Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Broaching as a strategy for intercultural understanding in clinical supervision

Connie T. Jones[a], Laura E. Welfare[b], Shekila Melchior[c], and Rebecca M. Cash[a]

[a]Department of Counseling and Educational Development, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina, United States, Blacksburg, VA, United States; [b]Counselor Education Program, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, United States; [c]Counselor Education Program, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee, United States

ABSTRACT

Broaching cultural similarities and differences with genuine, respectful inquisitiveness is an important supervisory intervention. Broaching allows supervisors to acknowledge the relevance of cultural identities and invite supervisee dialogue. Through dialogue, supervisors are tasked with openly receiving what is said by supervisees and working through ideas to maximize the effectiveness of supervision. In this practical article, broaching as an intervention in supervision is described. The importance of clinical supervision, the intercultural nature of supervision, sample broaching prompts, and recommendations for supervisors are also included.

As the field of counseling grows more diverse, the clinical supervisory relationship is becoming more intercultural in nature. Clinical supervision is vital to ensuring client welfare and fostering supervisee professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014); therefore, effective intercultural supervision is crucial. Broaching cultural identities is an intervention long recommended for use in the counseling relationship (Day-Vines et al., 2007). More recently, broaching has been recommended for use in counselor education (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013). In this article, the use of broaching in the supervisory relationship is described. The importance of clinical supervision, the intercultural nature of supervision, an overview of broaching, sample broaching prompts, and recommendations for supervisors are detailed herein.

The importance of clinical supervision

Clinical supervision is essential for developing counselors. Supervisors are charged with promoting supervisee growth while protecting client well-being (Borders et al., 2011). The supervisory relationship is a broad term used to describe the nature of the interactive work between the supervisor and

supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders & Brown, 2005; Muse-Burke, Ladany, & Deck, 2001). It is inherently complex as members of the relationship bring their own goals, styles, strengths, weaknesses, and identities to the dyad, triad, or group. Despite the complexity of the supervisory relationship, scholars have consistently found that the relationship is important to supervision effectiveness. A strong supervisory relationship has been linked with desirable outcomes such as supervisee development (Ladany, Mori, & Mehr, 2013), supervisee satisfaction (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), supervisee engagement in supervision (Weaks, 2002), supervisee willingness to share openly (Cook & Welfare, 2018), and even client outcomes (Bambling, King, Raue, Schweitzer, & Lambert, 2006). Therefore, cultivating a strong supervisory relationship is a common goal of clinical supervisors.

Operationalizing the "supervisory relationship" is difficult (Tangen & Borders, 2016), but one commonly recognized component is most relevant to this manuscript: the supervisor-supervisee bond. The bond or rapport between the supervisor and supervisee can be defined as an emotional connection, personal attachment, or positive regard for each other (Bordin, 1983; Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). The strength of the supervisor-supervisee bond is influenced by many things, including the social and cultural identities of the individuals (Beinart, 2014). Given the great diversity among supervisees and supervisors, attention to the intercultural nature of supervision is critical in the development of a strong supervisor-supervisee bond. Supervisors and supervisees may define their social and cultural identities broadly and in a particular combination that is most salient for the individual (i.e., intersectionality; Crenshaw, 1989). For example, among the identities related to "race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, ability status, family characteristics and dynamics, country of origin, language, historical processes (e.g., history, migration), worldview, spirituality and religion, and values" (Borders et al., 2011, p. 5), a supervisee may identify being a White, low-socioeconomic status, atheist, and cisgender female as most salient to her.

Indeed, as scholars within the mental health disciplines created guidelines to promote effective clinical supervision, diversity and the importance of supervisor cultural competence were consistently highlighted. For example, guidelines for counselor education (Borders et al., 2011, 2014), social work (National Association of Social Workers and Association of Social Work Boards, 2013), and psychology (American Psychological Association, 2015) each contain a specific section and infused references to the intercultural nature of supervision. The counselor education guidelines state explicitly that supervisors should initiate conversations about cultural identities and attend to the impact of culture, privilege, and social justice within the supervisory relationship. Supervisors are also encouraged to assess their own strengths and areas for growth related to cultural competence and seek opportunities for further development. The recommendations were based on a review of

the literature at the time the guidelines were written (Borders et al., 2014) and have been supported by additional research in recent years. In the following studies, researchers explored some aspect of the intercultural nature of supervision and what supervisees and supervisors might consider in planning an effective learning experience.

The intercultural nature of supervision

In recent years, the impact of differing identities on the supervisory relationship and recommendations for effectiveness have been investigated in studies of clinical supervision. In a content analysis of 184 supervision-related articles published between 2005 and 2014, Bernard and Luke (2015) highlighted 26 publications that examined the process of multicultural supervision and advocacy. Themes pertaining to the intercultural nature of supervision emerged from several of these articles; these themes, and others, are explored here.

It is critical to the supervisory relationship to acknowledge cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee as it encourages a safe, open supervisory relationship (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Inman, 2006). Many authors have recommended acknowledging these differences (Chopra, 2013; Gatmon et al., 2001; Haskins et al., 2013; Inman, 2006; Nilsson & Duan, 2007; Schroeder, Andrews, & Hindes, 2009; White-Davis, Stein, & Karasz, 2016).

