues about pedagogical issues related to instructing multicultural counselling and how far we should go with infusing culture into supervisory practices. For example, in the role of practicum seminar supervisor there are responsibilities for overseeing the experiences of students at their practicum sites, where they are also supervised by an on-site practitioner. Considerable independence is offered to site supervisors regarding the content of supervision and the nature of the supervisory relationship. The extent to which examination of culture enters into supervisory practices may differ at the practicum site or in the context of a course-related practicum seminar. We would advocate for a more proactive approach to working with site supervisors to extend the focus on culture in practicum site supervision. In turn, the extent to which practicum instructors examine culture in their course seminars appears to be entirely based on interests and varying levels of expertise with multicultural counselling.

Even if there is a willingness on behalf of supervisors to explore cultural influences through supervision, disparate levels of competency can be problematic for counsellors/supervisees. There is a risk of exploitation when supervisors depend upon their supervisees, often students, as the main source of education about culture or about the multicultural counselling process (Estrada et al., 2004). We will discuss this issue in more
detail in the next section as we explore ways to share expertise in a collaborative supervisory relationship.

Many authors have pointed to the existence and impact of bias in assumptions, beliefs and attitudes of supervisors (Brinson, 2004). Several potential consequences occur when supervisors are unaware of their personal cultural biases and assumptions (Garrett et al., 2001). First, supervisees may be inappropriately judged according to the supervisor's world-view and the viewpoints of the supervisee may not be seen as valid. In this instance, supervisees may feel compelled to work as if in agreement, even though the approach does not resonate with them or the supervisors' perspective contradicts their personal and professional world-view. Second, miscommunication or cultural misunderstandings often pose barriers to effective interactions. This includes lack of understanding about the verbal or nonverbal communication patterns used by the counsellor/supervisee. Such misinterpretations may be channelled into evaluations about the competence level of the counsellor/supervisee when rigid standards for communication skills are upheld (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice, & Ho, 2001).

Inherent power differences in supervision roles make it difficult for counsellors/supervisees to feel comfortable and confident about challenging their supervisor's views of multicultural counselling (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997). Power differences related to race and privilege can easily spill over into case conceptualisation and impact whose views are considered to be more expert and legitimate (Fong & Lease, 1997). These differences can also impact assessment of counsellor/supervisee competence. The imposition of power differences may be unintentional; supervisors who have not explored cultural influences may also be unaware of how they use power in the supervisory relationship and inadvertently dominate supervisees (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Hird et al., 2001). It may also be important for supervisors to learn specific skills for engaging in dialogue about cultural issues while expressly acknowledging the power differentials in the supervisor relationship (Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004).

The extent to which counsellors/supervisees view their supervisors as culturally aware and receptive to alternate points of view can either strengthen or detract from a satisfactory supervisory relationship (Constantine, 1997). Supervisees' perceptions about the multicultural competence of their supervisors impact the supervisory working alliance and are related to perceived supervision satisfaction (Inman, 2006). A breakdown of trust between supervisor and supervisee may result in important client cultural issues or multicultural dynamics between counsellor and client also remaining unexamined.
These observations raise the question of how to leverage discussion about cultural influences to a central place on the agenda for counsellor supervision. In order to do that, we must engage in open dialogue about the interest and competency levels of supervisors for managing culture-infused supervision.

Enhancing Culture-Infused Supervision Through Collaborative Inquiry

There are a number of positive ways that the supervisors and counsellors/supervisees can work together to enhance competencies for multicultural counselling. For example, even when counsellors/supervisees are more knowledgable, supervisors can initiate and facilitate shared learning through collaborative inquiry (Chen, 2001). Negotiating a stance of co-discovery promotes greater levels of collaboration and mutuality between supervisees and supervisors in their respective roles. However, to be effective, both supervisors and their counsellors/supervisees need to carefully examine their expectations about expertise in the supervisory relationship.

There is usually an expectation, at least by novice counsellors, that supervisors possess more knowledge and serve as experts in the supervisory relationship. In turn, counsellors/supervisees are expected to be less knowledgable and less experienced and to look to the supervisor for direction and coaching. When counsellors/supervisees possess more knowledge and experience about multicultural counselling, a renegotiation of the terms of supervision seems warranted. This is not an unusual situation in cases where highly experienced counsellors return to school for the purpose of professional credentialing or when they seek supervision opportunities as a way to enhance their professional practices in community-based agencies or private practice. If supervisors are able to shift their perspectives about what their main roles in supervision are, this can open up many possibilities for collaborative learning. The supervisor might be better positioned to offer more knowledge about the therapeutic process and the process of supervision and be willing to engage counsellors/supervisees in sharing their culture-specific expertise. It is the active negotiation that is characteristic of a culturally sensitive working alliance.

