

2019

Integrating Intersectionality into Clinical Supervision: A Developmental Model Addressing Broader Definitions of Multicultural Competence

Jennifer H. Greene

Texas State University, jhg45@txstate.edu

Paulina S. Flasch

Texas State University, paulina@txstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Greene, J. H., & Flasch, P. S. (2019). Integrating Intersectionality into Clinical Supervision: A Developmental Model Addressing Broader Definitions of Multicultural Competence. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 12(4). Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps/vol12/iss4/14>

Integrating Intersectionality into Clinical Supervision: A Developmental Model Addressing Broader Definitions of Multicultural Competence

Abstract

Intersectionality addresses multiple areas of diversity while considering areas of power, privilege, marginalization, and oppression. Intersectionality as a theory has gained recognition and utilization in multiple fields, including counseling. Intersectionality can and should be utilized in counseling supervision while maintaining a focus on the development of counselors in training. Intersectional supervision is a part of social justice work, the “fifth force” in counseling. The authors provide context for intersectionality as a theory and apply intersectionality to the multiple roles that supervisors take on in the context of supervision. Potential impact on clients is discussed. Suggestions for specific supervision techniques and even potential questions for supervisees are also included.

Keywords

counseling, clinical supervision, intersectionality, feminism, multicultural

The counseling profession has increasingly moved toward an integrated paradigm, forgoing the view of client problems as exclusively individual and recognizing systemic inequities and social forces that affect clients' lives, particularly marginalized populations. Ratts (2009) described *social justice* as the "fifth force" in counseling (p. 160), wherein counselors act as advocates and acknowledge clients' problems as contextualized in sociopolitical factors. Moreover, accrediting agencies, such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2016) have emphasized this need by requiring training programs to prepare counselors-in-training (CITs) to understand the institutional impact of marginalization and power and work with clients accordingly. The ability to address issues of diversity, intersecting client identities, and relative power and privilege in society is not only vital to counseling (Enns, Sinacore, Ancis, & Phillips, 2004; Grzanka, Santos, & Moradi, 2017), but also to the supervisory relationship and supervision of clinical work (Hernandez & McDowell, 2010; Gutierrez, 2018; Peters 2017).

Counselor educators and supervisors are tasked with facilitating the growth of counselor trainees and supervisees and to help them become ethical and multiculturally competent counselors (CACREP, 2016). In 2015, Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, and McCullough revised Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis' (1992) long-standing multicultural counselor competencies to create the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC), currently adopted by the counseling profession. In addition to Sue and colleagues' (1992) aspects of skills, awareness, knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs, the MSJCC emphasize the importance of addressing the relative power and privilege in clients' lives and in the counseling relationship. The four domains of the MSJCC through which counselors engage in multiculturally competent counseling include: (a) counselor self-awareness; (b) client worldview; (c) counseling relationship; and (d) counseling and

advocacy interventions. However, applying such aspects in working with supervisees may be challenging and abstract. Thus, our framework for integrating intersectionality and counselor development merges theory with practice and provides strategies for engaging in difficult conversations that match supervisees' developmental growth.

Intersectional theory, first introduced by Black feminist legal scholar Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw in 1989 and feminist social theorist Patricia Hill Collins in 1990, was used to explain the intersecting nature of identity and sociopolitical oppression, specifically related to the exclusion of Black women from feminist scholarship and thought (Carastathis, 2014; Maracek, 2016). The term has since become mainstream and is used today to explore how various identities (e.g., race, class, gender, sexual orientation, disability, nationality, and religion) intersect to create social realities. Collins (1998) explained that intersectionality “highlights how social groups are positioned within unjust power relations, but it does so in a way that introduces added complexity to formerly race-, class-, and gender-only approaches to social phenomena” (p. 205). Intersectionality can therefore be understood as systems of social categorization and stratification based on multiple identities and should not be used to simply label or describe individuals who have those identities (Maracek, 2016). Further, Cole (2009) argued that “failure to attend to how social categories depend on one another for meaning renders knowledge of any one category both incomplete and biased” (p. 173).

The counseling profession has made both scholarly and organizational efforts toward addressing intersectionality in counseling and in supervision, noted by the increase in scholarly literature (Grzanka et al., 2017; Haskins, Ziomek-Daigle, Sewell, Crumb, Appling, & Trepal, 2016; Hernandez & McDowell, 2010; McDowell & Hernandez, 2010; Peters, 2017). As the counseling profession heeds calls for client conceptualizations and interventions that better

account for diverse and intersecting identities and respectful ways of working with diverse clients, a continued emphasis on intersectionality is warranted in the clinical supervision of counselors.

Aspects of intersectional supervision, such as feminist supervision (Brown, 2008; Degges-White, Colon, & Boeizumato-Gainey, 2013; Douglas & Rave, 1990) and multicultural supervision (Roper, 2011; Smith, 2016), have been addressed in the literature on supervision, highlighting aspects of gender and ethnicity. Further, researchers (e.g., Arczynski & Morrow, 2017; Crethar, Torres Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Green & Dekkers, 2010; Nelson et al., 2006; Peters, 2017) have made efforts to examine aspects of intersectionality (e.g., power, social justice, feminist multicultural supervision) in clinical supervision. Yet there remains a gap in the counseling literature on how intersectionality can be infused in clinical supervision through a developmental lens with practical applications in the supervisory relationship. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to propose a needed framework for supervisors to infuse intersectionality throughout the professional development of their supervisees. This intersectional framework is necessary due to the impact that socio-political positions related to intersectional identities has not only on individuals but on relationships. Addressing this in supervision is critical in order to address multiple aspects of diversity in supervision (Peters, 2017) and to address the power inherent in the supervisory relationship (Gutierrez, 2018). Further, we address intersectionality through the multiple roles that supervisors embody within the supervisory relationship, particularly the impact that intersectional supervision may have on the supervisory relationship and the development of the supervisee.