Within the supervisory relationship, supervisors are in the position of leadership and power (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Supervisees, even those who are empowered by the invitation to bring their own ideas to supervision, may be reluctant to initiate discussion of cultural identities in the supervisory relationship. In fact, supervisees of color are less likely to introduce conversations about race and cultural difference with their supervisors, citing discomfort, fear of overemphasizing race, or supervisor disinterest as barriers (White-Davis et al., 2016). When discussions of cultural identities are initiated by the supervisor, supervisees of color tend to find the conversations beneficial, as it decreases role ambiguity and discomfort and increases a sense of agency within the relationship (Nilsson & Duan, 2007; White-Davis et al., 2016). This outcome is not surprising when viewed in context of the supervisees' lived experiences; that is, the supervisory dyad is not isolated from the social context of the supervisees' lives, and supervisees of minoritized and/or marginalized identities bring their lived experiences of prejudice and discrimination into supervision with them (Nilsson & Duan, 2007). Findings such as these further emphasize the intercultural nature of supervision and the importance of this work (Chopra, 2013; Fong, 1994).

If supervisors forego discussing differences and do not display cultural competence, then the relationship can be hindered (Haskins et al., 2013; Wong, Wong, & Ishiyama, 2013). For example, in their study of gender

differences in supervision dyads, Walker, Ladany, and Pate-Carolan (2007) found that further perpetuation of socialized norms and assumed stereotypes within the supervisory relationship hindered the working alliance, specifically affecting collaboration and goal setting. In addition, Wong and colleagues (2013) found that supervisors who are more competent in areas of teaching, guidance, and multiculturalism had stronger working alliances than those who were less competent.

Relatedly, the authors of two studies found that the supervisory working alliance is strengthened when supervisors initiate conversations about cultural identities (Haskins et al., 2013; White-Davis et al., 2016). Counselors-in-training are more likely to feel connected to the supervisor because of these conversations (Gatmon et al., 2001; Walker et al., 2007). Rapport-building has been linked with increases in trust, empathy, respect, and satisfaction in the supervisory working alliance, all of which, in turn, can increase comfort for conversations surrounding culture (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Inman, 2006; Wong et al., 2013). In addition, supervisors who are willing to discuss cultural issues, are open-minded, and provide support have stronger relationships with supervisees from minoritized identities (Inman et al., 2014). Researchers have also found a positive correlation between a stronger supervisory working alliance and the quality of the discussion of culture in terms of frequency, safety, depth, and integration of cultural considerations (Gatmon et al., 2001).

Not only is the supervisory relationship made safer by open discussions of cultural differences, but open discussions also positively affect supervisee growth, both professionally and personally. When supervisors address differences, supervisees tend to self-disclose more often and report increased self-awareness and higher satisfaction ratings of the supervisor and the supervisory relationship (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Gatmon et al., 2001; Schroeder et al., 2009). Discussion of cultural identities in supervision has also been linked to improved supervisee counseling skills, such as expanding case conceptualization, addressing culture in the counseling session, and building collaborative counselor-client relationships. These key counseling skills, in turn, have been shown to positively affect client outcomes (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Nilsson & Duan, 2007). In several studies, supervisors' discussion of cultural identities allowed supervisees to process their emotions toward multicultural differences within the supervisory relationship and counseling dyad, notice biases held about different populations, and explore their own identities, as well as their clients' identities (Glosoff & Durham, 2010; Goodrich & Luke, 2011; Wong et al., 2013).

In sum, supervisors are charged with the responsibility to address cultural considerations in the supervisory relationship. Supervisors need to actively lead discussions of cultural identities because supervisees, particularly supervisees from marginalized or minoritized identities, may understandably be reluctant to do so. When supervisors address cultural identities in the

supervisory relationship, they model for supervisees how to use similar interventions with their clients. Discussion of cultural identities can strengthen the supervisory relationship in multiple ways, which has been linked to more effective counselor development and enhanced client outcomes. How, then, should supervisors lead discussions of cultural identities in the supervisory relationship? Broaching, a term coined by Day-Vines and colleagues (2007), is an accessible method of acknowledging cultural differences that supervisors can use to address and examine the cultural factors in the intercultural supervisory relationship, the supervisee's counseling relationship, and the supervisee's development more broadly.

Broaching in the counseling relationship

First described in a counseling context, broaching is an ongoing behavior, attitude, and strategy that counselors use to address and examine the cultural factors impacting a client's life and/or presenting problem (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Broaching is a strategy that reflects a consistent attitude of openness and authentic commitment to learning about others (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Jones & Welfare, 2017). A counselor who broaches cultural identities is demonstrating behavior and utilizing a strategy that supports multicultural counseling. Counselors who implement broaching are able to explore how multicultural factors affect the client, the client's concerns, and the cultural dynamics in the counseling dyad.

