

SUPERVISION

Theorie – Praxis – Forschung

Eine interdisziplinäre Internet-Zeitschrift

Herausgegeben von:

Univ.-Prof. Dr.Dr.Dr. **Hilarion G. Petzold**

Freie Universität Amsterdam, Europäische Akademie für psychosoziale Gesundheit, Düsseldorf, Donau-Universität,
Krems, Institut St. Denis, Paris

In Verbindung mit:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. phil. **Jörg Bürmann**, Universität Mainz

Dr. phil. **Wolfgang Ebert**, Dipl.-Sup., Dipl. Päd., Europäische Akademie für psychosoziale Gesundheit, Düsseldorf/Hückeswagen

Jürgen Lemke, Europäische Akademie für psychosoziale Gesundheit, Düsseldorf

Prof. Dr. phil. **Michael Märtens**, Dipl.-Psych., Fachhochschule Frankfurt a.M.

Univ.-Prof. Dr. phil. **Heidi Möller**, Dipl.-Psych. Universität Innsbruck

Dipl.-Sup. **Ilse Orth**, Europäische Akademie für psychosoziale Gesundheit, Düsseldorf

Prof. Dr. phil. **Alexander Rauber**, Fachhochschule Bern

Dr.phil. **Brigitte Schigl**, Zentrum für psychosoziale Medizin, Donau-Universität, Krems

Univ.-Prof. Dr. phil. **Wilfried Schley**, Universität Zürich

Dr. **Ingeborg Tutzer**, Bozen, Stiftung Europäische Akademie für psychosoziale Gesundheit

www.fpi-publikationen.de/supervision

SUPERVISION: Theorie – Praxis – Forschung
Ausgabe 11/2002

Multi-cultural Supervision: Theory and Practice An Integrative Approach

Julianne Appel-Opper

© FPI-Publikationen, Verlag Petzold + Sieper Düsseldorf/Hückeswagen.

Foreword

Looking back it is amazing how “mono-cultural” I grew up. Eichelsachsen, a small village in Hessen with about 800 inhabitants, was my cultural world for my first years in life. My first language was the local dialect, which we all spoke at home. Every summer the sister of my grand mother stayed with us. She lived in Giessen, the nearest small town, for me a big city at that time. She was the first person who came across to me as being different. Like from a different culture: she spoke our local dialect with a High German accent and her manners were quite different to the other women in my family (my grand-mother and mother). I admired her. We two had a very special relationship in which I felt very special, very loved by her. For the first four school years I went to the local village school. We spoke high German in the class room and our village dialect in the breaks. Then nearly all of us changed school to go to the next “bigger” village and then to the next “bigger” village for my A levels (“Abitur” in German). I remember scenes in which I mis-translated the village dialect into High German and the others laughing at me. I always had a feeling of belonging to this village world. At the start I used the phrase of growing up “mono-cultural”. Actually it was not that “mono-cultural”, because there were already different milieus, different “social worlds” (Petzold, 1993:878), between which I moved.. Sometimes it felt like an electric field, these different milieus inside me as if they could not be integrated to one cultural identity.

After my training to be a foreign language secretary (“Fremdsprachen-Sekretärin”) I worked for some time as secretary in Frankfurt. I decided then to study Psychology, which I did in Giessen, where my grand-mother’s sister used to live. I enjoyed studying, which opened another world, an academic world for me. My brother and I are among the first inhabitants of this village who studied. I got fascinated by psychoanalytical and behavioural theories and frameworks. Through a conference I chose the Fritz Perls Institute to do my psychotherapy training there and luckily I was accepted..For me that was the best choice!

I would like to take this opportunity to especially thank, Ute Wirbel as my training therapist (“Lehrtherapeutin”) and Felix Zeitel as my group tutor .What I got from them I am now able to give to my clients. They both supported me with my ongoing process towards an integrated cultural identity.

Prof.Dr.Dr.Dr.Hilarion Petzold with co-workers like Johanna Sieper, Hildegund Heintz, Ilse Orth, Jürgen Lemke, and others (Orth in Petzold,2001:132/4) developed the “Integrative Therapy”. There is certainly not enough space here to honour this model of integration (“Integrationsmodell”), the “Tree of Science” into which the relevant theories for psychotherapy are integrated (Petzold, 1993). Especially the deep hermeneutics of the verbal and non-verbal expressions (“Tiefenhermeneutik des sprachlichen und nichtsprachlichen Ausdrucks”), (Schuch,2001) as part of this model mentioned above prepared me substantially to practise multi-cultural psychotherapy. How could that be? Deep hermeneutics stands for analysing, interpreting and to make sense of the own body’s perception (“Analyse, Interpretation und Sinnverstehen eigen-leiblicher Wahrnehmung” Schuch, 2001:29/157). Deep hermeneutics consist of feeling the own body, to grasp the atmospheres and the qualities of the feeling and to understand in a “scenic way” (“Bestandteilen eigenleibliches Spüren, Erfassen von Atmosphären, Erfassen von Gefühlsqualitäten und nicht zuletzt szenisches Verstehen” Schuch 2001:29:157). Concepts like these always incorporate the milieu, the cultural background my client is coming from.In my therapeutical work I ask my clients about their “family soup” as I name it.

This family soup is a metaphor for all the attitudes, beliefs, Do’s and Don’ts we all grow up with in our family. And then as a next step we have to integrate the social worlds as the outer fields of this family table with the soup. The phenomena of culture get woven into all of these fields/spaces/worlds. I remember I once drew the small river we used to play in and at as children in a group session. How all the richness and colours of these scenes unfolded.