Theoretical Background

Although feminist theory was perhaps a first step in exploring power differentials in counseling (Porter, 1994, 2009; Porter & Vasquez, 1997; Sharf, 2008) and supervision

(MacKinnon, Bhatia, Sunderani, Affleck, & Smith, 2011), it was critiqued for failing to include aspects of race and class (Nelson et al., 2006; Nutt Williams & Barber, 2004; Okin, 1998). Recognition of the need for multiculturalism in counseling (Sue et al., 1992) led to an acknowledgment of the need for multicultural competence in supervision (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Ladany, Britton-Powell, & Pannu, 1997), specifically related to factors involved in multicultural supervision dyads (Cook & Helms, 1988; Fukuyama, 1994; Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, & Pope-Davis, 2004) and creating models of multicultural supervision (Ancis & Ladany, 2010; Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Ober, Granello, & Henfield, 2009). Despite the many similarities between feminist and multicultural theories, researchers and scholars have grappled with how to integrate the two (Crethar et al., 2008; Nelson et al., 2006; Nutt Williams & Barber, 2004). Intersectionality provides an avenue for closing that gap and furthering explorations of identity and oppression.

Expanding on aspects of multiculturalism and feminism, intersectionality utilizes a broader definition of multiculturalism to include all aspects of diversity, both visible and hidden. Additionally, intersectionality focuses not only on intersecting identities but, more importantly, on the intersecting systems of power and oppression (Grzanka, Santos, & Moradi, 2017). It also attends to the aspects of feminism and multiculturalism that complement each other (Enns & Fischer, 2012; Green & Dekkers, 2010; Nutt Williams & Barber, 2004), particularly in regard to their overlap with social justice (Crethar et al., 2008). However, traditional examinations through the lens of intersectionality have typically focused on certain elements of power, such as gender, race, and sexual orientation and failed to include others, such as ability or disability status, class, trans identities, and nationality (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017).

Although examinations of more known constructs are valid, limiting the focus to certain aspects of identity may perpetuate the invisibility of other core aspects and fail to take into account the true nature of someone's experience. Further, it may preserve a bias regarding who is included in intersectionality and what identities *count* for examination. Moradi (2016) suggested the use of two questions to analytically investigate a social phenomenon, which can be paraphrased as: (a) Where is intersectionality located (in the identity of the person or within their social context)? and (b) How does the language used to describe intersectionality reflect assumptions about identity (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, among others) versus social systems (e.g., racism, sexism, cisgenderism, heterosexism, and others)? (cited in Moradi & Garza, 2017, p. 503). Such questions may guide supervisors in addressing intersectionality with supervisees and may foster a broader view of identity as it relates to social context and oppression. A supervisor who is able to attend to both issues of power and diversity within supervision, as is emphasized in both feminist and multicultural supervision, helps create a more supportive environment for clinical growth, increased supervisee satisfaction, and improved supervisee learning (Green & Dekkers, 2010). Therefore, intersectionality is an appropriate construct to examine as a merger between the two theories and as an aspect of competent supervision that honors the developmental nature of supervisees.

Developmental Models of Counselor Growth and Supervision

Scholars have supported the use of developmental models in counselor education and supervision (e.g., Aten, Strain, & Gillespie, 2008; Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders & Brown, 2005; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Such models typically emphasize the progression of counselor growth, from novice to expert, through a series of stages or phases (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). These models range from addressing counselor trainee development

(Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998) to counselor development throughout the lifespan (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003). Developmental models stress that supervisors tailor their approach to supervisees' growth, adjusting their skill training, feedback, reflection, scaffolding (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2003), and supervisee-supervisor interaction to fit the needs of the counselor (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Stoltenberg, 2005). It is important to note, however, that developmental models are not necessarily linear, and that counselors may embody characteristics from multiple stages simultaneously. For example, a counselor may be at mid-level in counseling skill development while still experiencing heightened anxiety, a characteristic of lower levels of counselor development.

The Integrative Developmental Model (IDM; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998) is perhaps the most widely recognized and utilized developmental approach. It focuses on examining counselors' cognitive complexity in a developmental sequence (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010), while emphasizing the development of expertise or schemas (Anderson, 1996; Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Furthermore, it outlines counselor trainees' development across time and provides a foundational basis for the supervisory process in counselor training.

Emphasizing counselor development, the IDM is comprised of three levels of counselor development: Levels 1, 2, and 3, which will be described in detail in the following sections. Within the three Levels of the IDM, counselor growth is conceptualized with three main structures for assessing counselor growth: (a) self-other awareness—cognitive and affective, (b) motivation, and (c) autonomy (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). Though supervisors are responsible for facilitating a supportive environment, they are also tasked with facilitating beginner counselors' professional growth and competency (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Borders & Brown, 2005). Thus, the two

aspects need to be deliberately integrated in the supervisory relationship. For the purpose of this paper, the IDM will be used as an example for integrating intersectionality into a developmental model of supervision.

