Practice Innovations

ISSN: 2377-8903

2022, Vol. 7, No. 3, 255–267
https://doi.org/10.1037/pri0000185

Extending Multicultural Orientation to the Group Supervision of Psychotherapy: Practical Applications

C. Edward Watkins Jr.[1], Joshua N. Hook[1], Cirleen DeBlaere[2], Don E. Davis[2], Melanie M. Wilcox[3], and Jesse Owen[4]

[1] Department of Psychology, University of North Texas
[2] Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, Georgia State University
[3] Department of Counseling Psychology, Augusta University
[4] Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Denver

The multicultural orientation (MCO) framework, which has shown empirical promise as a pragmatic way to enhance cultural understandings in psychotherapy, appears equally important for psychotherapy supervision: Emerging conceptual/practical work and a bourgeoning base of empirical studies support MCO's contribution to supervision processes and outcomes. However, virtually all such MCO supervision focus has been on individual supervision. We maintain that MCO, an additive perspective to the attitudes/beliefs domain of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies framework, is just as pertinent for the group supervision of psychotherapy. Because (a) most supervisees receive group supervision at some point; (b) group supervision can be an economical way to address multicultural and social justice issues; and (c) MCO appears to be a fruitful perspective for enhancing cultural understandings, the integration of MCO into group supervision of psychotherapy is a logical next step in advancing multicultural supervision practice.

Clinical Impact Statement
Multicultural orientation (MCO), consisting of cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities, can be fruitfully applied to the group supervision of psychotherapy. Illustrating that application, three group supervision vignettes are presented, and accompanying commentary is provided.

Keywords: group supervision, multicultural orientation, cultural humility, cultural comfort, cultural opportunities

> The [group] supervision encounter is really an encounter between . . . *cultural maps* . . . (Falicov, 2014, p. 54, italics in original)

For our purposes, "multicultural" is defined as an overarching term, referring to multiple cultures and identities, inclusive of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, ability, age, socioeconomic status and social class, religion/spirituality, and nationality. This overarching definition is embraced in the multicultural orientation (MCO) framework. MCO, a term first introduced by Owen and colleagues over a decade ago (Owen, 2013; Owen et al., 2011), refers to the interpersonal intersection of three crucial cultural factors: cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities. MCO accentuates the inexorable impact of cultural attitudes and values on personal interactions, has been increasingly recognized as important for the psychotherapy

C. Edward Watkins Jr. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9137-5526

The authors report no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to C. Edward Watkins Jr., Department of Psychology, University of North Texas, 1155 Union Circle #311280, Denton, TX 76203, United States. Email: watkinsc@unt.edu

relationship (Hook et al., 2017; Tao et al., 2015) and empirically affirmed through over 20 studies (Davis et al., 2018).

MCO also appears to matter for psychotherapy supervision (e.g., sensitizing supervisees to the salience of culture in their therapy relationships; Watkins et al., 2019), and a small but burgeoning base of conceptual/practical and empirical work supports that assertion (e.g., Wilcox et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Zhao & Stone-Sabali, 2021). However, all such work—a product of the last 3 years alone—has focused primarily on individual supervision. We contend that MCO is just as important for the group supervision of psychotherapy and subsequently explore that integration. Specific focus is given to (a) defining and adapting MCO concepts for the group supervision context, (b) showing how group supervisors can incorporate MCO concepts into group supervision via three case examples, and (c) discussing the implications of that MCO/group interface for supervisory practice. Our primary hope is that this paper demonstrates the promise of MCO as a versatilely viable framework for advancing group supervision practice.

Group Supervision of Psychotherapy: The What and the Why

Reasoning by Analogy

What follows might best be considered reasoning by analogy to group supervision. *Reasoning by analogy* refers to critically reflecting upon what is known in one area (such as therapy) to inform or extend thinking in another area (such as supervision; Milne, 2006). Thus, we draw upon attention given to MCO in psychotherapy supervision (e.g., Watkins, Hook, Owen, DeBlaere, Davis, & Callahan, 2019; Watkins, Hook, Owen, DeBlaere, Davis, & Van Tongeren, 2019) and MCO in group therapy (e.g., Kivlighan & Chapman, 2018; Kivlighan et al., 2019), use those sources as a fulcrum for informing our group supervision elaborations, and analogize accordingly.

Definition and Importance

Group supervision can be defined as follows: "... the regular meeting of a group of supervisees (a) with a designated supervisor or supervisors; (b) to monitor the quality of their work; and (c) to further their understanding of themselves as clinicians, of the clients with whom they work, and of service delivery in general" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019, p. 190). Group supervision can contribute to a host of valuable learning objectives, including developing and enhancing conceptual/treatment skills; developing and crystallizing a psychotherapist identity; developing conviction about the meaningfulness of psychotherapy itself; and monitoring treatment efforts and safeguarding client care (Gamliel et al., 2020; Mastoras & Andrews, 2011; Ogren et al., 2014; Proctor, 2008). Although the group ideally becomes a functional entity, with all members meaningfully involved, our main focus here is on the supervisor's contribution. Group supervisors are routinely in a position of power and hold an evaluative role vis-à-vis their supervisees; they also set the stage and tone for the group's relationship, process, and outcome (e.g., being a model of constructive interaction and fostering constructive interactions among supervisees; Ogren et al., 2014; Rowell, 2010). If a safe, constructive, and productive group supervision space is to be created, then the group supervisor plays a pivotal role in rendering those desiderata reality.

Group supervision is significant to consider because (a) most supervisees experience group supervision at some point during their training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019) and (b) it is an inherently multicultural gathering, where the group members—supervisor(s), supervisees, and supervisees' clients—have their own host of intersecting identities (e.g., ethnicity, gender, religion, and sexual orientation) that, in turn, intersect with the identities of others throughout the group process (Chin et al., 2014). If all supervision is indeed a multicultural experience (Chopra, 2013), nowhere is that seemingly more the case than in group supervision. However, the reality remains that the literature on multicultural competence in group supervision is quite limited. Continuing to build on and expand that limited literature is sorely needed. Introducing the MCO for use in group supervision, we contend, is one fruitful step in addressing that need.

