

Supervision

Using Supervision to Prepare Social Justice Counseling Advocates

Harriet L. Glossoff & Judith C. Durham

Over the past several years, there has been an increased focus on integrating not only multiculturalism in the counseling profession, but also advocacy and social justice. Although the professional literature addresses the importance of cultural competence in supervision, there is a paucity of information about social justice advocacy in relation to the process of counseling supervision. In this article, the authors share a rationale for integrating a social justice advocacy orientation in supervision, discuss the connection between diversity and social justice advocacy counseling competence, address challenges faced by supervisors, and suggest specific strategies for use in supervision to prepare counselors to be social justice counseling advocates.

There are many approaches to supervision such as theoretically based models (e.g., person-centered), developmental models (e.g., integrated developmental model), and social-role models (e.g., discrimination model; Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). In addition, several authors have described the need to present models of supervision that focus on cultural issues within supervision (e.g., Carney & Kahn, 1984; Hernández, 2008; Ober, Granello, & Henfield, 2009) or have offered frameworks to help supervisees understand how cultural issues may affect the supervisory process (e.g., Estrada, Wiggins Frame, & Braun Williams, 2004; Garrett et al., 2001; Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, & Ho, 2001; Steele, 2008). Recently, some authors have proposed models that use supervision to enhance supervisees' awareness of the impact of oppression and disenfranchisement on mental health needs and models that promote development of a social justice advocacy orientation with the supervisee (Chang, Hays, & Milliken, 2009; Garcia, Kosutic, McDowell, & Anderson, 2007). In this article, we offer specific recommendations for faculty members and field-site supervisors to assist supervisees in becoming more aware of social justice issues in counseling and to become more adept social justice advocates within their counseling practices. For this article, a *social justice counselor* or *social justice counselor advocate* is one who works with or on behalf of clients, or within the broader social system, to minimize oppression, discrimination, and disenfranchisement with the goal of obtaining fair, just, and equitable treatment and access to services (Chang et al.,

Harriet L. Glossoff, Department of Human Services, University of Virginia; Judith C. Durham, Department of Counseling and Family Therapy, Saint Joseph College. Harriet L. Glossoff is now at Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership, Montclair State University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Harriet L. Glossoff, Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership, Montclair State University, 1 Normal Avenue, UN 3156, Montclair, NJ 07043 (e-mail: glossoffh@mail.montclair.edu).

© 2010 by the American Counseling Association. All rights reserved.

2009; Lee, 2007). The core strategy includes using focused discussions to enhance critical consciousness and increase cognitive complexity (Vera & Speight, 2003). Also discussed is the use of Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956) within supervision (Ober et al., 2009), the use of reflective questioning, genograms (Estrada et al., 2004; Garcia et al., 2007), mapping worldview and social capital (Garcia et al., 2007), and examining intake and treatment procedures and interventions.

The Ethical Imperative of Social Justice Advocacy Supervision

Supervision is an integral part of counselor education training with most counselors receiving supervision during their academic training from both faculty and field-site supervisors, as required by both the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2009) and the Council on Rehabilitation Counselor Education (2008). According to Falender and Shafranske (2004),

Supervision is a distinct professional activity in which education and training aimed at developing science-informed practice are facilitated through a collaborative interpersonal process. It involves observation, evaluation, feedback, the facilitation of supervisee-self-assessment, and the acquisition of knowledge and skills by instruction, modeling and mutual problem solving. In addition, by building on the recognition of the strengths and talents of the supervisee, supervision encourages self-efficacy. Supervision ensures that clinical consultation is conducted in a competent manner in which ethical standards, legal prescriptions, and professional practices are used to promote and protect the welfare of the client, the profession, and society at large. (p. 30)

Sections of the American Counseling Association's (ACA; 2005) *ACA Code of Ethics* highlight several aspects of Falender and Shafranske's (2004) definition. For example, Section F.2.b. specifies, "supervisors are aware of and address the role of multiculturalism/diversity in the supervisory relationship" (p. 14). Section F.4.c. requires that "[s]upervisors make their supervisees aware of professional and ethical standards and legal responsibilities" (p. 14). Similarly, Section F.5.c. calls on supervisors to "address interpersonal competencies in terms of the impact of these issues on clients, the supervisory relationship, and professional functioning" (p. 14).

