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ABSTRACT

This conceptual article presents an application of the integrative developmental model (IDM) as a framework for supervising Asian international counseling students in the United States. Asian international supervisees’ characteristics and needs on four developmental levels and corresponding supervision interventions are discussed. Implications for clinical supervision, counselor education, and research are provided.
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Consistent with the growing enrollment of international students in the United States (U.S.), more international students have been majoring in counseling and related fields over the past decade (Mori, Inman, & Caskie, 2009). The recruitment of international students in counseling-related programs promotes a positive learning experience, as they contribute to the diversity of counselor-preparatory programs through cross-cultural
interactions in the classroom and beyond (Ng & Smith, 2009). However, international counseling students whose first language is other than English and whose culture of origin is vastly distinct from the U.S. are more likely to experience difficulties due to language and cultural differences (Nilsson & Anderson, 2004), thereby entailing additional efforts by counselor educators and supervisors in response to international students’ needs. International students from Confucianism-influenced countries (e.g., China, Korea, Japan, and Singapore) have communication patterns and interpersonal relationships (Yum, 2011) that are strikingly divergent from the typical U.S. student. These divergences are critical in supervisory and therapeutic relationships. In view of the step-by-step guidance that the integrative developmental model (IDM; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) can provide, this conceptual article proposes an application of the IDM for supervising Asian international counseling students, with an emphasis on those from Confucian societies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

International Students in U.S. Counseling and Related Programs

International students represent a significant percentage of the overall counseling student population (Ng, 2006a; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). Approximately 5% of the students in psychology doctoral programs are international students (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 1997). Forrest (2010) reported that in 2007, 8.2% of students in counseling psychology programs accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) were international students, and international doctoral students accounted for 8% of the total number of students in APA-accredited programs (Norcross, Evans, & Ellis 2010). Specific to programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), Ng (2006b) noted that international students were present in 41% of the student population across the 178 CACREP-accredited counseling programs. In addition, 24 out of the 45 CACREP-accredited doctoral programs recruited international students in 2006.

Despite the significant representation of international students in counseling and related programs, this population was inadequately studied in the existing literature. Pendse and Inman (2016) conducted a content analysis on journal articles targeting international students in counseling and
Asian International Counseling Students

Culture determines one’s orientation to construct the world and to make meaning of it. This in turn dictates one’s interpretation of social processes and interpersonal interactions (Shea & Yeh, 2008), along with one’s communication patterns (Yum, 2011). The Way of Humanity (rendao) constructed by Confucians has two aspects, ethics for ordinary people and ethics for scholars (Hwang, 2001), which provide implications when understanding Asian international supervisees’ clinical training and practice. The ethics for ordinary people upholds “the principle of Respecting the Superior for procedural justice and the principle of Favoring the Intimate for distributive justice” (p. 179); the ethics for scholars claims that people with superior positions “should play the role of decision-maker and should allocate resources by favoring intimate relationships” (p. 179). Accordingly, hierarchy and deference to authority frequently have been reported in studies of Asian supervisees (e.g., Bang, 2006; Bang & Park, 2009; Sohn, 2005). In addition, many Asian international supervisees are from countries (e.g., China, Korea, and Japan) where English is not the official language. As a result, cultural and linguistic barriers are particularly salient in supervising this population (e.g., Mori et al., 2009; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004).

Asian international counseling students frequently have been confronted with these challenges, as a high level of verbal communication and cultural competence is integral in counseling and supervision, which are relational in nature (Garrett et al., 2001; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). In addition to the counselor training that is the central area for all counseling students, Asian students, as non-English-speakers, need to simultaneously process the language switch mechanism as well (Lau & Ng, 2012). They also often encounter clients’ prejudice about their accents and the clients’ perception of their language as less professional and less trustworthy compared to English native speakers (Fuertes, Potere, & Ramirez, 2002). Finally, Asian students often have acculturation challenges as they struggle to understand Western norms (Ng, 2006a) and to adjust to the U.S. training environment (Killian, 2001).
The Critical Role of Clinical Supervision

The frequent interactions that clinical supervisors have with supervisees and the flexibility in supervisory roles (e.g., teacher, counselor, and consultant) (Bernard, 1979) allow supervisors to provide necessary individualized support and resources for international supervisees. In spite of the overall positive supervision experiences by some international students (e.g., Amanor-Boadu & Baptist, 2008), many others have reported challenges working with insensitive clinical supervisors (Mittal & Wieling, 2006; Ng & Smith, 2009), along with discomfort and nervousness in developing a supervisory relationship (Killian, 2001).