Applying Multicultural Orientation in Group Supervision

Multicultural Orientation as an Attitudes-Accentuating Perspective

The multicultural counseling competencies (MCC) framework, first proposed over 40 years

ago by Sue et al. (1982, 1992) and since updated (e.g., Ratts et al., 2016), holds a preeminent place in multicultural training across psychology programs (Chu et al., 2016). Conversely, the MCO framework is a product of this past decade alone (Owen, 2013; Owen et al., 2011), although the concept of cultural humility has been around for a generation now (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998). The MCC focuses on the variables of cultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes (or K-S-A), the MCO on the variables of cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities (Owen, 2013). Both frameworks share three critical commonalities: the need to understand/address cultural and social realities of diverse individuals and groups; the need for self-reflection about one's own biases, understanding of diverse identities, and the inequitable impact of power, privilege, and injustice; and the need to challenge systems and institutions that enable that injustice to continue (Greene-Moton & Minkler, 2020).

Although MCO and MCC have often been considered separately in the literature, we take the position that MCO is an additive perspective to the MCC attitudes/beliefs domain (Danso, 2018; Watkins et al., 2019), ideally serving as an attitudes/beliefs accentuator. By means of such accentuation, MCO potentially provides a way of deepening perspective through its focus on relational process and way of being; such a deepening of perspective is needed in our view (Watkins et al., 2019). That the K-S-A attitudes/beliefs domain has lagged behind the other framework domains, received inadequate attention comparatively, and yet is deemed central to multicultural competence success has been well recognized (Falender & Shafranske, 2021; Gonsalvez & Crowe, 2014; Ratts et al., 2016): "It is fascinating that the 'big' competencies with deep impact are attitude-value attributes, not knowledge competencies" (Gonsalvez & Crowe, 2014, p. 182). Perhaps what is needed now more than ever is an emphasis on an A(ttitudes)-K(knowledge)-S(kills) perspective (cf. Ratts et al., 2016), where attitude competencies (e.g., supervisor cultural self-awareness, cultural respect for others, humility, and commitment to lifelong cultural learning; Fickling et al., 2019) are privileged and prerequisite. We believe that more such "attitude" could benefit the group supervision of psychotherapy, that MCO is one avenue by which to render that benefit reality.

Components of Multicultural Orientation in Group Supervision

Paraphrasing Owen et al. (2011), MCO can be considered a "way of being" with supervisees. MCO can at least be seen as calling attention to cultural attitudes and values (already part of the MCC framework) in supervision in a way not done before (Watkins et al., 2019); that would potentially be so for the group supervision situation as well.

Culture is inescapably present in each group supervision session (Chin et al., 2014). MCO extended to group supervision of psychotherapy, what we will label MCO-GS, emphasizes that reality so as to benefit the group's members: It ideally provides a *consistent cultural lens* through which group work is interpreted and enacted, the hope being that—by integrating and making explicit naturally occurring cultural dynamics in the group supervision process—supervisee *and* client outcomes can be enhanced. Four analogized assumptions (cf. Hook et al., 2017; Watkins et al., 2019) provide the MCO-GS foundation: (a) group supervisor(s) and supervisees are joined together in a facilitative relationship that involves their cocreation of cultural expressions (i.e., the degree to which culture is rendered integral to group supervision); (b) MCO-GS, while readily acknowledging the importance of supervisory behaviors and actions, emphasizes group supervisors' way of being (i.e., the attitudes and values that undergird supervisory behaviors and actions); (c) cultural processes (e.g., cultural humility) are sine qua non for connecting with the group constituents'—supervisor(s), supervisees *and* clients—most salient cultural identities in group supervision; and (d) a high degree of group-MCO can motivate supervisor(s) and supervisees to learn more about their own cultural perspectives and worldviews as well as those of the clients being served.

Akin to MCO in group psychotherapy (Kivlighan & Chapman, 2018; Kivlighan et al., 2019), cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities are proposed here as being equally applicable to the group supervision of psychotherapy. Cultural humility, a knowing through "not knowing" (Watson et al., 2017), involves group supervisors' (a) openness and willingness to reflect on themselves as embedded cultural beings and (b) openness to hearing about and striving to understand the cultural backgrounds and identities of their group supervisees and their supervisees' clients; group supervisors ideally serve as models of

cultural humility, displaying curiosity about and respect for others' cultural selves (cf. Hook et al., 2016; Watkins & Hook, 2016; Watkins et al., 2019). In doing so, enacting cultural humility could increase group cohesion and provide a strong foundation for navigating through group conflicts when they occur (e.g., dealing with cultural ruptures).

Cultural comfort refers to the group supervisor's own internal experience or feelings that arise before, during, or after cultural conversations in group supervision sessions. Hallmarks of group supervisor cultural comfort include being sufficiently calm, at ease, and open and nondefensive while cultural conversations are in process (cf. Hook et al., 2017; Watkins et al., 2019; Zhao & Stone-Sabali, 2021). Given that cultural conversations can indeed create discomfort and unease, the group supervisor ideally is able to tolerate and manage such occurrences with a sense of "comfortable discomfort," facilitating and "staying with" difficult group discussions. The group supervisor's comfort or discomfort may also be reflective of supervisees' own sense of cultural comfort/discomfort, which can provide a useful point of parallel to process during group.

Cultural opportunities involve those times in group when "culture emerges" for consideration (e.g., due to the supervisor's own in-process group interventions or the ever-present cultural dynamics that transpire in the group). Group supervisors may take advantage of or, unfortunately, miss chances for, cultural discussion with their group supervisees; however, missed opportunities ideally then become opportunities for redress (i.e., returning to the missed issue for discussion). Cultural opportunities may involve not only the recognition of such markers, but also the appropriate *creation* of opportunities for the emergence of cultural discussions (cf. Hook et al., 2017; Watkins et al., 2019). These discussions are best conducted with intentionality to promote group cohesion, deepen client conceptualization, and enhance supervisee self-awareness.