Now that I am 43 years old ,the space I call home has changed a lot. In the last years I have lived for nearly 1 year each in France, Israel, California and since 1998 Great Britain. I am finding myself between 2 cultures, a little bit out of the German one and not fully in the English one. The Relational Gestalttherapy as developed by Gary Yontef and Lynne Jacobs focuses on this place of “between”, which goes back to Buber (Buber 1973). This place is needed for learning/transformation to take place. So , hopefully there is space for learning and integration as an ongoing process of finding my cultural/personal identity. I have worked as a self-employed psychotherapist for over 3 years now, in a different culture to mine and in a different language. I am fascinated by the multi-cultural work with my clients. I have multi-cultural supervision in a group, in which we all come from different cultural backgrounds. I find that enriching and stimulating.

As a German psychologist and Integrative Gestaltpsychotherapist working in the UK I am practicing multi-cultural therapy. My future task will be to offer multi-cultural supervision. During my personal and professional journey into multi-cultural work I was confronted with my feelings of racism and my own cultural identity. It helped me getting to know the various cognitive frameworks of how cultures could differ, but that was not enough. The main part of this process were and are my unconscious reactions to the culturally different.

Introduction

Motivated by my personal multi-cultural experiences I want to give an overview of the existing cognitive frameworks and models regarding multi-cultural supervision. But I will also look across to depth psychological approaches and related experiences based on creative interventions. Since I graduated as a supervisor in England and have continued to work in this country, I will mainly concentrate on the relevant English literature. Since I experienced excellent supervision in the past from supervisors of the Fritz Perls Institute in Germany, I will also include the relevant theoretical background for Supervision as developed by Hilarion Petzold, Johanna Sieper, Kurt Höhfeld, Jürgen Lemke, Astrid Schreyögg and others. I will not be able to go very much into detail. Nevertheless, I do hope that the reader will get a good overview into this very fascinating field.

The first chapter will give a definition of culture. In the 2nd chapter I focus on “classical” books on general cultural phenomena which come from multi-cultural therapy. Since the relationship is the core both in therapy and in supervision, the knowledge about cultural phenomena could be transferred from one to the other. This statement is supported by many authors like Gilbert & Evans (2000), Martinez & Holloway (1997), or Lago & Thompson (1996). In the 3rd chapter I will review results of empirical research on the effects of cultural differences in supervision. The 4th chapter will give a critical evaluation on how cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee enter developmental and integrative models of supervision. My review is completed with the 5th chapter on depth psychological concepts regarding multi-cultural supervision. My essay concludes with ideas and suggestions on how to use cultural differences creatively in order to put multi-cultural supervision creatively forward.

1.) Definition of culture

The following definition of culture seems to represent well most of the existing definitions of culture. According to that *culture* is a dynamic concept which “refers to milieu, the process of living and the system of values and practices shared by particular groups of people” (Acharyya, 2000:78). In contrast *race* belongs to ethnicity as a static concept of physical appearance (Acharyya, 2000:78 & Adams, 1996:9). But since racism is the worst form of cultural discrimination the concept of racism will naturally enter my review.

2.) Cultural phenomena in therapeutic communications

An excellent overview of cultural phenomena in therapy can be found in the books: “Counselling the culturally different” by Sue & Sue (1990), “Intercultural Therapy” by Kareem & Littlewood (1992), “Counselling and Psychotherapy, A Multicultural Perspective” by Ivey, Ivey & Simek-Morgan (1993) and “Race, Culture and Counselling” by Lago & Thompson (1996). From these books we learn about cultural barriers and different communication styles. From the variety of frameworks and models I want to point out the following:

Hall’s(1976a) concept of “cultural literacy”:

This concept includes the following 5 categories of difference between cultures:

a.) **SPACE :**

Hall divides this category into five subsections. The first subsection is the “interpersonal space”, (as the space between two people with which they feel comfortable). Hall identified four personal distance zones characteristic of the US. These are “intimate “(contact up to 18 inches),” personal” (from 1.5 feet to 4 feet), “social “(from 4 to 12 feet) and “public” (greater than 12 feet) (Hall, 1976a). The “olfactory space” (as the container of the sense of smell of the other person) is another subsection of his category “space”. The others

are “thermal space” (as “the experience of space” (Lago and Thompson 1996, 2000:42), “visual space” (as the visual space we gather and convey information) and “sociofugal and sociopetal space” (as the space we design and arrange, for example the way in which cultures use furniture arrangements and room designs, that enhance or inhibit interactions between people).

b.) TIME

Again this major category is divided into other categories, actually into two broad categories “monochronic” and “polychronic” time. Monochronic relates to the dominant world view of the 24-hour day as the only time system for measurement. In contrast polychronic time relates to a world view of the existence of various time schedules for various things and persons related to the individual’s own experience. Hall cites the Hopi Indians in the United States as an example of a culture practicing polychronic time.

As Lago & Thompson (2000:43) state, the subdivisions of monochronic time “could have enormous implications for the relationships between counsellors and culturally different clients”. These subdivisions are : the appointment times , the acquaintance time, the discussion time, the visiting time and the creation of time schedules per se. Our cultural upbringing , our cultural Do’s and Don’ts determine when we come for an appointment, how long we need to feel acquainted, how long we discuss, how long we visit somebody and transposing this into the supervisory and therapeutic session how long we would meet.

c.) VERBAL BEHAVIOUR

(as for instance the perceived loudness of the voice) Here I want to mention Hall’s (1976a) concept of “extension transference”. This concept focuses on the aspect of language as an extension, of what emotionally or somatically happened. Maw (1980) impressively showed that the translation of these extensions are culturally determined. He gives the example of African GP’s who (unlike their English colleagues)were able to translate the stomach-ache of african patients as anxiety/depression.

d.) NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOUR

Here Hall mentions “kinesics” as gestures, “oculesics” as the use or avoidance of eye-to-eye contact and “haptics” as culturally determined patterns of how and how often people touch each other.

e.) CONTEXT

(with low and high context). We find this category in Lago & Thompson (1996:44) and in Sue & Sue (1990:58). In low context (LC) communication words carry all the meaning. In high context (HC) communication the non-verbal channels are at least as reliable if not more as the words. Sue & Sue add that “it appears that the United States is a LC culture (although it is still higher than the Swiss, Germans and Scandinavians in the amount of contexting required). China, perhaps represents the other end of the continuum where its complex culture relies heavily on context. Asian, Americans, Blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, and other minority groups in the United States also emphasize HC cues” (Sue & Sue 1990:58).

