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This study presents an emerging qualitative inquiry about relational transformation in family therapy supervision at the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI), a postmodern collaborative learning community. Ethno-phenomenology is used as a blended methodology. The researcher acknowledged the participants performing co-researchers of their experiences of relational transformation through supervision relationships. Ten participants, seven supervisees and three supervisors, described their experiences of transformation through their supervision relationships at a postmodern collaborative learning community, the HGI. All participants defined transformation and the process of relational transformation in reference to their own experiences of transformation and their understandings of theory of social construction. As they described their experiences of supervision, supervision relationships, and the learning community at HGI, they also shared their stories, addressing the characteristics of the community that facilitate transformation in them. In addition, participants discussed how a learning community could become a relational, transformative-generative context that eventually facilitates and encourages transformation in all its members who are the learners of family therapy.
INTRODUCTION

This is a qualitative and collaborative study in which the participants, including the researcher, co-construct the process of inquiry through interviews. My interest in studying relational transformation in family therapy supervision evolved from my personal experiences of supervision in both the U.S.A. and Turkey. In Chapter I, I will introduce you to my background in family therapy and my experience of relational transformation along with my supervision relationships that originally inspired me in this study. My curiosity statement as a researcher will be introduced in Chapter II.

Chapter III reviews the research literature in accordance with current ideas in postmodern, social construction theory and practice in terms of supervision in family therapy and counseling. This chapter will accompany the reader in understanding postmodernism, social constructionism, and their premise that serve as a foundation for my evolving ideas and biases about relational transformation. It will describe the concepts of change, transformation, and relational transformation according to the postmodern, social constructionist approaches, family therapy literature, and my personal experiences.

Chapter IV defines the purpose of the study while Chapter V introduces the methodology. I will focus on the methodology and describe the research process as an evolving, collaborative endeavor to present a multiplicity of voices of the participants. Postmodern and social constructionist ideas of research are also presented in this chapter.

In Chapter VI, I will address the findings and the themes that emerged from the data. Chapter VII discusses the findings and their implications for family therapy supervision. It offers further ideas of the researcher as opening possibilities for future inquiry.
CHAPTER I

INSPIRATION FOR THE STUDY

A STORY STARTS...

The end of the night... the night is not ended yet, but the conversations outside... The traces of them inside like memories warm to hold on. I have just arrived back at my home from Harlene’s house after the tenth anniversary meeting commemorating Harry’s death. All those wonderful conversations around Harry Goolishian, and the intriguing stories of his sense of community I have only been able to participate in Houston Galveston Institute lately.

I am a part of the community, but apart from it... Only, the downtown city view welcomed me. —Me, myself, and all the being in this gray city, all in transformation with the city, with the conversations have been taken all around, and all inside me. I feel gray. I feel in transformation, and the transformation in me (Tinaz, 2002).

This paragraph is quoted from my personal journal of my doctoral internship at the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI) in Houston, Texas. As a therapist and a supervisor-in-training AAMFT (American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy) who has been working with human systems such as groups, families, couples, and individuals for more than nine years, I am particularly interested in understanding the experiences of transformation in supervisors and supervisees along with their supervision relationships.

My interest in this topic has evolved from my personal experiences of supervision relationships with different supervisors and supervisees in Turkey and in the U.S. The idea of relational transformation has emerged since my first supervision experience at the Istanbul Family & Marital Therapy Institute (IFTI), Istanbul, Turkey, and continued to evolve at Iowa State University, Marriage & Family Therapy Clinic, and lately at the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI). Since the beginning of my first supervision
relationship, my writings and dialogues have been personal expressions of this relational transformation.

**Turkish Culture and My Introduction to Family Therapy**

In Turkey, relationships and conversations are the mainstream of the daily culture. Turkish people like to spend a great deal of time around dinner tables, tea or coffee shops, take long vacations, enjoy life, relate with people and with ourselves in relation to other people around us, with other countries as we follow their news, with other ideas or thoughts as we enjoy and struggle to adjust ourselves. Although the invasion of American culture seems very rapid and visible on the streets (for instance, you can see the brands MacDonald, Burger King, Marlboro, etc. everywhere) and we have adjusted them to our own way of living. I come from the cosmopolitan, strong-willed, generous, welcoming culture of the city of Istanbul (once known as Constantinople), which is a synthesis of opposites and extremes, chaotic but with a unique harmony. I practiced thinking, feeling, and living relationally, inclusively, authentically, and acting creatively as a part of this rich culture.

My introduction to family therapy began when I met Murat Dokur, M.D., a psychiatrist, during the last year of my undergraduate program in Counselor Education at Istanbul University. At the time, I had not had a satisfactory internship experience where I worked at the human resources department in a very large textile company in Istanbul. However, I liked working with people in clinical settings and wanted to help those experiencing difficulties in their lives. When I heard that Dr. Dokur was leading workshops in family therapy, I introduced myself to him and enrolled in his workshops.

Murat Dokur received family therapy training at the Mental Research Institute, Palo Alto, California, and returned home to train people how to think and act systemically and pragmatically, and how to survive within social systems in order to help clients and their
families. The passionate learners who were in his family therapy training groups came together, to establish Istanbul Family Therapy School in 1996. We met every Wednesday evening for three hours to talk about systemic ideas, family therapy theories, and anything we would like to share with each other. We utilized this time for passionate discussions about different theories and how to apply them to our culture, how to learn more and to plan our future as the Istanbul Family Therapy School. We hardly wanted to leave it when the time was up. It was our home.

Those gatherings led us to the idea for an Institute where Dr. Dokur and his followers, who were interested in learning and practicing family therapy, could continue to learn, teach, and share our ideas with other people, and make systemic practices common in our society. We founded the Istanbul Marital and Family Institute (IFTI) in 1997. Same year. I was selected as a Distinguished Scholar at Istanbul University to study abroad. My passion in learning family therapy and our exciting accomplishments at IFTI inspired me to come to the U.S., and enter doctoral study in family therapy. In 1998, our attempts to found a family therapy association were successful. Both the association and the IFTI exist today.

The Association arranged the first National Marriage and Family Therapy Conference in 2002. Dr. Dokur and his colleagues continue to teach, practice, and disseminate the systemic-interactional ideas among diverse disciplines such as psychiatry, psychology, counseling, and family medicine. Although members of IFTI teach in different psychology and counselor education programs in Turkey, we still do not have accredited college level family therapy programs. My main passion to come the States was to learn more, gain a cultural experience in the States, the motherland of family therapy, to begin a graduate level family therapy program in Turkey.
My Experience of Supervision and Relational Exchange

My experience of supervision with my first supervisor was unforgettable as I learned how to listen to clients and join their languages, as well as how to create a change in any point in the system and see how that influences the entire system toward a change. Change was inevitable. As the therapists, we played a crucial role in helping the clients. I loved playing language games and using metaphors during sessions with the clients, which was also a very common practice at the Institute among learners. My experience of transformation was intense at the beginning of my practice. My supervisor related to me as a human being with all of my strengths and difficulties. The hierarchy between us lessened over the years, but never the respect. When we became colleagues and team members of the Institute and the Association, the supervisor role was decreased and an equal colleague role was more visible in our relationship.

When we worked with clientele, we also worked with ourselves, our becoming therapists, during the sessions. We worked with handling our feelings and thoughts at anytime in life in relation to the session, as well as our experience of the relationship with the client. I was “who I am” which is always an ongoing evolution. I was a “person” in the session instead of a role, “the therapist”. I observed how my supervisor struggled with some events in his personal life as a human being. We were aware of multiple ways of being, and being in interaction. I helped him through these difficulties as he helped me through mine. The personal was professional, and the professional was personal. He was out there, vulnerable in his own personal life, but so skillful, keen, and successful in his professional life. It was an intense, indescribable experience. We transformed in relation with each other, and our work transformed into an ongoing, passionate work. We believe that the relationships never end, and are healing when we are involved in them, either
actually experiencing or thinking about them. I still think about him and our supervision experience.

In 1999, I took a break from my work at the Institute and Istanbul University, where I was also teaching and conducting research, and began my doctorate at Iowa State University in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies, in Family and Marriage Therapy Specialization. The Family Therapy Clinic at ISU was in the process of moving to its current location at Palmer Building in Ames, Iowa. I experienced this transition period in parallel with my own transition to life in Ames, and witnessed the departure of one of my favorite Professors, Linda Enders, Ph.D. She was my first clinical supervisor at the family therapy clinic in ISU and a wonderful person who introduced me to postmodern, solution-focused, and narrative practices. She developed close relationships with the students, relating to each one of them as a unique individual. My current advisor, Harvey Joanning, Ph.D., then became my official supervisor and introduced me to the theories of social construction and collaborative language systems. I immediately loved the readings and discussions of these theories. He was also a living model of how to apply these theories in life and a great supporter of me as I was and what I was trying to accomplish in life.

In the second year, I met with John Littrell, Ed.D., a professor and the program coordinator of the Counselor Education Program at Iowa State University. He introduced me to the practice of supervision for his Master’s level counseling students. He also taught the Microcounseling class and I, with two of my classmates, assisted him in his class and counseling labs throughout the year. He supervised my supervision sessions in addition to the individual supervision of supervision sessions with Dr. Joanning. It was a lot of fun to work with him and two of my classmates in the process of learning supervision.

After I completed my second year at ISU, the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI) was the only place I applied for my clinical doctoral internship. The ideas of Harlene
Anderson and Harry Goolishian attracted me so intensely that I felt like they were languaging my thoughts as well. They were looking at language and its power similar to how we had experimented in Turkey. I knew I was going to go there and join their community. My experience of Anderson and Goolishian from their writings was so personal and so close to how I was practicing at the time. The Institute seemed like a fit, the appropriate place to be and to learn. My internship experience at HGI became a part of my overall journey of becoming a therapist and supervisor.

As a learner at HGI, I experienced connection, collaboration, and construction (Anderson, 1997, 2000), which were already intermingled in my journey as a therapist and supervisor. The HGI context reminded me of my home, IFTI, in Istanbul at the first sight. It felt like home. I loved the random gatherings and standup conversations in the kitchen. It reminded me of our kitchen consultations at IFTI, in Istanbul. I loved passionate working at both places. I loved the feeling of the community at HGI, just like at IFTI.

My current supervisors, Harlene Anderson, Ph.D. and Leonard Bohannon, Ph.D interact with me in relation to my own personal struggles, to my professional growth as a clinician and supervisor, and to my personal growth as an individual who always in process of change. I also continue to converse with my previous supervisors, Sue Levin, Ph.D. and Susan Swim, Ph.D. Candidate, at HGI in regards to my transformation as a therapist, supervisor and human being. I experience transformation and relational exchange through my relationships with them, and verbally reflect on this relational process as we go along with our own individual growth as well as our growth in the relationship.

I believe how we experience ourselves in a relationship informs the way we touch each other’s lives. This relationship can be any kind. When transformation is experienced relationally in a community, invisible differences might become visible as multiple possibilities arise. As a result, this community might transform a landscape that cultivates multiple buds of relational transformation in its members and associates.
My Experience of Transformation

I am crying.
My tears does not listen my mind anymore.
They want to pour slowly like a river unseen.
I am crying with the whole
I do not know who I am anymore.
Who I am, what I do, how I live.
I am not someone who I know.
I am "I am not" anymore.

I am crying with the whole
Whole is me, and me is not the whole.
Pain comes and never goes.
It is with me, with the whole.
Strengthens me,
Makes me closer to the whole.
Pain invokes me with the tears all along.
It becomes alive and transforms me, with the whole.

The mirror laughs.
I cannot see "me" in my eyes anymore...
The mirror cries
for me dying before the death.
I am crying to clean up my soul, with the whole.
I am crying to get closer.
I am crying for the river, there is no water to flow.
I am crying to be not to be. (Tinaz, 2002)

This poem reflects my own process of transformation as a human being in life.
which also informs my evolving identity in psychotherapy profession. My experiences of
transformation appeared to become alive in my journal entries. I became more and more
self-aware of the process of transformation in myself. My journal excerpts reflected my
inner dialogues, the learning process and their transformations in relation with my
experience of the HGI community and my own evolving ideas. Below, you will read an
example of my personal experience of transformation in relation to my learning process at
HGI. Each theme in the excerpt has multiple meanings and connected to the other themes. For instance, “feeling alone” is one of the themes in the journal for being in a connection with a self-created community, “We.”