We contend that cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities, interdependent, synergistic, and potentiating in group supervision (cf. Davis et al., 2020; Hook et al., 2017; Watkins et al., 2019), provide another lens that usefully adds to, ideally accentuates, the attitudes/beliefs domain of MCC. Cultural humility, considered the central organizing construct of MCO, may well be the anchor and ground for any and all MCO group supervision applications: ". . . cultural humility . . . is key to competent multicultural supervision" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019, p. 138). However, cultural comfort and cultural opportunities are also requisite if meaningful within-group cultural exchanges and transactions are to transpire and have impact (cf. Watkins, Hook, Owen, DeBlaere, Davis, & Callahan, 2019; Watkins et al., 2019).

Infusing MCO Into the Group Supervision of Psychotherapy

To paraphrase and extend the Kivlighan and Chapman (2018) original MCO/group therapy reasoning to group supervision, group supervisors—through attending to cultural processes in the here-and-now of the supervision group—have the potential to stimulate supervisees' awareness and understanding of systems of privilege and oppression. Group supervisors are encouraged to (a) recognize and understand that culture is an ever-important aspect of group supervision, (b) take the initiative to bring up aspects of culture for discussion in supervision, and (c) model how to identify, discuss, and "stay with" cultural topic opportunities (e.g., Kaduvettoor et al., 2009). The MCO framework can be most meaningfully used to engage and deepen cultural processes across the life span of supervision groups (cf. Kivlighan & Chapman, 2018).

In what follows, we illustrate these processes using three clinical vignettes in which MCO is infused into group supervision. Each example, although inspired by training/supervision events, discussions, or reflections occurring at one university training site, is a clinical supervision case construction. Although the first two examples primarily emphasize cultural humility, all three MCO (attitudes/beliefs affecting) components—cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities—are reflected in each example. The first example is most reflective of the Forming Stage of group work, the second example of the Norming Stage, and the third example of the Performing Stage (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019).

The context for each example is as follows: A doctoral program in which the faculty had previously made a decision that multicultural and social justice matters would be integrated pervasively into all courses, with that decision being reflected on the program's website, in the program manual, and in student admissions materials. Students were all well aware of the weight placed upon multicultural/social justice matters, were expecting them to be a

focus of their group practicum experience, and the influence of that weight and expectation is reflected in each example.

Three Examples of MCO in Group Supervision

Example 1: Orienting and Preparing the Group Through MCO Psychoeducation

Developing group supervisees' positive perspectives about MCO-GS is perhaps best executed at the group's outset through preparation and education (cf. Kivlighan & Chapman, 2018): "... pregroup planning can make a major difference" (Rowell, 2010, p. 206). We as group supervisors wish to orient and prepare our supervisees (a supervisor competency) for the group supervision process (e.g., Smith et al., 2014). Fruitful ways to productively begin group supervision include opening the space for cultural discussion, facilitating that discussion, and educating supervisees about the importance of cultural frameworks for enhancing treatment/supervision understanding (e.g., MCO or Hays' ADDRESSING [Hays, 2016]). We wish for a flexible yet planful beginning, because "it is very difficult later in a [group] supervisory relationship to recover from a disorganized beginning" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019, p. 155; Carter et al., 2009; Enyedy et al., 2003).

In this example, the supervisor and eight group members—a year-long practicum team serving clients in the Psychology Clinic—are meeting for the first time. The team is comprised of first-, second-, and third-year doctoral students; the second- and third-year students provide all therapeutic services, with the first years primarily in a listen-observe-learn role. Before the initial meeting, all group members have been provided with the course syllabus and supervision agreement for reading and review (both documents available from the senior author upon request); they have been asked to come to group supervision prepared to discuss those documents and raise any questions or concerns that they might have. This first practical example captures an initial effort to engage supervisees in discussion about multiculturalism, multicultural competence, and social justice and to introduce the concepts of cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities. Selected explanatory comments about the interactions are offered in brackets. Names are fictionalized.

Supervisor (SVOR: John Smith): Now that we have talked about our syllabus and supervision agreement, let us focus on one very important component of those documents: The emphasis on multiculturalism, multicultural competence, and social justice. I want to pull out one sentence from the agreement and ask for your reactions. That sentence is this: "The supervision you receive, individual and group, will include discussions about cultural context (your own, the supervisor's, and the client's) and how these affect the treatment relationships of which you are a part" (adapted from Ellis, 2017). As a program, we have committed to diversity, inclusion, and advocacy (DIA), striving to build multicultural competence; as you think about that commitment and this quoted sentence, what thoughts or feelings do you have about such cultural discussions being a part of what we do here? Feel free to bring your own sense of culture and the cultural identities that are important to you into our discussion. [supervisor acknowledging faculty/student commitment to DIA/multicultural competence and opening up the group space for beginning cultural discussion].

Asa (3rd year student): As a Black woman, I see those discussions as a natural part of our relationships, therapeutic, supervision, and otherwise—a vital part of our learning how to best help our clients.

Jeremiah (2nd year student): I see it that way, but I admit it's a little scary for me. As a White man, I do not feel I have the cultural perspective or experience that some of you bring with you to the group. I feel behind in that respect, that perhaps I'm going to say or do something wrong.

Natalie (3rd year student): I remember feeling the exact same way, scared, when I began my second year. But I think the nice thing about team is that we can talk all of that out here, help ease that feeling of scared-ness, and help us feel more prepared.

Jeff (1st year student): Being a White man, like Jeremiah, I also do not feel like I have the cultural perspective or experience that some others do. I also admit—if I'm being completely honest—that culture is not something that I have thought much about before getting here.

John (SVOR): Maybe we can all grant each other some grace. We have all had different cultural experiences, reflect that difference and diversity, and see both privileged and less privileged identities reflected here. Perhaps we can be informed by those differences as we learn and grow together. Just as becoming a therapist is a developmental

process, your multicultural growth is a developmental process, too.