Broaching in the counseling relationship has been linked with many positive outcomes, such as enhancing counselor credibility, increasing client satisfaction in the counseling relationship, deepening client disclosure in sessions, and increasing clients' willingness to return for future sessions (Sue & Sundberg, 1996). Broaching demonstrates that the counselor is aware that individuals are multicultural beings (Arredondo & Glauner, 1992; D'Andrea & Daniels, 2001) whose lives are impacted by cultural and sociopolitical factors that can emerge in the counseling space between counselor and client, and these factors can impact the client's presenting problem and their worldview (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

Due to the inherent power differential in the counseling relationship, the counselor should take the initiative to broach as the client may not be sure if the counseling relationship is a safe place to discuss cultural factors (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Jones & Welfare, 2017). The best time to begin broaching is within the first two sessions, as it contributes to establishing and maintaining a trusting and solid therapeutic relationship (Fuertes, Mueller, Chauhan, Walker, & Ladany, 2002; Knox, Burkard, Johnson, Suzuki, & Ponterotto, 2003). Also, clients who identify as racial and ethnic minoritized individuals have the highest attrition rate after the initial session (Alcantara & Gone, 2014). This finding implies that the earlier counselors can broach, the better the chance of reducing attrition and establishing and maintaining a stronger therapeutic alliance.

Broaching in supervision

This same strategy can be applied to the supervision relationship, as the supervisor can utilize broaching to acknowledge cultural factors between the supervisee and supervisor, examine the impact of culture in the counseling relationship (between the supervisee and his/her/their client), and determine how cultural discussions can be a source of growth throughout supervision. Broaching is most effective when supervisors have a consistent attitude of openness and genuine commitment to learning about their supervisees and expanding their own self-awareness. Broaching invites the supervisee to share, which gives the supervisor the opportunity to "validate and affirm" the supervisee's "sociocultural and sociopolitical realities" (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013, p. 153). Broaching is designed to begin a dialogue about how supervisee and supervisor identities impact the work in supervision. It is not a discussion of world events or a lesson about a certain cultural group per se, although both may be included at times. The focus is more narrowly on the work between the people in the relationship and the intersections of their identities that are most salient. The supervisor is tasked with inviting supervisee disclosure by explicitly acknowledging the relevance of culture, openly receiving what is said by the supervisee, and working through ideas and concerns during the supervision process.

The broaching continuum

Not all supervisors are prepared for the tasks associated with effective broaching. Day-Vines and colleagues (2007) developed a continuum of broaching styles that range from less complex to more complex broaching behaviors. The continuum is developmental in nature and can aid in assessing one's level of readiness to broach. The five broaching styles include (a) avoidant, (b) isolating, (c) continuing/incongruent, (d) integrated/congruent, and (e) infusing.

The avoidant style would apply to supervisors who prefer to focus on general supervisory goals and concerns rather than culture-related topics. For example, a supervisor operating in this part of the continuum might work from a race-neutral perspective and would not initiate dialogue about cultural identities or the intersectionality of identities. An isolating broaching approach would address cultural identities and concerns in a surface-level way. Supervisors who use an isolating approach may acknowledge a supervisee's comment about cultural considerations but redirect the discussion without addressing it in more detail. The continuing/incongruent supervisor may be interested in broaching cultural identities but be unsure of how to do so effectively. Sometimes anxiety or concern about saying things in the "right" way can interfere with execution in this part of the continuum.

Supervisors who find themselves working from the avoidant, isolating, or continuing/incongruent styles should not be discouraged, as growth along the continuum is possible. Supervisors who are not able to translate their appreciation of diversity into effective supervision strategies can benefit from additional training and support in this new approach, just as training and support were essential in their development of other supervisory skills (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

It is important to move to the final two styles of the broaching continuum: integrated/congruent and infusing (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013). This is where supervisors effectively broach culture and have integrated broaching behavior into their professional identity (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Integrated/congruent supervisors view broaching as much more than a technique, and it has become a consistent, ongoing part of their supervision. Supervisors who operate in this part of the continuum consider broaching an intrinsic part of their professional identity, and they consider how culture influences the supervisee, the supervisory relationship, and the supervisee's counseling relationship with clients (Day-Vines et al., 2007). The difference between the final two styles is that the integrated/congruent broaching style is apparent in supervision only and the infusing broaching style is evident in daily life beyond supervision (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Supervisors who work from the infusing broaching style are committed to social justice and equality in a way that transcends their professional work.

Broaching in practice

It is important to note that there is not one perfect way to broach, just as there is not a perfect supervisee response to broaching. Supervisees are allowed to decide if they want to discuss their cultural identities with their supervisors, even when the supervisor provides the space and invitation for the supervisee to do so. Supervisors should not be discouraged when initially attempting broaching with supervisees. It is normal to feel some discomfort. Even supervisors who do not consider themselves to be multiculturalism experts can use broaching to deepen and enhance intercultural supervisory relationships.