It is also possible that, by virtue of life experience, some counsellors/supervisees may be more attuned to issues of culture in professional practice. Research has suggested that supervisors from nondominant racial/ethnic groups spend significantly more time discussing cultural issues in supervision than their White counterparts (Hird, Tao, & Gloria, 2005). The dynamics of supervision can be enhanced through exchanges with counsellors/supervisees about identity issues if supervisors who are of cultural minority status also consider such practices to be within their roles...
and responsibilities (Taylor, Hernandez, Deri, Rankin, & Siegel, 2006). Similarly, counsellors/supervisees who are members of nondominant groups will often have more culture-specific knowledge about how to relate to clients from those groups than a supervisor who is from a dominant group (Fukuyama, 1994).

Working With Cultural Expectations in Supervision

Despite the potential benefits of collaborative inquiry in culture-infused counselling supervision, supervisors must be mindful of cultural expectations that impact the supervisory relationship. For example, it should not be assumed that all counsellors/supervisees share a modernist world-view of supervision wherein meanings and understandings are mutually negotiated in a collaborative relationship (Gonzalez, 1997; Neufeldt, 1997). Depending on the academic or cultural backgrounds of the supervisor or supervisee, there may be expectations (implicit or explicit) about the supervisor’s role as expert and the formal evaluative nature of the relationship.

There are rules of supervision that determine the roles of participants (Neufeldt, 1997), for example, supervisees and supervisors. The cultural norms of professional groups transmitted historically through education and supervision are powerful influences on contemporary practices (Hall, 2005). It is often difficult for supervisors who have been socialised within a particular professional context to break away from those traditions in socialising new supervisees.

The classic model of supervision is that the supervisor holds a position of authority in which expertise is shared with a supervisee who serves in a type of apprenticeship to the profession. Research confirms that most supervision unfolds in a top-down fashion in which the supervisor maintains relational control (Neufeldt, 1997). These findings are important considerations in culture-infused counselling supervision, where the sharing of multicultural expertise is presumably a major goal. Participants in a supervisory relationship may lack alternate models from which to tailor their relationship.

The supervision relationship differs depending upon the individuals involved. However, supervision rarely occurs in isolation and is heavily influenced by the organisational context in which supervision occurs (Holloway, 1995). The standards for supervisory relationships may be predetermined by cultural norms that have operated historically within an organisational context. Supervisors are encouraged to challenge those organisational norms that restrict the effectiveness of multicultural counselling supervision.

Rather than assuming that one way is the best way for all supervisory relationships, in a culture-infused model we challenge supervisors to tailor
their supervisory styles to meet the cultural and learning needs of their supervisees. In turn, we try to support students to examine the expectations that they hold about supervision and enter into discussion with their supervisors about their learning needs. When this happens, there is a greater chance of matching styles of supervision with the needs of counsellors/supervisees.

Although this appears easily done, it requires both parties to consider cultural influences on their expectations of supervision. For example, supervisors who adopt a nondirective approach may be matched with supervisees who have been culturally socialised to listen to persons in authority and who wait to receive specific direction (Garret et al., 2001). Supervisees may be reluctant to bring up issues that challenge the expertise of the supervisor due to cultural upbringing about relationships of authority or fears about the evaluative components of supervision.

Toporek and colleagues (2004) point to the importance of open dialogue about the cultural influences on the supervisory relationship: ‘... the relationship may be a pivotal component of multicultural supervision that moderates how all other experiences are perceived’ (p. 80). Within the supervisory relationship, trust must also be established in order to facilitate the mutual negotiation of supervisory goals and tasks. How trust and expertise are shared within the context of a supervisory relationship is bound by cultural expectations. Depending upon the degree of fit between supervisor and counsellor/supervisee expectations, the nature of the professional relationship may enhance or restrict the sharing of expertise.

Supervision Scenarios

In describing our approach to culture-infused supervision, we have provided four examples of how expectations about supervision are bounded by cultural beliefs and practices (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). These are adapted below in scenarios to illustrate multiple views of counsellor/supervisees regarding their experiences of supervision.