Talking about culture may not be perfect and easy, may not always be comfortable. However, if we understand that we are trying to become more multiculturally informed and work toward developing multicultural competence, that we are committed cultural learners who are willing to toil and struggle together in a constructive, nonshaming way, then I think that we as a group will prevail. Perhaps we can think of our aim as being the adoption of an attitude of cultural humility—a way of being toward each other and toward each other's clients—where we listen with respect, curiosity, openness, and a deep desire to understand the other's perspective. [supervisor acknowledging reality of/expressing respect for cultural/identity differences, that talking culture—while sometimes being uncomfortable—is well worth the committed effort, and introducing the concept of cultural humility].

Poornima (3rd year student): Like Asa, I want these cultural conversations to happen, believe they must happen. As an Indian American woman, now in my third program year, I see and feel culture everywhere. Like you said Dr. Smith, listening with respect, curiosity, and openness has become so very important to me.

John (SVOR): Yes, it is like culture is boundless, and cultural opportunities readily present themselves to us in treatment—and in supervision, too. [supervisor reinforces idea of cultural opportunities].

Bashir (2nd year student): I identify as a Muslim American man. Sometimes I have felt uneasy being in [state masked], even being here in this program, that my religion is not respected, that people may view me with suspicion for whatever reasons. As I begin to see clients, I wonder about that, too, and am worried.

John (SVOR): Bashir, I hear you and appreciate your sharing. I want this to be a place where you feel free to share your cultural concerns about treatment and how you are perceived. And I hope that we can make this a safe space for all of you here to risk the discomfort of such sharing. I guess what we ultimately strive for is developing a sense of cultural comfort in carrying out such conversations, being able to hold the discomfort of and stay with those conversations.

As a White man in my mid-60s, I reflect a host of privileged identities, I am aware of some cultural blind spots that result for me because of that and continually work at becoming more multiculturally minded and multiculturally competent. I think that is why our group process is so very important, that we recognize our cultural variations in experience, share our cultural perspectives with each other, and ideally grow ourselves and our clients in the process. How does that sound to everyone? [supervisor introduces concept of cultural comfort, striving to render it integral to the group's process of multicultural competency development, and shares his own identities as supervision affecting].

Example 1: Case Commentary

The group supervisor works to orient and prepare (Forming Stage) supervisees for group discussions about culture (Chin et al., 2014), introducing them to the foundational pillar of the MCO framework, cultural humility, acknowledging the discomfort and difficulty that can come with cultural conversations (cultural comfort), and creating a cultural opportunity for group discussion to occur. This example would be but a preview of continued interactions to come, where ideally supervisees become increasingly free to share and discuss all matters culture during group supervision. It remains the group supervisor's responsibility, however, to initially set the multicultural stage (Winkel, 2019), and the supervisor in this example—via pregroup planning and education (Enyedy et al., 2003; Rowell, 2010)—has attempted to do that: striving to prepare a place where constructive and productive cultural conversations can be had, providing a framework to anchor those conversations (e.g., introducing cultural humility as a guiding practice), and modeling the core features of the MCO framework in the process. As Chin et al. (2014) have made clear, these content areas are all critical in the facilitation of multicultural competence development.

Example 2: Putting Group Supervision Cultural Norms in Place

Role induction and session structuring are two important group supervision competencies (Roth & Pilling, 2008). Part of the supervisor's effective role induction and session structuring includes helping the group to develop norms for proper group functioning; those norms contribute to the likelihood of a more successful group process and outcome (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Proctor, 2008). As Mastoras and Andrews (2011) have asserted, "... supervisors must take an active role in establishing and maintaining a positive, safe, and respectful environment in order for the group supervision

experience to be a positive one" (p. 109). In this second example, the supervisor and same group members—while continuing their discussion about multicultural and social justice matters in a later supervision session—turn their attention to the importance of incorporating facilitative, culturally informed norms into the group's work so as to better enhance group supervision process/outcome and foster multicultural competency development. The supervisor uses the three MCO components—cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities—as a way to frame and facilitate that discussion.

John (SVOR): We have talked about creating a welcoming space for cultural conversations. Let us build on those earlier discussions, our mention of cultural humility and cultural comfort, and consider something that might help our group's working process: group norms. Supervision groups typically find it helpful to have such norms, perhaps what we might think of as ground rules or guidelines for putting cultural humility into practice—about how members will interact, relate to each other, and go about incorporating cultural discussions into their time together. The purpose of such norms would be to bring a sense of concreteness to our group process, help you feel more comfortable when having cultural conversations, help us put in place the very features of cultural humility that we have talked about as being so important here and, ideally, facilitate your multicultural competency development in the process. What do you think? [supervisor creates cultural opportunity, introducing the idea of discussing and developing norms anchored in cultural humility, then linking those norms to cultural comfort, group-facilitative features valued by members, and multicultural competency development].

Jeremiah: I think that would be helpful, a good reference point for us when thinking about how we want to treat each other in group.

Natalie: I'm with Jeremiah, having some norms would help me feel safer in group when discussing cultural matters.

John (SVOR): And I have found that to be the same for me as well—that having some structure helps me to feel safe. Other views, thoughts? [supervisor self discloses, reinforcing group members' opinions about norms].

Asa: I like the idea that you mentioned, Jeremiah. Group norms could be a reference point for us. [others nod in agreement and express assent].

John (SVOR): OK, great. It sounds like we agree that having some norms would be helpful. What are some of your ideas for norms that we could implement in our group?

Jeff: We have talked about the importance of openness when it comes to cultural matters. What about a commitment to come with an open mind and a willingness to explore cultural topics?

John (SVOR): I like that idea, Jeff. Openness and willingness to explore are two key aspects of cultural humility and having a commitment to do that will be important for us. Other thoughts?

Poornima: One of the key features of cultural humility seems to be a willingness to continue to learn about culture and diversity. What about a commitment to engage in self-reflection as a lifelong learner? And being willing to critique ourselves and our perspectives?

John (SVOR): I think that's great, Poornima. Whether student or faculty, we are all still learning and growing. A commitment to self-reflection and self-critique is key. What else?