Broaching is an ongoing behavior (Day-Vines et al., 2007). Because cultural factors are always present and sociopolitical issues can arise any time during the supervisory relationship, broaching has to be iterative. It is not a "one-and-done" approach; rather, the supervisor initiates broaching as supervision begins and continuously looks for opportunities to broach additional cultural considerations. Such consistency demonstrates the supervisor's openness to discuss cultural identities and the idea that the identities may be impacting the supervisee's work with clients or the supervisory relationship (Day-Vines et al., 2007; Jones & Welfare, 2017). Repeatedly

offering the opportunity for culturally focused dialogue to occur aids in creating a warm, safe, empathetic, and nonjudgmental environment for the supervisee (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013; Day-Vines et al., 2007).

In Tables 1, 2, and 3, we have provided sample prompts that supervisors can consider as they begin the process of broaching in the supervisory relationship. These prompts are not prescriptive; rather, they demonstrate the range of open inquiries a supervisor can use to invite supervisee dialogue in individual, triadic, or group supervision. The responses that follow open prompts like these can vary widely. It is important to remember that supervisees can respond however they choose; it is not the supervisor's duty to force the reaction of the supervisee, but instead to create the safe space, extend the invitation, and be willing to engage in the conversations if the supervisee chooses to engage further at that specific time or at a later time (Jones & Welfare, 2017). Supervisors can use their core skills in active listening to achieve the short-term goals of openly receiving what is said by the supervisee and working through ideas and concerns during the supervision process. In initial conversations, it is crucial to validate and acknowledge supervisee disclosures (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2013), as supervisor reactions of ambivalence or defensiveness have been linked with subsequent supervisee reluctance (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Gatmon et al., 2001; Schroeder et al., 2009). In each open invitation, supervisees might see the potential positive outcomes from discussing the impact of cultural identities in counseling and supervision.

Each prompt provided in Table 1 is designed to demonstrate the supervisor's awareness that cultural identities are important and specifically invite dialogue about cultural considerations in supervision. These prompts can be used in the first supervision session and repeated at any point. Table 2 provides examples of "broachable moments" that emerge throughout supervision. Like teachable moments, they offer observant supervisors an opportunity to invite dialogue about a current culturally relevant event or experience. Finally, Table 3 provides examples of how supervisors can revisit missed opportunities or address exchanges gone awry.

Some prompts in the tables include reference to a particular cultural identity. Those references are samples, and many other social and cultural identities could be applied to similar situations. The language of the prompts can be altered based on the cultural identity or identities and the situation. In all prompts, the supervisor uses core counseling and supervision skills, such as open questions, active listening, and positive regard when responding to supervisees.

Implications for supervisors and supervisor training

Broaching may seem like a daunting task, but any supervisor who is open, respectfully inquisitive, and committed to supporting supervisees can broach cultural identities effectively with training, practice, and support.

Table 1. Sample prompts to initiate broaching at the beginning of the supervisory relationship.

Prompt	Commentary
"One of my favorite things about my work is that I am always learning new things about myself and others. I think of every relationship as intercultural. Let's watch for opportunities to talk about our own identities in our supervision, okay?"	This prompt reveals the supervisor's interest in learning about cultural factors present in supervision. It extends an enthusiastic invitation from the supervisor to the supervisee and shows the supervisee that discussing cultural identities and the intercultural nature of the supervisory relationship is welcome.
"I'm looking forward to working with you in supervision. As we get to know each other, I hope you will feel comfortable sharing cultural considerations and concerns with me. I know I need to earn your trust for that to happen. I also know that this (academic or nonacademic) department has areas for growth. I want to be an ally in any way I can, and I'm always eager to learn about my own areas for growth."	This prompt can be used as a general way to introduce any cultural factors into the supervision setting. It extends an open invitation from the supervisor to the supervisee and acknowledges that the supervisor is not the expert in the room. Importantly, the supervisor acknowledges that there may be areas of growth. This also signals that the supervisor wants to be a support to the supervisee, which may be especially important for supervisees of marginalized or minoritized identities. It is a safe way for any supervisor to broach in the beginning of the supervisory relationship.
"As we begin our supervisory relationship, I want to take some time to point out that I intend for this to be a safe space. Every relationship we enter into will be intercultural, and the supervisory relationship is no different. Culturally we may have similarities and differences, and I am open to having discussions concerning those cultural similarities and differences. If at any time you feel as though I have offended you or failed to acknowledge the impact of your cultural perspective, please do not hesitate to let me know."	This prompt can be used as a general way to introduce any cultural factors into the supervision setting. It extends an open invitation from the supervisor to the supervisee and emphasizes the importance of a safe space. It acknowledges that the supervisor and supervisee enter into the supervisory relationship with complex multicultural identities. This prompt can be used by supervisors at any level of readiness at the beginning of the supervisory relationship.
"I am so excited to be working with you in supervision. As a supervisor of color, I want us to both feel that this is a safe space to discuss our cultural differences and similarities. Doing so allows us to learn more about each other and to have a positive supervisory relationship. In our time together, feel free to share any concerns you may have about the supervision experience, and let's celebrate your successes together."	This prompt can be used by a supervisor of any marginalized identity to set the stage for continuous and ongoing broaching within the supervisory relationship. It shows that the supervisor is aware of the importance of cultural identities and invites dialogue about them within supervision.
"I am thankful to have you in our supervision group. Your contributions have been wonderful! I want you to know that I am aware that you are the only international student in our group. I can only imagine what that is like for you. Please know that I am open to being a support for you. Share your ideas with me anytime so I can help make this the best supervision experience possible."	This prompt can be used to broach with an individual about interactions in a group supervision setting. It allows the supervisor to empathize and acknowledge to the supervisee an awareness of differences and similarities. It emphasizes an openness to facilitate discussions surrounding how having a different worldview in the group may impact the supervision experience, and that these differences are welcomed and appreciated. The supervisor also shares with the supervisee that she/he/they is there to support and aid in creating a safe space in which the supervisee can have the best supervision experience possible.