The cross-linguistic and cross-cultural status of international counseling students necessitates culturally relevant and effective supervision, which requires among other factors a strong supervisory relationship and cultural discussion (Ng, 2006a; Smith & Ng, 2009). Ng and Smith (2012) found that international student acculturation and role ambiguity significantly predicted the supervisory working alliance; in addition, training level and language use predicted students’ counseling self-efficacy. Similarly, Mori et al. (2009) identified positive predictive relationships between international supervisees’ acculturation levels and the engagement in cultural discussion with their satisfaction of the supervisory relationship. Nilsson and Dodds (2006) also highlighted the significance of cultural discussion by noting the positive correlation between cultural discussion and supervisees’ levels of satisfaction with their supervisors and their perceptions of supervisors’ multicultural sensitivity.

Asian international supervisees’ distinct needs have not received as much attention as is warranted (Mittal & Wieling, 2006; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004). The IDM is a multilayered and multidimensional model that depicts supervisees’ development from three foundational structures in eight clinical domains, which directly assists supervisors in providing multiculturally sensitive interventions. Thus, we use the IDM as a framework to guide the supervision of Asian students from Confucianism-driven cultures.

THE INTEGRATIVE DEVELOPMENTAL MODEL (IDM) OF SUPERVISING ASIAN STUDENTS

Three overriding structures underpin the IDM: motivation, autonomy, and self- and other-awareness (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Supervisees’
motivation manifests itself in their interest and investment in clinical training and practice, and is influenced by not only supervisees’ developmental levels, but by their relationships with their supervisors (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Stoltenberg and McNeill defined autonomy with its antithetical construct dependency. Supervisees’ growth tends to follow a consistent pattern in which they tend to wrestle with conflicts in their journey from dependency on authority figures (e.g., supervisors) to autonomy. The third structure, self- and other-awareness, entails supervisees’ awareness of two worlds: of their own and that of their clients’. Awareness has both cognitive and affective components.

Different cultures may uphold different views of the self, others, and the interdependence of the two, which influence, and even determine in many cases, people’s motivation, cognition, and emotion (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). When working with Asian international supervisees, supervisors should collaboratively explore how supervisees’ motivation, autonomy, and self- and other-awareness may be influenced by interpersonal harmony, self-restraint, hierarchy, and various ethics that are widely promoted in Confucian societies (Hwang, 2001; Hwang, 2009; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

It is worth noting that the three structures assist supervisors in generating assessments of supervisees’ professional growth in each of the eight clinical domains: intervention skills competence, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics; and yet, they are not used to provide an overall evaluation of supervisees’ developmental level, as commonly practiced in most other developmental models (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). For instance, Level 1 supervisees are characterized by high external motivation, high dependency, and high self-focus; Level 2 supervisees tend to experience fluctuating motivation, dependency-autonomy conflict, and high client-focus; Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees are inclined to have high internal motivation, high autonomy, and high self-awareness. Rather than a general label, the designation of Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, or Level 3i is specific to each domain. A detailed description of each level is provided below.

Extra attention is needed when the IDM is applied to supervising Asian international counseling students whose cultural and social contexts may carry an additional layer of complexity to this model. For instance, the
hierarchical social relationship widely upheld in Confucian societies may intensify the inherently defined power differential in the supervisory relationship (Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Bang & Park, 2009), which may impact Asian international supervisees’ ways of responding to supervisors’ feedback. The following section provides a discussion on how the IDM can be interpreted and enriched to meet Asian international counseling students’ supervision needs on various levels of development. The three structures are discussed under each level of supervision.