Scenario 1

Janet is a graduate student who is increasingly frustrated at her practicum site as she is disappointed by the quality of supervision. She chose the setting due to the reputation of the supervisor for excellent clinical practice. Yet, she is discouraged as the supervisor rarely gives his opinion and always asks her what she thinks. Janet is also very interested in discussing multicultural counselling. As the supervisor never brings up the topic, she does not believe it is an area of interest for the supervisor.

This scenario expands our consideration of mismatches when cultural influences and expectations in supervision are not discussed openly. The sense of frustration felt by the supervisee in this vignette may have been.
avoided through active negotiation of roles and expectations early in the supervisory relationship (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). In fact, to do so at the interview and selection stage may prevent mismatches in supervision preferences from occurring. Some supervisors or supervisees may self-select out of working together. However, such negotiation is more likely to open the door to working more effectively together.

Scenario 2

Michelle is very impressed with the clinical work of her supervisor but dreads their supervision sessions. Like many new supervisees, Michelle is reluctant to bring up any concerns or show areas of weakness for fear of being judged as incompetent. Yet, when Michelle asks for help, the supervisor gives her ideas that she always finds to be useful. When pressed to discuss what is ‘missing’ in the supervisory relationship, Michelle notes that she would like to have more informal discussion and have the supervisor show more interest in her as a person, rather than immediately launching into case consultation. The supervisee wonders if her experience might be different working with a female supervisor.

In this second vignette, a different kind of mismatch in supervisory relationship expectations is highlighted. Two of the key dimensions in counsellor supervision can be characterised as content needs (focus on case conceptualisation and intervention planning) and relational needs (developing a trusting working relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee). If we think about these dimensions on a continuum, Michelle’s supervision needs at this time might be characterised as higher on relational needs, whereas the supervisor appears to be basing supervision strongly on content to improve counselling competencies. In reality, these two dimensions are not mutually exclusive. For supervisees whose world-view emphasises relationships as a primary component of learning, an immediate focus on the business of supervision will be unsettling. Supervisors may need to consider how to create a basis of comfort prior to structuring supervision time around case conceptualisation (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). It is also possible that gender issues may emerge as salient in negotiating the nature of the supervisory relationship. Gender dynamics are influential for counsellor/supervisee satisfaction with the supervisory relationship (Gatmon et al., 2001).

Scenario 3

Quan believes that there has been a high level of conflict with his supervisor, to the point that he fears a negative evaluation. Quan is concerned with the amount of supervision time taken on nonessential matters and a lot of time seems to be wasted when he really needs help with strategies for working with clients. Quan feels a lot of pressure to disclose about himself and this is not something he feels comfortable doing. He attempted to discuss his
cultural values with his supervisor, but this only seemed to make a temporary
difference in how supervision was approached. Quan is concerned that unless
he shows more evidence of personal reflection, he will be penalised. This has
resulted in a lot of anxiety about supervision and what he might need to do to
meet the supervisor's expectations, despite his personal convictions.

The third scenario describes the experiences of a supervisee who felt that
his cultural boundaries around privacy were violated through supervision.
There is general agreement in the multicultural counselling literature on
the importance of self-awareness and counsellors are encouraged to be
continually reflective about the influence of their personal culture (Torres-
Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001; Collins & Arthur,
2005b). Supervision approaches based on models of personal develop-
ment also emphasise personal reflection and awareness as foundational
to the development of higher level counselling skills. This can be a particu-
larly sensitive area in multicultural supervision, as supervisees are
encouraged to engage in personal reflection and disclosure with their
supervisor about areas of potential vulnerability.

Underlying the process of gaining self-awareness are cultural norms
about sharing personal information in public contexts. Depending upon
the cultural backgrounds of either the counsellor/supervisee or the supervi-
sor, there can be mismatches in expectations about the degree of disclosure
expected and how that disclosure is managed. Without attention to expecta-
tions and the personal cultural identities of both the supervisor and the
counsellor/supervisee, there is a risk that conflicting expectations will be
detrimental to the supervisory relationship. In this scenario, the female
supervisor who was trained in western perspectives was inadvertently
challenging the gender role beliefs of a male who was socialised in a collec-
tivist eastern culture. Rather than insisting on a high level of verbal
disclosure, the supervisor may have expanded her methods for ascertaining
this supervisee's level of reflective practice. This example underscores how
conducting discussions about cultural variables in the supervisory relation-
ship may be a necessary intervention (Gatmon et al., 2001).