'We' has been a form of expression of the nature of my reflections in my journal, kind of a style to reflect on my thinking, acting, creating, and sometimes even talking with in the absence of an literal connection with another human being... [I feel down, deep down under the ground... Nobody could help, except me... this 'we' thing... I am scared to death to be alone, but I feel alone for years, and still alive...] 'We' keeps me from being alone and helps me get through this feeling. 'We' helps me to keep going and help me to be rational... 'We' understands me and listens me genuinely. 'We' does not judge me, tell me what to do; just listens and cares about me. 'We' helps me not to feel alone, helps me to be not scared of being alone; helps me to enjoy being alone with 'myself'. [I do not care about not having no other, and the feeling of loneliness as long as 'we' stays with me]. (Tinaz, 2002)

My orientation in family therapy and my philosophy of life evolved as I go along, within relationships and conversations. Reflecting on a particular relationship enabled me to punctuate the differences and then allowed me to make differences. I continued to construct a personal way of experiencing and experimenting. These inner dialogues similarly are informed by postmodern, social constructionist ideas, which are still in transformation through my own meaning making process. These dialogues continued to evolve, and transformed my theoretical stance in family therapy. Before talking about these differences and the concepts of change and relational transformation theoretically, I would like to introduce you to first my curiosity statement as a researcher, and second, in Chapter III, to postmodernism and the theory of social construction.
CHAPTER II

CURIOUSITY STATEMENT

While the concept of “dialogue” is not a new one for therapy (Andersen, 1987), it is new as an area for supervision research. Dialogue and the meaning generated through it have become a focus of some postmodern, social constructionist theoreticians in social research (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988; Gergen, 1985; Shotter & Gergen, 1989, 1994). This study presents and co-unites the multiple definitions, and stories of transformation of supervisees and supervisors in a collaborative learning community of family therapy, the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI).

By acknowledging this study as an ongoing dialogical, meaning generating learning process, the researcher attempts to hear the voices of the participants and to present them with attempting not to interpret. Their voices and verbal expressions as relational forms are the remarkable reflections of relational transformation. The transformations of individuals and relationships are socially constructed in these relational-dialogues, and stories evolve in history through them (Hodge & Kress, 1988). Dialogues, internal and external, can become transformative for who are involved in them (Anderson, 2001; Gergen, 1985; Shotter & Gergen, 1989, 1994).

This study focuses on this type of exploration of the participants' internal and external dialogues about transformation. Some external dialogues, conversations, that could be meaningful to the conversational partners in a collaborative supervision relationship may facilitate connection, construction, and transformation. Some internal dialogues, thoughts, may continue reflectively afterward, and may continue to evolve in their multiple forms of expressions.

Although both conversational partners may interpret the meanings of those internal and external dialogues differently, the parallel processes of transformation may appear in or
later outside of this relational and dialogical space. Reflective and internal dialogues may
enliven this infinite ongoing process to catalyze relational transformations in their owners.
Reflectivity refers to expressing initial ideas and feelings without pressing them in a form.
Reflective listening and dialogue may also become tangential paths of the multiple
possibilities of relational transformation outside of the conversation, therapy and supervision.
The dialogues that continue the signs of transformation are conveyed into other
conversational expressions such as art, music, and poetry in our daily lives, and therefore
become ongoing and transform with us. The dialogues are ongoing and unique in their ways
of expression, as well as in their meanings regarding the community we live in and what we
live for.

We, as therapists, aim to perform in ways that help make a difference in our clients
and affect others within our professional and personal communities. Although we “human
beings” are not necessarily aware of it, transformation as an ongoing process becomes a
significant part of our daily lives as we relate with each other and with ourselves. We also
converse with our own and others’ ideas, feelings, and thoughts during and in between these
relational exchanges. We create meaning by making distinctions, punctuations and
connections. However, we usually do not make distinctions between the tones of gray, in
which most of the transformations appear in the nuances and in how we express them. Again,
this study focuses on the personal nuances in relational transformation process of supervision
of family therapy, where the stories of relational transformation are told and retold.

We, as the members of any community—in my case HGI, have invisible touches in
each other’s lives in a way that public, shared and mutual. However, for the purpose of this
study, the data collection procedures will be limited to one context, supervision, which is
only one part of this collaborative learning community at HGI (Anderson, 1998, 2000). As a
researcher, I have been particularly interested in the impact of postmodern, social
constructionist and collaborative practices on supervision experiences of the learners in their
journeys, in therapy related contexts and the multiple contexts within which therapy embedded. Supervision, as a relational contextual process, could also be described as a part of “relational transformation process” in which supervisee and supervisor can connect, collaborate, and socially construct each other’s transformation in a reference to their unique relationship.

In the family therapy field of research, there are a few research studies that have focused on student therapist development (Black, 1988; Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Worthen & McNeill, 1996) rather than supervisor development (Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Galante, 1988). Moreover, the research on supervision mostly focuses on training, curriculum, and evaluation (Rosiello, 1989). An inclusive literature review of the supervision research in family therapy is included in Chapter III. The research literature does not address the relational transformation nature of the supervision relationship.

In this study, the researcher aims to fill the gap in the literature, try to understand the relational transformation experiences, if any, of both supervisors and supervisees. This would be possible by attempting to understand the experiences of supervision relationship in a postmodern-collaborative supervision culture, the Houston Galveston Institute.

The curiosity statement for this study is “How are supervisees and supervisors relationally transform along with the supervision relationship in a postmodern collaborative learning community of family therapy?”
The studies in family therapy supervision usually have not been designed from a qualitative approach. Faulkner, Klock, and Gale (2002) found that only seven articles on family therapy supervision have been published from a qualitative approach, which became popular in family therapy research in the 1990s and continues to be favored by many clinicians and researchers up to the present. In family therapy literature, most research studies examine the effectiveness of the training programs and supervision. Almost all the studies have suggested that the field needs some standards to evaluate the outcome of family therapy training. Others have explored the experiences of supervision in training programs, mostly at a graduate level, from supervisee or trainee perspective, and few from supervisor or trainer perspective.

In the family therapy supervision literature, the two main areas of study have been competency and personal growth of the supervisee. There is a need for research to determine the aspects of training that produce growth, health, and enhanced skills, as well as the aspects that produce detrimental stress. These areas of knowledge help trainers “to nurture a healthier training environment” by hearing from the “neglected experts” or trainees in family therapy (Deacon & Piercy, 2000). Hardy and Keller (1991) also suggested that trainees be viewed as “co-owners” and “educated consumers” of family therapy training programs rather than passive receivers. The search for knowledge in research studies should include the voices of all co-owners, both the therapists and the supervisors.

Polson and Piercy (1993) found that few family therapy programs systematically evaluate the general welfare of trainees. There are a few research studies on the effect of trainees’ life experiences on their training and therapy processes and vice versa (Black, 1988; Sori, Wetchler, Ray, & Niedner, 1996). In some studies, trainers and trainees also offered their opinions on the process of training (Bava, 2001; Dell, Sheely, Pulliam, & Goolishian, 1977; Henry, Sprenkle, & Sheehan, 1986; Littrell, Lee-Borden, & Lorenz, 1979; Rothberg.
Other studies researched possible new arrangements in the program according to the supervisee's needs and feedback (Dowling, Cade, Breunlin, Frude, & Seligman, 1979; Galante, 1988; Polson & Piercy, 1993; Wetchler, Piercy, & Sprenkle, 1989).

Studies in both counseling and family therapy evaluated the supervisee's experiences of the supervision (Allen, Szallos, & Williams, 1986; Black, 1988; Ellis, 1991; Galante, 1988; Heppner & Roehlka, 1984; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996; Nelson, 1978; Williams, Judge, & Hill, 1997; Worthen, & McNeill, 1996), supervisee's needs and expectancies (Gabbay, Kiemle, & Maguire, 1998; Hardy & Keller, 1991), and live supervision (Hardy, 1993; Liddle & Schwartz, 1983; Lowenstein, Reder, & Clark, 1982). Only a few research studies have explored the supervisors' and trainers' experiences of the supervision and supervisors' growth (Dufly-Roberts, 1999; Galante, 1988; Green, Shilts, & Bacigalupe, 2001). The others studied the relationship factors during supervision (Black, 1988; Galante, 1988; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Kaiser, 1992; Kniskern & Gurman, 1979; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997; Veach, 2001; White & Russel, 1995).

The main topics that have been evaluated in supervisee development and growth include the assessment of knowledge and skills gained by students, the relationship between trainee and trainer, the effectiveness of trainees in the therapy room, and the personal changes of trainees (Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Liddle & Halpin, 1978; Flores, 1979; Hess, 1986; Kniskern & Gurmann, 1979; & Liddle, 1991).

Hanna and Bemak (1997) looked at "identity in the counseling profession" and stated that the quest for identity can be reframed as a "dialectical process" that is necessary for continued development of counseling. The professional self is a socially constructed concept that has been shaped through talking in a dialogical space with the other (Shotter & Gergen, 1994). Much of the existing supervision research focused on supervision experiences of the
supervisee that contributed to her/his professional/personal growth and therapy outcome (Gabbay, Kiemle, & Maguire, 1999; Green & Kirby-Turner, 1990) or therapist identity construction and professional development (Bava, 2001; Daugherty, Esper & Linton, 1998).

From a postmodern stance on supervision (Anderson & Swim, 1993, 1995), no research in family therapy has explored the relational context of supervision regarding supervisors’ and supervisees’ experiences of transformation along with the supervisory relationship. The research studies in postmodern therapies and supervisory practices are few (Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Anderson & Swim, 1993, 1995; Bava, 2001; Laughlin, 2000).

Lowe (2000) discussed supervision stories that shape the behavior and realities of the performers during supervision. According to Lowe, a supervision story emerges as a broader story through the stories of the therapist and the client. He suggested a process of constructive inquiry that connects all the stories to construct the identity of a self-sustaining therapist. This process requires a shift toward supervising self-supervision instead of supervising practice. However, the supervisor’s story as a part of this overall narrating process has not been included in his study. Fisher (1984) also described discursive forms of talking as stories or coherent narratives. Thus, a story provides a rationale for decision-making and performing in supervision.

Although there are studies that examined the supervisor’s development and growth (Galante, 1988; Green, Shilts, & Bacigalupe, 2001), the family therapy literature has almost overlooked the relational nature of transformation in clinical supervision. Research on relational transformation in clinical supervision does not exist. No previous studies have explored the nature of the transformation and how it has been relationally experienced in supervisors and supervisees. In order to fill this significant gap in the literature, this study examines the evolving self-narratives and lives of the supervisees and supervisors experiencing relational transformation along with their supervision relationship in a collaborative postmodern learning community of family therapy.
CHAPTER III

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

POSTMODERNISM

Postmodern: That which follows the modern; after World War II: a phase of capitalism; a movement in the arts; a form of social theory; that which cannot be avoided: undefinable.

Postmodernism: Living the postmodern into experience... the cultural logics of late capitalism.

Postmodern Self: The self who embodies the multiple contradictions of postmodernism, while experiencing itself through the everyday performances of gender, class, and racially-linked social identities. [italics in original] (Denzin, 1991, p.vii).

Given these definitions, it becomes obvious that there are as many definitions of postmodern and postmodernism as there are people who live and describe them subjectively (Rosenau, 1992). According to Bava (2001), "Postmodernism, inherently un-definable, is ironically identified as socio-cultural practices via the distinction characterized in the unmaking of the taken-for-granted "distinct" categories".

Postmodernism emerged as a flow of thought, action, and life style among several disciplines such as architecture, art, literature, poetry, and the social sciences (Rosenau, 1992). The emerging context of postmodernism historically referred to four interrelated phenomena: (1) a movement called postmodernism in the arts; (2) a new form of theorizing the contemporary historical moment; (3) historical transformations that have followed World War II; (4) and social, cultural and economic life under late capitalism" (Denzin, 1991, p.3).

According to Lyotard (1984), postmodernism reflectively and skeptically critiqued the assumptions about what we know and how we know what we know. Wittgenstein (1965, 1969) explained this learning process through language games, how we learn to language an object. We learn the name of an object from others through language in the process of

Truth cannot be out there -cannot exist independently of human mind- because sentences cannot so exist, or be out there. The world is out there, but the descriptions of the world are not... The world does not speak. Only we do. The world can, once we have programmed ourselves with a language, cause us to hold beliefs. But it cannot propose a language for us to speak. Only human beings can do that (Rorty, 1989, p 5).

Rosenau (1992) divided postmodernists into two groups, based on different ways of being, the skeptical and the affirmative. While skeptical postmodernists rejected modern views of science and epistemology, the affirmatives did not and instead offered drastic changes in both. The affirmatives and some skeptical postmodernists agreed that the distinction between mental states and the outside world was a pure illusion. Although both were preoccupied with the nature of truth and how people know the truth, their attitudes toward these topics varied. “To the extent that the mind furnishes the categories of understanding, there are no real world objects of study other than those inherent within the mental makeup of persons” (Gergen, 1985, p 141).