Later on in this chapter I will also review Sue & Sue’s frameworks of “communication styles” and “dimensions of world views”. Like Hall (Hall 1976a), Sue & Sue (1990) focus on verbal and non-verbal behaviour as categories ,in their case as styles and dimensions, in which cultures differ. Sue & Sue’s framework provide us with more detailed information and very good examples from their rich experiences. The next model of cultural phenomena and cultural differences I want to outline in this chapter is the work by Geert Hofstede.

The work of Hofstede (1980):

Hofstede (1980) understood culture as “the collective mental programming of a people in an environment” (p.45). His interest was to find the dimensions of this cultural conditioning, in other words how cultures differ. Through his research he tried to determine empirically these main criteria. 116,000 questionnaires were sent to employees of one large US-based multinational corporation in 40 countries around the globe. Hofstede found 4 dimensions, which are:

- a) **power distance**. This dimension indicates the extent to which a society accepts the fact that there are individual and institutional differences in power. Individuals coming from a culture with a small power distance would favour the value “all should have equal rights”. In contrast people with a large power distance would favour the belief “power holders are entitled to privileges”.

- b) **uncertainty avoidance.** The two poles of this dimension differ in the way the society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations, deviant ideas and behaviours. Statements of weak uncertainty avoidance are “the uncertainty inherent in life is more easily accepted and each day is taken as it comes” and “the accent is on relativism, empiricism” (Hofstede, 1980). In contrast statements of the strong uncertainty avoidance are “the uncertainty inherent in life is felt as a continuous threat that must be fought” and “ the search is for ultimate, absolute truths and values” (Hofstede, 1980).
- c) **individualism–collectivism.** This dimension encompasses these two opposite social frameworks. These are characterized by “I consciousness holds sway” for the individualism and “we consciousness holds sway” for the collectivism.
- d) **masculinity-femininity.** Measurements in terms of this dimension express the extent to which the dominant values in society are masculine or feminine. Masculine in this context stands for assertiveness and approve of the acquisition of money and things. Feminine in this context stands for caring for others and showing concern for the quality of life or people.

From his findings Hofstede (1980) developed various graphs showing the relative location of different cultures as nations along the above-mentioned dimensions. Lago & Thompson (1996, 2000:50) state that these findings should find their way into multi-cultural therapy. “The graphic representation of culturally determined values that depict the relative positions between one culture and another, provide a unique and readily accessible mechanism for hypothesizing the potential value differences that lie between the counselor and their client.”

The iceberg conception of the nature of culture:

This concept (American Field Services in Lago & Thompson, 1996) reminds us of the more or less aware aspects of culture like “ways of establishing rapport” and “perceptions of professionalism” or attitude towards words” (Lago & Thompson, 1996:51)

Sue & Sue’s frameworks of “communication styles” and “dimensions of world views”(Sue & Sue, 1990)

Sue & Sue (1990) define communication styles as the social rhythms, “the factors that go beyond the content of what is said” (p.52). They “are most strongly manifested in nonverbal communication” (p.52). Sue & Sue provide us with good examples of how culture may influence the areas of nonverbal communication. These are:

- a) **proxemics.** Similar to Hall’s (1980) first category of space this area refers to the perception and use of personal and interpersonal space. Sue & Sue (1990) demonstrate that a certain distance between counselor and client could be regarded as coldness, or a desire not to communicate, or even as a sign of superiority depending on the cultures of the counselor and the client.
- b) **Kinesics.** Sue & Sue (1990) use this term “to refer to bodily movements” like “facial expression, posture, characteristics of movement, gestures, and eye contact”(p.54)
- c) **Paralanguage.** With this Sue & Sue (1990) refer to “loudness of voice, pauses, silences, hesitations, rate, inflections and the like”(p.56). One good example is about how different cultures interpret the use of silence differently. In American culture, for instance, silence could be recognized as uncomfortable, whereas in Asian culture silence is traditionally a sign of respect, politeness. Sue & Sue also refer to the fact that the volume and intensity of speech are also influenced by cultural values. They add, that “a counselor working with culturally different clients would be well advised to be aware of possible misinterpretations as a function of speech volume” (Sue & Sue, 1990:57)
- d) **high-low context communication.** Sue & Sue refer to Hall’s concept of high-low context communication, to which some examples are added.

In their model of dimensions of world views Sue & Sue define world views as” how a person perceives his/her relationship to the world “ (p.137), and that they are “highly correlated with a person’s cultural upbringing and life experiences” (p.137). Sue & Sue apply the two psychological concepts of the Locus of Control by J. Rotter (1966) and of the Locus of Responsibility by Jones et al. (1972) to the field of cultural world views. These two psychological orientations are used as axis for a graph, in which the various cultures could be distributed to.

Perelberg's(2000) conceptual framework:

To the culture and the actual behaviour there is social structure, social organisation, family maps and patterns of interaction added. These are all functions of the culture and are different in their abstraction. As example the family map includes the way in which wife and husband, parent and children, family and friends and relatives relate with each other dependent on their culture. Perelberg, herself a family therapist, states that this concept of the family map is "important in the encounter between therapists and any family they deal with. The included four case studies demonstrate that when dealing with the "exotic one is reminded that the rules of everyday life which are taken for granted are not, in fact, a given part of the natural world, but are the product of a specific culture. With this model differences within cultures and not only between cultures could be focused on.

These frameworks and models provide us with general information about cultural differences.