Table 2. Sample prompts for broachable moments during ongoing supervision.

"Excellent work with this adolescent. It sounds like she is really trying to figure out what it means to be Black Caribbean in the United States. What is it like for you, as an African-American woman, to explore that with her?" [Later] "Now step back, if you will: What is it like for you to explore these things with me, a White woman?"	This prompt can be used to broach cultural differences that are evident in the counseling relationship. It may come after initially broaching similarities and differences as the supervisory relationship began. It aids the supervisor in encouraging the supervisee to explore her own identities and how culture may be impacting her work with a client. The prompt also conveys an awareness of the differences and similarities in the supervisory relationship and an openness to discussion surrounding how this may impact the supervision experience.
"This is a great video clip for our individual supervision today. Thank you for bringing it in. I wonder what it is like for you to hear your client describe feeling left out of a workplace clique? I know you have made comments before about your experience being significantly older than the other supervisees in our group and how you do not feel connected to them. Is that something we could explore today? It is important to me that all of my supervisees feel supported in the group, so I'd very much like to understand your experiences."	This prompt allows the supervisor to broach the impact of age differences on the supervisee's experience in the supervision group by exploring the parallel process of the supervisee's client. The supervisee's client shared that she felt left out of a workplace clique and the supervisee has shared previously that she felt left out of the supervision group because of her age. Exploring similarities observed between the supervisee and the client may be crucial to helping the supervisee understand the relevance of age as a social identity and explore potential parallel processes. The prompt conveys to the supervisee that the supervisor is in tune with the challenges faced by being or feeling different from one's group. The supervisor is offering a genuine, open invitation to the supervisee and stressing the importance of all supervisees feeling supported in group.
"I want you to know that mentoring students is an area of special interest for me. I have heard you mention several times that you are a first-generation graduate student. I would like to understand what that means for you because your success here is important to me. As we get to know each other better, please consider sharing things with me so we can work together to improve your experience here."	This prompt can be used to begin a conversation about any cultural factors that a supervisee mentions in the supervision setting. It extends an open invitation from the supervisor to the supervisee. This signals to the supervisee that the supervisor wants to understand who she or he is and contribute to working together collaboratively to improve the overall supervisory experience.
"We just confirmed your internship placement, and as I reflect, I notice that almost all of the clinicians there are White. I expect that is very different from your previous experience working at Howard University! If you ever have questions, concerns, or just want to discuss how things are going, please know that I would be happy to discuss things with you. I am always honored to hear feedback when students feel comfortable enough to share it."	This prompt demonstrates the importance of looking for opportunities to introduce any cultural factors into the supervision setting. It acknowledges the differences that may be impacted by culture but does not assume what the impact may be. It extends an invitation to the supervisee that if she or he would like to ever discuss the matter, then the supervisor is willing to listen and engage. The prompt also assures the supervisee that she or he can share concerns, thoughts, and feelings only if she or he is comfortable and if the supervisee feels like the proper space has been created.

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued).

"I wanted to check in with you about our group supervision today and acknowledge that I was uncomfortable with some of your peers' unprofessional commentary about Jo's male client. What was that like for you to be the only male supervisee in the room?" [Later] "I really appreciate you sharing these experiences with me. I may not be able to share details with you, but please know I will continue to work with your peers on this issue."	This prompt allows the supervisor to acknowledge microaggressions and culturally insensitive dialogue within group supervision. If the supervisee chooses to share, it is important for the supervisor to focus on openly receiving what is said. Doing so will invite additional sharing and allow the supervisor to better address supervisee needs. The prompt also acknowledges the supervisor's commitment to ongoing work to address the group's behavior.
"I heard your coworkers discussing Christmas plans again and wondered what it must be like for you to be in such a Christocentric region of the United States? I have appreciated what you've shared with me about your own practices, and I have noticed more of my own biased language as a result of your willingness to be open with me."	This prompt offers the supervisor the ability to acknowledge an awareness of othering behaviors and includes an appropriate self-disclosure. It also expresses the supervisor's genuine appreciation of the supervisee's openness and vulnerability and invites future dialogue.
"In group supervision today, as one of your peers discussed his thoughts concerning individuals from working-class families, I noticed your nonverbal behavior changed. We have talked a little about your financial stressors in the past, so I want to check in with you. Would you like an open space to talk about how the comments made you feel, or do you have any thoughts you want to share?"	This prompt allows for the supervisor to acknowledge to the supervisee that she or he was aware that the comments made in group supervision were stereotypes and biased language toward a particular cultural group with which the supervisee identifies. Also, it illustrates that the supervisor is attentive to not only the verbal communication in the room but also the nonverbal communication. It shows that the supervisor is intentional and genuine about providing a safe space for all and invites the supervisee to describe that experience.