In addition to sections specific to supervision in the *ACA Code of Ethics* (ACA, 2005), the need for ethical practitioners to adhere to the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCC; Arredondo et al., 1996) is implied throughout the *Code*. For example, the *Code* stipulates that "[w]hen appropriate, counselors advocate at individual, group, institutional, and societal levels to examine potential barriers and obstacles that inhibit access and/or the growth and development of clients" (ACA, 2005, A.6.a., p. 5). Although the *Code* does not explicitly connect supervision and social justice, attention to cultural competence within the supervisor-supervisee and counselor-client relationships for the purpose of promoting social justice does not seem to be a major conceptual leap. As Arredondo and Perez (2003) described, awareness of issues of power and privilege and of social justice advocacy is a major component of

the MCC (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992), and as Kiselica (2004) noted, social justice is an ethical imperative and requirement for all counselors. This includes counselors who are supervisors.

Current Practices and Challenges to Addressing Social Justice in Supervision

There is a paucity of literature specifically addressing social justice advocacy training within the supervisory process (Durham & Glosoff, 2010). However, in recent years, many researchers have examined the role of various cultural and contextual issues such as gender (e.g., Gatmon et al., 2001; Granello, 2003; Wester & Vogel, 2002); race, ethnicity, and racial identity development (Borders & Brown, 2005; Chang, Hays, & Shoffner, 2003; Hays & Chang, 2003); and sexual orientation (e.g., Gatmon et al., 2001; Pfohl, 2004) in counseling supervision. Being able to attend to cultural issues and issues of power, oppression, and privilege within the supervisory relationship is an important step in helping students to be able to do the same with their clients (Chang et al., 2009). In addition, failure to address such issues can contribute to unproductive and/or harmful counseling interventions (Estrada et al., 2004). Because of this, several authors (e.g., Borders & Brown, 2005; Estrada et al., 2004; Garcia et al., 2007; Garrett et al., 2001) emphasized the responsibility of the supervisor during the early stages of supervision to initiate, in an inviting way, a dialogue pertaining to cultural diversity and then continue such discussions throughout the supervisory relationship. Unfortunately, research findings have indicated that this may not be happening with sufficient frequency (Constantine, 1997; Durham, 2002; Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Gatmon et al., 2001; Rambo, 2008).

Although it is the responsibility of supervisors to raise issues of diversity, power, and privilege with their supervisees (Hays & Chang, 2003; Durham & Glosoff, 2010), some may be reluctant to initiate or engage in such discussions. According to Durham and Glosoff (2010), the following are examples of reasons cited in the literature for such reluctance: (a) depending on when they were trained, some supervisors may believe that their supervisees are better prepared than they are to engage in dialogue related to diversity and advocacy (Durham, 2002; Garcia et al., 2007; Gatmon et al., 2001); (b) some supervisors do not believe or are unaware that such dialogues are relevant and necessary to the supervisory process (Gatmon et al., 2001; Hays & Chang, 2003); (c) some supervisors are concerned that they will be viewed by others as being overly concerned about diversity and advocacy (Gatmon et al., 2001); and (d) some supervisors may lack self-efficacy regarding their abilities to effectively manage such dialogues.

Strategies to Address Advocacy and Social Justice in Counselor Education Supervision

In the following paragraphs, we describe strategies that may be used to assist supervisors in promoting the development of social justice

advocacy in their counseling supervisees. These include the assessment of supervisees' level of cognitive complexity using Bloom's taxonomy and the use of focused discussions. Then, reflective strategies are presented that include specific ideas for reflective questions, cultural genograms, mapping of worldview and social capital, and an analysis of agency assessment and intake practices and records. The designs of the strategies aim to increase supervisees' critical consciousness or enhance their level of cognitive complexity.