**SUPERVISING LEVEL 1 ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS**

The first underlying assumption of most developmental supervision models is that despite the presence of individual idiosyncrasies, supervisees in general tend to go through distinct stages of professional development (Chagnon & Russell, 1995; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). According to Stoltenberg and McNeill, Level 1 supervisees are characterized by extrinsic motivation, high dependency on supervisors, and elevated levels of self-focus.

**Motivation**

At the onset of a supervisory relationship, clinical supervisors can start by exploring Asian international supervisees’ motivation to study counseling in the U.S. given the foreseeable cross-cultural and cross-linguistic experiences. This initiative signifies supervisors’ willingness to open the cultural door and to walk through it with supervisees, which is “the single most powerful intervention for multicultural supervision” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2010, p. 128).

In a study of supervisees in Korea, Bang (2006) found that age and counseling experience were positively associated with motivation. This finding lent support to the overall increasing tendency of motivation in the IDM. However, Bang’s entire model (i.e., age; educational level; counseling experience; gender; and interactions of gender with age, educational level, and counseling experience, respectively) explained 26% of the variance in motivation, which was lower compared to the explained variance in self-/other-awareness (39%) and autonomy (33%). This finding warrants further investigation of factors that account for the variance in motivation for domestic Korean supervisees as well as for the Asian international supervisee population.
The motivation of Korean supervisees in Bang’s (2006) study may not fully represent Asian international supervisees’ motivation in view of their cross-national educational pursuits. Indeed, international students’ motivation to study abroad is worth exploring because it is related to students’ cultural adaptation outcomes (Chirkov, Vansteenkiste, Tao, & Lynch, 2006). In two studies of Chinese international students in Belgium and Canada, Chirkov et al. (2006) found that the more self-determined students are in their decision to study abroad, the more self-determined they are in their academic motivation as well as their subjective and psychological well-being (Chirkov et al., 2006).

Given that a multitude of international counseling students come from countries where the counseling profession is absent or emerging (Arkoff, Thaver, & Elkind, 1966; Lau & Ng, 2012), Asian international supervisees and their supervisors should jointly explore supervisees’ motivation to study counseling in the U.S. This will create a space for both supervisors and supervisees to examine the counseling profession across nations and to discuss how the U.S. education and training may advance supervisees’ career development.

**Autonomy**

Given the limited knowledge, skills, and experience in U.S. counseling contexts, Asian international supervisees may exhibit high dependence on supervisors, authority figures, and other credible sources of knowledge for guidance in professional practice, as commonly seen in novice practicum counselors-in-training (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). In order to match supervisees’ developmental level with the optimal supervisory environment, which is the second fundamental assumption of most developmental supervision models, supervisors should provide appropriate levels of guidance and structure based on supervisees’ developmental needs and cultural contexts (Chagnon & Russell, 1995; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

A role induction at the beginning of a supervisory relationship, particularly for novice counseling students, is vital in setting the tone for the ensuing supervision and helps mitigate supervisees’ uneasiness and anxiety as a result of the uncertainties generated in unfamiliar supervisory contexts (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Ellis, Hutman, & Chapin, 2015). A critical issue to address when working with Asian international supervisees is how counseling and supervision (e.g., the roles of counselor, client, supervisor,
and supervisee) are perceived by the supervisor and supervisee, respectively, and how the two constructs may be interpreted by the majority and minority ethnic groups in the U.S. (Ng & Smith, 2012).

Arkoff et al. (1966) found that Asian international students tended to view counseling or psychotherapy as a relatively directive, paternalistic, and authoritarian process, compared to their American counterparts. Yuen and Tinsley (1981) found that Chinese international students were inclined to expect counselors to be authority figures who prescribed solutions to their problems. Given a parallel process between counseling and supervision, the passive or dependent role may be transferred to clinical supervision.