However, their application to a concrete therapeutic/supervisory relationship is problematic. The authors are very aware of this danger as they state that the reader should not "overgeneralize" (Sue & Sue, 1990:28) or use these frameworks as "recipes" (Lago & Thompson, 1996:xix, Rapp, 1999:4). Uncritically applied, this knowledge of cultural phenomena acts as a filter in the communication between therapist and client or supervisor and supervisee. In such a case a person will get reduced to and imprisoned in a mere cultural stereotype and the other knows better how he should behave. In contrast Gordon (1996) states that "the culture is in the whole of a person's being" (p.201). Another critical issue is the tendency to focus mainly on the client and his/her culture. The therapist/supervisor as a cultural being together with the implications for his work does not get focused much. Ivey, Ivey & Simek-Morgan's (1993) exercise in Cultural Awareness is a counter-example. Their questionnaire is quite similar to that presented by Tuckwell (2002) at the Open Seminar on "Cross-Cultural Awareness in Supervision" as part of the post-graduate Certificate Course in the Supervision of Counselors at the University of Birmingham. The participants were asked to present themselves in terms of their cultural and racial identity by answering the following questions regarding heritage, significant people, places and so on: "Where were you born and where did you spend your childhood? What are the significant people, places and/or events which define your cultural identity? When you were growing up, what messages were you given about Black/White? What do you most like or dislike about being Black/White? How has being Black/White been helpful or unhelpful in your life? What experiences have you had that help or hinder you in understanding people from other cultural or racial groups?"

I have concentrated on general cultural phenomena first, which could be relevant both in therapy and in supervision. Now I want to look more closely at cultural issues which are more specific in cross-cultural/multi-cultural supervision. I want to begin with a review of the empirical work.

3.) Research on cross-cultural supervision

Leong & Wagner (1994) in their review "Cross-Cultural Counseling Supervision: What Do we know; What do we need to know?" complain about the lack of research in this area. They only found 3 relevant studies, which lead them to the conclusion, that "very little" was known. (p.128). I want to go one step further, that these studies actually reveal nothing relevant about cross- or multi-cultural issues in supervision.

The first study by Vander Kolk (1974) found racial differences influence the supervisee's anticipation of the supervisory relationship. "Black students expected their supervisors to be less empathic, respectful, and congruent than their White counterparts" (Leong & Wagner, 1994:127). This demonstrates that racism is a part of the world of these students back in 1994 which they bring as expectations to their supervisor. But what does it say about cultural differences? Probably, that experienced racism is part of their cultural expectations?

The second study by Cook & Helms (1988) reveals that "in terms of racial group differences Blacks, Hispanic and Native Americans perceived lower levels of supervisor liking than Asian Americans." (Leong & Wagner:127) Here the focus again is on race, again culture is reduced to the static concept of race as a physical appearance. Furthermore, both studies show major empirical limitations (for instance small sample size, in the second study no white supervisees).

The third study by Hilton, Russell & Salmi (in press) could not find differences in supervision effectiveness and relationship related to the factor of race. The empirical set-up of this study with 60 white supervisees, 3 white role-play clients and 3 white and 3 black supervisors is hopelessly inadequate to test anything. The situation is much better in the following two more recent qualitative studies.

With their Case Study Daniels, Andrea & Kim (1999) give an impressive example on how culture could be a barrier in supervision. The supervision between an European American supervisor and an Asian American

supervisee led to differences in their interpersonal style (directness versus confrontational), counseling goals (the degree of goal orientedness) and perceptions of the roles of the supervisor and supervisee in the supervision process (as supervisor versus supervisee-focused).

In another non-quantitative study Hird et.al. (2001) published their personal and professional experiences as supervisees in multi-cultural supervision. A brief overview of their cultural backgrounds is added at the end of the study. The text contains more negative (to the extreme of silencing the supervisee) than positive experiences (a supervisor being motivated to understand the supervisee's "self-in-the-world" (Hird et.al, 2001:118) . While empirical research provide us with observational data, it is necessary to embed those into a theoretical framework of multi-cultural supervision.

4.) Models of multi-cultural/cross-cultural supervision

Cultural phenomena will appear in the supervision, but will there be trained supervisors and supervisees recognizing and addressing them? The studies by Thompson (1991) and Constantine (1997) do not lead to positive expectations. Thompson denounced the lack of formal teaching in multi-cultural supervision in the UK at that time and Constantine's study showed that 70% of the supervisors taking part in their study had not received any such training. With Carroll (1996) I agree that supervisors need to develop themselves into multi-cultural supervisors and the same accounts for the supervisees. There are quite a few developmental or stage models focusing mainly on the supervisee (for instance Carney & Kahn, 1984) or on the supervisor (for instance Priest, 1994) . Both models are able to give some guidelines about how to interpret and classify the actual supervisors' or supervisees' behaviour and attitude into different stages of multi-cultural competence. In general it is agreed in the literature that the cultural awareness of the supervisor and the supervisee is the main important motor for good multi-cultural supervision. In this respect I want to add that there are various scales available to assess this cultural awareness, like the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (MAKSS, D'Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991) or the CCCI-R the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (LaFromboise, Coleman & Hernandez, 1991). The model of Cook (1994) applied Helms' (1993) theory of racial identity to supervision. Like Ladany (1997) he thought about how different stages of the supervisor and supervisee in their racial identity awareness could influence the supervisory process. I expect that the same accounts for different stages in cultural awareness. So far supervisor and supervisee can be measured in their cultural awareness. In a clear survey Carroll (1995:38) lists the various supervisee stages and the responses of the supervisor to advance further awareness. I expect that these models are quite hard to put into practice for the case of group supervision. A supervisor with a group of supervisees having various stages of multicultural awareness will be quite challenged. In my multi-cultural supervision group I sometimes experienced not to be understood by my peers in my comments. But my supervisor herself having come to the UK from a different country was always able to understand my way of thinking (and speaking) and to translate it to the others.