Assessment of Supervisee Cognitive Complexity

Cognitive complexity embraces the notion that the formal operations stage, as presented by Piaget (1952), is not the final level of cognitive development. This qualitatively different form of thinking relates to postformal thinking or dialectical thinking and goes beyond the abstract reasoning seen in adolescence or young adulthood. It "involves a higher use of reflection and integration of contextual, relativistic and subjective knowledge" (Labouvie-Vief & Diehl, 2000, p. 490). Several theorists (e.g., Kegan, 1982; Loevinger, 1976) hypothesized that linkages exist between cognitive and social-emotional development. Postformal cognitive development or cognitive complexity is indicative of more mature ego development, self and affect regulation, as well as flexibility in the way one sees the world. Therefore, it is essential that an individual have critical thinking skills, cognitive complexity, and critical consciousness if he or she is to analyze the social conditions and policies that maintain the injustices and inequities in the lives of oppressed people (Vera & Speight, 2003).

Regardless of the theoretical approach used by supervisors, we believe that it is critical for supervisors to assess how effectively supervisees can absorb, integrate, and use abstract information and integrate multiple perspectives. As Ober et al. (2009) stated, "higher levels of cognitive complexity have been linked to many advanced counseling skills, including more flexibility in counseling methods, greater empathy . . . less prejudice . . . and more focus on counseling and counseling effectiveness with less self-focus" (p. 208). Thus, it is imperative that supervisors assist supervisees in moving to higher levels of cognitive complexity to increase their capacity for flexibility of thought and the ability to hold multiple perspectives at one time. Without this ability for critical thought, supervisees will be less able to hold the multiple oppressive realities faced by their clients and less likely to seek ways to empower their clients and alleviate some of the systemically driven inequities in their lives. Ober et al. further recommended the use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Bloom et al., 1956) as a tool to assess and promote the cognitive complexity of supervisees.

Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom et al., 1956) comprises six levels of learning outcomes from least to most complex, with each level building on the previous ones. The outcomes are (a) knowledge, or simply being able to recall or recognize information; (b) comprehension, when students can provide an explanation or describe reasons for the topic or issue in question; (c) application, whereby students demonstrate

that they can apply existing information in a new situation or can use information to solve a problem; (d) analysis, which demonstrates a higher order or more abstract thinking process that allows students to break information down into components and compare and contrast constructs; (e) synthesis, which demonstrates the ability of students to summarize, generalize, and organize component parts to form a new whole; and (f) evaluation, demonstrating that students can judge or evaluate information on the basis of specific criteria and, in terms of their own work, can evaluate their counseling skills and think about ways in which they can improve or become more effective. Supervisors can assess the level of Bloom's taxonomy on which supervisees are operating by looking for evidence of specific skills and by asking questions correlated with each of the levels. For example, supervisees who can discuss what types of culturally appropriate resources are available to clients may be operating at the knowledge level; being able to use this type of knowledge to develop counseling plans for clients would be indicative of a supervisee operating at the application level; and assessing strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of counseling programs in a school would indicate that a supervisee is able to work from the evaluation level (Ober et al., 2009). When a supervisor has identified the supervisee's primary functioning level, he or she can focus discussions and questions with supervisees in ways that help the supervisee to move from less to more cognitively complex levels. Having focused discussions regarding diversity, power, and privilege offers many opportunities for doing this.

Focused Discussions

We agree with the assertion made by Vera and Speight (2003) that the use of focused discussions around issues of culture and power is essential to the development of supervisees' critical consciousness. Borders and Brown (2005) cited the importance of supervisors addressing diversity and, by extension, attending to advocacy competence. Addressing diversity should be an integral component of supervisory competence rather than a segmented aspect of the supervisory process. This requires intentionally carving out time and space within the supervisory process. It is important to begin examinations of culture, diversity, power, and advocacy as early as possible within the supervisory process to let supervisees know that not only are these topics safe to discuss, but that supervisors expect their supervisees to engage in critical examinations about these topics throughout their time together. Unfortunately, it is easy to get caught up in review of cases, logistical matters, discussions of what may be happening at practicum, internship, or work site, and addressing specific questions posed by supervisees. Garcia et al. (2007), however, noted the importance of ensuring time throughout the supervisory process to reflect on issues of oppression and privilege. We agree with their observation that it is helpful to socialize supervisees' critical consciousness at the beginning of the supervisory relationship. Our experience is that supervisors can open the doors to exploration of issues of culture, power, and privilege