The cultures that Asian international supervisees are socialized within may not only shape the way the counseling profession is conceptualized but may bring unforeseen dynamics to supervisors in assessing trainees’ developmental levels. For instance, in Confucian cultures, people are expected to show respect to those who are higher along the social hierarchy (Hwang, 2009). Counselor educators and clinical supervisors are senior members in the counseling field and thus are entitled to more power with their higher social status (Kuo, 2004). Hence, it is common to observe Asian international students deferring to (e.g., being receptive to authorities’ feedback) educators and supervisors both in and outside classrooms as this is an established cultural norm. If not examined with discretion, this deference may simply be interpreted as dependency on authorities, which is an indication of Level 1 supervisees.

Self-/Other-Awareness

According to Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010), novice supervisees are inclined to have a cognitive self-focus; possible sources of this self-focus include excessive concerns about being competent and maintaining a high level of self-efficacy, or simply being confused in clinical practice. This tendency results in clients’ perspectives and needs being left unattended (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Specific to non-English-speakers, multiple research studies underscored that cross-linguistic barriers impacted the effectiveness of international students’ professional training as well as their counseling competencies (e.g., Gutierrez, 1982; Lau & Ng, 2012; Mittal & Wieling, 2006). In Lau and Ng’s (2012) study, international counseling graduates described their language barriers as learning and communicating counseling concepts first in English, translating clients’ problems into their first
languages, and then re-translating them to clients in English. Consequently, the extra work needed to translate between languages may intensify international supervisees’ self-focus, in both cognitive and affective ways. One’s accent is another factor that complicates Asian international students’ training experience. Researchers have found that in rating accented counseling psychologists or therapists, speech accents came into play, which gave rise to lower evaluations on counseling- and status-related dimensions but were mediated by listeners’ universal-diverse orientation (i.e., multicultural awareness) (Fuertes, 1999; Fuertes et al., 2002). In spite of limited control over clients’ reactions, supervisors can at least support their Asian international supervisees by being respectful listeners with the universal-diverse orientation.

SUPERVISING LEVEL 2 ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Level 2 is often fraught with a collision of two driving forces, such as fluctuating motivation and dependency-autonomy conflict. Moreover, supervisees’ high focus on clients shifts their attention from themselves to the clients, but may expose them to the complexity of clinical issues that were unforeseen, unexperienced, or overly simplified in the past.

Motivation

The two or three semesters of practicum may equip supervisees with basic skills in counseling sessions, but may not be sufficient enough to sustain the continuous growth in motivation as expected (Bang & Park, 2009; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). The previously accrued motivation can be challenged by a broader array of clinical issues with increased complexity. The fluctuating motivation engenders divergent pathways that supervisees can undertake. Although some are propelled by the fluctuating motivation to actively seek learning resources, others may feel discouraged from the clinical process and even start to question their initial career decision to enter the counseling profession (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Supervisors play a pivotal role in helping supervisees navigate through a plethora of cloudy issues and professional decision-making processes. However, it is not uncommon for international counseling students to experience hardships in cross-cultural supervision contexts. In Mittal and Wieling’s (2006) study, five out of the 13 participants reported that their faculty were inadequately prepared to work with international
students. One participant described her faculty as not “anticipating issues” or “oblivious to them” (p. 377). Specifically, her faculty did not understand what was going on with her because they had a “framework where people only asked if they wanted something” (p. 377). If not examined carefully, this underlying “framework” can easily become an institutional barrier that discourages supervisees with different frameworks (e.g., Asian international supervisees) from seeking help.

Similarly, one participant in Lau and Ng’s (2012) study experienced loneliness and inadequacy when unable to grasp cultural cues in class. Faculty often said “oh you guys, just speak up!” or “if you have a question, just come by and ask” (p. 95), but this participant was unsure whether these invitations were literally intended or were merely official language that is otherwise suggested. In contrast, some international students in Mittal and Wieling’s (2006) study described well-paced supervision, addressing individual struggles, and being validated in the program as contributing to their supportive supervisory relationships, which provided insights for supervisors to motivate Level 2 international supervisees.