Integrating Intersectionality with the IDM

It is important to understand the foundational elements of intersectional supervision, which addresses the various social locations of identity for supervisors, supervisees, and clients (Peters, 2017). Multicultural supervisors have utilized strategies such as directly addressing diversity of the supervisee, supervisor, and clients, discussing power and privilege, and building multicultural competence (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Ladany et al., 1997). The overlap between feminism and multiculturalism in supervision is evidenced in the focus on power inherent in the hierarchical supervisory relationship. Therefore, integrating intersectionality through each level of the supervisee's development allows for the development of a healthy working alliance, development of counseling skills, application of skills in a multiculturally-sensitive manner, and development of the counselor as a multiculturally-competent, intersectionally-aware professional. Further described are integrated strategies and tenets outlining the roles of supervisors and the experiences of supervisees through the stages of counselor development. Within each of these areas, strategies and interventions are provided from an intersectional lens.

Though we address the three levels chronologically, supervisors may begin their work with supervisees at various stages. Additionally, counselors may vacillate between levels as they learn, practice, and encounter new challenges in specific areas (e.g., a counselor who is generally characterized as Level 2 may encounter a client with an issue they do not have skills and training in, causing them to revert to Level 1 in terms of skills and conceptualization for that situation). It is the intent of the following sections to provide a general framework for utilizing intersectionality

in accordance with counselor development. Supervisors may draw from the different levels of development based on supervisee familiarity with intersectionality, maturity, awareness, and skills.

Level 1

Supervisee characteristics. Level 1 supervisees are at a beginning level of clinical development when working with clients (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). This stage of counselor development is characterized by a state of high anxiety, self-focus, need for structure and feedback, and limited self-other awareness (Stoltenberg, 1981, 2005; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). Furthermore, this developmental stage is characterized by dependence on the supervisor and a focus on skill acquisition (Borders & Brown, 2005). Supervisees in early stages of counselor development are aware of theories and skills but often lack the practical knowledge needed for integration into professional work (Stoltenberg, 1981, 2005), which becomes one of the supervisors' tasks (Borders, 1992; Borders & Brown, 2005).

Role of the supervisor. The Level 1 supervisee benefits from structure and instruction and is less likely to initiate conversations about power (Nelson et al., 2006) and diversity (Ancis & Marshall, 2010), despite valuing them (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Fukuyama, 1994). Thus, it is the supervisor's responsibility to initiate conversations about power and diversity with Level 1 supervisees. Therefore, supervisors must strive for a balance between supervisees' needs for structure and skill-based feedback and the promotion of social and personal examinations. Furthermore, although considerations of power and other-awareness within the supervisory and clinical relationship are appropriate to lay a foundation, a primary focus on greater social examinations, divorced from concrete counseling skills, may hinder supervisee growth. Thus, a supervisor's goal in Level 1 is to introduce and provide a foundational framework of

multiculturalism and intersectionality in a way that matches their developmental needs. Doing so grounds the supervision experience and prepares supervisees for discussions of intersectionality and examinations of power and oppression as they become more skilled in their counseling work. For the Level 1 supervisee, grounding intersectional supervision in clinical skills while infusing intersectionality allows for supervisee growth in a developmentally appropriate way.

Though beginning supervisees are often anxious and self-focused as they develop their counseling skills, there are some steps supervisors can take to introduce supervisees to intersectionality and to ground supervision in egalitarian, reflective, and collaborative processes. Taken from feminist theory, *demystifying the process* refers to the idea of transparency (Degges-White et al., 2013). That is, supervisors model openness and clarity regarding the supervision process, the clinical experience, and the supervisory relationship. Educating supervisees on the supervisory process is an important aspect of intersectional supervision as it serves to lessen hierarchical structures and also models for supervisees how they can do the same with their clients. With early exposure to the process, supervisees are able to understand what is occurring in supervision sessions with their supervisor, are aware of expectations, and become more comfortable with the process (Brown, 2008).

Degges-White and colleagues (2013, p. 94) suggest that one way supervisors may demystify the process is to model a “not knowing” or nonexpert stance with supervisees, with the goal of fostering trust and mutuality in the relationship and encouraging beginner counselors to take more risks in supervision and with their own clients. Another way to utilize demystification is to review the models of counselor development with supervisees. This may help normalize their developmentally appropriate experiences as a Level 1 supervisee, such as feelings of anxiety, self-doubt, and need for structure, which in turn may provide opportunities for candid and open

discussions. Further, in alignment with feminist supervision (Prouty, Thomas, Johnson, & Long, 2001), an intersectional supervisor may create a supervision contract with supervisees, outlining the supervisor's model of supervision (including multiculturalism and intersectionality), supervisee expectations, criteria for evaluation, and supervisee goals. Alignment of goals has been found to increase supervisee satisfaction and contribute to the supervisory working relationship (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Prouty et al., 2001). To minimize hierarchy and power differential and to encourage autonomy and self-efficacy, the supervision contract should be jointly developed with as much input from the supervisee as possible (Arczynski & Morrow, 2017; Green & Dekkers, 2010). The development of the contract may also provide an opportunity to directly acknowledge the power differentials inherent to supervision (i.e., evaluation, gate-keeping) and intersecting sociopolitical and cultural aspects of identity between supervisor and supervisee (i.e., differences in gender, education, class, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, nationality, ability). Conversation starters about intersectionality and power help foster the supervisory relationship as well as model to supervisees the parallel processes likely to be experienced between themselves and their clients. *Demystifying the process* is thus an intervention used to not only show transparency, openness, and to empower supervisees through information, but it consequently helps increase equality in the supervisory relationship (Enns, 2004). Moreover, it serves to begin discussions of intersectionality in the counseling process.