Bashir: I'm aware that, because we have different levels of experience and expertise, there are power differentials that are present in the room. What about a commitment to recognize and try to minimize power differentials? That might be helpful so we can hear from everyone.

John (SVOR): I like that idea, too, Bashir. We probably cannot completely erase power differentials in the room. For example, I am in an evaluative position over you all as students, and we cannot completely remove that. You are at different years in the program, and with that can come a sort of power differential among you as well. We cannot completely remove that either. However, as much as is possible, it would be great if we could level the playing field, because we all have things to learn from each other. [the conversation continues as the students and supervisor collaboratively come up with ideas for culturally informed norms; what a set of group-created cultural humility ground rules could look like is provided in Table 1].

Example 2: Case Commentary

Therapy groups need norms; so too do supervision groups (Ogren et al., 2014). Such supervision norms (Norming Stage) contribute to the development of group safety and cohesion (Fleming et al., 2010). Group supervision provides the perfect space to have a discussion about, and put in place, norms that are culturally

Table 1
Group Supervision-Adapted Ground Rules Based on Cultural Humility

No.	Rules
1	I will enter each group supervision experience with an open mind and possess an attitude willing to explore new concepts.
2	I will be aware of my own personal values, beliefs, and behaviors and respect that other supervision team members may not abide by the same values and belief system.
3	I will focus on the feelings and experiences of other supervision team members as well as my own.
4	I will enter each group supervision meeting with a flexible and humble attitude and not allow my ego to impede the learning experience.
5	I will engage in healthy, supportive interactions with my supervisor and group supervision peers to help foster an engaging learning environment.
6	I will engage in self-reflection as a lifelong psychotherapy learner and strive to critique my own thoughts, actions, and behaviors as I interact with my supervisor and supervision team members who have both similar and opposing views as myself.
7	I will attempt to embrace conflicting viewpoints that are expressed in group supervision by giving those viewpoints my full consideration.
8	I will support my supervision team members as we engage in discussions and learning.
9	I will try to recognize supervision team power differences and minimize them.
10	I will strive to demonstrate respect for my supervisor and my supervision team members.

Note. The material in Table 1 is from "Multicultural Streaming in Group Psychotherapy Supervision: Orientation to and Preparation for Culturally Humble Practice", by C. E. Watkins, Jr., S. Toyama, M. Briones, G. Gaskin-Cole, S. Zuniga, J. Yoon, H. Hwang, F. Hasan, D. Doty, J. R. Harker, J. N. Hook, C. D. C. Wang, & M. M. Wilcox, 2021, *American Journal of Psychotherapy*. Advance online publication. Copyright 2021 by American Psychiatric Association. Reprinted with permission.

respectful and informed and that will accordingly guide the group's ongoing process, and foster multicultural competency development (Riva & Erikson Cornish, 2008). Increased buy-in, and a softening or decentering of the power differentials present (Kleist, 2021), can also occur if supervisor and supervisees work collaboratively (a cultural opportunity) to develop norms on which the group can agree, as was the case in this example highlighting cultural humility (cf. Watkins et al., 2021). The group's developed norms, which capture the group members' core cultural-relational ideals, ideally present the concept of cultural humility in a much more concrete, tangible way, show its practical applicability, and serve as a ready reference point for group supervision guidance; the norms reflected in this example were also easily linked to another MCO component, cultural comfort. Norms work best when they are fully embraced by the group (Proctor, 2008). Supervisor effort was made here to facilitate that exploration and embrace and, thereby, promote culturally humble practice within the group, the attitudinal competency domain again being targeted.

Example 3: Dealing With a Rupturing Microaggression in Group Supervision

Microaggressions refer to "verbal and nonverbal interpersonal exchanges in which a perpetrator causes harm to a target, whether intended or unintended" (Sue & Spanierman, 2020, p. 8); they can be thought of as brief, commonplace indignities or slights, negative, hostile, or derogatory in nature, which are directed toward a member or members of an oppressed group (Sue & Spanierman, 2020; Torino et al., 2018). Microaggressions occur in group psychotherapy (Lefforge et al., 2020; Miles et al., 2021) and can also occur in group supervision. Yet, microaggressions in group supervision and their group supervision impact have received minimal attention in the published professional literature (e.g., based on current Google Scholar and PsycINFO database searches); such attention is sorely needed. In this third example, the supervisor and same group members deal with a microaggression, occurring during a case presentation, that has rupturing effect.

John (SVOR): Let us go over our new cases. If you could, briefly tell us about your new client or

clients. Why do not we begin with you, Poornima. I know you saw your new client yesterday.

Poornima: Yes, her name is Jhumpa. She wanted to discuss family conflict, particularly with her brother who recently came out to the family as gay. Jhumpa kept referring to him as a [slur often used to refer to a gay man], and it made me feel uncomfortable. I didn't really know what to do.

John (SVOR): You were caught off guard by her comment, particularly her use of language?

Poornima: Right, it seemed so odd to have her refer to her brother as a [slur often used to refer to a gay man]. I was not sure if I should confront it.

John (SVOR): [notices Jeff having visible reaction, pursing his lips at Poornima's sharing] Jeff, you seemed to have a reaction to what Poornima said. Would you be willing to say more?

Jeff: Sorry, I didn't mean to have a reaction. I was just surprised, that's all.

John (SVOR): Having a reaction is part of being human. Could you say what was surprising?

Jeff: I was shocked that the client would use that word to describe her brother. If I'm honest, I was surprised that that word, slur, would be repeated here in group supervision. My little brother is gay, has had to deal with so much shit over the years, with people calling him names like that. He got depressed, even had to go to counseling at one point. I cannot stand words like that. It's not okay to say the n-word, and it's not okay to say slurs toward gay people either.

Poornima: Oh, my goodness, Jeff, I . . . I'm sorry, I didn't mean to . . . (stops in midsentence).

John (SVOR): Jeff, you feel angry in response to Poornima's comment. Poornima, I hear hesitation in your response, like you are not sure what to say? Is that accurate? [supervisor begins by acknowledging the perceived feelings of both parties and asks for clarification].