by initiating such discussions with a few questions or activities. For example, we routinely acknowledge cultural similarities and differences within the supervisory dyad and ask supervisees how it feels to be supervised by us (from the perspective that we are White women); we then move into other cultural factors such as being supervised by "a woman who grew up in the North." Supervisors can also initiate activities in which supervisees list their membership in groups that afford them privileges and their membership in groups that are oppressed or marginalized (Chang et al., 2009). Having supervisees become accustomed to doing this with supervisors assists them in becoming more aware of these issues and feeling better prepared to address such topics with clients.

As is true in developing most counseling competencies, self-awareness is essential for both the supervisor and the supervisee. Supervisors must consider how their own cultural backgrounds; belief systems; and understanding of power, class, ability, oppression, and advocacy affect their views of effective counseling and the supervision process (Estrada et al., 2004; Garrett et al., 2001). It is necessary, however, for supervisors to go beyond self-awareness regarding belief systems to a certain level of critical consciousness, or to have "the ability to recognize and challenge oppressive and dehumanizing political, economic, and social systems" (Garcia et al., 2007, p. 4) before they are likely to be able to assist supervisees in becoming social justice advocates. To raise critical consciousness, supervisors and supervisees can explore, individually and together, how their own cultural traditions and values reflect or fit into the sociopolitical systems in which they grew up. For example, Garcia et al. (2007, p. 5) stated, "[when] we learn about strong family values in the Latino culture and yet fail to understand their functionality within the U.S. socioeconomic system, we are likely to blame our Latino clients for their problems and, perhaps, expect them to assimilate into the dominant culture." It seems likely that the same would hold true for the importance of understanding how the sociopolitical systems in which both supervisors and supervisees develop their cultural values may influence the supervisory process, and, ultimately, the effectiveness of counseling services.

Building on early discussions in supervision as well as those, it is hoped, that supervisees also had in ethics and other courses, supervisors can focus discussions with supervisees to help them examine how their cultural values, biases, and positionality may affect their interpretation of ethical guidelines and laws. Garcia et al. (2007) provided an excellent example of this when they examined the need for counselors to be aware of how their values influence their mandated reporting to social service systems and, in turn, the welfare of clients being served. It can be useful in supervision to ask supervisees to discuss the impact of their worldview on their definition of abuse, mental illness, and wellness, and their decisions about when clients may need to be protected. This helps counselors-in-training not only to examine their own biases, but also to reflect upon how their values influence their perceptions of when it would be most effective to intervene across the continuum of microlevel to macrolevel advocacy.

Discussions of Power and Privilege

Garcia et al. (2007) reflected on the need for counselors to be aware of power differentials in society and the ways in which these differentials affect both the lives of clients and the therapeutic process. Supervision, by its very nature, involves some level of power differential between supervisors and supervisees. This differential may be more apparent in counselor education programs than in their postacademic supervision. Regardless of setting, however, supervision offers many opportunities for supervisors to help supervisees understand how their own experiences with power, oppression, and privilege influence their work with their clients.

Empowering supervisees to voice their own opinions and understand their own knowledge and expertise and to build on their strengths are critical factors in modeling what we hope they will do with clients. This requires intentionality on the part of supervisors to use time to get to know their supervisees, their learning styles, and the most effective ways to provide critical feedback. Certainly, intentionally acknowledging their own power and helping supervisees see their power for their own learning is an essential step in facilitating a safe climate (Estrada et al., 2004) in which supervisees can explore their issues and grow as counselors. If supervisors are unaware of their own power as well as the power dynamics related to race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and other social and cultural identities, they will likely inhibit the development of critical consciousness of their supervisees (Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Garcia et al., 2007).