Scenario 4

Nick was an experienced counsellor and he was very keen to enhance his
multicultural counselling competencies through his graduate practicum. The
instructor who coordinated his practicum placement encouraged him to
discuss his interests with his site supervisor to see if it would be possible to
place a greater emphasis on cultural influences on his work with clients. The
supervisor was really interested in this idea, and they negotiated agreement
that either of them could raise issues about culture in their supervision
sessions. This openness motivated Nick to pay more close attention to the
ways that he was approaching multicultural counselling and how his personal
socialisation was potentially influential in the way that he worked with clients.
Discussions with his supervisor included aspects of Nick’s cultural identity that were considerably different to the cultural identity of his supervisor. Through more open sharing of their world-views, their supervisory relationship was also strengthened.

The fourth scenario depicts a counsellor/supervisee who has high levels of multicultural competencies and who was proactive about pursuing his learning needs related to culture-infused supervision. A major contributing factor to Nick’s positive experience of supervision was the openness of the supervisor to explore Nick’s expressed learning needs. In this vignette, the receptivity of the supervisor to engage in a discussion of cultural identities provided an indication of support and acceptance.

These scenarios illustrate how culture-infused supervision is enhanced when supervisors are both open to and sufficiently skilled to address the learning needs of counsellors/supervisees. Ideally, supervisors respond to each counsellor/supervisee and each counsellor/client relationship in a unique way (Holloway, 1995; Neufeldt, 1997). In turn, when supervisors are responsive to discussions about cultural influences with their supervisees, they model appropriate behaviour for counsellors to initiate and follow with their clients (Hird et al., 2001).

**Addressing Cultural Influences in Supervision**

The previous discussion and supervision scenarios illustrate some of the ways that cultural factors influence expectations and behaviours in the supervisory relationship. Three positions were apparent in the scenarios: (a) supervisors avoid addressing cultural issues with supervisees, either intentionally or unintentionally; (b) supervisors wait for supervisees to bring up cultural issues and address them if they come up in the process of supervision; or (c) supervisors attempt to infuse cultural issues in supervision discussions from the beginning (Garrett et al., 2001).

When supervisors do not address culture in their supervisory practices, there are, at minimum, missed opportunities for deeper case conceptualisation and for enhancing the supervisory relationship and, at worst, examples of potential cultural oppression of either supervisees or clients. There have been strong positions taken that consideration of cultural influences for counselling goals and processes are essential for ethical practice (Sue & Sue, 1999; Pedersen, 1991). Developing cultural competence is now an integral part of standards of practice and codes of ethics in the field of counselling with clients (Pettifor, 2005). We are suggesting a similar mandate for culture-infused counselling supervision. Barnett (2007) identified attention to issues of diversity as a core requirement for effective and ethical supervision. We would argue that standards of prac-
tice for the supervision of multicultural counselling need to be addressed to enhance ethical practices.

Without discussion of the diversity/similarity within the supervisory dyad, unexamined cultural issues can adversely interfere with the development of a solid working alliance between supervisor and supervisee. The costs of not discussing cultural influences in supervision are most likely to be felt by supervisees and clients, as they typically hold the least amount of sociopolitical and contextual power (Hird et al., 2001). In most cases, supervisors are White and experience privilege in other areas of cultural identity (Brinson, 2004; Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001). This may make it more difficult for them to self-assess power differentials and appreciate the experiences of supervisees or clients from nondominant groups.

A layer of cultural complexity is added in dyads where the supervisor is from a nondominant group, including a nondominant racial group. The ‘hierarchical difference’ (McGoldrick et al., 1999, p. 203) is a sensitive issue that relates to matters of privilege and supervisor credibility. For supervision to be maximally effective, both supervisors and counsellors/supervisees need to be willing to explore the potential influences of their cultural background for the supervisory relationship. Discussion of cultural variables such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion and socioeconomic status have been implicated for the strength of the supervisory working alliance and the supervisee’s satisfaction with supervision (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995; Constantine, 1997, 2003; Gatmon et al., 2001).

In reviewing the literature on crosscultural supervision, an important recommendation is offered: the onus is on the supervisor to initiate discussions about culture in supervision (Estrada et al., 2004). Initiating discussions about personal culture can model to supervisees the importance of addressing difficult topics related to culture (Constantine, 2003). It opens the door for reflection about the influence of personal culture in supervisory relationships and in relationships with clients. The willingness of supervisors to initiate, take risks and show vulnerabilities to supervisees may support counsellors/supervisees to do the same through reflective practice. Supervision should provide a supportive foundation from which supervisees improve their multicultural counselling competencies. Research suggests a positive relationship between greater amounts of multicultural supervision and a supervisee’s perceptions that they hold higher levels of multicultural counselling competence (Constantine, 2003).