Postmodernism alternatively suggests a move to a local knowledge and multiplicity of realities. People who take a postmodern stance invite an “ongoing skeptical attitude and critical reflection of foundational knowledge and privileging discourses, including their certainty and power (Anderson, 2001, p 19)” This ongoing skeptical attitude invites
uncertainty, self-reflexivity, multiplicity, and diversity over homogeneity, locality over universality, and leads postmodernists to explore language and meaning making through its usage in social contexts. Being a social creature, human beings naturally negotiate meaning through language. Moreover, this meaning negotiation is an ongoing act in constant evolution, a social construction.

THEORY OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION

Social Constructionism (McNamee & Gergen, 1992; Shotter & Gergen, 1989, 1994) has evolved as a theoretical venue in postmodern thought. In this venue, knowledge is socially constructed (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) in a local culture in which language, interpreting, and knowing continuously and interdependently occur. This social conceptualization of knowledge informs our relationships and identities (Gergen, 1999; Shotter & Gergen, 1989; 1994).

Knowledge, including self-knowledge or self-narrative, is a communal construction, a product of social exchange. For Gergen the relationship is the locus of knowledge. From this perspective ideas, truths, or self-identities, for instance, are the products of human relationships. That is, everything is authored, or more precisely, multiauthored, in a community of persons and relationships. The meanings of language, that is, the meanings that we attribute to the things, the events, and the people in our lives, and to ourselves, are arrived at by the language people use – through social dialogue, interchange, and interaction that we socially construct. The emphasis is on the “contextual basis of meaning, and its continuing negotiation across time” (Gergen, 1994, p.66) rather than on the location of the origins of meaning (Anderson, 1997, p.40).

Social constructionism frees the dichotomy between the individual and relationship. It describes individuals in relationships. The identity of self or of an individual is under inevitable, ongoing construction in a social context in which the individual lives. Therefore,
the location of psychological knowledge is not separated from this local, social and historical context in which the relationships emerge. In such a context, psychological knowledge appears as a discursive, linguistic performance among people who speak the language of the local community. Realities are shaped in such a local context, instead of an individual context. Hoffman (1990) also emphasized that the social construction theory "posits an evolving set of meanings that emerge unendingly from the interactions between people. These meanings are not skull-bound and may not exist inside what we think of as an individual 'mind' (p.3)."

Social construction theory focuses on the local culture and/or community as a social context (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Gergen, 1985, 1991, 1999, 2001; Shotter, 2000; Shotter & Gergen, 1994) in which reality and meaning are multiple, socially constructed, and continuously defined in relationships and language (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1992; McNamee & Gergen, 1992; Shotter & Gergen, 1989, 1994). In this theory, communication is regarded as "actions that [are] presented and embedded as utterances within an interactive-social context. Words are actions with practical consequences. In an interactive conversation, utterances construct and maintain social contexts" (Gale, 2000).

**IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE**

Post-modern social science "rejects the Kuhnian model of science as a series of successive paradigms and announces the end of all paradigms. Only an absence of knowledge claims, an affirmation of multiple realities, and an acceptance of divergent interpretations remain (Rosenau, 1992, 137)". In a postmodern world, there are multiple interpretations, and all are valid. none of them is a superior over another. A postmodernist has no interest in convincing others that her/his view is best. "For these post-moderns the pursuit of knowledge results in a sense of wonder and amazement" (Murphy, 1988). It is an
encounter with the unexpected, a "voyage into the unforeseen" (Graff, 1979)" (Rosenau, 1992, p.169).

Post-modernists rearrange the whole social science enterprise. Those of a modern conviction seek to isolate elements, specify relationships, and formulate a synthesis; post-modernists do the opposite. They offer indeterminacy rather than determinism, diversity rather than unity, difference rather than synthesis, complexity rather than simplification. They look to the unique rather than to the general, to intertextual relations rather than causality, and to the unrepeatable rather than the re-occurring, the habitual, or the routine. Within a post-modern perspective social science becomes a more subjective and humble enterprise as truth gives way to tentativeness. Confidence in emotion replaces efforts at impartial observation. Relativism is preferred to objectivity, fragmentation to totalization (Rosenau, 1992, p.8).

According to Kvale (1996), postmodern approach to science focused on "interrelations in an interview, on the social construction of reality in an interview, on its linguistic and interactional aspects including the differences between oral discourse and written text, and emphasizes the narratives constructed by the interview" (Kvale, 1996, p.38).

A postmodern researcher questions "causality, determinism, egalitarianism, humanism, liberal democracy, necessity, objectivity, rationality, responsibility, and truth in social science" (Rosenau, 1992, p. ix). As a form of postmodern inquiry, a social constructionist researcher studies knowledge as a product of social exchange in a dialogical context in which meaning is continually negotiated over time (Anderson, 1997). Social constructionism is "principally concerned with explicating the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or otherwise account for the world (including themselves) in which they live" (Anderson, 1997, p.40).
IMPLICATIONS FOR FAMILY THERAPY

Postmodern thought's influence on therapy as a language-based performance was inevitable due to its emphasis on the language and social construction of a reality. According to Mills and Sprenkle (1995), postmodern thought appeared in the form of reflecting teams (Andersen, 1987), increased therapist self-disclosure (Garfield, 1987), focusing on the self-of-the therapist (Aponte, 1992), and postmodern supervision (Anderson & Goolishian, 1990; Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Anderson & Swim, 1993, 1995) in family therapy practice. On a postmodern, socio-linguistic ground, "psychotherapy may be thought of as a process of semiosis - the forging of meaning in the context of collaborative discourse" (Gergen & Kaye, 1992, p. 182).

The Postmodernists accused modernists of believing in "totalizing truths" and "grand narratives". The modernists declared their opponents to be relativists without values. The quarrel spilled over from the academy into other fields, including family therapy, where it created much argument but also an explosion of new energy and ideas (Hoffmann, 2002, p. xii).

In their development of a theory that is compatible with postmodernism, Anderson and Goolishian described human systems as linguistic systems and developed the "collaborative language systems" approach of family therapy (Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1992; Anderson, 1997). Anderson described postmodernism and social constructionism as informing her "philosophical stance" that refers to "a way of being, a way of thinking about, experiencing, being in relationship with, talking with, acting with, and responding with the people we met in therapy" (Anderson, 2001, p. 20).

Others focused on a narrative form of social construction theory, which constructs alternative stories in therapy (Freedman & Combs, 1996, White & Epston, 1990). Freedman
and Combs (1996) emphasized realities as socially constructed and constituted through language, but organized and maintained through narrative:

There is a shift from focusing on how an individual person constructs a model of reality from his or her individual experience to focusing on how people interact with one another to construct, modify, and maintain what their society holds to be true, real, and meaningful. It is this social epistemology that attracts us to social constructionism. It presents a more satisfying way of conceptualizing the 'interactional view' that originally attracted us to systems theory (Freedman & Combs, 1996, p.27).

IMPLICATIONS FOR FAMILY THERAPY SUPERVISION


From a postmodern-social constructionist stance, supervision starts with “being curious” and strives to maintain a position of curiosity (Cecchin, 1987), which is the same ingredient for starting a conversation with a client in therapy and/or with oneself. Anderson and Swim (1995) draw attention to the diversity of experiences, cultures, and ideas in their work within supervision teams. Both describe supervision as a collaborative conversation or collaborative inquiry (Anderson, 2000; Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1990, Anderson & Swim, 1995; Fine & Turner, 1997) that might also occur in a collaborative learning community (Anderson, 1988, 1990; Anderson & Swim, 1995). Supervisor and supervisee
exchange ideas through a dialogue, through making their internal conversations public. During this dialogical exchange, different possibilities can arise and/or are co-constructed as they talk with each other. Anderson (2000, p.11) prefers to use "consulting with" or "having a conversation about" rather than the term "supervision."

The collaborative language systems approach to supervision emerged in family therapy in the late 1980s (Anderson, 2000; Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1990; Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Anderson & Swim, 1995; Fine, 1993; Turner & Fine, 1996). Collaborative inquiry as a supervision process in family therapy involves "face-to-face ongoing dialogues between a supervisor and therapist where goodwill prevails: the learning is mutual and intense; the power relations are transparent; and the emphasis is on meeting standards of the profession" (Fine & Turner, 1997, p.229).

Collaborative practices invite a diversity of voices and experiences to challenge the traditional view of power inequality in supervision relationships. From a postmodern-collaborative approach, a supervision relationship is simply described as an ongoing, collaborative dialogue that occurs between individuals (Anderson, 2000; Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1990; Anderson & Swim, 1995).

The collaborative approach contrasts with traditional approaches to supervision where the supervisor is the expert and superior to the therapists who are under supervision. The supervisor’s role is more egalitarian, non-hierarchical, and non-expert and her/his knowing always changes in dialogue with the supervisee. A supervisor and supervisee join each other through conversation and explore multiple possibilities. While the supervisor cannot ever truly understand, s/he is always on the way toward fuller understanding. Supervisors dialogically participate with supervisees to author the untold story. Supervisor in collaborative approach takes a position of curiosity or not-knowing (Anderson, 1997) that invites supervisee’s untold story and its meaning for the supervisee. Through the dialogue, supervisor and supervisee explore and co-construct the story of the supervisee.
In this consultation view, supervision is an "embedded narrative; involving the case story, the therapist story, and the supervision story" (Lowe, 2000). My personal bias dictates that these stories should also include the supervisor's story, which is often overlooked in family therapy literature. In this dialogical, relational space of supervision, both parties can start to "shape and re-shape" their stories mutually. As therapists and supervisors, our stories are intermingled in a narrative and text that continuously emerge as we tell and re-tell. When individuals dialogue with each other, their stories are being told and re-told. This telling and re-telling in supervision facilitates shaping, re-shaping, meaning making, and therefore transformation in both supervisee and supervisor.

CHANGE AND TRANSFORMATION
IN THE POSTMODERN, SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION LITERATURE

My ideas and personal biases about change have been evolving ever since I became interested in learning how individuals and systems change, and what we do as therapists to facilitate that kind of change. Initially I thought of change as described by Buber (1953), "There is a meaning in what for long was meaningless. Everything depends on the inner change; when this has taken place, then and only then, does the world change" (p.5)

As an ongoing learner, this idea of change stayed with me although I looked for other definitions and experiences of change in my life. I passionately continued to read, observe and study the nature of relationships and change. My endless questioning of who I am and my purpose in life led me to explore how I constructed my knowing about relationships, including my relationship with myself, and changes in relationships.

I imagine relational connections like spider webs among individuals. Each web emerges from its own culture and climate and functions for survival. We human beings are social creatures who have no way to escape from that spider web. We look for connections and communities, places that make us feel alive and worthy of living well, places relating with each other is necessary for survival, and where relationships are valued and nurtured.
Each relationship, like a living energy with a unique character, evolves in a social community. Like an individual, a relationship has a potential for its own transformation, shaping and re-shaping itself.

Transformation refers to a process of a change in quality occurring over time and therefore also refers beyond the moment-to-moment differences in the process of becoming [who we are]. Any variation in a system is brought about by this time-dependent, constant, and inclusive nature of ongoing change known as transformation. It depends on continuity, not discreteness, as well as on recognizing the time factor as an overall arch in which meaning generating takes place through the relationships (Tinaz, 2002).

Transformation is not a new concept in literature and art, as Rilke’s poems and Kafka’s 1912 story of ‘metamorphosis’ demonstrate (Stein, 1998). In psychology, Jung has addressed the process of transformation through archetypical images and collective consciousness (Jung, 1956). As Carl G. Jung stated, “Many fathomless transformations of personality, like sudden conversions and other far-reaching changes of mind, originate in the attractive power of collective image” (Stein, 1998, p.39). Transformation means “change of form” for Jung in his book “Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido” [Transformations and Symbols of Libido], which was translated into English as “Psychology of the Unconscious” in 1916.

Stein’s concept of liminality emphasized the notion of transformation as an ongoing, constantly changing process as he described, “the times rush ahead like a swollen river, our destination directed by forces beyond our understanding, never mind our control. An end and a beginning are about to coincide” (1998, p xx) In his book, “Transformation. Emergence of the Self,” Stein (1998) explored how transformation leads people to become who they are and to become who they have potentially been His definition of transformation follows.
Change to the new, paradoxically, is change to the very old. Transformation is realization, revelation, and emergence, not self-improvement, change for the better, or becoming a more ideal person. The transforming person is someone who realizes the inherent self to the maximum extent possible and in turn influences others to do the same. (p. xxiv).