Many Asian cultures have the interdependent view of the self, as opposed to the independent view of the self that is commonly seen in American culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In predominantly interdependent cultures, people are directed “to restrain their inner feelings and particularly the overt expression of these feelings” (p. 236) to maintain interpersonal harmony, which is also considered a sign of a person’s moral maturity. When Asian international supervisees view their supervisors as “inadequately” prepared to work with them, they may turn to self-restraint as the primary coping strategy in face of fluctuating motivation.

**Autonomy**

The accumulated knowledge, skills, and experience enhance Level 2 supervisees’ counseling self-efficacy with certain situations, resulting in autonomy that is conditional to that situation (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Nevertheless, if there are circumstances in which the existing professional repertoire is insufficient to address those clinical concerns, supervisees’ dependency on supervisors may surpass their conditional autonomy (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

When working with Level 2 Asian international supervisees, supervisors may examine whether the aforementioned self-restraint to maintain interpersonal harmony influences their supervisees’ coping
strategies in face of the autonomy-dependency conflict. If these supervisees constantly request supervisors’ opinions and affirmations that were infrequently observed in the past, this may be an indication of supervisees’ excessive dependency on supervisors, which is one extreme form as a result of the autonomy-dependency conflict. Fortunately, this dependency is easily detectable so that supervisors can intervene in time by exploring the sources of Asian international supervisees’ confusion, uncertainties, and self-doubts.

The other extreme form due to the autonomy-dependency conflict is supervisees’ resistance to supervisors’ feedback and nondisclosure, as a demonstration of acquired autonomy that is assumed more positive than dependency (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). In a study of Korean supervisees, Sohn (2005) found that the primary reasons for supervisees’ nondisclosure included (a) anticipation about the negative impact on the supervisory relationship; (b) concern about negative evaluation; (c) perception of no need to disclose and doubt about the effectiveness of disclosure; (d) sense of inadequacy as a counselor; and (e) lack of trust in supervisors’ intention and competence. Their nondisclosure took multiple forms, including concealment (68.8%), diminution (11.4%), distortion (8.8%), indirection (6.9%), and avoidance (4.1%). Level 2 Asian international supervisees may interact differently with supervisors, but Sohn’s study of nondisclosure can enrich supervisors’ toolkit should an autonomy-dependency conflict arise.

Because supervisees’ nondisclosure is easily unattended, Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010) recommended observing and processing video recordings of supervisees’ clinical practice. If supervision is solely or largely dependent on supervisees’ self-report, incomplete and inaccurate information can risk clients’ welfare and supervisees’ professional growth. As described by a Korean supervisor in Bang and Park’s (2009) study, “for the beginning supervisees, I can only give them 70% to 80% of what I could give, because they don’t provide me enough data to work with” (p. 1056). Although this supervisor targeted beginning supervisees, this same struggle can confront supervisors when working with Level 2 supervisees who withhold clinical information.

Self-/Other-Awareness

Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010) pointed out two salient risks that Level 2 supervisees may encounter: (a) being overwhelmed by clients’ affective experiences; and (b) overidentifying themselves with clients,
which can be easily channeled to countertransference reactions (i.e., responding solely from supervisees’ personal reactions). The countertransference risk was echoed by some Korean supervisors’ observations of their supervisees (Bang & Park, 2009).

In Bang and Park’s (2009) study, supervisors typically grouped their supervisees into two levels: beginning and advanced. Despite the dichotomous split of supervisees, advanced supervisees in their study were similar to the profile of Level 2 supervisees in the IDM. As Participant 1 witnessed, advanced (Level 2) supervisees occasionally underwent a stagnation phase or exhibited regression in their clinical skills. Specifically, “when supervisees reach a plateau, sometimes their performance is even worse than before. One of the reasons could be related to countertransference…Their own issues may surface” (p. 1056).

When working with advanced (Level 2) supervisees, Korean supervisors encouraged supervisees to “hold clients’ negative emotions and use them therapeutically” (pp. 1055-1056). This intervention is aligned with Stoltenberg and McNeill’s (2010) suggestion on the high-road processing of the affective experience, which means to label clients’ emotions, embed them within an understandable context, and then communicate them back to clients.