The call for infusing culture into supervision and training requires an intentional approach to working with counsellors/supervisees. Divac and Heaphy (2005) emphasise experiential learning of supervisees in their model through regularly scheduled meeting for the purpose of facilitating
cultural competence. The reflections offered in an article by Garrett and colleagues (2001) provide an excellent example of ways for supervisors to strengthen the supervisory relationship and, ultimately, the delivery of multicultural counselling. In keeping with our model of culture-infused counselling, however, the starting point is reflective learning about cultural biases and assumptions on the part of the supervisor (Brinson, 2004). The sharing of personal reflections by supervisors with supervisees may facilitate the imparting of multicultural counselling competencies. It has been suggested that self-disclosure about struggles with multicultural counselling may be comforting to supervisees and help them to address their own issues as they attempt to integrate multicultural perspectives into counselling (Hird et al., 2001). Through discussing their personal struggles and challenges, supervisors model the ongoing process of reflective practice and multicultural development (Chen, 2001; Helms & Cook, 1999). In this way, supervisors reveal themselves as lifelong learners interested in improving their understanding about the influences of culture in professional practice.

Tools for Reflective Practice
Although there is a growing body of literature attesting to the importance of multicultural counselling competencies, we have noted that there are few practical tools or concrete guidelines available in the literature that help counsellors translate concepts about multicultural counselling and supervision into practice (Estrada et al., 2004). Tools to facilitate exchanges about cultural influences in the supervision process are only beginning to appear. For example, Guanipa (2002) has developed a questionnaire for evaluating multicultural issues in marriage and family therapy supervision that is informative for multicultural counselling supervision. Supervisors and supervisees are invited to begin by reflecting about the way that culture is defined in supervision. Next, a series of questions have been designed for both supervisors and supervisees to support reflection on how culture is infused in supervision practices. In reviewing the items, supervisors and supervisees are invited to reflect upon cultural influences in their supervisory relationship and in the context of working directly with clients. Estrada and colleagues (2004) propose that both supervisor and supervisee create cultural genograms and complete racial identity inventories as a foundation for discussing their own cultural influences and the impact these may have on the supervision and counselling processes.

Cultural Auditing of Counselling Supervision
In addition to cultural auditing tools designed to enhance multicultural counselling competencies in direct client work and through organisational
development (Arthur & Collins, 2005a; Collins & Arthur, 2005b), we have developed a cultural auditing tool for culture-infused counselling supervision (see Appendix B). This tool contains the steps and supervisory relationship considerations in conducting a cultural audit of supervision practices. We designed the cultural auditing process to provide practical points of reflection and discussion to be used in supervisor and supervisee relationships. The cultural auditing tool for supervision has been positively received by the counsellors/supervisees who we work with directly and by colleagues in Canada who are counsellor educators.

The Conducting a Cultural Audit of Supervision Practices (CCASp) tool is organised around 16 steps, or points of consideration for reflective practice. The steps are not intended to be followed in a linear order; rather they specify domains that are relevant at different stages and times of working together in multicultural counselling supervision. Not all steps may be relevant for every supervisory relationship; some may be more salient, and it may be beneficial to revisit certain stages as supervision unfolds. We have organised key content for reflection around six domains, which include: (a) relationship between supervisor and counsellor, (b) relationship between counsellor and client, (c) counselling and supervision conventions, (d) multicultural case conceptualisation, (e) goal-setting and intervention and (f) multicultural competency development. In each of the domains, content areas for reflection and discussion are suggested. We encourage supervisors to incorporate a cultural auditing process into their ongoing supervisory practices.

Summary and Conclusions
Counselling students, graduates, more experienced counsellors, and those who hold supervisory roles need to consider how culture is infused into their professional roles and relationships. Culture impacts the reciprocal relationships between counsellors/supervisees, supervisors and clients. Supervision practices can support cultural learning during counsellor education programs or through ongoing professional practice in the workplace. We agree with other authors who take the position that cultural influences need to be examined within every aspect of the supervision process (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001). To that end, we have suggested the following strategies for strengthening culture-infused supervision practices (Arthur & Collins, 2005a):

1. Supervisors can become familiar with the applications of theoretical perspectives on supervision in crosscultural contexts. For a review of supervision theories and approaches and their crosscultural relevance, see Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995). In addition, a number of
models specifically address multicultural counselling supervision (e.g., Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Chen, 2001; Constantine, 1997; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Garrett et al., 2001; Martinez & Holloway, 1997; Porter, 1994; Robinson, Bradley, & Hendricks, 2000; Stone, 1997).