The postmodernists who pursued questioning the concept of the self as a social construction (Gergen, 1999; Shotter & Gergen, 1994) might contradict Stein's claim about the inner self, but my bias is that the postmodern thinkers merely extended Stein's ideas further. They all questioned the notion of control as an illusion and ascribed to the ideas of the unknown and unpredictable nature of human beings and change, holding the attitude that one is always on the way to knowing, and therefore in a position of not-knowing or understanding ultimate truth. Gergen questioned self and identity in relation and transformation:

Are not all the fragments of identity the residues of the relationships, and aren't we undergoing continuous transformation as we move from one relationship to another? Indeed, in postmodern times, the reality of the single individual, possessing her/his own values, emotions, reasoning capacities, intentions and the like, becomes implausible (1991, p. 28).

While there are several theories of change in the family therapy field (Keeney, 1983; Papp, 1983; Prochaska, 1994; Satir & Baldwin, 1983), for the purpose of this study, I chose to focus on only a few of these that are defined as close to postmodern and social constructionist thought. Hanna and Brown (1999) described change in three realms in the family therapy field: naturalistic, therapeutic, and relational. Naturalistic change has been a focus in Buddhism from an existential angle. In Buddhist thought *duhkha*, one of the four noble truths, means pain, suffering, and dissatisfaction, although these concepts are not complete enough to fully describe the experience of *duhkha* (Hagen, 1997). In Buddhism,
change is a second form of duhkha, which is described as the constant flux of our physical and mental experiences. When we experience discomfort, we want to know the causes and solutions to our disturbance. This attempt to control reality and manipulate the world, our lives, relationships, other people, or events — brings us back to the state of duhkha. The only escape comes through accepting and becoming at peace with this state of being, which is known as enlightenment through seeing [that there is no way out].

Even if we manage to make our situation comfortable for the moment, it can only be temporary. All circumstances surrounding this momentary situation will inevitably change. And when they do, our momentary pleasure will depart, only to reveal duhkha once again.

The attempt to nail down the world is a profound, if subtle, manifestation of the second form of duhkha. Change [duhkha] is so painful and disturbing because it’s nothing more than our desperate attempt to defy Reality. ... Everything that lives must die; everything that comes into being must come to an end or change its form. It is simply impossible for anything to exist and not change. (Hagen, 1997, p.30-31)

Naturalistic change first became identified with the ideas of Bateson in family therapy. According to Bateson (1972, 1979), change occurs spontaneously from variations in the natural world that become amplified over a period of time. The change occurs naturally and inevitably in the flow of life. In this flow, a therapist can create a therapeutic change that eventually can become natural.

I do not believe that anyone fully knows or can ever fully know the processes that account for personal and social change inside or outside of therapy. Rather, I see social science’s attempts to understand change as providing innumerable partial models of therapeutic process. More often than not, these partial models are sorted into either/or dualities in which only one side of a distinction is held to be true, correct, or more useful. [italics in original] (Keeney, 1983, p.3)
In his improvisational clinical work, Keeney (1990) practiced Bateson's ideas. His work evolved from second order cybernetics, changing rules about the rules in a family system, to become an improvisational way of being with individuals to join the process of change. The narrative approach in family therapy also utilized the Batesonian ideas to punctuate exceptions and amplify them with homework assignments in the natural family setting in order to create and maintain therapeutic change (Freedman & Combs, 1996; White & Epston, 1990).

Evolution of change theories from first order cybernetics to second order and then beyond in family therapy brought the theoreticians' focus to postmodern ideas about change. Through her collaborative approach to family therapy, Anderson (2001) described transformation and the transformative power of language as occurring when people “shape and re-shape” their experiences, ideas, and stories together. According to Anderson, both conversational partners inevitably risk change through involvement in dialogue.

Transformation (e.g., new knowledge, expertise, identities, and futures), therefore, is inherent in the inventive and creative aspects of language. This transformative view of language invites a view of human beings as resilient; it invites an appreciative approach.

...client and therapist become conversational partners who engage in collaborative relationships and dialogical conversations. ...these kinds of relationships and conversations involve uncertainty. ...client and therapist are shaped and reshaped -transformed- as they go about their work together. (Anderson, 2001, p.XX) [italics in original]

According to client reports of their experiences in therapy, therapeutic change is mainly explained through relationship factors such as acceptance, non-possessive warmth, positive regard, affirmation, and self-disclosure more than the therapy model itself (Hanna & Brown, 1999; Miller, Duncan, & Hubbel, 1997; Pinsof & Catherall, 1986). Satir (1972) was
the one of the pioneers in family therapy who emphasized the relationship as the most crucial factor in creating change.

From a narrative approach, Frank (1995) described the theme in one’s own story as the identity of this individual. Similarly, Widdershoven (1993) has discussed the impossibility of separating stories from one’s own life. As humans experience life, they story their actions and act upon their stories. In this journey, the experience of transformation usually takes place as individuals identify with the multiple realities offered by the stories. Individuals’ responses to these different realities and how they talk about them as they continue their journey occur in a community in which individuals have been socially co-creating and co-sharing the meaning of life.

Paul Ricoeur (1981) writes that narrative is a response to the human experience of chaos and discord that time brings. He believes that stories are reinvented each time they are told because, in between the telling, time intervenes and changes occur between each telling of the story (Penn, 2001, p.37).

A local culture or a community might provide such a generative and collaborative learning environment that transformation is facilitated among its members (Shotter, 2000). As a result, meaningful connections and storytelling might continue to transform individuals as they relate with one another, eventually transforming the culture over time.
CHAPTER IV

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

As the primary researcher, I am interested in how supervisees and supervisors experience their supervision relationship in terms of their transformation narratives and how they experience the supervision sessions in relation to their own transformations at HGI. The goal of this study is to understand how this specific, postmodern-collaborative learning culture, HGI community, might cultivate the relational transformation of supervisees and supervisors. By being informed by the transformational stories of supervisees and supervisors at HGI, the primary researcher hopes that this study will facilitate understanding this learning community and its role to facilitate transformation of supervisees and supervisors.

This study offers a different approach to family therapy supervision research literature by including supervisees’ and supervisors’ experiences in relation to each other as a supervision team. In family therapy training programs, emphasis is often focused on the individual development of therapist (Daugherty, Esper & Linton, 1998) rather than on the supervisor and her/his experience of the supervisee (Black, 1988; Galante, 1988; Williams, Judge, & Hill, 1997; Worthen, & McNeill, 1996). Galante (1988) and Green, Shilts, and Bacigalupe (2001) focused on the supervisor’s experiences of supervision. By focusing on the relationship between two, this study fills a gap in the field of family therapy research. This may create future possibilities to understand how both parts construct together their supervisory performance in this unique relational context.

Understanding the relational transformation experiences of supervisory partners through their descriptions of supervision relationships can bring a different angle to traditional practices of family therapy supervision. This understanding will create a chance to re-evaluate our assumptions and theories of supervision, and being a supervisor. Through this
study, we can also expand our practice of supervision including a relational reference frame of thinking about our supervisory experiences.

Moreover, this study adopts a collaborative-postmodern approach to social qualitative inquiry in which the process includes ethno-phenomenological interviews to study the experiences of transformations and the culture of a collaborative learning community. Therefore, the design of this study is an experimental model for future qualitative social inquiry. Rather than trying to fit the topic into only one type of methodology or design, some features of phenomenology and ethnography were selected.

This approach views research as evolving or emerging, reflexive, and collaborative (Anderson & Burney, 1997; Chenail, 1992; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Duffy, 1995). It is compatible with the theory of social construction and postmodernism. The researcher hopes that not only the topic of supervision, but also the emerging design of the study expands the creativity and transferability of the study design to diverse social disciplines such as teaching, education, clinical practice, management and business.
CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

A POSTMODERN EMERGING QUALITATIVE INQUIRY

In this study, I am interested in learning about the perspectives of both supervisees and supervisors of family therapy as they experience postmodern, collaborative supervisory relationships. I am curious how they experience their own transformations during their supervision relationships. Specifically, how are the stories of supervisees and supervisors relationally transformed through the process of supervision relationships in a postmodern, collaborative learning culture of family therapy?

For the purposes of this research, “stories” refer to any verbal expression by the participant about being in supervision. Although the themes that emerged from the interviews in this study may be relevant for future family therapy training, my main goal is to explore the personal voices of both supervisees and supervisors in a postmodern, collaborative learning culture at the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI).

Reflecting On The Emergent Methodology: The Transition From An Emerging Collaborative Design to A Blended Postmodern Design

This study had originally been planned as a collaborative, qualitative inquiry with supervisees and supervisors who were in search of their own transformations during their supervisory relationships in family therapy. In this approach, the participants are the experts of their lived experiences and co-creators of the proposed inquiry (Anderson & Burney, 1997; Chenail, 1992; Duffy, 1995; Reason, 1994)

My original idea was to create a collaborative research team that included all the supervisees and supervisors at HGI to study their transformations through their supervision relationships. I planned to invite all the supervisees and supervisors at HGI to a meeting in which their ideas about possible research designs for studying their experiences of
transformation, if any, could be developed collaboratively. However, an initial meeting of supervisors and supervisees was dropped from the design due to a combination of factors. Two supervisees concluded their internships at the end of May, and one supervisor traveled abroad in the same month, which shortened the timeline for collecting the data considerably.

Scheduling a time for an initial meeting that everyone could attend would have delayed the study process, making it impossible to finish collecting the data before the two supervisees and one supervisor left in May. Therefore, the collaborative meeting for input for the research design was eliminated.

Over time other changes occurred in the study that required making some adjustments in the proposed methodology. For instance, when I began to collect the data in April 2002, the supervisee-supervisor assignments at HGI were changed. Switching supervisors each semester is a tradition at HGI that provides supervisees the opportunity to work with different supervisory styles. By April there was only one supervisee-supervisor pair; the others were arranged in threesomes with one supervisor and two supervisees. Under these circumstances, the original proposal to work with supervision pairs was no longer possible.

I modified my design and interviewed supervisees and their supervisors separately rather than in pairs. In addition, collecting reflections immediately following the sessions was not as helpful as collecting reflections during the interviews. The first interviewees repeated the content of their supervision meeting rather than reflecting on its influence on their own possible transformation processes. For that reason, I no longer asked the interviewees to reflect immediately after their supervision meetings. As a result, my data emerged thorough the individual interviews with the participants and their demographic descriptions of themselves in the “Participant Essay” (Appendix D). My initial frustration transformed into a learning experience of how to work with participants in the field during a qualitative study. The changes in the data collection process guided me to proceed step by step to build a design that best fit my study. During this process, ethnography and phenomenology emerged
as the two main qualitative methodologies used to create a mixed method to study my research topic. Below, the reader will find the descriptions of the two methods as well as the unique characteristics of each that were included in the study design.

A BLENDED METHODOLOGY: ETHNO-PHENOMENOLOGY

The design of this study combines selected characteristics of two qualitative methodologies, phenomenology and ethnography, which are compatible with postmodern, reflexive stances and social constructionist approaches to social inquiry (Gergen, 2001; Gergen & Gergen, 1985, 1995; McNamee, 1993; Thomas, 1993).

Ethnography

As a long-standing method in sociology and cultural anthropology, ethnography helps to study the culture of social groups, communities, and cultures (Atkinson, 1990; Burgess, 1984; Fetterman, 1989; Geertz, 1973; Hammersely, 1992; Johnson, 1975; Spradley, 1979, 1980; Van Maanen, 1983; Wolcott, 1980). Creswell defines ethnography as a "description and interpretation of a cultural or social group or system (1998, p.58)". The researcher observes and records the patterns of daily living in a culture under inquiry. In addition to the researcher’s intensive engagement with the field, the data usually is collected through observations, interviews, and materials that describe the culture.

The researcher draws conclusions by focusing on the emic, which is her/his view of the individuals in the group or culture, and the etic, which is her/his interpretation of views about human social life from a social science perspective. S/he has to picture a cultural portrait by synthesizing all the aspects that s/he learned when s/he lived in the culture. The researcher does that from a holistic approach by describing the main characteristics of the culture in detail such as history, religion, economy etc. S/he describes the culture, analyzes
the data, and interprets the overall results to be able to describe the cultural behavior of a group or system of individuals.

The researcher attempts to provide validity and reliability of the results through triangulation (comparing different views from different sources of information), respondent validation (determining if the participants recognize the validity of their views), and her/his own personal reflections over the study process (Creswell, 1998). When a researcher lives in a culture for a prolonged period of time, sooner or later, the ethnographic way of studying a culture transforms the researcher into a participant observer in the process of inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Hesse, 1980; Reason, 1994). By living in the study culture, the researcher undergoes the risk of change as much as the members of the culture under the study.