Jeff: Yeah, I do feel angry and upset. We have gone through so much with my brother, as he tried to gain acceptance. When my brother was growing up, it was not okay at all to be gay. He had to go through a lot, and I felt so protective of him. I still do.

John (SVOR): You are connecting with what was said and bringing your own experience to the table. Your brother had to go through so much difficulty growing up. I can see why you'd be upset, like you have been culturally insulted? [supervisor validates Jeff's response to microaggression].

Jeff: Not so much me personally, but I'm thinking about my brother, the client's brother, and the LGBTQ+ community.

John (SVOR): Poornima, I heard your hesitation, maybe even a sense of real uneasiness. But would you please share with us any thoughts that you might have about what Jeff has said? [supervisor again acknowledges Poornima's feelings and encourages her to dialogue].

Poornima: I feel terrible that I used an insensitive word to describe a gay person here. I was wanting to repeat what the client had said to be clear, but I see now how that was insensitive, especially to people who are in the LGBTQ+ community, and I wish I hadn't done that.

John (SVOR): Your goal was to be clear but saying the slur here in group had unintended consequences. You regret your mistake.

Poornima: Yes, I do. I want to . . . [supervisee stops, seems stuck, perhaps scared].

John (SVOR): Please, take a breath, Poornima. I want us to continue our conversation but let us all take a mental step back, giving ourselves some breathing room. These can be difficult, culturally uncomfortable conversations; sometimes we need that breather and space to help us better manage that difficulty and discomfort. I especially want to give you that space now, Poornima, and you, too, Jeff. I will check back with you both in a moment. Might others have any thoughts or reactions you wish to share? [supervisor seeks to provide a breathing space for both parties to increase likelihood of their event processing/reflection and continued dialogue].

Jeremiah: I feel for you both. As a straight man, not too familiar with the LGBTQ+ community, I could have made the same misstep. But I can also see why Jeff would be really upset.

Adaline: As a first year, I feel out of my depth here. I didn't give the word, slur, a second thought. I am glad I was not the one saying it, but I feel worried I might also mess up one day.

John (SVOR): I hear you resonating with Jeff, understanding how he'd feel upset. Talking culture can be uncomfortable, perhaps we are feeling that discomfort right now? [supervisor acknowledges members' validation of Jeff's anger, acknowledges reality of cultural discomfort].

Jasmine (2nd year student): For sure!

Bashir: I feel the tenseness of it all.

Sam (1st year student): Me, too.

John (SVOR): I think when cultural missteps happen, as was the case here, it makes talking culture all the more difficult. Poornima, after taking a breather, I want to come back to you for response.

[supervisor comes back to Poornima so that she can address the microaggression].

Poornima: I understand now that it was wrong to repeat the slur here in group. I didn't realize how repeating that word was disrespectful. I see why you were upset, Jeff, and I am so sorry for what I said. I can see how much love and care you have for your brother, and I'm deeply sorry for saying something that disrespected him.

Jeff: Thank you, Poornima. I hear that you did not do this with malice or ill-intent. We are all learning, but sometimes that can be hard. This was upsetting, caught me off guard that it happened here, a place I consider to be safe, and that will probably sit with me for a while. I do appreciate that what happened was acknowledged. I appreciate your apology, Poornima.

Poornima: This is important learning for me. I will continue to think about this today and ways that I might act differently in the future. Thank you for hearing my apology, Jeff.

John (SVOR): We are working through a difficult moment, I appreciate everyone's input, and I especially thank Poornima and Jeff for their honesty and willingness to risk in this conversation. [supervisor expresses appreciation to Poornima and Jeff, and the team members as well, for their willingness to dialogue and work through the issue of concern].

Example 3: Case Commentary

"Dealing with cultural differences in supervision can be awkward and difficult . . . and can lead to misunderstandings and hurt feelings" (Christiansen et al., 2011, p. 109). This case example (Performing Stage) readily reflects that reality: Jeff was understandably angry and hurt by the microaggression. Although the supervisor's action was anchored in cultural humility, we clearly see cultural comfort and cultural opportunity on full display here as well. Poornima's use of the slur in group thrust a cultural opportunity to the forefront, and the supervisor moved to address this microaggression in group with cultural comfort. The microaggression could be considered a cultural rupture in the group supervision process; dealing with such ruptures is a critical multicultural supervision competency (Casmar, 2019). Intentional repair is crucial to preserving and strengthening the group supervisory alliance, and doing so requires directly and openly addressing the rupture (Hedegaard, 2020; Watkins, 2021; Watkins et al., 2016). We see that intentional approach applied to the group supervision process in this example: Building on a foundation of cultural humility and cultural comfort, appropriate use of the cultural opportunity allowed for the possibility of repair. Supervisor multicultural orientation was used so as to: (a) facilitate group discussion about the cultural conflict (Fleming et al., 2010), (b) sit with and work through the cultural discomfort of doing so (Christiansen et al., 2011), (c) encourage breathing space to discourage emotional escalation (Hardy, 2016), and (d) facilitate movement toward successfully processing the cultural conflict (Bobes, 2016).

Pulling It All Together: MCO-GS

The MCO framework—cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities—has, we contend, a valued place in the group supervision endeavor: It collectively positions the supervisor to lead from a multiculturally informed, evidence-based foundation (Davis et al., 2018) and can be useful in stimulating cultural dialogue, expanding cultural perspectives, and navigating through cultural conflicts. We have attempted to show how that is practically so by means of three case examples.

To paraphrase Manathung's (2011, p. 368) apt quote:

> We do not leave our identities as raced, classed and gendered bodies outside the door when we engage in [group] supervision: instead our personal histories, experiences, cultural and class backgrounds and social, cultural and national locations remain present (some might say omnipresent). Culture, politics and history matter in [group] supervision.

MCO-GS, an additive to the MCC attitudes/beliefs domain, gives voice to those identities, histories, experiences, backgrounds, and locations. It is our contention that MCO, already fruitfully extended to group psychotherapy (Kivlighan & Chapman, 2018), can be fruitfully extended to the group supervision of psychotherapy and that supervisees' cultural learnings and multicultural competency development can be much enhanced in the process.