Working with intersectionality. As supervisees begin to engage in clinical work with clients, the supervisor must pay particular attention to the needs of Level 1 supervisees as they infuse intersectionality in the supervisory process, so as not to overwhelm the beginner counselor who may be anxious and skills-focused. Because an important focus for beginner counselors is the

acquisition of counseling and professional skills, failing to account for and address these ignores the reality of beginner counselors (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010).

Furthermore, viewing counseling skills as secondary to analyses of intersectional examinations ironically disempowers supervisees who need tangible skills to increase counselor self-efficacy. Yet not accounting for considerations of power within the supervisory relationship and not addressing the identities that are tied to socio-political realities of power and oppression, also serves to disempower supervisees. Addressing intersectionality at this level of supervisee development requires balance and intentionality. As they work with Level 1 supervisees, supervisors may begin infusing explorations of intersectionality that align with supervisees' Level 1 needs.

One concrete way for supervisors to developmentally introduce intersectionality to supervisees in Level 1 is to ask them to consider their own intersecting identities. Shainna Ali Borenstein created an experiential activity, *Pieces of Me*, where participants work in small groups to examine social stereotypes, biases, power, and views of their own and each other's intersecting identities (Ali & Lee, in press; Young, 2017, p 312). In the activity, supervisees are asked to examine how several of their identities (e.g., race, nationality, employment status, employment title, social class, mental health diagnosis, family composition, hobby, sexual orientation) interact to create assumptions, stereotypes, and positions of power. For example, what assumptions does society have about someone who is a CEO and White? What about someone who is a CEO and Black? What if either of those people were male or female, transgender or cis gender? What if they were also obese? How do various combinations of identities intersect to create biases, assumptions, and stereotypes, and how can we challenge those in ourselves? By engaging supervisees in relatable discussions and explorations, they are left with a tangible concept that can be grasped

and applied to conceptualizations of clients. Creating developmentally appropriate opportunities for analysis helps supervisees gain a more concrete view of intersectionality, its application to counseling and supervision, and allows for supervisee growth as an intersectional counselor.

Another way for supervisees to work with intersectionality is to utilize the concept as it applies to Level 1 counseling skills. Bernard (1994) recognized the need for supervisory emphasis in the areas of conceptualization skills and personalization skills. Conceptualization skills include ways of thinking about clients, understanding their core issues, and planning treatment (Bernard, 1994; Borders & Brown, 2005). Personalization skills refers to how supervisees' own processes, experiences, and feelings impact the counseling relationship, as well as identity formation (Pearson, 2004). Therefore, supervisors may use the areas of *conceptualization* and *personalization* for discussions of intersectionality. For example, using a similar approach to the *Pieces of Me* activity, supervisors may ask supervisees to reflect on multiple aspects of clients' identities to help them conceptualize client realities and help them develop a broader view of context. In terms of *personalization*, supervisors may work with beginner counselors to reflect on how their own identities intersect to create a lens with which they view their clients. Explorations of countertransference, values, and biases are encouraged with Level 1 supervisees in order to facilitate their ability to view their clients as unique beings within a complex social structure (McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016). Utilizing such examinations as they plan treatment helps supervisees minimize generalized treatment approaches which may not fit clients' sociopolitical realities.

Level 2

Supervisee characteristics. A supervisee at Level 2 has gained experience and is becoming a more autonomous practitioner who is less dependent on the supervisor for feedback

and for help with initiating difficult conversations with clients (Stoltenberg & McNeil 2010), including those about identity and intersectionality. At Level 2, supervisees are more technically skilled and more confident in many of their skills. Yet, at this level, due to the realizations of the complexities of counseling and growing awareness of the many ways to apply skills, supervisees can feel less sure of themselves than they felt at the first level of counselor development. Though more skilled in the topics, supervisees at Level 2 may still be reticent to bring up difficult conversations in counseling related to intersectionality, multiculturalism, and aspects of power, oppression, and privilege. Thus, the supervisor must be ready to watch for and encourage those conversations.

As Level 2 supervisees become more competent with counseling skills, they are better able to focus on the cognitions and emotions of the client (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). The shift in awareness from self-focused to client-focused is a characteristic of the move from Level 1 to Level 2 (McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016). Although this shift is developmentally appropriate, the Level 2 supervisee can be at risk of over-identifying with the client, becoming overly emotionally invested, and even becoming enmeshed (McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016). Thus, it can be construed that when counselors and clients match each other in key identities, over-identifying may be more likely to occur; however, when identities are different in key areas, such as race, gender, and religion, Level 2 counselors may become overly emotionally invested, perhaps with a desire to rescue or win the acceptance of the client. Additionally, the increasingly autonomous Level 2 supervisee is more likely to push back against intervention of the supervisor. Conceptualizing the Level 2 supervisee's push against the power and authority of the supervisor through an intersectional lens lends to the awareness that the development of autonomy may look and feel different depending on various intersecting identities of the supervisee and supervisor. The supervisee development of autonomy

should be considered through the differences one sees during adolescence in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures. In individualistic cultures, the adolescent is expected to push back against authority, in this case the supervisor. Expectations for adolescence in collectivistic cultures do not center around the push for autonomy against authority. Thus, the growth of the supervisee through this level may look different depending on the identities of the supervisee.