In addition, Stoltenberg and McNeill (2010) recommended the use of process comments to increase Level 2 supervisees’ self-awareness. Specifically, supervisors can help Asian international supervisees examine their moment-to-moment reactions and feelings toward clients. This can be best achieved by reviewing supervisees’ recorded counseling sessions (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Particularly, the interpersonal process recall (IPR; Kagan, 1980) is the most well-known supervision method to process video recordings (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014) and is deemed developmentally appropriate for Level 2 supervisees (Huhra, Yamokoski-Maynhart, & Prieto, 2008). By highlighting profoundly weighted meaningful segments of the video recording (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014), supervisors can help supervisees become more aware of the counselor-client dynamics on various levels that went unattended in counseling sessions (Cashwell, 1994). Meanwhile, supervisors’ appropriate disclosures can normalize supervisees’ concerns about their own questioning (Huhra et al., 2008).
SUPERVISING LEVEL 3 AND LEVEL 3I ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

High intrinsic motivation, conditional dependency (mostly autonomy), and high self-awareness characterize Level 3 supervisees (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Given the closer resemblance of Level 3 and Level 3i than the other two, the authors decided to discuss how the IDM informs the supervision of Asian international supervisees on the two levels together.

Motivation

Despite the existence of factors that may occasionally challenge Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees’ clinical effectiveness, they tend to maintain a high level of intrinsic motivation for clinical practice and professional development, as well as to show commitment to these endeavors (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Their intrinsic motivation and dedication can be explained by the self-determination theory (SDT; Gagné & Deci, 2014) that the counseling profession has been increasingly internalized into these supervisees. Being less preoccupied by the acquisition of concrete counseling-related knowledge and skills, supervisees become more aware of how what they do fits into who they are and how who they are dictates what they do.

In Lau and Ng’s (2012) investigation of international counseling graduates who worked in their countries of origin, one participant brought up that after receiving counselor training in the U.S., many of them developed an identity that was distinct from their U.S. peers and trainees in their home countries. As described by this participant, “international students often end up being a stranger of everywhere; you’re like the forever foreigner. We don’t actually belong here; neither do we belong there” (p. 96). Although one’s identity development is subject to abundant factors, an ongoing scholarly discourse on professional goals and development is exceptionally crucial in helping Asian international supervisees disentangle the identities they assume and the roles they perform in their cross-cultural training and experiences.

In Nilsson and Anderson’s (2004) study of international students from APA-accredited professional psychology programs, more than half (57%) of these students planned to return to their home countries. As professionals who closely work with Asian international supervisees, supervisors can guide them to process how their professional development
drives their career decision-making (e.g., pursuing a career within or outside the U.S.) and how their current training in the U.S. assists or impedes their career pursuit. Conversely, supervisors can facilitate dialogues on how Asian international supervisees’ personal values and roles influence their professional development.

**Autonomy**

The autonomy of Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees becomes increasingly visible in multiple clinical domains, which enables supervisees to view their supervisors as colleagues rather than mere experts or role models (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Ideally, supervisors take on a fairly non-directive consultant role, promoting the overall professional development of Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees and assisting them in navigating through new clinical environments (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Nevertheless, the hierarchy that is widely upheld in Asian cultures may add complications to the autonomy in Asian supervisees, given the evaluative and hierarchical nature of the supervisory relationship (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Bang and Park’s (2009) study of Korean supervisors demonstrated that less emphasis was directed to the consultant role, compared to the teacher role and counselor role. This may result from the hierarchical structure that undergirds Korean social relationships (Bang & Park, 2009). The deeply rooted hierarchy may intensify the power differential that is inherently embedded within the supervisory relationship (Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Bang & Park, 2009).