Phenomenology

Phenomenology focuses on "the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept, or the phenomenon" (Creswell, 1998, p. 51). It has been a widely used approach in different fields, such as psychology (Giorgi, 1985; Moustakas, 1994; Polkinghorne, 1989, 1994), sociology (Borgatta & Borgatta, 1992; Swingewood, 1991), education (Tesch, 1990), and nursing and health sciences (Nieswiadomy, 1993; Oiler, 1986).

The researcher starts to study a phenomenon by expressing or writing the epoche, her/his own preconceived ideas about the phenomenon. This process helps to delineate the researcher's biases and previously shaped ideas and/or lived experiences. Next, the researcher lists her/his own questions regarding the meaning of the phenomenon under the study. After these initial questions, s/he interviews the individuals who experienced this specific concept or phenomenon to learn about their lived experiences and its meaning.

After transcribing the verbal data, the researcher analyzes the data through various steps: (1) horizontalization, listing and shaping verbal statements into clusters of meaning.
(2) textural description, describing what was experienced or describing the phenomenon, and
(3) structural description, describing how the phenomenon was experienced by the
individuals who participated in the study. Through these processes phenomenology presents
an essence of the lived experience in regards to a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 1998).

The researcher attempts to provide validity and reliability of the results through
including only individuals who actually lived the experience of the phenomenon under study.
through the member check procedures to determine if the participants validate the accuracy
of the verbal data and the meaning that emerges from the data, as well as through her/his own
personal reflections throughout the study process (Creswell, 1998).

Ethno-phenomenology

Ethnography and phenomenology complement each other very well in terms of the
researcher’s purpose for this study. Phenomenology, the main design of the study, is useful
for its focus on the experiences of individuals who were performing as supervisees and
supervisors in a training culture with a postmodern collaborative approach. Ethnography is
an appropriate complementary design to study this specific postmodern, collaborative family
therapy learning culture because it allows accessing the voices of participants of the study,
which then become the phenomenological focus for learning about the experiences of
supervisees and supervisors in terms of their transformations.

The decision to blend some of the characteristics of the phenomenology and
ethnography in this study came out of my interest in studying both the culture of a
postmodern, collaborative learning community as well as the lived experiences of
transformation in its members. The main characteristics of my blended design as well as the
various pieces of ethnography and phenomenology that I drew from are listed below. Some
of them belong to both methodologies. My blended methodology included the following
characteristics:
- writing my biases, personal ideas about transformation in relation to my own experiences (*phenomenology*).

- creating questions to learn about the lived experiences of transformation of the individuals in a postmodern, collaborative learning community, HGI (*phenomenology and ethnography*)

- developing interview questions to study the culture of the community, limiting them to those concerning contextual characteristics and philosophy that might generate transformation in its members (*ethnography*)

- interviewing participants individually for one to two hours to learn primarily about their lived experiences of transformation during their supervision relationships at HGI (*phenomenology*)

- transcribing the taped interviews (*phenomenology and ethnography*)

- conducting member-checks (*phenomenology and ethnography*)

- analyzing the data (*phenomenology and ethnography*)

- interpreting the results and adding my own reflections in the discussion chapter (*phenomenology & ethnography*)

- addressing the implications and giving suggestions for future research (*phenomenology & ethnography*).

**THE SCENE: HOUSTON GALVESTON INSTITUTE**

The setting for this study is the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI), a non-profit, private organization previously known as the Galveston Family Institute. The Institute was historically based in the “Multiple Impact Therapy” research project with adolescents and their families that started in 1955 (Anderson, Goolishian, Pulliam, & Winderman, 1986). In the 1970s, the theoretical orientation could be described as cybernetic, systemic, strategic.
and brief. Throughout their many years of training students, working with clients, and thinking about their evolving ideas, their theories about family therapy continued to develop, even after Goolishian's death in 1991.

The simultaneous evolution of theory and practice was a fundamental task of the Institute. We refused to design a training program to fit the requirements of an accrediting agency since those very requirements themselves ran contrary to our beliefs in a non-eclectic approach and to our increasing questions about the very concept of family therapy... Our tightly structured theoretical framework provided a powerful context in which trainees were able to experience the shift from an individual objective on "curing" pathology to a systemic focus which emphasized dealing with relationships (Anderson, Goolishian, Pulliam, & Winderman, 1986, p.111-112).

In the late 1970s the Institute was under the influences of constructivism, and in the early 1980s, the influences of hermeneutics, postmodernism, and social constructionism could be seen in its theoretical and philosophical orientation. These several disciplines influenced their practice and led the faculty toward experimenting with new ideas. Readers can find more detailed information about postmodernism and social constructionism in the literature review of this text. I will summarize the basic ideas of cybernetics, cybernetics of cybernetics, constructivism, and hermeneutics here.

Cybernetics, first-order change, is a science of self-correcting systems, like a human body temperature. The body keeps within "an optimum range of temperature by perspiring when it is hot and shivering when it is cold (Hoffman, 1981, p.47)". Families have been thought of as a cybernetic system in family therapy. Any symptom in a family functions to maintain homeostasis and insure survival of the system. The therapist becomes involved in a family system to make a change by manipulating recursive feedback mechanisms.
Cybernetic of cybernetics, second-order change, proposes that human systems are not like machines. They are more complicated and unpredictable. Family systems influence and are influenced by changes in the environment. Cybernetics of cybernetics highlights ecosystemic epistemology (Keeney, 1979), in which each symptom in a family system becomes a part of metaphorical communication in the family. The family therapist is included as an insider, who is also subject to change, and as a participant observer, who is actively involved in change as s/he perturbs the system instead of manipulating the change from an outsider position. “Cybernetics of cybernetics enables us to speak of the autonomy of whole systems, whereas simple cybernetics gives us the view of a system in the context of its relationship with outside systems” (Keeney, 1982, p. 161).

The next theoretical notion, constructivism, refers to the individual construction of reality and meaning that occurs in an individual’s mind. Reality is constructed in an individual’s mind internally and is manifested during interactions and language. Social constructionism, on the other hand, refers to the social creation of multiple realities that occur in a social interaction, a community or a local culture. The theory of social construction emphasizes the role of language in dialogue and socially constructed meaning. Hermeneutics refers to the ways of understanding meaning in a social interaction, a reality, a written text, or a dialogue. It is compatible with the theory of social construction and focuses on language, meaning, and the meaning making processes of human beings.

These evolving theoretical orientations influenced the therapists at HGI in therapy, supervision, research, and learning. Their theory about therapy, known as collaborative language systems, has been evolving around ideas such as “human systems are language systems”, “the client is the expert”, “not knowing stance of the therapist”, “positioning rather than being neutral”, “realities are socially constructed and multiple”, “language generates the meaning”, “shared inquiry”, “collaborative learning community”, “ongoing dialogues”, etc. (Anderson, 1997, 2001; Anderson & Goolishian, 1988, 1992; Shotter, 2000).
I first discovered the Institute's theoretical ideas in 2000 during my study of "Cybernetics of Cybernetics" at Iowa State University. After reading Anderson and Goolishian's articles plus those of Gergen, I became excited about their ideas and the theory of social construction. After meeting with Harlene Anderson and other faculty members in April 2001, the Executive Director offered me a one year Clinical Doctoral Internship, starting on August 1, 2001, and finishing on July 31, 2002. My current position as a Doctoral Fellow at HGI started in the beginning of September 2002.

Currently, the HGI community includes several faculty members throughout the U.S. and associates all over the world, four master's level interns, one doctoral fellow, and several therapists who practice in three different office locations as well as in clients' homes. In addition, faculty members also supervise interns and teach in the Masters' Level Psychology Program of Our Lady of The Lake University (OLLU), Houston Campus. The students complete intensive weekend classes and work within small groups called PODs (Peer Orchestrated Development). PODs are established in the first semester and students study within the same POD until they graduate. Through discussions, group assignments, and preparation of class presentations, PODs promote collaborative, student directed learning in which knowledge is generated together.

During the second and third year, the OLLU students take their practica at HGI, where they work with clients in teams under live supervision. In my study, all the supervisees except one were current students or graduates of this program, and all the supervisors were OLLU faculty. Two of the supervisees were interns from OLLU at the time and graduated in August 2002. One supervisee was a masters' intern from another family therapy program, providing therapy under supervision at HGI.

Family therapy supervision at HGI takes place formally and informally through individual and team meetings. Each therapist or intern therapist has a supervisor assigned by the faculty. The supervisors typically are changed every six months. Supervisees may change
their supervisors to experience different styles of supervision. Supervisors usually have two individual supervisees in addition to weekly group supervision meetings. The informal supervision setting was not the focus of this study. However, supervisees are encouraged to seek help whenever they feel the need and can consult with other supervisors besides their own to hear a different view about a dilemma at hand.

THE PARTICIPANTS AS CO-RESEARCHERS

This study attempts to understand the phenomenon of relational transformation in relation to a supervision relationship in a postmodern, collaborative training culture. In regards to my own personal transformation experiences, taking a primary researcher position in this study seems a natural process to discover others' experiences as well as my own. By taking into account my bias that "transformation is relational", I position myself as the primary researcher in relation to the study participants, who are my co-researchers (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Hesse, 1980; Polkinghorne, 1992, 1990; Reason, 1994).

In designating the participants as co-researchers, I accept them as the experts regarding their own experiences (Anderson, 1997; Anderson & Goolishian, 1992). During the interviews they were so enthusiastic about inquiring and discovering their own experiences that they indeed became co-researchers along with me. I appreciated their additional, self-generated questions and extra personal reflections outside of my research questions. Their contribution added a different, wonderful flavor to my study.

In my position as the primary researcher, I was responsible for planning, organizing, and pursuing data collection, analyzing the results, and writing the dissertation. I scheduled and conducted the interviews with the participants. The participants provided verbal and written data according to the guide I have given them in advance. By inviting the participants to be co-researchers who collaborate with the primary researcher during interviews and data analysis, I acted like an orchestra director to organize the data. I met with the participants
after I transcribed the data to do member-checks. The participants were also involved in the data analysis phase when they provided their views on the emergent themes.

The participants included seven supervisees and three supervisors who practiced at Houston Galveston Institute and defined their practice as collaborative and transforming. Their demographic information ("Participant Essay" in Appendix D) included the supervisees' and supervisors' ages as well as years of experience in providing therapy, supervision, and supervision of supervision. On the same form, they wrote a short description of their experience of being a therapist, a supervisor, and being in a supervision relationship. For a summary of the participants' demographic information, please refer to Appendix E.

In this study all participants, including the primary researcher, are viewed as learners regarding their personal experiences of relational transformation during their supervision relationships and the process of study. Shotter (2000) and Anderson (1998, 2000) refer to this process as establishing a collaborative learning community. In my case, this community also includes the reader and the dissertation committee.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS: PATCHWORKING THE VOICES

This section explains the data collection and data analysis processes in detail. The verbal transcriptions of the interviews are considered the raw data, which have been shaped and reshaped after the interviews according to the procedures that are explained below in order to discover the emergent themes. With respect to the unique voices of the participants, I include their voices and stories by copying and pasting excerpts from the transcripts throughout the results chapter. I like to call this process "patchworking the voices."
The Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected from ten individuals, three supervisors and seven supervisees who worked or supervised at HGI. As a supervisor and a supervisee, I did not include myself as an interviewee in the study. However, my ideas became alive during some of the interviews as well as in the discussion chapter as the primary researcher. After receiving Human Subjects Approval (Appendix A), the data was collected over a span of eight weeks.

Step-by-step data collection:
Step I: Writing my ideas and biases

I began to keep a journal to explore my biases and ideas about transformation in relation to my own experiences during my internship at the Houston Galveston Institute. During this journaling, some questions and ideas in relation to supervision started to emerge and became my initial draft questions about transformation. I culled the main questions from these initial questions.

Step II: Listing the initial draft of interview questions:

I listed an initial draft of interview questions that I would like to ask to the participants. My main questions (p.46) became clear after my first interview. The initial draft questions included the following:

- How do you describe "transformation"?
- What does "relational transformation" mean to you?
- How do you see yourself in transformation, if any occurs?
- How would you describe your relationship with your supervisor/supervisee?
- How do you see this supervision relationship in your relational transformation?
- How do you see transformation (if any) mutually occurring during your supervision process?
- How does the experience of supervision relationship facilitate your own transformation?
Step III: Inviting participants

All supervisees and supervisors, who had been designated to work with each other at HGI during the study period, were invited to participate in this study through an Invitation Letter (Appendix B). I invited the supervisees and supervisors to share their experiences of supervision and transformation during their supervisory relationships. All of them, seven supervisees and three supervisors at HGI, voluntarily agreed to participate and were included in the study.