Throughout all of the foci of the previous discussions, the appropriate use of self-disclosure on the part of supervisors regarding their own development of critical consciousness can demonstrate to supervisees that it is appropriate for them to explore personal issues and issues of diversity during supervision (Borders & Brown, 2005). The use of self-disclosure may also provide for deepening reflection on the part of both supervisor and supervisees regarding the causes of inequities and injustice. This, in turn, can help supervisees critically examine ways in which they might effect social change (Garcia et al., 2007).

Reflective Interventions

As mentioned previously, we view focused discussions designed to increase critical consciousness as a core strategy for use in the supervisory process to enhance students' development of competence as social justice advocates. In addition to the use of focused discussions, there are other recommendations offered in the literature that can raise critical consciousness or enhance cognitive complexity. Some of the most pertinent to the supervision process include reflective questioning (Garcia et al., 2007), the use of genograms (Estrada et al., 2004; Garcia et al., 2007), therapist mapping of worldview and social capital (Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Garcia et al., 2007), and the examination of intake and treatment procedures and interventions.

Reflective questioning. Reflective questions facilitate the ability of supervisees to recognize power dynamics that may be operating in the lives of their clients (Garcia et al., 2007), as well as in the counseling and supervisory relationships. Borders and Brown (2005) suggested that early on in the supervisory process, supervisors use semistructured questions such as, "What cultural variables construct your cultural identity" (p. 26). Supervisors can use reflective questions at all stages of the supervision process. Following are examples of questions or statements supervisors can pose to increase supervisees' social justice advocacy orientation, along with the corresponding level of Bloom's taxonomy in parentheses. As with all specific tools, counselors and supervisors should use reflective questioning judiciously within a developmental context.

- "Where does your knowledge of dysfunctional families come from?" (comprehension; Garcia et al., 2007, p. 21)
- What cultural and sociopolitical factors (e.g., race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability) may be influencing how the families with which you work interact with systems of public education or community mental health? (knowledge)
- What is your experience with the identified factors? (knowledge and/or comprehension, depending on the complexity or depth of the response)
- "Pretend that I am a community member. Role-play how you would suggest that I participate in school-family-community partnerships." (application; Ober et al., 2009, p. 212)
- How might your personal beliefs influence your proposed treatment plan (or ethical decision) and actions in empowering or advocating for this client? (application)
- What do you believe or how would you analyze the relationship between your client's stage of racial identity development and his or her disinclination to talk with you about the frustration with school's policies? (analysis)
- "Would the outcome be different if you established a partnership that did not include visits to university campuses?" (synthesis; Ober et al., 2009, p. 213)
- "What would you say to a counselor who is thinking of recommending school-family-community partnerships as a resource to schools, families, and members of the community?" (evaluation; Ober et al., 2009, p. 213)
- What is your personal comfort with advocacy on the individual level? (knowledge) Supervisors can follow this at an appropriate time by the question "How might your personal comfort with advocacy influence the actions you are willing to take with or on behalf of client X [specific client] at the systemic or public levels? (application)

Genograms. Supervisors can build on the cultural genograms suggested by Estrada et al. (2004) to examine critically the ways in which

their own beliefs about oppression, power, and privilege shape who they are and how they may practice as counselors. The first author has had supervisees create genograms of their families (however the supervisees define their families). Supervisees begin by examining the cultural traditions they associate with each of their relatives and how these have influenced their identity. From there, the author asks supervisees to shift their focus to explore power dynamics that exist or existed between and among family members. Sometimes, this is as easy as simply asking supervisees to "Tell the story of the relationship between relative X and relative Y." At other times, it is helpful to ask questions. For example, one can have supervisees select a specific generation, dyad, or group within their family and ask, "How were important decisions made in your family" (who was involved, who had the "final say")? The first author has found that asking about educational and career paths for each person in the family history is often an effective way to have supervisees understand how cultural factors and social structures may have provided opportunities for or acted as obstacles to various members of their families. If opportunities existed for certain family members, how did those arise? Were these privileges of one's status (e.g., class, race, sex, sexual orientation, ability/disability)? If a member overcame challenges, did anyone advocate on behalf of that family member (e.g., a clergy member collecting funds to aid in the cost of medical school)? If there were obstacles that someone in their family could not overcome, how do supervisees explain this? Regardless, it is important to explore what messages supervisees learned from their families.