In spite of supervisees’ autonomy growth in clinical domains, they are still junior members in a supervisory relationship, who are expected to show trust and respect to their supervisors (Kuo, 2004). As senior members, supervisors are entitled to the authority and power to determine the nature, process, and rules of clinical supervision (Bang & Park, 2009). To advance autonomy in Level 3 and Level 3i Asian international supervisees in the presence of autonomy-hierarchy discrepancy, supervisors need to consider (a) how hierarchy may manifest itself in a supervisory relationship when supervisees’ autonomy is encouraged; and (b) how hierarchy may affect the consultant role that supervisors intend to take on.

In addition, supervisors need to take into account the age effect, which was found to be a significant factor in explaining Korean supervisees’ autonomy (Bang, 2006). Culturally speaking, the age effect in Bang’s study
was deemed related to the social expectation in Confucianism that older people are more mature and autonomous, and thus serve as role models for younger people. When working with Asian supervisees, supervisors should examine what age means to supervisees’ growth in autonomy and the representations of autonomy in supervision. Particularly, supervisors should openly discuss how supervision dynamics may vary due to the age effect, such as when supervisors are younger than supervisees (Bang, 2006).

Self-/Other-Awareness

After the elevated self-focus at Level 1 and redirected attention to clients at Level 2, Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees have developed the ability to move flexibly between low-road processing (i.e., emotional experiencing and empathy on the preconscious level) and high-road processing (i.e., conscious decision-making, reflecting, and labeling feelings) (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010), with a balanced focus on self and others in both counseling and supervision settings (Huhra et al., 2008). They are encouraged to “continue self-exploration and to monitor their personal reactions to clients” and place their “therapy interactions within various contexts” (Huhra et al., 2008, p. 417).

Level 3 and Level 3i Asian international supervisees may be experienced in therapeutic skills, cognitive and emotional awareness of therapeutic and personal reactions to clients, and professional knowledge (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Nevertheless, a constant exploration of multilayered and multidimensional contextual factors, the relationships among them, and how to make meaning of these factors and relationships, should never be ceased. To explore the contextual factors, supervisors can use the Supervision-in-Context (SIC; Delworth, 2010) model to help Asian supervisees examine the role of supervision across contexts (e.g., supervisor-supervisee dyad, supervisor-supervisee-client triad, and the setting where supervision occurs).

Supervisors should also enhance supervisees’ awareness on contextual factors that may influence their clinical work (Amanor-Boadu & Baptist, 2008). Many Asian international supervisees grew up in homogenous communities, thereby being less familiar with historical contexts of minority groups in the U.S., the concepts of racial identity development and ethnic consciousness, as well as how these contexts and concepts play pivotal roles in their professional development as counselors (Amanor-Boadu & Baptist, 2008). Cross-cultural discussions about
Table 1. Supervising Asian International Counseling Students: Using the Integrative Developmental Model (IDM; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 supervisors</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Self- and Other-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural considerations and supervision interventions</td>
<td>High external motivation</td>
<td>High dependency</td>
<td>High self-focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring supervisees’ motivation to study counseling in the U.S. (examining the counseling profession across nations; how to advance supervisees’ career pursuits)</td>
<td>Role induction (the definition of counseling and supervision); Social hierarchy in Confucian cultures</td>
<td>Cross-linguistic barriers (language and accent); Universal-diverse orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 supervisees</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Self- and Other-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural considerations and supervision interventions</td>
<td>Fluctuating motivation</td>
<td>Dependency-autonomy conflict</td>
<td>High client-focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The interdependent view of self (self-restraint and interpersonal harmony); Well-paced supervision; Addressing individual struggles; Being validated in the program</td>
<td>Self-restraint; Excessive dependency; Nondisclosure; Observing and processing video recordings of clinical practice</td>
<td>Counter-transference; Process comments; The Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR); Supervisors’ appropriate disclosure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3 and Level 3i supervisees</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Self- and Other-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural considerations and supervision interventions</td>
<td>High internal motivation</td>
<td>High autonomy</td>
<td>High self-awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The intersectionality of identities; Ongoing scholarly dialogues on personal values and professional development</td>
<td>Social hierarchy; Inherently embedded power differential in supervision; Age effect</td>
<td>Enhancing awareness on multidimensional and multilayered contextual factors; Supervisee use-of-self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
counseling enables both supervisors and supervisees to envision the internationalization that has been unfolding in the counseling profession (Lau & Ng, 2012; Ng & Noonan, 2012).