It is important that supervisors work to build trust with supervisees and remember that broaching is an ongoing behavior. Approaching broaching as a checklist item or a one-and-done technique is not beneficial and can actually impede the supervisory relationship. The sample prompts provided in the tables demonstrate the great variety of ways that supervisors can acknowledge and invite discussion about cultural identities throughout supervision.

Supervisors who believe they fall on the beginning end of the continuum (i.e., avoidant, isolating, and continuing/incongruent) can begin by seeking didactic instruction and practicing with peers and faculty. Didactic instruction in clinical supervision as well as culturally responsive supervision is an important base for competency. Practice with broaching specifically may build confidence and comfort that will enable supervisors to use their best listening skills in the moment when engaging in intercultural dialogue. Supervisor trainers or supervisors of clinical supervision can model broaching as part of their supervision curriculum. Another strategy for supervisors who are new to broaching is to begin with the most open prompts as listed in Table 1 or other broaching phrases that are broadly applicable and can be practiced in advance.

Table 3. Sample broaching prompts for missed opportunities and/or unsuccessful attempts at broaching.

Prompt	Commentary
A supervisee who speaks English as a second language attempts to discuss her accent and how some of her internship clients react negatively to it. The supervisee expresses her frustration over this matter, and the supervisor responds, "I'm not sure why this bothers you. All clients will not like you. This sounds like something you need to work through." The supervisor walks away from this situation and reflects. During the next supervision session, the supervisor shares, "I was reflecting back to our previous session and realized I completely ignored your reality and how your cultural identity impacts your work with clients. I am sorry, and if you are willing, I'm here and open to discuss."	This prompt illustrates how a supervisor can recover from a culturally neutralizing, insensitive comment that was said to the supervisee in the previous supervisory session. It allows ownership of the mistake, reflection, and a genuine apology, with an open invitation to discuss if the supervisee would like to do so. The supervisor indirectly shows that she or he is not the expert in the room and is culturally aware enough to acknowledge the mistake. This prompt demonstrates that it is appropriate in the next session to discuss a previously missed opportunity to broach. The supervisor has to be secure in her or his role as the supervisor to admit fault and apologize; doing so is important for supervision to progress.
A supervisee who identifies as a lesbian attempts to discuss her sexual orientation, explain how she feels different from the heterosexual supervisor, and disclose that she is afraid of being judged by the supervisor by being "different" in how she may perceive things. The supervisor responds, "No need to worry about that. Love is love. You being gay never enters my mind." The supervisee responds, "But I *want* you to see me as a lesbian. It's important to who I am as an individual and influences my worldview. I want to learn more about how who I am impacts my work as a counselor." The supervisor says, "I'm sorry. I didn't mean to dismiss who you are and overlook an identity that is important to you. I want this to be a safe space for you to share and be who you are. Could we please explore this more?"	This prompt illustrates another type of culturally neutralizing comment. The supervisee explains that the comment was denying part of who she is and that she wants to be seen and understood from the perspective of identifying as a lesbian. The supervisor should try to receive the feedback and take ownership of the mistake, issue a genuine apology, and invite the supervisee to share more if she would like to do so. The supervisor indirectly shows that she or he is not the expert in the room and is culturally aware enough to acknowledge the mistake. This prompt demonstrates that it is important to create a space to allow the supervisee to express concerns about cultural matters, and it is appropriate to discuss a missed opportunity to broach during the session in which the missed opportunity occurred.
A Black male supervisee shares his concerns and experiences related to the police shootings of Black men. His supervisor agrees that the shootings are horrible but never explores the supervisee's feelings related to his race and how it may impact his work in supervision and with his clients. The supervisor notices the supervisee become withdrawn and solemn. After the supervision session ends, the supervisor checks in with the supervisee about his change in behavior and affect. The supervisee responds, "I just feel like you don't get it. I opened up to you, and you shared your feelings and then just moved on. I wanted to discuss how this is affecting me and my work, but you just brushed it off and moved on to a different topic." The supervisor begins to respond in a defensive manner but realizes this behavior and says, "I apologize. I completely made this about me and ignored what you shared. Please excuse my defensiveness. If I provided you a space to explore your feelings and experiences, would you still be willing to discuss with me? It is completely your decision, and I understand either way."	This prompt illustrates how a supervisor can recover from a failed attempt to explore supervisee identity-related experiences. The supervisor attempts to connect on the shared concern about a social issue but then quickly moves on to discuss the next topic in the room without inviting dialogue about what it means for the supervisee and his work. The supervisor is aware enough to notice the supervisee's change in behavior during the supervisory session and later checks in to determine if something happened to cause the shift. Once the supervisee shares what is bothering him, the supervisor initially becomes defensive but catches her or himself and immediately apologizes for making the situation about her or himself. The supervisor takes ownership of the mistake and defensive behavior, issues a genuine apology, and invites the supervisee to discuss if he would like to. This prompt demonstrates that it is important to create a space to allow the supervisee to express concerns about cultural matters in the supervisory relationship, and it is appropriate to discuss a missed opportunity to broach as soon as the supervisor realizes what has happened.