Step IV: Receiving the consent

The Informed Consent Form (Appendix C) and the Demographic Information Form (“Participant Essay” in Appendix D) were distributed to the participants. The signed consent forms were returned immediately to me, while the demographic information forms were returned as soon as they had been completed. Next, I scheduled the interviews with each participant to collect the data. All the participants had returned their
demographic information forms by the time the interviews were completed.

**Step V: Conducting the participant essay**

Before beginning each interview, I collected the participant essay, which included information such as age, sex, number of years of experience as a therapist or supervisor, graduation year, degree, field of graduation, length of clinical practice, length of supervising experience, length of supervision of supervision, and short descriptions of their experience of being a therapist or supervisor, and their supervision relationship (Appendix D). This data was collected to give the reader more context and background about the individuals who participated in my study and to help me introduce the participants to the reader in a more personal way (Appendix E).

**Step VI: Deciding the main interview questions**

The interview questions focused on each participant's individual experiences of the supervision relationship with regard to their description of relational transformation and their description of postmodern collaborative supervision. The main emphasis was the supervision relationship and the individual's experiences of transformation, whether supervisor or supervisee, during the interviewing process.

During the first two interviews of data collection, my main interview questions emerged from the questions that are listed at the beginning of this study. However, there was no need to ask the other initial draft questions because the participants responded so spontaneously to the following main questions:
1. How do you describe transformation?
2. How do you experience transformation, if any?
3. How do you describe your supervision relationship at HGI?
4. How do you experience your supervision relationship at HGI?
5. How do you experience transformation, if any, during your supervisory relationship?

These main interview questions provided a starting point for discussion but were shaped with the interviewee during the process of interviewing. I paid careful attention to how I spoke, how I asked the questions, and the tone of my voice to avoid specific emphases in my language, which could lead the participants in a particular way as they answered. The inter-views were conducted as two individuals in a conversation in which both could explore and try to understand a specific experience under inquiry.

Step VII: Conducting the interviews

One interview was conducted individually with each participant at HGI for a total of ten interviews. The interviews were audio taped, and confidentially was assured by assigning a code number to each tape and securing the tapes in a locked cabinet. I was the only person to have access to the tapes. The goal of the interviews, which lasted from one to two hours according to the course of our dialogue, was to primarily learn about the participants' lived experiences of transformation during their supervision relationships at HGI.

The main interview questions, which emerged from my journaling, are listed as an initial draft and explained in Step II. I asked some additional questions (listed as “initial draft”) questions if I needed to understand their experiences more in detail. The flow of the dialogue with
each participant as well as the amount and type of information given by
them in response to my main questions guided the process of interviewing.

The Data Analysis Procedure

The data analysis was completed according to the data analyzing procedures of
phenomenology instead of ethnography. Ethnography complemented phenomenology in
terms of studying the culture of the learning community in which supervisory relationships
were explored. Including excerpts from my journal as well as introducing HGI and its
learning community in this chapter also demonstrate ethnography's complementary role in
this study. According to phenomenology's data analysis procedure, the transcripts of the
interviews facilitated to discover the emerging themes.

Step-by-step data analysis:

Step I: Transcribing the data

I listened to the tapes as I finished the interviews, and typed the
verbal data into written data as transcribed raw data material. I finished
each one after the interview separately. All the participants were given
pseudonyms, which were used in the transcripts (Appendix F) and
throughout the text, to protect their confidentiality.

Step II: External and internal audits

After the data were transcribed and organized, an external auditor
listened to the tapes and revised the transcribed text (external audit). I also
read the raw transcriptions and highlighted the ideas and keywords that
stood out for me in the text to become aware of my own biases (internal
audit)
Step III: Conducting member checks

Next I gave the participants their raw transcriptions to complete the member checks with the following instructions: “Please highlight keywords and phrases in your statements. Also make any changes necessary to insure accuracy. You may add additional comments if necessary.” Each participant completed an individual member check to correct the transcript for mistakes, to explore any further reflections on their transcripts and to highlight ideas that they thought were meaningful in terms of their experiences. The necessary changes were made and the workable data was complete with the checked transcripts. I wanted to see if there was any consistency between my highlighted ideas and their highlighted ideas in the raw data. After the member-checks were returned, the keywords and highlighted topics were compared with the ones that I had listed to determine the consistency and to discover my own biases in the data analysis process. I looked at the keywords the participants highlighted or wrote next to the sentences, later I looked at my own highlighted keywords in their raw transcripts. The keywords appeared very similar in most transcriptions. Although I listed the keywords that stood out for me separately, I only included the participants’ ideas or keywords in the emergent themes. The reason for doing so was to only include the participants’ perceptions of what was important, not mine.

Step IV: Listing the highlighted ideas and keywords

The highlighted ideas and keywords of each participant were culled from the transcripts returned after the member checks and listed using an individual column for each participant. By placing these columns next to each other on the wall, I could compare the similarities and
disparities in their keywords and ideas. Supervisors' and supervisees' lists were located as sub-groups close to each other. Next, I underlined the similar words and phrases among all the columns. I also noted each story that each participant told during the interviews. I gave a name to each story in this list, and later renamed these stories as I wrote the themes in the results chapter. The themes and the connections among the ideas and keywords started to emerge from the lists on the wall.

**Step V: Connecting and clustering the themes**

Next, I marked the key words and ideas according to their similarities by using a colored marker to draw lines like spider webs among the keywords, and eventually among the lists. During this process the main themes started to emerge. Since the participants described transformation and their stories of transformation as two different themes, I decided to include their emphasis of the relational nature of transformation as a separate theme. Then, I clustered the keywords that described the main characteristics of their supervisory relationships. This whole process became one of patchworking their voices rather than reducing them into sub-categories. I intentionally attempted to capture and vividly present the essence of the experiences and the voices of the participants. In the writing process, I did not categorize the themes according to the two sample groups, supervisor or supervisee. Rather I chose to present their themes together to prevent any sub-categorization or hierarchical distinction among the participants. The result was a patchwork of all the voices represented equally and inclusively in a rich mixture of personal and unique experiences.
Step VI: Reflecting on the emerged themes

I asked the participants who were available to re-visit the themes that emerged from the transcripts and reflect on them as a second member check. I met with the three available participants, one supervisor and two supervisees, for 15 minutes to ask if they found the themes similar to their own experiences. They suggested no changes in the themes and expressed their appreciation for the opportunity for their voices to be heard through this study. In this phase I also referred to my own experience of transformation as I made the connections among different emergent themes of the participants. During the interview process, I kept a journal of reflections about my experiences in the study, which included my own transformation during the study process. These journal entries facilitated auditing changes as they occurred in the study. I also integrated these entries when they seemed pertinent to the data in both the introduction and discussion chapters.

REFLECTIONS ON VERIFICATION

I adopted phenomenology and ethnography for this study, blending their relevant characteristics to study relational transformation in a postmodern, collaborative learning culture of family therapy supervision. The verification procedures to assure the reliability of the results of my study are described below for both methodologies. In phenomenology, making the researcher's perspective and biases public rather than using pre-conceived verification strategies significantly increases the credibility of the results (Dukes, 1984). In ethnography, strategies such as triangulation of the informants, informant feedbacks, personal reflections, and reflections of outside readers increase the credibility of the study results (Creswell, 1994).
My attempts to provide verification (validity), credibility (reliability), and authenticity of the study results primarily included the audits, the member check procedures, the personal reflections of the participants, and my own reflections. "Member check procedure" refers to the process of determining if the participants validate the accuracy of the verbal data and the meaning that emerged from the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). According to Creswell (1994), asking participants to comment or reflect on the results is an external verification method, whereas looking at the consistency of the study in terms of the researcher's sense of meaning or sense making of the topic under study is an internal method of verification. In my study, all these procedures verified the results and increased the authenticity of the results according to both phenomenology and ethnography.

An external audit included a reader who listened to the tapes after I transcribed them, revising the transcribed texts to correct any mistakes during the transcription process. I included their comments by changing the corrected words and/or phrases in the raw transcriptions. I also referred my initial readings of the raw transcriptions and highlighting outstanding keywords for me as a way of auditing my biases, internal thought processes. I called this process as an internal auditing process, which helped me to acknowledge my biases before interpreting the results. My purpose in conducting these internal and external audits was to increase the credibility of the data and the study results. These audits indicated my personal biases that I held during transcribing and interpreting the data. My biases were around the differences between supervisors' and supervisees' descriptions about how a transforming, or transformation generating relationship looked like.

As another verification procedure, the member check procedures included two steps of checking with the study participants. In the first step, I gave the raw interview transcriptions back to the participants to make corrections and additions if necessary, which helped to increase the trustworthiness of the data. In the second step, I asked participants to read the list of themes that emerged after the data analysis and verbally state whether these
themes seemed valid for the study topic. I asked if the themes related to their experiences. Two supervisees and one supervisor read the list of the theme sub-titles and agreed that the themes were similar to their personal experiences in regards to the study topic. Unfortunately, I have not recorded these verbal comments because they were short comments and I did not pursue to ask more reflection in these short meetings. That would have been very helpful for my study. It is my hope that, the first step of the member check procedure increased the credibility of the data and the results whereas the second step significantly verified the overall study results.

I also aimed to assure the credibility of the study results by including my personal reflections as well as those of the participants (respondent validation). I referred to my journal entries in the text, although I did not refer to them in the results chapter at all. The purpose of including the excerpts from my journal was to make my experiences and biases about relational transformation transparent for the reader. By making my experiences and biases public, I hoped to increase the level of credibility of the study results, as well as connect with the reader. I hoped that if the reader knew more about the story of the researcher, s/he could better understand the position of the researcher in studying relational transformation. Eventually, this would help the reader to situate the researcher in the context and topic of the study.

The excerpts and two poems from my journal are included in the text to present the evolving process of my own experience of transformation. In the very beginning of the text, the reader encounters one of my journal excerpts with more excerpts and poems included throughout the paper. Through the inclusion of these personal writings, the reader can also follow the process of transformation in my ideas about relational transformation during the study. It is my hope that this opportunity will provide the reader with my perspective and experience of relational transformation, and therefore facilitate the evaluation of my interpretation of the results in discussion chapter. The reflections of the participants are
included as a last theme in the results chapter. Their validations of the themes, the second member checks, are not included in the text in detail since these were given verbally. The two supervisees and one supervisor validated the themes and results in regards to their experiences of relational transformation through family therapy supervision, both inside and outside of the supervision sessions at HGI.

As an intern and researcher, I worked and studied for a little more than fourteen months at the HGI. During the study, I was an insider in the HGI community. Therefore, I felt comfortable enough to portray the culture, the organizational structure of the institute, and the community from my own lived experience as a learner, therapist, supervisee, and supervisor at HGI. I also asked the participants to describe HGI culture and the collaborative learning community. Due to the participants' detailed descriptions of the HGI community and culture during the interviews, which are detailed in the results chapter as one of the main themes, triangulation as a verification method has been conducted. In addition to my own descriptions, I asked to the executive director about how many therapists, supervisors, and faculty members existed at HGI. This information was used as a way to triangulate the sources of information where I described HGI community as my study scene on page 38.

It would have been more supportive of the study results, if I interviewed with the Executive Director of the Institute about how she, as a director, perceived that transformation occurs relationally in HGI learning community. This would have been helped the reader to understand the context of learning culture at HGI. Another way of including her as a director could have been interviewing her after analyzing the data to check if the themes emerged were consistent with her perception, as a director, of the learning community at HGI. She could have commented credibility of the results in regards to the Institute from a director position. These procedures have not been included as triangulation of the sources of the information in this study. I wanted to reflect on these possibilities as I address triangulation, so that one knows there are always multiple ways of triangulating the informant sources.
REFLECTIONS ON A POSSIBLE ETHICAL DILEMMA

At the beginning of my study, I was concerned about including and interviewing two of my own supervisees as a part of the study. With my supervisees, I was concerned that my supervisory position might have limited the supervisees' responses to specific questions about our supervisory relationships. I publicly acknowledged this issue with them at the beginning of our interviews and double-checked if they wouldlike to continue under the circumstances. Both supervisees wanted to continue to participate and stated that they already knew about this issue when they decided to participate. Consequently my ethical dilemma was dissolved.