2. Models and competency frameworks can be used by supervisors to help them gain insight into their level of multicultural supervision competencies (e.g., Allen, 2007; Ancis & Ladany, 2001; Constantine, 1997; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Guanipa, 2002). These are helpful tools for supervisors to use in identifying their strengths and areas for continued professional development. In this chapter, we have additionally presented the CCASP tool as a new contribution to help supervisors and counsellors/supervisees translate ideas about culture into meaningful practices.

3. We have noted that there is a wide range of levels of exposure to multicultural competency training in counsellor education, and even less opportunity to gain competencies in multicultural counselling supervision (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). Workshop planning and attendance at presentations designed to address multicultural counselling and supervision are important directions for continuing education. Supervisors can lobby with conference planning committees to include content about multicultural counselling supervision (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997).

4. Building a network of community resources is an important way to inform crosscultural understanding (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). Involvement in local communities helps strengthen supervisors’ knowledge about cultural diversity. Bridging community resources also leads to important opportunities for counselling consultation to ensure culturally appropriate services (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997).

5. Supervisors need to examine their professional strengths and limitations with counsellors/supervisees. It is reasonable to declare a scope of expertise, as supervisors cannot be expected to be experts in all areas of counselling practice. In reference to culture-infused counselling, supervisors should clarify their level of competence (Arthur & Collins, 2005a). For example, they may have a great deal of practical experience but lack the theoretical knowledge that is now available in counsellor education curriculum. In contrast, supervisors may be well informed about multicultural counselling competencies but lack the practical experiences that supervisees may have gained. This kind of discussion models ethical practice in establishing boundaries of expertise for culture-infused counselling (Chen, 2001).

6. We reiterate that responsibility for initiating discussions of cultural variables rests with the supervisor, to open the cultural door and walk
through it with the supervisee’ (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, p. 45). Discussions about cultural influences can ultimately strengthen the supervisory working alliance, enhance satisfaction with the quality of the supervisory relationship, facilitate a supportive learning environment and support the acquisition of culture-infused counselling competencies by both supervisor and supervisee (Constantine, 1997; Gatmon et al., 2001; Leach & Carlton, 1997; Ridley, Espelage, & Rubinstein, 1997).

In summary, the multicultural counselling field would benefit from expanding the focus of cultural influences on the counsellor–client dyad to also consider cultural influences on the supervisory relationship. Collaboration to enhance culture-infused counselling competencies through supervision can lead to rewarding ways of teaching and learning about culture together.

**Educational Questions and Activities**

1. Individual and Small Group Reflection Exercise

   The following reflection questions are intended to promote discussion about culture-infused supervision. Reflect about the way that you currently supervise students, or, if you are a student, the way that you are supervised during your practicum or field placement.

   • How are cultural influences about client issues introduced into supervision?

   • How are supervisor and supervisee cultures taken into account in the supervision process?

   • What cultural influences in the relationship between supervisors and supervisees have you experienced?

   • What are the cultural influences that you would like to discuss with your supervisor/supervisee?

   • What barriers do you experience in discussing culture with your supervisor/supervisee?

   • What helps you to discuss cultural influences with your supervisor/supervisee?

2. Some people argue that the multicultural counselling movement is directed towards racial and ethnic minority clients. Others suggest that the focus of multicultural counselling be placed on a broader range of clients from nondominant groups who have experienced social oppression. Advocates of a generic position argue that every encounter with a client involves counselling across cultures. What are the relative strengths and limitations to each position? Which position do you support?
The field of multicultural counselling has grown from a focus on racial and ethnic minorities to considering cultural influences on an expanded range of nondominant populations, such as religion, socioeconomic status, age, sexual orientation, gender and ability. However, it is not group membership alone that determines cultural influences; rather, it is the ways in which individuals internalise their identity, often based on multiple and intersecting notions of culture. Advocates of a universalistic approach argue that no two individuals are the same and that counselling always involves counselling across cultures. It is important to recognise that some groups continue to experience oppression in ways that require social advocacy on behalf of counsellors. It may be particularly important for counsellors to attend to the effect of culture on the experiences of clients from these groups.