Role of the supervisor. For a Level 2 supervisee who has already worked with intersectionality within supervision, setting the foundation may be less critical, though there are still developmental needs that should be considered by the supervisor. For a Level 2 supervisee who is new to intersectionality within supervision, it is the supervisor's responsibility to initiate conversations about diverse, intersecting identities as well as the socio-political positioning of those identities (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017; Peters, 2017). With a supervisee at the second level of development, the supervisor should continue to focus on skill development but at a higher level.

The following domains are identified as foundational counselor competency areas and lend themselves to be addressed through an intersectional lens: (a) intervention skills competence, (b) assessment techniques, (c) interpersonal assessment, (d) client conceptualization, (e) individual differences, (f) theoretical orientation, (g) treatment plans and goals, and (h) professional ethics (McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016; Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). Supervisors are thus tasked with considering each domain of counselor competency through the lens of intersectionality; that is, they should not simply examine the role of identities in people's lives but also the impact of socio-political systems that award power and privilege, or, conversely, marginalization and oppression based on those identities. For example, some skills and assessments have been developed by and for particular groups, often White men. Such techniques and assessments should be used with caution for individuals not meeting norm-group demographics; it is the role of supervisors to help

their supervisees understand such limitations. An understanding and acknowledgement of the intersections of multiple identities with their sociopolitical locations is critical for both supervisees and the clients they counsel (Peters, 2017). Since Level 2 counselors are able to think more abstractly about client concerns without the rigid reliance on specific techniques, experienced by Level 1 counselors, counseling techniques themselves can be examined with intersectionality in mind. Supervisee growth at this level takes place not only with skills development but also with their ability to critically reflect on their own training and assumptions.

Working with intersectionality. The Level 2 supervisee is better able to engage in discussions about intersectionality, which encompasses both intersecting identities and social locations, including privilege and oppression. To expand on self- and other-examinations, supervisors may provide an overview of intersectionality and its origins. Further, they may demonstrate how intersectionality can be applied as a lens for counseling by examining case studies from an intersectional lens. Case studies, such as the one provided in Appendix A, should include varied aspects of intersectional identities as well as socio-political realities for supervisees to explore. Supervisors may use Moradi's (2016) questions to guide the discussion of the case example presented: (a) whose experiences are at the center of analysis? (b) how is intersectionality conceptualized and examined? and (c) what are the things considered to be intersecting? Such conversations allow for a collaborative supervision experience that centers around counselor and client realities critical to the counseling process.

Given the more complex thinking of the Level 2 supervisee, in addition to the identification with their clients due to their development of self-other awareness, parallel process between the supervisory relationship and the therapeutic relationship is especially meaningful to explore at this stage (Friedlander, Siegel, & Brenock, 1989; McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016). To illuminate the

parallel process, supervisors should address and discuss the here-and-now processes of the supervisory relationship. For example, a supervisor is urged to process the effect that multiple identities, privilege, and oppression have or may have on the supervisory relationship. Modeling healthy discussions of intersectionality and power in supervision can model those same conversations in a healthy therapeutic relationship.

Connected to the identities of the supervisor and supervisee are systems of sociopolitical power and privilege or, conversely, areas of marginalization (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017; Peters, 2017). The interaction of these systems with the power inherent in the role of the supervisor can either serve to increase or challenge the authority of the supervisor. For example, a White, male, able-bodied, heterosexual supervisor arguably has power and privilege ascribed to each of these identities which is only enhanced by the power inherent in his role of supervisor. The inherent authority of the supervisory role would be viewed differently for a supervisor who is Black, female, transgender, differently-abled, or gay, due to the societal marginalization of those identities. The intersectional supervisor needs to not only be aware of how these areas of power and/or marginalization affect the supervisory relationship and, potentially, the parallel counseling relationship, but he or she needs to be able to address it with supervisees. One way to do this is to use the supervisory relationship as a case study for analysis, situated in the sociopolitical context.

It is well known that discussing differences between therapist and client in terms of race, culture, and ethnicity strengthens the therapeutic relationship (e.g., Day-Vines et al., 2007; Gim, Atkinson, & Kim, 1991). Similarly, broaching such conversations in the supervisory relationship benefits supervisor and supervisee alike and promotes transparency and intersectional examination. Day-Vines et al. (2007) defined *broaching behavior* as a “consistent and ongoing attitude of openness with a genuine commitment by the counselor to continually invite the client

to explore issues of diversity” (p. 402). Further, they suggested counselors use questions such as, “We’re both from different ethnic backgrounds. I’m wondering how you feel about working with a White European American woman on your concerns” with their clients (p. 402). Incorporating Day-Vines’ et al. (2007) suggestions into the supervisory relationship, supervisors might utilize similar lines of questioning with their supervisees, modeling for and processing with their supervisees the process of broaching. Extending broaching, a supervisor working from an intersectional lens might further such discussions by contextualizing supervisory identities in power and privilege as well as exploring overlapping identities. A female Jewish supervisor working with an atheist African-American male supervisee might follow-up a broaching conversation with questions such as:

- How might my identity as a Jewish woman influence the way you view and interact with me as a supervisor?
- How might it influence the way I view and interact with you as a supervisee?
- What obstacles might we need to overcome to engage in meaningful work?
- Is there inherent power in our respective identities and if so, what is it?
- Which parts of our identities carry social power and which carry oppression?
- How does inherent power change by introducing additional intersecting identities?