In the literature it is mainly agreed that these cultural differences should be addressed and assessed *early* in the supervisory relationship. A different opinion is presented by Gordon (1996) and Adams (1996). Both authors coming from different backgrounds point out the side-effects of focusing cultural differences in the therapeutic/ supervisory relationship. Adams (1996) stated that by doing so we remind the other "of a certain epidermal pigmentation" (p.167) or with Gordon (1996) we see only the race and "may be blinded to other aspects of her" (the client) (p.203). Gordon's (1996) main argument is that we all are different anyhow. Focussing on differences may again reduce the other to a cultural stereotype. In an extreme this could lead to see the other radically different disabling a real cross-cultural dialogue. On the other extreme by not focusing on the cultural differences the client or supervisee does not get the space and the opportunity to express their personal and professional experiences of being cultural different. In Kareem & Littlewood (2000:152) we find a good example. A client dropped out of therapy because his experiences of racial oppression on the way to his session were of no importance to the therapist. From my own experience it can be shameful to share negative experiences with the cultural different as this is so shameful. As an observer in a triade work at the supervision course I experienced that the lecturer entering the room silenced the supervisee to continue to air her stereotypes about a cultural different client.

As the next type of models I want to focus on integrative models of multi-cultural supervision. "Integrative" so far as they try to integrate the phenomena of culture into their models.

The 4-dimensional model of the "Systems Approach to Supervision" by Martinez & Holloway (1997) consists of 4 context factors (supervisor, supervisee, client and institution). The supervision tasks and functions create the so called "process matrix". Every cell of this matrix could be looked at in combination with the

factors of supervision relationship as contract, phase and structure. Cultural characteristics are included in the supervisor's and the supervisee's context factors. This model is a cultural up-date of the already existing model of Holloway (1995). My critique here is as follows: The existing cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee should find their way into the various cells of the process matrix. Besides this critical remark it is positive how the authors focus on the importance of empowering and involving the supervisee in the supervisory relationship. Their case study also gives a good example on how previous negative cultural experiences of the supervisee enter the supervisory working alliance. In this case, the supervisor was hispanic and one of her hispanic-american supervisees had lived in Latin cultures and had had negative experiences there. Through consultation the supervisor became more aware of how these negative experiences must have entered the supervisory relationship. The consultation also encouraged the supervisor to self-disclose her own personal experiences with latin culture so as to empower and encourage this supervisee to share her own experiences.

Hawkins & Shohet (2000) also have included the phenomena of culture into their new edition of their model of the 7-eyed supervisor (Hawkins & Shohet, 1986).

Let me introduce the old edition of this model first: As Hawkins & Shohet state, "we have not confined ourselves to one approach, but rather presented the various choices and issues that each supervisor needs to consider in the process of establishing a personal style of supervising." (Hawkins & Shohet, 1986:155) This model provides the supervisor and the supervisee with seven possible foci for supervision. These seven foci or modes are:

1. "The content of the supervision session" (or the client as one of the two matrixes of the model),
2. "Focusing on strategies and interventions",
3. "Focusing on the therapy relationship",
4. "Focusing on the therapist's process",
5. "Focusing on the supervisory relationship",
6. "Focusing on supervisor's own process",
7. "Focusing on the wider context".

(Hawkins & Shohet, 2000:68-87).

In their above mentioned book these seven foci of the supervision process are described very clearly and easy to understand. Overall, it is remarkable, how Hawkins & Shohet enrich the main methods from classical psychoanalytical supervision with other existing psychotherapeutic theories and effective methods. These seven modes could also be seen as a mind map of seven different areas in which the supervisor and the supervisee could look for the missing client. In their Process Model of Supervision transference/countertransference and parallel process are embedded by the supervisory relationship. From this relationship Hawkins & Shohet expect that "you are staying in an adult-to-adult relationship (as far as possible) rather than working through the transference" (Hawkins & Shohet, 1986:83). They agree with Hunt, when she says „, it seems that whatever approach or method is used in the end it is the quality of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee that determines whether supervision is effective or not.“ (Hunt, 1986).

Hawkins & Shohet (2000) also have included the phenomena of culture into their new edition of their model of the 7-eyed supervisor (Hawkins & Shohet, 1986). In all of their 7 eyes as foci of supervision the supervisor and the supervisee could improve their multi-cultural awareness. Unfortunately this model does not go into detail about how the different cultural background loads the transferences/countertransferences of the supervisor and the supervisee. My experience with different cultural ways of eye-contact loaded my countertransference in a drastic way. Now, that I understand more and more that there are differences I feel more encouraged to air my counter-transference or to focus on the cultural/personal background. After all the 7-eyed supervision model of Hawkins & Shohet (2000) is a clear and easily comprehensible framework. Being less complex than the model of Martinez & Holloway (1997) it provides us with 7 foci to look for the phenomena of culture in supervision.

Before ending this chapter I want to add a few other interesting concepts, which focus on different areas of the supervisory process in which cultural differences could play a role. The "tooling up" concept of Rapp (1999) especially focuses on culturally different learning styles and information processing strategies. This tooling up Process consists of four steps:

1. To give interest and attention to the details of intersubjective communication
2. To attune to the Other. Here, Rapp (1999) uses Kagan's (1995) technique of "Interpersonal Process Recall". Using this technique Rapp asks their supervisees to bring audio or video tapes. Then the supervisor will ask the supervisee to stop the tape, where she/he wishes to initiate a discussion. As Gilbert states "such a process recall is likely to bring to the surface the psychotherapist's countertransference... his thoughts..." (Gilbert 2000:79). This method also gets mentioned by Hawkins & Shohet in their model. As Gilbert states "this (IPR) offers a possible interface between the two traditions (psychoanalytical and person-centred)" (Gilbert, 2000:79). For Rapp this process recall is a "useful tool for ladder-ing the supervision process, from becoming aware of feelings to unpacking assumptions" (Rapp in King & Wheeler, 2001:148), especially for critical choice points in the supervisee's work. Rapp (1999) states, that "hesitations and silences, broken eye contact, shifts in posture, changes in the tone of voice and such like, are in fact the signs which alert us that something has changed in the emotional flow between ourselves and the other" (p.10).
3. To match perceptual and cultural styles. As Rapp (1999) states, "the matches and mismatches between the visual, auditory or kinaesthetic information processing strategies of participants has profound effects on the relationship between therapist and client as well as on the therapeutic task" (p.10) And of course this is "equally true of supervision" (p.10)
4. To manage complexity and contracting as the last of the four steps to "tool up".