3. Name three advantages of taking a culture-infused approach to supervision.
   - A culture-infused approach to supervision recognises the responsibility of supervisors and supervisees to acknowledge cultural influences on the ways in which counselling issues and interventions are determined.
   - The supervisory relationship provides a unique opportunity to integrate role modelling and discussion of cultural influences between supervisors and supervisees.
   - Through increasing competence and confidence about addressing cultural influences in counselling, supervisees develop competencies for service provision to all clients.

4. What are the potential barriers to infusing culture in counselling supervision?
   - Supervisors may lack knowledge about multicultural counselling and limit such discussions to specific clients, for example, racial minorities.
   - Supervisees may be interested in discussing cultural influences but may feel bound by cues from their supervisors about their level of interest and the perceived acceptability of doing so.
   - Perceived power differences between supervisees and supervisors may lead supervisees to remain silent about cultural differences that they believe impact the supervisory relationship.

5. Discuss three ways that supervisors foster a positive approach to infusing culture during multicultural counselling supervision.
   - Supervisors take the initiative to discuss their own sense of cultural identity and ways that they believe their identity impacts their pro-
fessional supervisory relationships, and they encourage supervisees to do the same.

- Supervisors take the initiative to discuss their own sense of cultural identity and ways that they believe their identity impacts their work with clients, and they encourage supervisees to do the same.

- Supervisors incorporate discussions about cultural influences on client issues and interventions as a regular agenda item for supervision sessions.

6. How does culture-infused counselling supervision potentially enhance the working alliance between counsellors and clients?

As noted in #3 above, positive role modelling in the supervisory relationship provides a forum for supervisees to explore their cultural identity and to develop multicultural counselling competencies to increase their awareness, knowledge and skills for practice. When discussions about culture are held in an open manner and considered ‘everyday’ practice, counsellors are more likely to incorporate reflective practice about culture into their work with clients. The supervisory relationship potentially offers a supportive forum for supervisees to learn about themselves, their clients, and ways to enhance the working alliance in multicultural counselling.

Selected Internet Resources


These guidelines provide a framework and specific standards of practice for delivering services to racial and ethnic minorities, as well as guidelines for training, research, and organizational change.


The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) emphasises the need for quality education and supervision of counsellors in all work settings. The site contains news and information links to conferences and ongoing projects related to counsellor education and supervision.

- Counselor Education and Supervision is the official journal of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. The journal is dedicated to publishing manuscripts concerned with research, theory
development, or program applications related to counsellor education and supervision. Available from http://chdsw.educ.kent.edu/ces/

• The Clinical Supervisor is a journal devoted exclusively to articles on the art and science of clinical supervision. An interdisciplinary, refereed publication, the journal facilitates the communication of ideas, experiences, skills, techniques, concerns and needs of supervisors in psychotherapy and mental health. Available from http://www.haworthpress.com/store/product.asp?sku=J001
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Appendix B

Conducting a Cultural Audit of Supervision Practices

Relationship between Supervisor and Counsellor
1. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on establishing initial rapport in the supervision relationship.
   This involves openly acknowledging the similarities and differences in cultural identity(ies) of both the supervisor and the supervisee and exploring the potential impact their world-views may have on the supervision process. It also involves understanding the processes and goals of supervision from a cultural perspective.

2. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on the development of a supervisory relationship of trust and respect.
   The style of supervision, supervisor credibility, openness in exploring cultural issues and issues of power and expertise are all culturally-embedded. Developing trust and respect is dependent upon recognition and appreciation of the impacts of culture on the relationship.

Relationship between Counsellor and Client
3. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on establishing initial rapport in the counselling relationship.
   First impression, both on the part of the client and the counsellor, are often formed around obvious cultural factors and, without careful reflection, can lead to misinterpretation and misperception. Building rapport depends upon learning about each other’s perspectives, world-view and visible and less visible cultural influences. Premature foreclosure on such exploration may lead to significant barriers in working together.

4. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on the development of a relationship of trust and respect.
   Establishing a solid working relationship is predicated on the development of a sense of trust and mutual respect. Client trust is closely linked to counsellor credibility, and credibility is built through cultural awareness and sensitivity. Flexibility and responsiveness to particular client needs and expectations of the counselling process are also central factors. Without trust and respect, the working alliance is compromised.