While broaching conversations may also be part of supervision with Level 1 counselors, such conversations may be explored in more depth with Level 2 counselors who are less self-focused and better able to integrate more abstract and other-focused discussions and interventions. Helping supervisees examine power from this lens may facilitate deeper understanding of intersectionality and power dynamics in supervision as well as promote modeling and comfort for supervisees in bringing such conversations to their counseling relationships.

Level 3

Supervisee characteristics. At the third level, the supervisee is an experienced and autonomous practitioner (McNeil & Stoltenberg, 2016). Supervisees at this level are closer to colleagues than subordinates and have developed their own style that may be different from the styles and theories they learned about in school. A Level 3 supervisee is better able to initiate conversations about intersectionality and to identify and discuss power differentials both within the supervisee relationship and within the counseling relationship. Therefore, the responsibility for initiating conversations about intersectionality and culture, including power, privilege, and oppression is more likely to be the supervisee's, though this responsibility should be shared. At this level, there may be less of a power differential between the supervisor and supervisee in terms of the supervisory relationship, though sociopolitical and cultural power structures and their impact should continue to be explored and examined. In Level 3, there is also less need for hierarchical methods and more use for collaborative methods (Prouty et al., 2001).

Role of the supervisor. At this level, the supervisor is moving into a role with less authority than at previous levels, and one which involves more collaboration (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Supervisors may encourage supervisees to initiate and integrate conversations about intersectionality and power as appropriate for supervisee growth, for example in case conceptualizations and presentations. Supervision at this level may include reminders to keep the focus of intersectionality on social and political realities that involve power and oppression, rather than just intersecting identities of clients and counselors. To supplement broaching conversations in supervision (Day-Vines et al., 2007), supervisors may also process how the power dynamics are different or may have changed as a result of the supervisee becoming more autonomous.

Working with intersectionality. Considering the more advanced skill level of Level 3 supervisees and the development of their own unique style, supervision may provide an opportunity to challenge the assumptions and *ways of knowing* that are inherent in development of a counselor (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). *Ways of knowing* in marginalized groups may be quite different (i.e., more intuitive; Harper, 2000) from the accepted scientific, quantifiable *ways of knowing* related to those in positions of power (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). In conceptualizing skill development in terms of intersectionality, for example, choosing and working from a particular theoretical perspective, it is important to consider which voices have been silenced and which carry more weight (i.e., are recorded and taught). For example, many voices, especially those with intersecting marginalized identities (i.e., black and female), are not taught in typical counseling theories classes (Sommer-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 2015). Thus, supervisees may or may not be aware of the contributions and alternate perspectives of female counselors and counselors of color. Intersectional supervision is an opportunity to explore alternate perspectives in counseling that may have benefit for the supervisee or their clients. Intersectional supervision, as presented in this framework, is appropriate for each developmental level of supervisees and promotes counselor growth.

Discussion

Intersectionality as a focus in supervision not only aligns with *social justice as the fifth force in counseling* (Ratts, 2009), but it can be utilized developmentally through an established model of counselor supervision with supervisees. Supervisors who use an intersectional lens not only allow space for exploration of the multiple identities of supervisees, but they directly address the diversity of identities in both the supervisory and therapeutic relationships. Additionally,

intersectionality is used to understand and address the power and marginalization inherent in sociopolitical locations of those identities (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017; Peters, 2017).

Supervision from an intersectional lens with a developmental focus allows for the development of supervisee skills, both general counseling skills and identity-specific skills. Furthermore, acknowledging power and context within the supervisory relationship provides room for such conversations to be translated to the counseling relationship, promoting multiculturally-competent and aware counselor development. A supervisor operating from an intersectional lens is able to help a supervisee develop competence across multiple intersecting areas. Knowing and acknowledging not only the varied social identities of supervisors, supervisees, and clients, but also the social realities connected to those identities allows for the supervisee to develop as an autonomous practitioner who is able to address the varied social realities of their diverse clients.

Implications for Counselor Education, Supervision, and Research

Counselor educators and supervisors are in a unique position to help supervisees better understand the complex realities of clients and to facilitate understanding and competence that goes beyond a simplistic view of multicultural competency (e.g., knowledge and skills). Required by both CACREP (2016) and current ethical standards, counselor educators and supervisors are responsible for incorporating holistic examinations of diversity, both in therapeutic relationships with clients and in the supervisory ones. In line with the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2015), supervisors are urged to explore relative power and privilege with their supervisees, and how it pertains to clients' lives and therapeutic relationship. This article provides a blueprint for such examinations from a developmentally appropriate standpoint. That is, the intersectional framework provides needed context to supervision regarding diversity within identities and within the sociopolitical positioning of those

identities (Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). This exploration aligns with multicultural competencies and provides an opportunity for supervisors to address the power inherent in the supervisory relationship and the clinical one (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Fukuyama, 1994; Nelson et al., 2006). Further, it allows for the recognition and discussion of power, privilege, and oppression associated with the intersecting identities of both the supervisor and supervisee. Applying intersectionality in this way may also reduce the impact of the inherent power differential within the counseling relationship. Furthermore, intersectionality provides a framework for the supervisee to learn critical skills related to multicultural counseling competence without compartmentalizing areas of diversity or the areas of power and oppression associated with that diversity.