Much like a client's response to a counseling intervention, the supervisee's response to any broaching intervention cannot be scripted. Supervisors may have to adapt and adjust their broaching style to fit the supervisee, the situation being broached, and the sociopolitical factors impacting the supervisee. When broaching in any supervision session, supervisors can rely on their core skills to validate, affirm, and explore their supervisees' perspectives in order to maximize effectiveness of supervision for all supervisees. Seeking supervision of supervision or peer feedback after trying a new supervisory intervention may be a helpful way for new supervisors to seek support and feedback.

Limitations and future research

Most of the available literature concerning the benefits of broaching is focused on the counseling relationship. It is important to note that there are differences between counseling and supervisory relationships. For instance, the supervisory relationship includes an evaluative component and is often an assigned match rather than a chosen one. Due to the evaluative component and assigned duration, supervisees may be even more vulnerable as they take risks in intercultural dialogues. Thus, although research on broaching in counseling relationships provides some helpful directions, studies specific to the supervision context may identify some additional considerations or nuances to inform effective broaching in supervision. Future research that explores broaching in clinical supervision, including our suggestions in the tables, is necessary to inform best practices. Supervisor training that incorporates didactic and supervised experiences with broaching is much needed, and research into training practices would fill this key gap in the literature.

Conclusion

Broaching social and cultural identities in the supervisory relationship is an important strategy for providing effective clinical supervision. It aids in creating a stronger supervisory relationship that allows for open, genuine intercultural dialogue, and it aids in meeting the ethical duty of supervisors to address diversity and multiculturalism in the supervisory relationship (Borders et al., 2011; Borders et al., 2014). All supervisory relationships are intercultural in nature, and rich learning can occur when supervisors initiate dialogue about ways in which supervisees' identities impact their work.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Alcantara, C., & Gone, J. P. (2014). Multicultural issues in the clinical interview and diagnostic process. In F. T. Leong (Ed.), *APA handbook of multicultural psychology: Vol. 2. Applications and training* (pp. 153–163). Alexandria, VA: American Psychological Association.

American Psychological Association. (2015). Guidelines for clinical supervision in health service psychology. *The American Psychologist*, *70*, 33–46. doi:10.1037/a0038112

Ancis, J. R., & Marshall, D. S. (2010). Using a multicultural framework to assess supervisees' perceptions of culturally competent supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *88*, 277–284. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00023.x

Arredondo, P., & Glauner, T. (1992). *Personal dimensions of identity model*. Boston, MA: Empowerment Workshops.

Bambling, M., King, R., Raue, P., Schweitzer, R., & Lambert, W. (2006). Clinical supervision: Its influence on client-rated working alliance and client symptom reduction in the brief treatment of major depression. *Psychotherapy Research*, *16*, 317–331. doi:10.1080/10503300500268524

Beinart, H. (2014). Building and sustaining the supervisory relationship. In C. E. Watkins Jr. & D. L. Milne (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of clinical supervision* (pp. 257–281). Oxford, UK: Wiley. doi:10.1002/9781118846360.ch11

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Bernard, J. M., & Luke, M. (2015). A content analysis of 10 years of clinical supervision articles in counseling. *Counseling Education and Supervision*, *54*, 242–257. doi:10.1002/ceas.12024

Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *New handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, ST: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Borders, L. D., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., Glosoff, H. L., Hays, D. G., Page, B., & Welfare, L. E. (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision*. Retrieved from http://www.acesonline.net/resources/

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *33*(1), 26–44. doi:10.1080/07325223.2014.90522

Bordin, E. S. (1983). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *11*(2), 35–42. doi:10.1177/0011000083111007

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

Cook, R. M., & Welfare, L. E. (2018). Examining predictors of counselor-in-training intentional nondisclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*, 211–226. doi:10.1002/ceas.2018.57.issue-3

Crenshaw, K. (1989). *Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics* (pp. 139–167). University of Chicago Legal Forum. Retrieved from http:chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8

D' Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (2001). RESPECTFUL counseling: An integrative multidimensional model for counselors. In B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *The intersection of race, class, and gender in multicultural counseling* (pp. 417–466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Day-Vines, N. L., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2013). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture as a tool for addressing diversity in counselor education classes. In J. West, D. Bubenzer, J. Cox, & J. McGlothlin (Eds.), *Teaching in counselor education: Engaging students in meaningful learning* (pp. 151–165). Alexandria, VA: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.