Based on the existing "model of integration" for the "Integrative Therapy" Petzold et al. developed the "Integrative Supervision" as taught at the Fritz Perls Institute. It is "integrative" as various relevant theories regarding supervision and psychotherapy are used as alternating interpretation transparencies ("Interpretationsfolien", Petzold 1995). In my opinion this multiperspectivity ("Mehrperspektivität") is one of the main strengths of this model. The more important one is the atmospheric (atmosphärisch) and scenic (szenisch) (Petzold, 1993a) recognition and understanding which is required to practice multiperspectivity. For me the most important characteristic of this approach lies in its use of creative media in psychotherapy and supervision. I will come back to this later in chapter 6, about creative uses of the cultural difference.

Dennis (2001) in her integrative approach also includes thoughts about what the supervisor and the supervisee regard as normal behaviour depending on their cultural background. The diagnose and the therapy goals will also be effected by this.

Another interesting area is how different psychotherapy theoretical approaches incorporate culture. Culturally different supervisor and supervisee also come with different theoretical concepts of culture. They both have experiences in their own personal therapy how or how not their heritage, their cultural milieu and values, rituals had a space there. The supervisor and the supervisee have to be aware of not only purely cultural barriers but also theoretical barriers. In a classical psychoanalytical supervision group I experienced that the concept of culture was of no importance at all. The supervisees and the clients came with different cultural backgrounds but it was never focused.

So far we have focused on literature based on a *more* cognitive approach (except Hawkins & Shohet 2001, whose model includes transference and countertransference phenomena and Martinez & Holloway (1997), who aim to involve their supervisees on a personal level.). In the next chapter I will complete the overview by depth psychological concepts.

5.) Depth psychological thoughts to multi-cultural supervision

Rustin (1991) points out that racism is not about conscious beliefs, but about unconscious projections. Again, the phenomena of racism play a role in becoming culturally aware. My next question is then: Can these unconscious projections be addressed by frameworks, models and questionnaires? From early research in Social Psychology it is known that mere transmission of knowledge can act counterproductively as a sort of "vaccination" against the intended change in/of attitude (McGuire 1980). I agree with Wheeler & Izzard (1997) that a "therapeutic space" is needed, in which "free association is encouraged and unconscious processes can evolve, leading it is hoped to a more profound experience" (p.412). Wheeler & Izzard (1997) are talking about finding ways of integrating differences in psychodynamic counsellor training. In my opinion the same accounts for cultural differences in supervision. It is easy to focus on cultural barriers in communication or on different learning styles. The real challenge is to provide a safe space in which the supervisor and the supervisee feel safe enough to face their cultural stereotypes and projections. Lago & Thompson (1997) show with their model of "proxy-self" in supervision how it is likely that supervisor and supervisee communicate with a "presentable face" if they do not feel safe enough (p.124,126). From a depth psycho-

logical perspective a confrontation on a deeper level should be included in multi-cultural supervision. In the next chapter I want to focus on relevant creative interventions.

6.) Creative uses of the cultural difference

The relevant literature does provide us with some good examples of how to use the cultural differences in a creative way.. The questionnaire presented by Tuckwell (2002) at the Open Seminar on “Cross-Cultural Awareness in Supervision” is a good example. For example, for one group member the confrontation with these questions had the impact of recalling a forgotten past memory related to cultural issues. These experiences did not emerge in her personal therapy. Another example is the name game by Preli & Bernard (1993). The members of a supervision group were asked to introduce themselves only by their name and ethnicity. The subsequent discussion focused on the feelings involved .

As I mentioned earlier on, I experienced excellent supervision during my psychotherapeutic work in Germany. The Integrative Supervision provides a multiperspectivity to reflect on my clients but also a multiplicity of creative media which are used. I am choosing the following example from my own experience as a supervisee:

At the time I worked in a psychodynamic/psychosomatic clinic in Germany. I was in psychotherapeutic training at the Fritz Perls Institute in Integrative Gestaltpsychotherapy. I had to be in supervision with a supervisor accepted by this Institute. So for some months, I was fortunate to have two different supervisions, one classical psychoanalytical Balint group at the clinic and an Integrative Gestalt Single Supervision. Working in such a clinic was quite tricky. Tricky in the sense, that some of the clients with psychosomatic symptoms were not motivated to see a psychotherapist. To them psychosomatic illnesses was stereotyped as madness and who wants to be mad? In my work there I was confronted with clients who cancelled their appointment after the first session. Or they did not even want to enter my room in the first place. Through role play the Integrative supervisor and I focussed on my and my client’s behaviour. We agreed that my supervisor would play one of these unmotivated clients and that I would show my typical approach towards such a client. After that we changed roles, so that I would be the client and he mirrored my previous behaviour as the therapist. In this second setting I was shocked to see how insecure I must have appeared to my client. I could also feel now that underneath the client’s visible anger I as the client also felt frightened being in his role . I then realized how my insecure behaviour as a therapist must have increased the existing fears of my client to the unknow horrors of psychotherapeutic treatment. After that supervision I was able to be more active, more informative towards my clients. I explained to them about psychosomatic medicine first, and then started my sessions as usual. Doing that I had more and more clients attending and staying in therapy . In other supervisory sessions I drew a picture of the conflicts or impasses with my clients on a piece of paper. Other creative methods were voice work, movement, and to use the gestalt intervention of the empty chair. I found that enriching and a lively, colourful way of reflecting on my client by using all these creative methods. Funnily enough I found a very similar example in the related literature, in which role play was used (Schreyögg, 2000:375). Using the method of mirroring the behaviour of the therapist made clear, why his clients disappeared. These are examples for “dramatising”(Dramatisierung), “role reversal” (Rollentausch) as creative techniques used in Integrative Supervision at the Fritz Perls Institute. Looking at relevant English literature, there are many examples of working creatively in supervision, for instance in Hawkins & Shohet , Feltham & Dryden and Inskipp & Proctor. The latter give a good overview of the various creative methods in supervision (Inskipp & Proctor, 1995: 146-49).