Their shift from being my supervisees to being my interviewees occurred easily, which may be explained by our practice of shifting positions at HGI. The community at HGI values shifting among multiple positions and multiple realities. The supervisees at HGI are perceived as students learning to construct multiple realities and to work in multiple positions. As an ongoing practice, the members of the HGI community are all positive about their ability to switch positions and to share their private thoughts without the influence of other positions, in this case supervisory relationships.

It is my bias that having a supervisory relationship with these two interviewees helped me as a researcher because, due to this relationship, I knew how to approach them and how to explore this concern with them. One of the interviewees stated that the interview process gave her a chance to experience me, initially her supervisor, in another way. Interestingly, she stated that our interview was transformative for her by giving her an opportunity to talk about this with me as the researcher.
CHAPTER VI

THE RESULTS

INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

The ten voluntary participants in the study included seven supervisees and three supervisors who stated that they had experienced transformation in their practice of therapy and supervision at HGI. The participants' ages ranged from 27 to 53 with the average age of 45 for supervisors and 43 for supervisees. One participant was male, and the rest of the participants were female. Supervisees had an average of 2 years in providing therapy, and supervisors had an average of 18 years in providing therapy and an average of 12 years in providing supervision. Two supervisors were AAMFT approved clinical supervisors, and one was an AAMFT supervisor-in-training and post-doctorate fellow. One supervisor was bicultural with an ethnic identity and two were white Americans. A summary depicting the participants' demographic information can be found in Appendix E.

On the demographic information form, the participant essay (Appendix D), the participants were also asked to briefly describe their experiences as a therapist, as a supervisor, and their feelings about their supervision relationship. Before presenting these results, the qualitative data given below will introduce the participants to the reader:

Mary is a 41 year old female supervisee with a master’s degree in marriage and family therapy. She became a licensed therapist two years ago and has had three years experience providing therapy. She described being a therapist as “an opportunity and a gift of sharing others’ lives, experiences, thoughts, feelings, and of making connections with other human beings.” She described her supervision relationship as “a supporting, nurturing relationship that has as its purpose the growth of both the supervisor and supervisee toward their potentials.”

Lisa is a 44 year old female supervisee, who is an associate licensed therapist with three years experience providing therapy. She described being a therapist as “nearly hard at times. I am
very pleased with following through with this career but question
my skills and effectiveness at times. At other times, I feel very
rewarded.” In describing her supervision relationship, she stated, “I
am very appreciative, non-judgmental, non-hierarchical when
discussing clients in supervision. Two years ago, before starting at
HGI, I was in the more traditional mode of thinking of supervision,
which would be more as a teacher/student relationship. I prefer
this approach as I can be more myself.”

Mel, a 27 year old female supervisee, is a masters student in
psychology with a family therapy focus and an intern therapist at
HGI. She has no license to practice yet. She wrote that her two
years’ experience of being an unpaid therapist “has changed as this
year has passed. In the beginning, I felt very uncomfortable
working as a therapist and really disliked it. Now, I feel much
more at ease and feel fewer conflicts.” She described her
supervision relationship as “a good experience for me. I appreciate
the new thoughts I have and the changes I feel.”

Elle, a 50 year old female supervisee who is an associate licensed
therapist, has had three years experience providing family therapy.
She described being a therapist as the “culmination of a long term
dream, a goal. It is rewarding, challenging, demanding, and
sometimes depleting. I have found that a balanced life style is key
to my doing a good job.” She described the most important aspect
of her supervision relationship as being “the trust and freedom to
be honest. It is just as important in this relationship as it is between
client and counselor.”

Grace, a 51 year old female supervisee with an associates’ LPC
license, has had two years experience providing therapy. She
wrote, “the last two years have probably been the hardest yet the
most challenging. I have experienced highs and lows, times of
feeling successful and times of [feeling] completely inept. I have
learned more about myself in two years than I did in the 40
something before. I love what I am doing.” She included her
previous supervision as an intern when she described her
experience of supervision. “Both of my supervision experiences
have been wonderful. I have been challenged to look at myself, my
biases, and also to see myself from someone else’s perception.
These have been both fascinating and healing.”

Joy, a 52 year old female supervisee, is a masters student in
psychology with a family therapy focus as well as an intern
therapist at HGI. She has had one year of internship experience in
providing therapy and is not yet licensed. She described being a therapist as "challenging and rewarding, frustrating and humbling, satisfying and overwhelming." Her experience of supervision relationships was "supportive and challenging, empowering and reassuring, I learned that those with lots of experience still have their doubts and tough issues."

Kelly, 34 year old female supervisee with an M.S. in family therapy and associates' LMFT license, has two years of experience providing therapy. She recently started a doctoral study. She described being a therapist as "I have enjoyed the experience. It has been challenging and many times very uncertain. I question how helpful the process is when clients are mandated to attend therapy. I feel like I still have a lot to learn, yet I feel like I am effective with the skills that I already have." Her experience of supervision, in her words: "I felt very supported, yet I am also grateful for my supervisor's direct confrontation on certain issues with which I struggle. I am energized by the experience. I appreciate that my supervisor makes me think and I hope I can give the same experience to my clients."

Steve, 48 year old male supervisor with a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology, has had twenty-two years experience providing therapy and fifteen years experience providing supervision. He described both being a therapist and supervisor in similar a way: "participating in the aesthetics of interaction." He described supervision relationship as "an entity created by interaction."

Pam, a 54 year old female supervisor, has twenty years experience providing therapy and fifteen years supervisory experience. She has a Ph.D. in family therapy and became licensed as an LMFT and LPC about twelve years ago. She's also been providing supervision of supervision for the last ten years. She described being a therapist as "a constant learning opportunity. I am often in awe of how many clients survive very challenging and difficult experiences." She described her years as a supervisor as "also a good learning experience- my challenge is to bring theory/practice/research into conversation- questions are usually case-specific- broadening them and inviting supervisee[s] to use their own resources." She described her supervisory relationships as "mutually beneficial."

Nora, a 33 year old female supervisor, has a social work background and recently received her Ph.D in family therapy. She has had her associate's family therapy license for four years. She's
been providing therapy for twelve years and supervision for five years. She described being a therapist as "a dynamic, challenging way to live... A way of being such as a plumb line that checks for consistency of my own relationships and dreams in life... A privileged and turbulent way of maintaining consistency..." She described her experience of being a supervisor as giving her "a new sense of respect for the unknown and a tremendous sense of responsibility. Finding another voice. Sense of authority and vulnerability! A counterbalance!" She defined her supervision relationships as "a learning relationship of joy, of learning about myself and my theories of therapy in relation to the other!"

**EMERGENT POLYVOCAL THEMES**

The themes that emerged from the listed keywords during the data analysis are described below. All themes, used as subtitles of this chapter, are supported with relevant excerpts from the interviews.

**Transformation**

Supervisees (Mary, Mel, Lisa, Elle, Joy, Grace, and Kelly) and supervisors (Nora, Pam, and Steve) defined the concept of transformation in regards to their own experiences and its difference from the concept of change. All similarly reported that transformation can happen in any kind of relationship, not only limited to the supervision relationship.

Steve described transformation as a type of fundamental change. He gave the difference between change and transformation in the following example:

All change is not transformation, you know, a room [getting] hotter or colder is not transformation. The room going from hot to cold is transformation... some fundamental shift and understanding or experience or something, so that what was one experience becomes another.

He emphasized process when he described the difference between the two. He also stated that the word transformation reminds him of hypnotic trance and defined transformation as a
hypnotic process of change: "It's funny when you asked about that definition, [it] always reminds me that there is [an] Ericksonian play on words, [with] the first part "trans" being spelled as t-r-a-n-c-e-formation. Trance is like a hypnotic trance."

Joy, a supervisee, described transformation as simply a "sort of change, opening up to see other possibilities, and therefore, being able to take those possibilities and carry [them] with you, then at one point they become a part of you." Mary had a similar definition of transformation as that which facilitates a person to become and grow into who this person wants to be:

Transformation is about experiencing yourself and your relationships in a new way. It can be trying on new roles and finding yourself successful or not and then changing your narrative about self and relationship as a result. It can be reading something or hearing something or being inspired by someone else and having an idea about incorporating that into what you want to be.

It can happen in positive or negative ways in a relationship according to Elle and Mary who stated, "[a] person has no control to direct its destination." Grace and Kelly, other supervisees, also described its positive nature. In addition, Kelly stated that it also has an experiential and intellectual nature. "I guess it is change in a positive way. I think it is experiential more than intellectual. I guess it is combination of both." Mary described the same nature of transformation but also added a physical component.

It is not so much an intellectual experience though it can start that way... I think an intellectual kind of change, one existing only in the mind as abstract isn't really a transformation. It comes for me as an integration into who I am. I have to feel it physically, throughout my whole body and my heart. I think it must be integrated into our stories about ourselves, what others say about us, and how we behave. I think the transformation comes sometimes from within but also from others as well, or in response to others.
Mary's idea of the experience of transformation in the intellectual and physical levels seems parallel with Steve's idea about transformation as a hypnotic process of change. Hypnosis also can create similar types of experiences. While some supervisees only focused on the experience on an intellectual level, others focused on the physical and emotional levels. The reader will find examples of these different perspectives below.

Grace emphasized the intellectual and cognitive levels of transformation. She described transformation as "looking at things in a different way, changing one's perception, and enlightening, learning something new." Mel, the youngest supervisee, defined transformation in a similar way as a "process of changing from what you were, what your thoughts were to something different and newer." She also described her feeling that "transformation takes me to a different place, I mean, something I can feel, not just for my parts but more global."

Grace addressed transformation as an "adding onto" act. Adding onto what one has at hand makes the transformation visible and creates a newer, better way of being and acting. Lisa, one of the supervisees, described her understanding of transformation similarly:

Transforming means to me [that] you are becoming someone or something entirely different. I don't think I was transformed. I changed my looking at what I was doing. Instead of having a smaller picture, my picture grew, so I could add into the session what I was missing.... I'd described [it] as taking one behavior or one being, and working from either completely erasing it or changing it completely, and starting the new... Transformation to me is almost [that] you become something different than what you started out being, [while] you still have the essence of what you were. I think.

All the participants declared the concept of transformation as being different than the concept of change. When compared with change, transformation is a long-term process.
Transformation is described by the participants as a grandiose, spiritual, intense, overwhelming, shocking, not under control, evolution-like, and long-lasting concept. Mel, the youngest supervisee, stated that it is a long process:

I guess transformation is more long term, and change is more moment to moment- that you can change today, but go back the next day. Transformation is more what across the process to the change, but the things in long term, and more long lasting. I would say it’s a real change; it would sticks with you longer and maybe effects more than just that particular event.

Elle described transformation as a spiritual and overwhelming experience that one has no control over. Mary had a similar idea about the timing of transformation as Elle. She gave an example from her therapy practice.

Elle: I just thought that here transformation is almost used in religious contexts, like in Christianity, Jesus transformed… It is more like that infinitive, spiritual way of change. I think transformation is almost like shocking. Something overwhelming… may not be under your control.

Mary: It happens in its own time. Not by my time schedule but my clients’. You can’t be impatient otherwise you inject judgment into the relationship, which negates everything you have tried to build. I think you can challenge clients or express being uncomfortable or concerned but you have to be respectful of their pace.

Nora, a supervisor, stated that transformation is similar to change. According to her, it’s a matter of semantics. She described change as “something you’re maybe expecting, you’re one thing and then you become something else,” while she described transformation as “fluid [and] ongoing. If someone’s definition of change is fluid, then it’s the same. If it’s “oh, yesterday I used to [do] this and I stopped doing that”, it’s a definition of change. I
Kelly similarly focused on the grandiose nature of transformation in relation to her understanding of change.

Kelly: Transformation to me seems very grand. I mean it's bigger than change. So usually, experiences are more transformative for me than just reading something from a book. Transformation is more a kind of process of change in a long run. I guess I would use the word transform for the process. It's usually larger than change, it's important. It doesn't just happen in one day or two days, maybe it does take time unless like, for example, this weekend I went to a workshop. It was very intense. So, then over the weekend I felt transformed, but it was outside of daily living.

Another female supervisor, Pam, described transformation as more of an evolution. She also stated that her notion of transformation has changed due to her experience of her two and a half year old child's experience with the language of transformation through his toys. She addressed how impressive it is to observe children learning this language through their toys.