Moreover, in the Model of Cross-Cultural Competent Clinical Supervision, Amanor-Boadu and Baptist (2008) highlighted the importance of supervisee use-of-self. It not only acknowledged supervisees’ unique cultural strengths but encouraged supervisees to integrate their indigenous therapeutic interventions into their clinical practice, such as interventions that highlight social and familial relationships as sources of support (Yeh & Wang, 2000) and that infuse collectivistic strategies into counseling (Kuo, 2004), if needed.

**IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

The IDM provides a comprehensive and systematic framework that guides the discussion of cultural considerations when this model is applied to supervising Asian international students. Although cultural considerations in this article were organized by each IDM structure on various developmental levels, they are not limited to any specific structure or level. Rather, an integration of these cultural considerations across levels and structures, ensuring the fluidity of culturally relevant supervision interventions in response to supervisees’ identified needs, is more than needed. A close review of literature and a thorough examination of the IDM within the Confucian context generated multifaceted implications pertaining to clinical supervision, counselor education, and research.

Although Asian international supervisees may become increasingly acculturated to the mainstream behaviors in the U.S. (e.g., achieving high proficiency in English and making friends with Americans), they may still strongly adhere to the traditional Asian values, such as emotional restraint and social harmony (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999; Shea & Yeh, 2008). Indeed, acculturation encompasses at least two distinct components – values and behavior (Kim et al., 1999). In Kim et al.’s study of Asian Americans, values acculturation transpired much slower than behavioral acculturation. Thus, supervisors need to take into account Asian international supervisees’ acculturation level in both values and behavior realms. Supervisors can use the Asian Values Scale-Revised (AVS-R; Kim & Hong, 2004) and the Acculturation Index (AI; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999) to gauge Asian international supervisees’ values and behavior acculturation.
Additionally, supervisors’ evaluation of supervisees’ clinical competencies can easily be entangled with language- and culture-related factors. In determining the developmental level of supervisees in any domain, supervisors need to execute a thorough examination of supervisees’ competencies in all areas contributing to counseling outcomes. As discussed earlier, supervisors can use the IPR to help Asian international supervisees explore their moment-to-moment reactions and feelings toward clients and toward themselves. For instance, the question “If you had the chance now, how might you tell him/her what you are thinking and feeling?” (Cashwell, 1994) may help supervisors disentangle supervisees’ language proficiency from clinical competency. Moreover, the Supervisee Levels Questionnaire-Revised (McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Romans, 1992) is a useful tool to measure supervisees’ developmental level in clinical domains. If there is any discrepancy between supervisors’ and supervisees’ evaluations of specific items, supervisors should facilitate an open discussion on the rationale behind their assessments.

Supervision transpires not only in dyadic, triadic, or group supervision sessions, but in the classroom setting as well, where counselor educators are called to create inclusive and supportive environments advancing the optimal growth of international students. International students are encouraged to engage in a collaborative learning process by unmasking barriers that impede their professional development. As our discussion indicated, contextual factors may alter current supervision models. In designing the supervision curriculum, counselor educators need to familiarize themselves with the diversity of counselor trainees and how that appears in different elements (e.g., country of origin, culture, values, and language) at different stages. International doctoral students in counseling and psychology programs are strongly urged to take an active leadership role, in conveying diverse cultural norms and personal experiences.

Instilling a Confucian cultural lens into the application of the IDM in this article allowed for an in-depth exploration of culturally relevant supervision interventions when supervising Asian international counseling students. However, international supervisees’ status quo and needs are inferred based on the limited number of empirical studies in supervision (Pendse & Inman, 2016). Further investigations should be conducted to examine important variables associated with supervising international counseling students, particularly those from the same cultural heritage.
Future research using qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods is encouraged in order to have an enriched understanding of Asian international supervisees’ lived experiences and how their counselor training and clinical practice are influenced accordingly.
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