Another creative technique used in Integrative Supervision (Fritz Perls Institute) is the “sculpturing” (“Skulpturierung”) (Petzold, 1993a:1314). This is a very good technique I use now with my supervisees. I ask my supervisee to sit in the “empty chair” and to attain the client’s posture as detailed as possible. In a sense, the supervisee’s body becomes the body of the client. This technique was developed in Integrative Supervision in order to help the supervisee to be aware of all the non-verbal aspects the client’s body carries with him. The supervisee and the supervisor can then focus on cultural dimensions of these non-verbal aspects.

What other ways do I consider in which the difference may be used creatively? I thought about the following exercises:

As a supervisor I would ask my supervisees to imagine having to communicate in a foreign language (or non-verbal). First I would ask them to be *motivated* to understand the other talking in a foreign language. For the second part I would advise them *not to be motivated* to understand. The following encounter would focus on the questions: how did you experience trying to understand and the opposite of not being motivated to understand. The focus on the feelings being involved might lead to the emergence of scenes from the past of not being understood and how that could get in the way in the Here and Now. With a colleague of mine I experienced that even before saying something he looks at me as if he already would not understand.

Another exercise would be to ask the supervisee to draw a picture of her/his culture inside. Indeed this would be a bit similar to questionnaires, but using this creative medium it could reveal more unstructured, unconscious material related to the supervisee's culture.

Outlook and conclusion

To practice multi-cultural supervision creatively means to enable experiences of the other to emerge. However, it is clear that supervision cannot be a substitute for therapy as the ideal safe place for this.

When we talk about cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee we say that one of them is bi-cultural: the culture of the heritage and the culture of the actual social world mix in one person. My own experience of becoming bi-cultural somehow forced me to a new cultural identity. The paper of Sapriel and Palumbo (2001) is a good example of how these two authors were able to understand their culture and its implications for their therapeutic work. Lolita Sapriel and Dennis Palumbo present their personal history as their way into bi-lingualism and bi-culturism. In their added clinical vignettes we learn how their cultural context including their "Organisation Principles" (Sapriel and Palumbo, 2001) is one of the contexts to find meaning with their clients. Sapriel and Palumbo illustrated "how cultural biases and specific familial dynamics can join in influencing both therapist's and client's organisation of experience, and the always present danger that the therapist's assumptions about the patient (either of perceived social/cultural similarity or dissimilarity) can obscure the appreciation and investigations of the patient's personal universe" (p.95). They conclude that both "Gestalt therapy and intersubjectivity theory (a relational, psychoanalytic theory) are viewed as being ideally suited for cross-cultural application as they reject the notion of only 'one truth', are contextual and field-theory based, and respect the phenomenology of subjective experience" (p.86). This paper also confronts us with the existence of female and male cultural subworlds within a culture. The complexity of culture in its vitality within a person will have to be understood in relation to many other factors like social status, gender etc.

A German expression says that it is better to stand on both legs. I want to apply this to the field of cultural differences in supervision. The transmission of knowledge is a good leg to stand on. But it also needs emotional confrontation leading to experiences and awareness.

Bibliography

Acharyya, S. (2000). 'The Doctor's Dilemma: The Practice of Cultural Psychiatry in Multicultural Britain' in Intercultural Therapy: Themes, Interpretations and Practices, Kareem, J. & Littlewood, R., Oxford: Blackwell Scientific

Adams, M.V. (1996). The Multicultural Imagination: "Race", Color, and the Unconscious, London: Routledge

American Field Services Orientation Handbook Resource. AFS Intercultural/International Programmes, Equality quoted in Lago, C. & Thompson, J. (1996) Race, Culture and Counselling, Buckingham: Open University Press

Buber, M. (1973). Das dialogische Prinzip. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider.

Carney, C.G., Kahn, K.B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view', The Counseling Psychologist, 12 (1), 111-119

Carroll, M. (1996). Counselling Supervision Theory, Skills and Practice, London: Cassell