As supervisees share this information, supervisors can use reflective questions similar to those presented in the previous section of this article. This can help supervisees examine how oppressive beliefs and practices, both within their families and within the larger society, may have shaped the lives of their family members as well as their own lives (Garcia et al., 2007). They can move from this self-awareness to include, as part of case conceptualization, an understanding of how oppressive beliefs and environments have influenced the lives of clients and of the therapeutic process. As counselors, then, they will understand the most effective way to intervene from the micro to the macro level, both acting with and, when necessary, on behalf of clients. Readers can refer to the Advocacy Competencies (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003) for additional information.

Mapping worldview and social capital. The use of maps developed by supervisor, supervisee, and client that examine worldview orientation inclusive of such factors as optimism and pessimism is another tool that can advance the advocacy orientation of the supervisee (Falender & Shafranske, 2004). Garcia et al. (2007) suggested that "as supervisors and supervisees become aware of the dynamics of social forces, they can map these forces to track social capital and accentuate areas of constraints and opportunities in gaining connections (social capital) to those with access to resources" (p. 23). They cited Bourdieu's (1986) definition of *social capital* as "the total resources linked to relationships with others, be it institutions or

persons, which provide the backing of belonging to a group that has an accumulation of collectively-owned capital” (Garcia et al., 2007, p. 23). Together, supervisor and supervisee explore the distribution of social capital, examine where the client may be left lacking in position of negotiating relationships, and discuss possible opportunities that may allow clients to gain increased access to social capital resources. We have found that it is instructive to have supervisees do this in relation to their own lives before they do this in conceptualizing their clients’ worlds. The process of mapping social capital begins with the supervisees drawing the systems in which they are involved or have been involved in their youth (e.g., school, work, religious institutions) using circles or symbols for each system. For each system, they then denote the opportunities afforded by and limitations imposed within each. For example, in their depiction of their relationship with their childhood school system, a supervisee may put symbols of both opportunities (e.g., mentorship by teachers who provided access to resources such as financial aid) and limitations or constraints (e.g., systemic discrimination, harassment because of sexual orientation). As part of the case conceptualization of clients’ issues, we have asked supervisees to think about and/or visually present the systems in which their clients engage (e.g., school, work, religious institutions, courts, social services, mental health systems). Supervisees are to discuss what they know about their clients’ relationships within each of the systems as this relates to what clients present as problems in their lives as well as to potential resolution to those problems. This entails having supervisees think about patterns of opportunities afforded to clients and constraints placed on them by societal inequities. In which systems do clients have access to the resources they need to achieve their goals? In doing this, counselors must consider what factors affect clients at the meso and macro levels, not just what is happening from an intrapsychic perspective.

Examination of intake and treatment procedures and interventions. In addition to the tools already discussed, the following are examples of activities or assignments used by the first author with supervisees at various stages of their professional development to expand their concepts of privilege, oppression, and advocacy. These are directly or indirectly related to the counseling process and offer an opportunity for supervisees to examine their own strengths and growing edges as social justice advocates as well as the strengths and limitations imposed on counseling services by the policies and procedures established within the systems wherein counselors provide such services.

- Have supervisees analyze the intake or request for services form used in their field or work site for indications of assumptions of bias (e.g., heterosexism, classism).
- Ask supervisees during case presentations whether they know if their clients have indoor plumbing or how their clients get to their counseling sessions (or school); this often sparks in-depth discussions of the things supervisees may or may not take for granted.