Day-Vines, N. L., Wood, S. M., Grothaus, T., Craigen, L., Holman, A., Dotson-Blake, K., & Douglass, M. J. (2007). Broaching the subjects of race, ethnicity, and culture during the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 85, 401–409. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00608.x

Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 322–329. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.37.3.322

Fong, M. L. (1994). *Multicultural issues in supervision* ERIC Digest. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services No.CG025748). doi: 10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(94)77044-2

Fuertes, J. N., Mueller, L. N., Chauhan, R. V., Walker, J. A., & Ladany, N. (2002). An investigation of European American therapists' approach to counseling African American clients. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30, 763–788. doi:10.1177/0011000002305007

Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 102–113. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00508.x

Glosoff, H. L., & Durham, J. C. (2010). Using supervision to prepare social justice counseling advocates. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 116–129. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1556-6978

Goodrich, K. M., & Luke, M. (2011). The LGBTQ responsive model for group supervision of group work. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 36, 22–39. doi:10.1080/01933922.2010.537739

Haskins, N., Whitfield-Williams, M., Shillingford, M. A., Singh, A., Moxley, R., & Ofauni, C. (2013). The experiences of black master's counseling students: A phenomenological inquiry. *Counseling Education and Supervision*, 52, 162–178. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00035.x

Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy*, 32, 73–85. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2006.tb01589.x

Inman, A. G., Hutman, H., Pendse, A., Devdas, L., Luu, L., & Ellis, M. V. (2014). Current trends concerning supervisors, supervisees, and clients in clinical supervision. In C. E. Watkins Jr. & D. Milne (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of clinical supervision* (pp. 61–102). Oxford, UK: Wiley.

Jones, C., & Welfare, L. E. (2017). Broaching behaviors of licensed professional counselors: A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, 38, 48–64. doi:10.1002/jaoc.12028

Knox, S., Burkard, A. W., Johnson, A. J., Suzuki, L. A., & Ponterotto, J. G. (2003). African American and European American therapists' experiences of addressing race in cross-racial psychotherapy dyads. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 466–481. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.4.466

Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77, 447–455. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x

Ladany, N., Mori, Y., & Mehr, K. E. (2013). Effective and ineffective supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 41, 28–47. doi:10.1177/0011000012442648

Muse-Burke, J. L., Ladany, N., & Deck, M. D. (2001). The supervisory relationship. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counseling supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 28–62). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

National Association of Social Workers and Association of Social Work Boards. (2013). *Best practice standards in social work supervision*. Washington, DC: NASW.

Nilsson, J. E., & Duan, C. (2007). Experiences of prejudice, role difficulties, and counseling self-efficacy among U.S. racial and ethnic minority supervisees working with white supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *35*, 219–229. doi:10.1002/jmcd.2007.35.issue-4

Schroeder, M., Andrews, J. J. W., & Hindes, Y. L. (2009). Cross-racial supervision: Critical issues in the supervisor relationship. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, *43*, 295–310.

Sue, D., & Sundberg, N. D. (1996). Research and research hypotheses about effectiveness in intercultural counseling. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), *Counseling across cultures* (4th ed., pp. 323–352). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tangen, J. L., & Borders, L. D. (2016). The supervisory relationship: A conceptual and psychological review of measures. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *55*, 159–181. doi:10.1002/ceas.12043

Walker, J. A., Ladany, N., & Pate-Carolan, L. M. (2007). Gender-related events in psychotherapy supervision: Female trainee perspectives. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research*, *7*, 12–18. doi:10.1080/14733140601140881

Weaks, D. (2002). Unlocking the secrets of 'good supervision': A phenomenological exploration of experienced counsellors' perceptions of good supervision. *Counseling & Psychotherapy Research*, *2*, 33–39. doi:10.1080/14733140212331384968

White-Davis, T., Stein, E., & Karasz, A. (2016). The elephant in the room: Dialogues about race within cross-cultural supervisory relationships. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, *51*, 347. doi:10.1177/0091217416659271

Wong, L. C. J., Wong, P. T. P., & Ishiyama, I. (2013). What helps and what hinders in cross-cultural clinical supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *41*, 66–85. doi:10.1177/00110000124426-52

Connie T. Jones, *PhD, LPCA, LCAS, NCC, ACS, holds a PhD in Counselor Education and Supervision from Virginia Tech. She is an assistant professor at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) and has a background in clinical mental health. Her areas of research and teaching interest include addictions and multiculturalism. Dr. Jones also has a particular interest in the concept of broaching and has published on the topic and continues to research this concept. She also has many years of experience as a clinical supervisor for clinical mental health and school counselors in training.*

Laura E. Welfare, *PhD, LPC, NCC, ACS, holds a PhD in Counseling and Counselor Education from The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) and is currently an Associate Professor at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia. Her research interests include counselor development and clinical supervision. Dr. Welfare has conducted research and produced many publications on the topic of clinical supervision. She has many years of experience as a clinical supervisor for clinical mental health and school counselors in training, as well as doctoral-level supervision.*

Shekila Melchior, *PhD, NCC, holds a PhD in Counselor Education and Supervision from Virginia Tech. She is an assistant professor and program coordinator of school counseling at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga (UTC). She has a background in school counseling. She also has years of experience as a clinical supervisor for clinical mental health and school counselors in training.*

Rebecca M. Cash, *MS, is a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Educational Development at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG).*