Counselling and Supervision Conventions
5. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on the structure and contexts of counselling and supervision.
In some cases, clients from nondominant populations may not even make it into the counsellor’s office because the normative way of doing business presents barriers to accessible, effective and sensitive service. Hours of operation, location and scheduling may need to be reviewed, along with the physical characteristics of the professional environment. Similar issues in the context of supervision should also be considered.

**Multicultural Case Conceptualisation**

6. Reflect on the potential influences of differences in personal culture on how you view the client.

Too often counsellors are focused on understanding their client and miss the critical step of self-reflection on personal cultural, values, world-views and assumptions. How I view others is intimately related to how I view myself and how I view the world around me, which in turn is a reflection of my own cultural and social history. This type of reflection is important for both the supervisor and the counsellor since each will come with their own cultural lens.

7. Reflect on the potential influences of your personal cultures on how you each view the client’s presenting issues.

One area where the counsellor’s personal cultural is likely to be influential is in the assessment of client presenting concerns. How we define health, healthy and unhealthy development, and the nature of problems are all culturally embedded. The challenge for both the supervisor and the counsellor is to identify their own cultural assumptions and to develop hypotheses about client issues that are inclusive of what they know of the client’s cultural perspective.

8. Reflect on the potential influences of broader social, economic and political systems on the client’s presenting concerns.

Our perspectives are also strongly influenced by dominant theoretical models, which tend to locate the problem within the individual. The cultural auditing process encourages a broader reflection on the interpersonal, familial, societal and other influences on the client that may, in fact, be the primary sources of distress or barriers to career development. Thinking systemically then leads to the need to act systemically.

**Goal-Setting and Intervention**

9. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on the definition and negotiation of client goals.

Understanding the impact of world-view on the client’s presenting concerns provides a foundation for building agreement about goals. These goals may be influenced by the client’s level of acculturation or cultural identity development, and the counsellor’s commitment to these goals
will also be influenced by personal identity development, multicultural competency and skills for multicultural case conceptualisation.

10. Reflect on the potential influences of culture on the negotiation of counselling interventions.
Recognition that culture impacts how a problem is defined opens the door to a broader range of options for how the problem is then addressed and requires supervisors and counsellors to expand their repertoire of both intervention strategies and targets of intervention. Supervisors must be prepared to explore alternative roles for advocacy, consultation, social justice, organisational change or community capacity building.

11. Reflect on the best ways to evaluate her progress in counselling.
Success is a highly culture-bound concept and must be defined in collaboration with the particular client and in response to her/his cultural norms and world-view. Goal attainment and processes for evaluating progress must also be developed and implemented together. Building culturally sensitive measures into evaluation will also impact the profession as a whole as counsellors share challenges and successes with one another.

12. Reflect on the influence of culture on termination and follow-up.
The cultural meanings attached to ending a relationship may be very different across clients and will also depend on the degree to which each client is influenced by various personal cultural factors. Active negotiation of termination and follow-up, beginning early on in the counselling process, will ensure that client needs are met and counsellor professional boundaries are sufficiently maintained.

Multicultural Competency Development
13. Reflect on the cultural learning obtained through various client encounters.
Supervisors and counsellors are in an ideal position to observe how culture impacts the wellbeing of their clients and to search for common themes. These themes may result in identification of targets of advocacy interventions, in changes to counselling conventions or in modifications to personal theories of counselling. Clients remain our richest source of information.

14. Reflect on the counsellor’s experience in counselling and her continued competency development.
These emergent themes may also provide a mirror for further self-reflection and identification of areas for continued competency development.
development. The cultural auditing process provides a tool for assisting in both building an effective working alliance with clients to ensure culturally sensitive and responsive practice and also in highlighting areas for further professional development.

15. Reflect on the counsellor’s experience in supervision and her continued competency development.
If culture is effectively infused into the supervisory relationship then a further opportunity is provided for the counsellor to explore issues for further multicultural competency development both through the feedback of the supervisor about client interactions and counselling processes and through reflection on the working alliance developed between supervisor and supervisee.

16. Reflect on the counsellor’s experience in supervision and the supervisor’s continued competency development.
When approached with openness and a willingness to learn from the experience of supervision, the supervisor relationship also offers an opportunity for reflective practice on the part of the supervisor. The opportunity exists to learn in more depth about both supervisee and client cultural identities and to continue to develop awareness of one’s of identity and identity development processes.