References

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Bobes, T. (2016). Dialogues about power, privilege, and difference. In K. V. Hardy & T. Bobes (Eds.), *Culturally sensitive supervision and training:*

Diverse perspectives and practical applications (pp. 127–135). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648064-17

Carter, J. W., Enyedy, K. C., Goodyear, R. K., Arcinue, F., & Puri, N. N. (2009). Concept mapping of the events supervisees find helpful in group supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *3*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013656

Casmar, P. V. (2019). Ruptures in the supervision relationship due to cultural issues. In T. R. Burnes & J. E. Manese (Eds.), *Cases in multicultural clinical supervision: Models, lenses, and applications* (pp. 191–209). Cognella.

Chin, J. L., Petersen, K., Nan, H. M., & Nicholls, L. (2014). Group supervision as a multicultural experience: The intersection of race, gender, and ethnicity. In C. A. Falender, E. P. Shafranske, & C. J. Falicov (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and diversity in clinical supervision: A competency-based approach* (pp. 255–272). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14370-011

Chopra, T. (2013). All supervision is multicultural: A review of literature on the need for multicultural supervision in counseling. *Psychological Studies*, *58*(3), 335–338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-013-0206-x

Christiansen, A. T., Thomas, V., Kafescioglu, N., Karakurt, G., Lowe, W., Smith, W., & Wittenborn, A. (2011). Multicultural supervision: Lessons learned about an ongoing struggle. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *37*(1), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2009.00138.x

Chu, J., Leino, A., Pflum, S., & Sue, S. (2016). A model for the theoretical basis of cultural competency to guide psychotherapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *47*(1), 18–29. https://doi.org/10.1037/pro0000055

Danso, R. (2018). Cultural competence and cultural humility: A critical reflection on key cultural diversity concepts. *Journal of Social Work*, *18*(4), 410–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017316654341

Davis, D., DeBlaere, C., Hook, J. N., & Owen, J. (2020). *Mindfulness-based practices in therapy: A cultural humility approach*. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000156-000

Davis, D. E., DeBlaere, C., Owen, J., Hook, J. N., Rivera, D. P., Choe, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Placeres, V. (2018). The multicultural orientation framework: A narrative review. *Psychotherapy*, *55*(1), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000160

Ellis, M. V. (2017). Clinical supervision contract & consent statement and supervisee rights and responsibilities. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *36*(1), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2017.1321885

Enyedy, K. C., Arcinue, F., Puri, N. N., Carter, J. W., Goodyear, R. K., & Getzelman, M. A. (2003). Hindering phenomena in group supervision: Implications for practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *34*(3), 312–317. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.34.3.312

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2021). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000243-000

Falicov, C. J. (2014). Psychotherapy and supervision as cultural encounters: The multidimensional ecological comparative approach framework. In C. A. Falender, E. P. Shafranske, & C. J. Falicov (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and diversity in clinical supervision: A competency-based approach* (pp. 29–58). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14370-002

Fickling, M. J., Tangen, J. L., Graden, M. W., & Grays, D. (2019). Multicultural and social justice competence in clinical supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *58*(4), 309–316. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12159

Fleming, L. M., Glass, J. A., Fujisaki, S., & Toner, S. L. (2010). Group process and learning: A grounded theory model of group supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *4*(3), 194–203. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018970

Gamliel, K. H., Geller, S., Illuz, B., & Levy, S. (2020). The contribution of group supervision processes to the formation of professional identity among novice psychotherapists. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, *70*(3), 375–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207284.2020.1727747

Gonsalvez, C. J., & Crowe, T. P. (2014). Evaluation of psychology practitioner competence in clinical supervision. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *68*(2), 177–193. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2014.68.2.177

Greene-Moton, E., & Minkler, M. (2020). Cultural competence or cultural humility? Moving beyond the debate. *Health Promotion Practice*, *21*(1), 142–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839919884912

Hardy, K. (2016). Mastering context talk: Practical skills for effective engagement. In K. V. Hardy & T. Bobes (Eds.), *Culturally sensitive supervision and training: Diverse perspectives and practical applications* (pp. 136–145). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648064-18

Hays, P. A. (2016). *Addressing cultural complexities in practice: Assessment, diagnosis, and therapy* (3rd ed.). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14801-000

Hedegaard, A. E. (2020). The supervisory alliance in group supervision. *British Journal of Psychotherapy*, *36*(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjp.12495

Hook, J. N., Davis, D., Owen, J., & DeBlaere, C. (2017). *Cultural humility: Engaging diverse*

identities in therapy. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000037-000

Hook, J. N., Watkins, C. E., Jr., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Ramos, M. J. (2016). Cultural humility in psychotherapy supervision. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *70*(2), 149–166. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2016.70.2.149

Kaduvettoor, A., O'Shaughnessy, T., Mori, Y., Beverly, C., Weatherford, R. D., & Ladany, N. (2009). Helpful and hindering multicultural events in group supervision: Climate and multicultural competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *37*(6), 786–820. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009333984

Kivlighan, D. M., III, Adams, M. C., Drinane, J. M., Tao, K. W., & Owen, J. (2019). Construction and validation of the Multicultural Orientation Inventory-Group Version. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *66*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000294

Kivlighan, D. M., III, & Chapman, N. A. (2018). Extending the multicultural orientation (MCO) framework to group psychotherapy: A clinical illustration. *Psychotherapy*, *55*(1), 39–44. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000142

Kleist, D. M. (2021). The Reflective Model of Triadic Supervision as a means of fostering cultural humility. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, *51*(3), 219–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-021-09496-6

Lefforge, N. L., Mclaughlin, S., Goates-Jones, M., & Mejia, C. (2020). A training model for addressing microaggressions in group psychotherapy. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, *70*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207284.2019.1680989

Manathung, C. (2011). Moments of transculturation and assimilation: Post-colonial explorations of supervision and culture. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *48*(4), 367–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2011.617089