Constantine, M.G. (1997). Facilitating Multicultural Competency in Counseling Supervision. In: Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training and supervision, Pope-Davies, D.B. & Coleman, H.L.K. (eds.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Cook, D.A. (1994). 'Racial Identity in Supervision', Counselor Education and Supervision, 34, 132-141
- 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
- D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., Heck, R. (1991)' Evaluation the impact of multicultural counseling training', Journal of Counseling & Development,70,143-150
- Daniels, J., d'Andrea, M. Kim, BSK (1999)'Assessing the Barriers and Changes of Cross-Cultural Supervision: A case study', Counselor Education and Supervision, 38, 191-204
- Dennis, M.(2001)' An Integrative Approach to 'Race' and Culture in Supervision 'in. Integrative Approaches to Supervision ,Carroll, M. & Tholstrup, M (eds.) , London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Feltham, C., Dryden, W. (1994) Developing Counsellor Supervision, London: Sage
- Gilbert, M., Evans, K. (2000) Psychotherapy supervision,an integrative relational approach to psychotherapy supervision, Buckingham: Open University Press
- Gordon, P. (1996) 'A fear of difference? Some reservations about intercultural therapy', International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 73:1:195-207
- Hawkins & Shohet (1986 and 2000). Supervision in the Helping Profession, Buckingham: Open University Press
- Helms, J.E. (1993)Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice, Westport,CT:Praeger
- Hilton, D.B., Russell, R.K., Salmi, S.W. (in press) 'The effects of supervisor's race and level of support on perceptions of supervision', Journal of Counseling & Development
- Hird, J., Cavalieri, C.E., Dulko, J.P., Felice, A.A.D., Ho,T.A. (2001) 'Visions and Realities: Supervisee Perspective of Multicultural Supervision', Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, Vol.29, 114-130
- Holloway, E. (1995) Clinical Supervision, A Systems Approach. London:Sage
- Inskipp, F. & Proctor,B. (1995) Making the most of Supervision. Twickenham: Cascade
- Ivey, A.E., Ivey, M. & Simek-Morgan, L. (1993) Counselling and Psychotherapy: A Multicultural Perspective, Boston: MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Kagan, N.L. and Kagan, H. (1990)' IPR-validated model for the 1990s and beyond', The Counselling Psychologist, 18: 436-440
- Kareem, J. & Littlewood, R. (2000) Intercultural Therapy: Themes, Interpretations and Practices, Oxford: Blackwell Scientific
- King, D. & Wheeler, S.(1995)'The responsibilities of counsellor supervisors: a qualitative study', British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, Vol.27, No.2
- LaFromboise, T.D., Coleman, H.L.K., & Hernandez, A. (1991)' Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised', Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22,380-388
- Ladany, N.D.,Brittan-Powell, C.S., 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, 284-304
- Lago, C. & Thompson, J. (1996,2000) Race, Culture and Counselling. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Lago, C. & Thompson, J. (1997) 'The Triangle with Curved Sides: Sensitivity to issues of race and culture in supervision' in Supervision of Psychotherapy and Counseling: Making a place to think,Shipton,G., Buckingham: Open University Press

- Leong, F.T. & Wagner, N.S.(1994) 'Cross-Cultural Counselling Supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know?', Counselor Education and Supervision , Vol. 34, 117-130
- Martinez, R.P., Holloway, E.L.(1997) 'The Supervision Relationship in Multicultural Training' in Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education and training and supervision, Pope-Davies, D.B. & Coleman, H.L.K. (eds.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Maw, J.(1980) Lecture on the experience of African students in the United Kingdom, University of London, June, Equality quoted in Lago, C. & Thompson, J. (1996) Race, Culture and Counselling, Buckingham: Open University Press
- McGuire, W.J. (1978)'The communication/persuasion matrix' in Evaluating advertising: a bibliography of the communication process, Lipstein, B. & McGuire, W.J.(eds.), New York: Advertising Research Foundation. Pp
- Orth, I.(2001)'Integrative Therapie: Das "biopsychosoziale Modell kritischer Humantherapie und Kulturarbeit – ein "lifespan developmental approach"" in Integrative Therapie. Das "biopsychosoziale" Modell kritischer Humantherapie und Kulturarbeit. Ein "lifespan developmental approach". Theorie, Praxis, Wirksamkeit , Jubiläumsausgabe zum 25jährigen Bestehen der Zeitschrift "Integrative Therapie", Petzold, H., Paderborn: Junfermann Verlag
- Perelberg, R.J.(2000) 'Familiar and Unfamiliar Types of Family Structure: Towards a Conceptual Framework' in Intercultural Therapy: Themes, Interpretations and Practices, Kareem, J. & Littlewood, R., Oxford: Blackwell Scientific
- Petzold, H.(1993) Integrative Therapie, Modelle, Konzepte und Theorien einer schulenübergreifenden Psychotherapie, ausgewählte Schriften, Bd. 2, Paderborn, Junfermann
- Petzold, H.(1995) 'Mehrperspektivität – ein Metakonzept für Modellpluralität, konnektivierende Theoriebildung und sozialinterventives Handeln in der Integrativen Supervision.' Gestalt und Integration 1/95, S. 225-297
- Rapp, H. (1999)'Working with Difference : Culturally Competent Supervision' in Taking Supervision Forward, Lawton, B. & Feltham, C., London: Sage
- Rustin, M. (1991) The Good Society and the Inner World, London, New York: Verso
- Sapriel, L. & Palumbo, D (2001). 'Psyche and Culture: An exercise in Peer Supervision' , British Gestalt Journal, Vol. 10, No.2, 86-96
- Schreyögg, A.(1991,2000) Supervision. Ein Integratives Modell. Lehrbuch zu Theorie & Praxis, Paderborn: Junfermann Verlag.
- Schuch, W.(2001)'Grundzüge eines Konzeptes und Modells Intetrativer Psychotherapie' in Integrative Therapie. Das "biopsychosoziale" Modell kritischer Humantherapie und Kulturarbeit. Ein "lifespan developmental approach". Theorie, Praxis Wirksamkeit, Jubiläumsausgabe zum 25jährigen Bestehen der Zeitschrift "Integrative Therapie", Petzold, H., Paderborn: Junfermann Verlag
- Sue, D.W., Sue, D (1990) Counseling the Culturally Different: Theory and Practice, 2nd Ed. New York: Wiley
- Thompson, J. (1991) Issues of race and culture in counseling supervision training courses. MSc thesis, Polytechnic of East London
- Tuckwell, G.(2002) Culturally and Racially Speaking, Questionnaire presented at the Open Seminar Cross-Cultural Awareness in Supervision, University of Birmingham, School of Education
- Vander Kolk, C.J. (1974)' The relationship of personality, values and race to anticipation of the supervisory relationship', Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 18(1),41-46
- Wheeler, S. & Izzard, S. (1997) 'Psychodynamic Counsellor Training–Integrating Difference', Psychodynamic Counselling, 3:4, 401-417
- Yontef, G. (1993) Awareness, Dialogue and Process. Essays on Gestalt Therapy, Highland NY: Gestalt Journal Press.