Future research may focus on evaluating the effectiveness of intersectional supervision on supervisees' learning and competency. For example, self-report measures of multicultural competency (e.g., D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 2002; Sadowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) can be used by to track supervisee growth in this area. Such examinations can also explore how a developmental intersectional framework of supervision affects the supervisory and therapeutic clinical relationships. In sum, applying an intersectional lens in supervision, with attention to developmental aspects of supervisees, helps supervisors integrate multiculturally competent conceptualizations and interventions that promote an encompassing view of clients and relationships that facilitate supervisee growth.

References

- Ali, S., & Lee, C. C. (in press). Using creativity to explore intersectionality in counseling. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*.
- Ancis, J. R., & Ladany, N. (2010). A multicultural framework for counseling supervision. In N. Ladany & L. J. Bradley (Eds.), *Counselor supervision* (4th ed., pp. 53-94). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ancis, J. R., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88(3), 277-284.
- Anderson, J. R. (1996). ACT: A simple theory of complex cognition. *American Psychologist*, 51, 355-365.
- Arczynski, A. V., & Morrow, S. L. (2017). The complexities of power in feminist multicultural psychotherapy supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64(2), 192-205.
- Aten, J. D., Strain, J. D., & Gillespie, R. E. (2008). A transtheoretical model of clinical supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Bernard, J. M. (1994). Receiving and using supervision. In H. Hackney & S. Cormier (Eds.), *Counseling strategies and interventions* (pp. 169-189). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bhat, C. S., & Davis, T. E. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 35(2), 80.
- Borders, L. D. (1992). Learning to think like a supervisor. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 10(2), 135-148.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L.L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Brown, L. (2008). Feminist therapy. In Lebow, J. (Eds.), *Twenty-first century psychotherapies* (pp. 277-306). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Carastathis, A. (2014). The concept of intersectionality in feminist theory. *Philosophy Compass*, 9, 304-314. doi:10.1111/phc3.12129
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 64, 170-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014564>
- Collins, P. H. (1998). It's all in the family: Intersections of gender, race, and nation. *Hypatia*, 13, 62-82. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.1998.tb01370.x
- Cook, D. A., & Helms, J. E. (1988). Visible racial/ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35(3), 268-274.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Crethar, H. C., Torres Rivera, E., & Nash, S. (2008). In search of common threads: Linking multicultural, feminist, and social justice counseling paradigms. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86, 269-278. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00509.x
- D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 143-150.

- Day-Vines, N. L., Wood, S. M., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Holman, A., Dotson-Blake, K., & Douglas, M. J. (2007). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture during the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 85*, 401-409.
- Degges-White, S. E., Colon, B. R., & Boeizumato-Gainey, C. (2013). Counseling supervision feminist framework: Guidelines for intervention. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 52*, 92-105.
- Douglas, M. A. D., & Rave, E. J. (1990). Ethics of feminist supervision of psychotherapy. In H. Lerman & N. Porter (Eds.), *Feminist ethics in psychotherapy* (pp. 137-146). New York, NY: Springer.
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive “snapshot” of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*(2), 131-46.
- Enns, C. Z. (2004). *Feminist theories and feminist psychotherapies: Origins, themes, and variations* (2nd ed.) New York: Haworth.
- Enns, C. Z., & Fischer, A. R. (2012). On the complexity of multiple feminist identities. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*(8), 1149-1163.
- Enns, C. Z., Sinacore, A. L., Ancis, J. R., & Phillips, J. (2004). Toward integrating feminist and multicultural pedagogies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 414-427.
- Fukuyama, M. A. (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to supervision research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*(2), 142-51.
- Friedlander, M. L., Siegel, S. M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel processes in counseling and supervision: A case study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 149-157.
- Gim, R., Atkinson, D., & Kim, S. (1991). Asian-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity and cultural sensitivity, and ratings of counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 57-62.
- Green, M. S., & Dekkers, T. D. (2010). Attending to power and diversity in supervision: An exploration of supervisee learning outcomes and satisfaction with supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 22*, 293-312.
- Grzanka, P. R., Santos, C. E., & Moradi, B. (2017). Intersectionality research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64*(5), 453-457.
- Gutierrez, D. (2018). The role of intersectionality in marriage and family therapy multicultural supervision. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 46*(1), 14-26. DOI: 10.1080/01926187.2018.1437573
- Harper, P. B. (2000). The evidence of felt intuition: Minority experience, everyday life, and critical speculative knowledge. *The GLQ Archive, 6*(4), 641-657.
- Haskins, N. H., Ziomek-Daigle, J., Sewell, C., Crumb, L., Appling, B., & Trepal, H., (2016). The intersectionality of African American mothers in counselor education: A phenomenological examination. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 55*, 60-75.
- Hernandez, P., & McDowell, T. (2010). Intersectionality, power, and relational safety in context: Key concepts in clinical supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4*(1), 29-35. DOI: 10.1037/a0017064.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C. C. & Meyers, J. E. (1999). Multicultural competence and counselor training: A national survey. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 294-302. DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02452.x

- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*(4), 284-304.
- MacKinnon, C. J., Bhatia, M., Sunderani, S., Affleck, W., & Smith, N. G. (2011). Opening the dialogue: Implications of feminist supervision theory with male supervisees. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 42*(2), 130-136.
- Maracek, J. (2016). Invited reflection: Intersectionality theory and feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*(2), 177-181.
- McDowell, T., & Hernandez, P. (2010). Decolonizing academia: Intersectionality, participation, and accountability in family therapy and counseling. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 22*, 93-111. DOI: 10.1080/08952831003787834.
- McNeill, B. W., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (2016). *Supervision essentials for the integrative developmental model*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Moradi, B. (2016). (Re)focusing intersectionality: From social identities back to systems of oppression and privilege. In K. A. DeBoard, A. R. Fischer, K. J. Bieschke, & R. M. Perez (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual orientation and gender diversity in counseling and psychotherapy* (3rd ed., pp. 105-127). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Moradi, B., & Grzanka, P. R. (2017). Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64*(5), 500-513.
- Nelson, M. L., Gizara, S., Hope, A. C., Phelps, R., Steward, R., & Weitzman, L. (2006). A feminist multicultural perspective on supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*(2), 105-115.
- Nutt Williams, E. & Barber, J. S. (2004). Power and responsibility in therapy: Integrating feminism and multiculturalism. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 390-401.
- Ober, A. M., Granello, D. H., & Henfield, M. S. (2009). A synergistic model to enhance multicultural competence in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*(3), 204-221.
- Okin, S. M. (1998). Feminism and multiculturalism: Some tensions. *Ethics, 108*, 661-684.
- Pearson, Q. M. (2004). Getting the most out of clinical supervision: Strategies for mental health. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 26*(4), 361-373.
- Peters, H. C. (2017). Multicultural complexity: An intersectional lens for clinical supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 39*, 176-187.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., et al. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*(6), 1016-103.
- Porter, N. (1994). Empowering supervisees to empower others: A culturally responsive supervision model. *Journal of Hispanic Behavioral Sciences, 16*, 43-56.
- Porter, N. (2009). Feminist and multicultural underpinnings to supervision: An overview. *Women & Therapy, 33*, 1-6.
- Porter, N., & Vasquez, M. (1997). Co-vision: Feminist supervision, process, and collaboration. In J. Worell, & N. G. Johnson (Eds.), *Shaping the future of feminist psychology*:

- Education, research, and practice* (pp. 155–171). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.
- Prouty, A. M., Thomas, V., Johnson, S., & Long, J. K. (2001). Methods of feminist family therapy supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 1*, 85-97.
- Ratts, M. J. (2009). Social justice counseling: Toward the development of a fifth force among counseling paradigms. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 48*, 160–172. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2009.tb00076.x
- Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2015). Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies. Retrieved from <http://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/competencies/multicultural-and-socialjusticecounseling-competencies.pdf?sfvrsn=20>
- Ronnestad, M. H. & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 5-44.
- Roper, L. D. (2011). Supervising across cultures: Navigating diversity and multiculturalism. *New Directions for Student Services, 2011*(136), 69–80. doi:10.1002/ss.415
- Sharf, R. S. (2008). Feminist therapy: A multicultural approach. In Sharf, R.S. (Eds.), *Theories of psychotherapy and counseling: Concepts and cases* (435-477). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Smith, A. (2016). Effective multicultural supervision for a culturally diverse country. *Georgia School Counselors Association Journal, 23*, 38-46.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the multicultural counseling inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*(2), 137-148.
- Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2012). *Counseling and psychotherapy theories in context and practice: Skills, strategies, and techniques* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor-complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychologists, 28*, 59-65.
- Stoltenberg, C. (2005). Enhancing professional competence through developmental approaches to supervision. *American Psychologist, 60*(8), 857-864.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeil, B. W. (2010). *IDM supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors & therapists* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 477-486.
- Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*(2), 66.
- Young, M. E. (2017). *Learning the art of helping: Building blocks and techniques* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. S. (2003). *Educational psychology: A century of contributions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix

Supervisors may use Miradi's (2016) questions for discussion in analyzing the following case study example with supervisees. Whose experiences are at the center of analysis? How is intersectionality conceptualized and examined? and What are the things considered to be intersecting?

You are a White, male, Christian counselor named Robert. Pritima enters your office seeking counseling for depression. She presents as an able-bodied, Hindu, female, undergraduate international student from India. In her intake form, prior to knowing which counselor she would be assigned to, she revealed she was struggling with her upcoming arranged marriage, but when you ask her about it, she quickly changes the subject and states she would rather focus on school-related stressors.

In this case, supervisors want to help supervisees examine the multiple identities of Pritima and Robert, how they intersect, how they influence each person's realities, and how they may influence the counseling relationship and client outcome.

1. How do Pritima's identities intersect in terms of power and oppression and how do these identities affect her experiences, both in society and personally? That is, what does it mean to be a Hindu woman of Indian descent living and studying in the United States? Would this experience be different if Pritima was male rather than female? How does gender as its own identity affect the other aspects? What potential marginalization is she facing in her native culture as well as in the United States? What cultural expectations exist as a result of the overlapping identities?
2. How do Pritima's and Robert's identities intersect in the counseling room? That is, what is Pritima's experience as a client in counseling with Robert? What cultural values and power

differentials may affect how she interacts with and what she opens up about with Robert? What internalized beliefs might she have about Robert as a White American Christian male, and how might it affect her counseling experience? Would this be different if Robert was of Indian descent? Would it be different if he was female? How do each of Robert and Pritima's identities create a reality? What identities could be added or subtracted to create a different reality? What societal power is given based on the each of their identities?

3. Given the intersecting identities and power associated with them, what counseling skills would be most useful in this session? What are the implications of Robert respecting Pritima's request to focus on school-related stressors? What does that communicate about a White male, respecting her wishes regarding the topic of focus? When and how might it be helpful to bring up the differences in their identities and how that impacts the counseling relationship?