- In case conferences, require supervisees to include not only their diagnostic impressions but also a discussion of the historical, cultural, and sociopolitical factors that may influence their impressions and the experiences of their client and how members of different groups are often assessed, diagnosed, and treated (Hernández, 2008).
- Require supervisees to keep data on the types of issues with which clients present and identify themes that may exist. Have them then examine these in terms of what is most effectively addressed through individual or group counseling, implications for empowerment, strategies to help clients identify personal strengths and resources as well as external barriers to their growth, and ways in which clients may be internalizing oppressions.
- Have supervisees identify client issues that may be most effectively addressed by developing alliances with groups to work for change, identify policies that may be in place that are counterproductive to client welfare/growth, and articulate information that they believe needs to be disseminated to promote awareness of identified issues related to respect of human dignity. Supervisors and supervisees then can work together to help supervisees begin to implement plans that have them begin to work outside their own comfort zone using the security and support of the supervisory relationship to grow as social justice advocates.

Structured Instruments

Garcia et al. (2007) presented several questionnaires that may be effective in facilitating supervisee exploration of social identities and systems of privilege and oppression. They discussed how using instruments such as the Black/White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990), the Cross Racial Identity Scale (Vandiver et al., 2000), the Privilege and Oppressions Inventory (Hays, Chang, & Decker, 2007), and the Social Justice Advocacy Readiness Questionnaire (Chen-Hayes, 2001) can open up discussions about issues that may be very difficult for both supervisees and supervisors to examine. For example, have supervisees complete one or more of the instruments (depending on the assessment of their cognitive complexity and the goals for supervision). After the instruments have been scored, whether in group or individual supervision, focus discussion on supervisees' reactions to the statements in the instruments rather than scores. What were they feeling and thinking as they responded to statements? What is it like to discuss this with their supervisor and/or other supervisees? Do factors such as the supervisors' (or supervisees') race, sex, sexual orientation, age, class, and ability status make a difference in how the supervisees feel about discussing the statements?

Conclusion

As supervisees explore their own beliefs, cultural biases, the socio-political systems in which they live and work, the privileges afforded

to them, and the types of oppression that they and their clients have faced or may be facing, it is common for them to feel angry, overwhelmed, and/or powerless to effect significant social change (Durham & Glosoff, 2010). This may be especially true when supervisors ask supervisees to focus beyond interventions that take place directly with clients during counseling sessions and to consider issues of access to services, equitable distribution of power and resources and to interventions that may involve acting with or on behalf of clients to effect change at a policy level. As was the case when assessing the cognitive complexity of supervisees to assist them in moving to the more complex levels of cognitive development as articulated in Bloom's taxonomy, it is also important to help supervisees understand the full range of advocacy work and develop comfort across this range. As Durham and Glosoff (2010) noted,

Kiselica spoke to this issue in an interview with Ward (2006) by stating: "It is important for counselors to identify a style of social justice work that is right for them. One of the shortcomings of the social justice literature is that it tends to create the erroneous impression that you must be extremely vocal to be an effective advocacy counselor. But some counselors advocate in very quiet yet persistent ways to make a positive difference. We must respect these different approaches to advocacy work." (p. 147)

We challenge supervisors to aid their supervisees in thinking of the continuum of advocacy work based on the ACA Advocacy Competencies (Lewis et al., 2002). Kiselica (2004) emphasized the importance of individual comfort and style and suggested that all counselors have a place on that continuum. At the same time, supervisors are in the position to help supervisees more critically examine how they may quietly go about the business of effecting change in systems. Regardless of where on the social justice advocacy continuum supervisees fall, we encourage supervisors to reinforce the courage that it takes for supervisees to develop critical consciousness and to practice advocacy in whatever form it may take.

References

- American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA Code of Ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Arredondo, P., & Perez, P. (2003). Expanding multicultural competence through social justice leadership. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 282-289. doi:10.1177/0011000003031003003
- Arredondo, P., Toporek, M. S., Brown, S., Jones, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). *Operationalization of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Pearson.
- Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. D., Furst, F. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain*. New York, NY: McKay.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, NJ: Lahaska Press.
- Carney, C. G., & Kahn, K. B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 111-119. doi:10.1177/0011000084121010

- Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., & Milliken, T. (2009). Addressing social justice issues in supervision: A call for client and professional advocacy. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 28, 20–35. doi:10.1080/07325220902855144
- Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., & Shoffner, M. F. (2003). Cross-racial supervision: A developmental approach for White supervisors working with supervisees of color. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 22, 121–138. doi:10.1300/J001v22n02_08
- Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2001). Social justice advocacy readiness questionnaire. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 13, 191–203. doi:10.1300/J041v13n01_13
- Constantine, M. G. (1997). Facilitating multicultural competency in counseling supervision. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision* (pp. 310–324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Constantine, M. G., Warren, A. K., & Miville, M. L., (2005). White racial identity dyadic interactions in supervision: Implications for supervisees' multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 490–496. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.490
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *Accreditation manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Council on Rehabilitation Counselor Education. (2008). *Current accreditation standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.core-rehab.org/Standards.html>
- Durham, J. C. (2002). Inclusion of multicultural and diversity issues by field supervisors. *Kentucky Counseling Association Journal*, 21, 27–34.
- Durham, J. C., & Glosoff, H. L. (2010). From passion to action: Integrating the advocacy competencies and social justice into counselor education and supervision. In M. J. Ratts, J. A. Lewis, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *ACA Advocacy Competencies: A social justice framework for counselors* (pp. 139–150). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Estrada, D., Wiggins Frame, M., & Braun Williams, C. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 32, 307–319.
- Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10806-000
- Garcia, M., Kosutic, I., McDowell, T., & Anderson, S. (2007). *Critical supervision*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Garrett, M. T., Border, L. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural supervision: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 147–158.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkariahn, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., et al. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 102–113.
- Granello, D. (2003). Influence strategies in the supervisory dyad: An investigation into the effects of gender and age. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 42, 189–202.
- Hays, D. G., & Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 134–145.
- Hays, D. G., Chang, C. Y., & Decker, S. L. (2007). Initial development and psychometric data for the Privilege and Oppression Inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 40, 66–79.
- Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White racial identity models. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 66–80). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hernández, P. (2008). The cultural context model in clinical supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2, 10–17.
- Hird, J. S., Cavalieri, C. E., Dulko, A. A., & Ho, T. A. (2001). Visions and realities: Supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 114–130.

- Kegan, J. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kiselica, M. (2004). When duty calls: The implications of social justice work for policy, education, and practice in the mental health professions. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 32, 838-854. doi:10.1177/0011000004269272
- Labouvie-Vief, G., & Diehl, M. (2000). Cognitive complexity and cognitive-affective integration: Related or separate domains of adult development? *Psychology and Aging*, 15, 490-504. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.15.3.490
- Lee, C. C. (2007). *Counseling for social justice* (2nd ed.) Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lewis, J., Arnold, M. S., House, R., & Toporek, R. L. (2002). *ACA Advocacy Competencies*. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/Publications/>
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ober, A. M., Granello, D. H., & Henfield, M. S. (2009). A synergistic model to enhance multicultural competence in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48, 204-221.
- Pfohl, A. H. (2004). The intersection of personal and professional identity: The heterosexual supervisor's role in fostering the development of sexual minority supervisees. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 23, 139-161. doi:10.1300/J001v23n01_09
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Rambo, T. D. (2008). *Supervisory informed consent: Supervisees' priorities and perceptions of current practice*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.
- Steele, J. M. (2008). Preparing counselors to advocate for social justice: A liberation model. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48, 74-85.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992) Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 477-483.
- Vandiver, B. J., Cross, E., Jr., Fhagen-Smith, P. W., Worrell, F. C., Swim, J., & Caldwell, L. (2000). *The Cross Racial Identity Scale*. Unpublished scale.
- Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and counseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31, 253-272. doi:10.1177/0011000003031003001
- Ward, C. C. (2006, February). Catalysts to becoming a "change agent": An interview with Mark Kiselica. *Counseling Today*, 48, 16-17, 23.
- Wester, S. R., & Vogel, D. L. (2002). Working with the masculine mystique: Male gender role conflict, counseling self-efficacy, and the training of male psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 370-376. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.33.4.370

Copyright of Counselor Education & Supervision is the property of American Counseling Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.