Mastoras, S. M., & Andrews, J. J. (2011). The supervisee experience of group supervision: Implications for research and practice. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *5*(2), 102–111. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023567

Miles, J. R., Anders, C., Kivlighan, D. M., III, & Belcher Platt, A. A. (2021). Cultural ruptures: Addressing microaggressions in group therapy. *Group Dynamics*, *25*(1), 74–88. https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000149

Milne, D. L. (2006). Developing clinical supervision through reasoned analogies with therapy. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *13*(3), 215–222. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.489

Ogren, M., Boalt Boëthius, S., & Sundin, E. (2014). Challenges and possibilities in clinical supervision. In C. E. Watkins, Jr., & D. Milne (Eds.), *Wiley international handbook of clinical supervision* (pp. 342–363). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118846360.ch31

Owen, J. (2013). Early career perspectives on psychotherapy research and practice: Psychotherapist effects, multicultural orientation, and couple interventions. *Psychotherapy*, *50*(4), 496–502. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034617

Owen, J. J., Tao, K., Leach, M. M., & Rodolfa, E. (2011). Clients' perceptions of their psychotherapists' multicultural orientation. *Psychotherapy*, *48*(3), 274–282. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022065

Proctor, B. (2008). *Group supervision: A guide to creative practice*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446221259

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2016). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: Guidelines for the counseling profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *44*(1), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035

Riva, M. T., & Erickson Cornish, J. A. (2008). Group supervision practices at psychology predoctoral internship programs: 15 years later. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *2*(1), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/1931-3918.2.1.18

Roth, A., & Pilling, S. (2008). *The competencies framework for supervision*. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/pals/sites/pals/files/specific_supervision_competences.pdf see also https://www.ucl.ac.uk/pals/research/clinical-educational-and-health-psychology/research-groups/core/competence-frameworks-8

Rowell, P. C. (2010). Group supervision of individual counseling. In N. Ladany & L. J. Bradley (Eds.), *Counselor supervision* (4th ed., pp. 197–231). Routledge.

Smith, A., & Foronda, C. (2021). Promoting cultural humility in nursing education through the use of ground rules. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, *42*(2), 117–119. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NEP.0000000000000594

Smith, R. D., Erickson Cornish, J. A., & Riva, M. T. (2014). Contracting for group supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *8*(4), 236–240. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000075

Sue, D. W., & Spanierman, L. B. (2020). *Microaggressions in everyday life* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *70*(4), 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1992.tb01642.x

Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. E., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E. J., & Vasquez-Nuttall, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *10*(2), 45–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000082102008

Tao, K. W., Owen, J., Pace, B. T., & Imel, Z. E. (2015). A meta-analysis of multicultural competencies and psychotherapy process and outcome. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *62*(3), 337–350. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000086

Tervalon, M., & Murray-García, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, *9*(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2010.0233

Torino, G. C., Rivera, D. P., Capodilupo, C. M., & Nadal, K. L., & Sue, D. W. (Eds.). (2018). *Microaggression theory: Influence and implications*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119466642

Watkins, C. E., Jr. (2021). Rupture and rupture repair in clinical supervision: Some thoughts and steps along the way. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *40*(2), 321–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2021.1890657

Watkins, C. E., Jr., & Hook, J. N. (2016). On a culturally humble psychoanalytic supervision perspective: Creating the cultural third. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *33*(3), 487–517. https://doi.org/10.1037/pap0000044

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Mosher, D. K., & Callahan, J. L. (2019). Humility in clinical supervision: Fundamental, foundational, and transformational. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *38*(1), 58–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2018.1487355

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Ramaeker, J., & Ramos, M. J. (2016). Repairing the ruptured supervisory alliance: Humility as a foundational virtue in clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *35*(1), 22–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2015.1127190

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Owen, J., DeBlaere, C., Davis, D. E., & Callahan, J. L. (2019). Creating and elaborating the cultural third: A doers-doing with perspective on psychoanalytic supervision. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *79*(3), 352–374. https://doi.org/10.1057/s11231-019-09203-4

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Owen, J., DeBlaere, C., Davis, D. E., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2019). Multicultural orientation in psychotherapy supervision: Cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunities. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *72*(2), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20180040

Watkins, C. E., Jr., Toyama, S., Briones, M., Gaskin-Cole, G., Zuniga, S., Yoon, J., Hwang, H., Hasan, F., Doty, D., Harker, J. R., Hook, J. N., Wang, C. D. C., & Wilcox, M. M. (2021). Multicultural streaming in group psychotherapy supervision: Orientation to and preparation for culturally humble practice. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, Appipsychotherapy*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.20210021

Watson, P., Raju, P., & Soklaridis, S. (2017). Teaching not-knowing: Strategies for cultural competence in psychotherapy supervision. *Academic Psychiatry*, *41*(1), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-016-0552-9

Wilcox, M. M., Drinane, J. M., Black, S. W., Cabrera, L., DeBlaere, C., Tao, K. W., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Watkins, C. E., & Owen, J. (2022). Layered cultural processes: The relationship between multicultural orientation and satisfaction with supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *16*(3), 235–243. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000366

Winkel, J. (2019). Fostering multicultural competence using group supervision: Addressing different cultural competencies in a group setting. In T. R. Burnes & J. Manese (Eds.), *Cases in multicultural clinical supervision: Models, lenses, and applications* (pp. 339–353). Cognella.

Zhang, H., Watkins, C. E., Jr., Hook, J. N., Hodge, A. S., Davis, C. W., Norton, J., Wilcox, M. M., Davis, D. E., DeBlaere, C., & Owen, J. (2022). Cultural humility in psychotherapy and clinical supervision: A research review. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research*, *22*(3), 548–557. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12481

Zhao, C. J., & Stone-Sabali, S. (2021). Cultural discussions, supervisor self-disclosure, and multicultural orientation: Implications for supervising international trainees. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *15*(4), 315–322. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000309

Received November 1, 2021
Revision received July 5, 2022
Accepted July 7, 2022 ■