It's funny that my notion about transformation [has] changed recently because my child is using that language. His toys transform, and evolve. Pokemon evolves and transformers transform. So, that's the picture I get immediately. He has a tree that turns into a robot, and vice versa. They go back and forth. It's interesting because he's two and a half, and he already has a notion about what transformation is and what evolving [is]. For me actually it's interesting too, those words are very related. For me transformation is a shorter term process than evolution, as if there is some sort of a change that you can see, the train go to the robot, you know, that I might become something different in a more visible way. I think although that's just me... I think more in terms of evolution, that we're always changing—that we as people, as learners, as supervisors, as therapists, as clients, as humans, that we're always changing. The ways in which we change have to do both with ourselves and with the relationships that we're involved in, and environment, and culture, all the different things that influence us.
Pam also drew attention to the culture of society, "a microwave culture", in which children live. She addressed how a specific language is learned in communities of children and built into the daily spoken language throughout their different experiences. Naturally, her experience with her five-year-old son also has changed her understanding of transformation.

Well, I guess I was struck by how in his culture, already in our culture, there are now experiences that he can have that exposed him to this idea of change in a way that I think reflect our society's pace, you know, the microwave culture. So, he knows about how the microwave changes things although that's not verbalized very much.

**Relational Transformation**

Both supervisees and supervisors stated that transformation occurs relationally in and outside of supervision. All participants described relational transformation according to their personal experiences and gave examples. The main concept underlying transformation was that it occurs along with, during, within, or through relationships. This process also is not only limited to the supervision relationships.

Others described relational transformation as relating not only with a human being, but also in relation with or to an object, an idea, or an experience. Thinking relationally and seeing interactions relationally were the key aspects of positioning oneself in a context that facilitates self-transformation. It refers to a contextual, interactional, and relational way of being, thinking, and acting in the world. Therefore, not relating and not transforming were always impossible.

Relational transformation is a formation of a process toward another flow of action that is defined relationally and socially constructed in language by its participants.

Kelly: I guess relational [means] that it occurs in relationships. I agree. I agree. Even when you're by yourself, things you hear in your head generally came from some interaction, something or
somewhere else. Probably, relational transformation [occurs] through your interactions with other people... I’ve never thought about themes or nature but I can relate to that a lot. Through your interactions, that brings about change. That’s where you get new information.

Nora: [It] occurs in relationships—that relationships [are] central to it somehow. That’s when you use it, that’s not my way of thinking or talking. But in conversation with you, I thought that. So, in that sense I definitely think that [it] occurs relationally because I think about it as being more a qualifier. I think qualifies that transformation is relational. However, I think of transformation as more relational in nature.

Nora talked about the audience when one is presenting this idea of transformation. “The difference [is the] audience you talk to, but even that the transformation is change, to that kind of audience I would emphasize relational. Like all my meaning is social; with a different audience I would use social meaning.” While she described this meaning difference in semiotics of language, Pam, another supervisor, stated her struggle with relationality in its radical form.

That being its radical form of interpretation—that some people define identity only in its relational form...I struggle with taking into the continuum as opposed to individualism, you know, relational terms as the opposition of individualism, all those extremes. So, when you say relational transformation, yes, I believe transformation is a result of a combination of what the individual brings, which is a result of relationship, which is a result of what the individual brought, which is a result of the relationship. I think those are real intertwined. I don’t t think it is just relational, in the extreme.

According to the supervisees and supervisors, any kind of relationship can be transformative. Joy described her thinking of transformation as being relational by giving some examples in regards to human-to-human and human-to-nature relationships. She talked
about "holding a relationship" as a frame of reference to make meaning out of an experience with a deeper sense of awareness that becomes transformative.

I do [think transformation is relational], because it's sort of the comfortableness of the setting and the relationship [that] makes it possible to bring up the difficulties... Because without the relationship, you can't kind of hold them, you know that you are not going to be judged as a terrible therapist just because you bring up difficulties, you know and, that's sort of holds the whole thing, and then in the conversation, something will loosen up, at least you have talked about it if nothing else, and you have more ease. So, I think that's a lot to do with the relationship, you know, because I don't think that kind of sharing can happen without a holding relationship.... The word you "relate to".... It's sort of the words and how you're using [them]...most people think of relation[ship] as only human-to-human, and a relationship... you can have a relationship with a plant, with a house. If something has a meaning, I think it's because I let it into my awareness in a deeper level than I had it before. (Joy)

Lisa, a supervisee, viewed her philosophical stance as the background of her thinking and practice in family therapy. I will present more of a theoretical influence on the understanding and experience of transformation later in this chapter. Lisa's excerpt facilitates understanding the concept relationally, rather than explaining the postmodern, social construction theory. Lisa described how this relational way of thinking informed her understanding of transformation as a relational concept.

I think, I guess partly that [it] is just from [the] philosophical stance point that I come from, and then I think any relationship that you have with people can create change. I think that when you interact with people; relate with people... I just think that happens according to my belief system on my part. I don't know if I [were working] somewhere else, and I was doing a cognitive behavioral therapy, I would also think that... just because you're relating to somebody, that creates change too
Stories of Relational Transformation

Below, I present verbal excerpts from the participants' transformational stories and anecdotes to provide their personal and lived experiences. In this way, their voices are preserved in their originality, as is the uniqueness of the content, expression, and flow.

Supervisees and supervisors had anecdotes and stories in which they expressed how transformed they experienced themselves after the specific incidents. While Kelly and Elle described those transformational anecdotes outside of the supervision context, the other supervisees described them within the supervision sessions. Pam, and Steve, the supervisors, did not report any significant transformation stories while Nora, the youngest supervisor, shared a transformational story about how she positions herself in relation to her supervisees and learns from them about who she is.

Pam stated that she always transforms, and constantly changes and expressed her ideas about how transformation occurs theoretically. Steve, another supervisor, also answered my question “Have you experienced transformation relational transformation?” theoretically.

Steve: Sure, I think that vast majority of more than minimum relationships include transformative aspects. Probably not transformed by the typical everyday experience with going to a grocery store. You know... in relationships, in friendships, psychotherapy, volunteer work, supervision, teaching. All of those are transformative.

While Mary did not offer any story of transformation, she stated that she experiences transformation constantly, both professionally and personally. She stated that one should believe in oneself and in the process. “I feel I am in constant transformation, growing into myself. I see this as a never-ending process. It is the process itself, which is so valuable...”
see it as courageous to be in a place that is open to becoming something different. There has to be a trust in the process and in oneself."

Story I

Intimacy and Healing

Kelly described a recent workshop experience as being very transformative for her, especially how she relates with men. I will present the dialogue to show the flow of the conversation during the interview as well as to demonstrate how we, as the conversational partners, were able to converse with each other and construct the meaning of her unique experience of transformation.

Kelly: It was a couples' workshop... I went with my husband. The focus was on sexuality. A lot of it, which was transformative to me, was the focus on intimacy and connecting with other people. For example, they had an exercise that the women in the center of the circle were facing out to their partners and the men were outside. So, you sat and you looked into your partner's eyes, and people led the discussion like kind of meditation, looking at your partner's eyes. Closing your eyes and then, say you put your hand this far and then closing your eyes again. Then, women all moved one partner over to the left. And you had a similar kind of experience, looking and gazing into someone's eyes that you didn't know. The leader then talked about healing, and said "let this person give you the love, and affection that you may have missed from the opposite sex", "let this person heal your wounds." Someone you didn't know puts his hands on your heart. A very intimate moment with a stranger. It wasn't sexual but it was very safe. For me, going through the world I am generally, if there are men I am not used to touching men that I don't know. I am not used to getting close to men, not used to [having] eye contact. So, to have that experience with my husband, but also with fifteen or twenty men, to feel really safe, and it doesn't have to be sexual. It was really, really transforming.

Dilek: Intimate connection, and connecting with a heart or connecting to a different heart. That's interesting. How did it make
you transformed? What made you think that you were transforming through this experience?

Kelly: Do you mean what was about the experience that I think I was transforming?

Dilek: Yes.

Kelly: It was, maybe, I will use performance as a metaphor. You do things that you’re not used to doing, and then later you’re able to do it outside in an uncontrolled environment. So, I think that was part of it. In my daily life, I just never look at men in the eyes. touch their hearts and think that they’ve been wounded and that I can be a part of their healing and vice versa. What did I think about it that was transformative? I think it was the ability to form that. I don’t feel as awkward, lets say when I see my supervisor. I could look at him in the eyes and feel safe, say thank you so much for what you’ve given me; not have that kind of like jerk that I tend to have as a reflex when people stare at me too long. I just don’t do it. I don’t open my heart, and I felt it was Okay.


Kelly: I think you’re doing a great job. You told something that like -opening the heart to others- that I did not use. But I think I would have said, because the leaders used the same words, opening the heart. They said open your heart as much as you can with this person.

Toward the end of the interview, Kelly and I returned to talking about the same workshop experience. This time, she addressed what she thought about how this transformation happened to her. I found myself sharing my own transformational experience with her during the interview. She also stated that not feeling alone in a journey was important to her. When I told my story to her, we were not alone in the journey.

Dilek: You had mentioned this experience of becoming intimate to other people last weekend. It was about sex, but at the same it was about connecting to other people, to strangers. In a different way, at one point maybe so connected in a different way that you’re not strangers anymore. So, I don’t know. That something stayed with
me. How did you see what kind of intimacy you took with you that transformed you?

Kelly: What kind of intimacy? Oh, well, maybe this goes back to my supervisor as well. For me, I guess, it’s an insecurity or what intimacy and knowing others’ thoughts, struggles, and experiences in a relationship that helps me transform; without that it’s difficult because [of] my insecurities. It’s, “Okay, are we even on the same planet? Is this person thinking that I am not right?” and so, I need that. And that came from this workshop. People were willing to be as open as I was and also were willing to share more. Some people were directed to talk about what their fears were when I looked into their eyes. And so, for me, it helps me feel safety. These people are not judging me. Sometimes, my supervisor, I need to talk with him [about] something. And it feels odd, because I [do not] really understand of what has been his experience.

Dilek: So, if you would understand. That’s how transform...

Kelly: It would feel safer like I wasn’t walking the journey alone necessarily. Does that make any sense?

Dilek: Yes. I had the same experience with my supervisors except with my first one. I had with him little bit, but somehow like there is a person rather than a role. Those type of things maybe relating naturally and learn from that experience. So, we’re just human beings with all the strengths and weaknesses we have. I think we did a very good job about working through multiple realities and multiple relationships. He was my supervisor, colleague, head of the Association, and the director of the institute, my friend. So, I am thinking if you don’t feel alone on the way, you’re together...

Story II

Carrying A Voice Over

Joy, another supervisee, told her story about how she felt transformed. Like Kelly’s story, her story had some characteristics such as not feeling alone, hearing the other’s voice, and carrying that with you wherever you go.

Joy: A sort of feeling like you’re not alone in what you’re doing. So, it’s like a there is someone with you. It is kind of
transformation that you know you're not alone doing it. ... I think like when you see someone else, like if you're observing a therapy setting or something like and you see something, and later on you feel like -I can try that. You feel like the other person is still with you in it. [you] kind of take them with you, and the same thing with the conversations you know, you hear like someone else's voice being with you. You take it from one setting and put it into another setting.

She also described this process as transformative, that which helps her to carry another voice with her into the other settings in life. By doing that, she also gains some confidence to experiment with different approaches that she never thought of before. She described her awareness of this experience as "I remember that it's just a feeling [that] happens, that's kind of how it works." She details this process further in our dialogue below:

Joy: If I had a conversation that I feel like... I really learn something from, and then I had an experience that it kind of makes me different. Then, when I go into a different setting, I am not really the same person. And so, I am a different person in that setting.

Dilek: Okay. So, you connect the first experience with the next one...you relate with the 1st experience and then you continue relating this experience into other settings...

Joy: Yeah.

Dilek: So, you carry on sometimes, maybe not the same thing, but some-thing from that previous experience into the other ones...

Joy: Right...

Dilek: and that makes you a different person?

Joy: Right. Like I can think of, O.K.... and this is like from a client, not... Um, when a client...shared a story that I have never heard before. I did not know that kind of life existed, I mean it was just like an opening up, oh my gosh, you know...some people actually live in this kind of a world... and that was transformative for me because I did not know that lives like that existed in the
world, and so, then when I learned that, then when I go into another setting, I have more depth, more... you know, there is more there to drawn in the next setting. ... If something has a meaning, and I think it's because I let it into my awareness in a deeper level than I had it before. Um, I am trying to think an example of... You know, think that you're walking down the street, and you're just walking down the street. And another day, you're walking down the street, and you see this tree how beautiful it is... and just reminds you of life. And, then all these bigger, bigger things, and then... it's transformative. It takes you out of... maybe you're upset that they, and maybe you see this tree that reminds you meaning of life, and all of a sudden you're not in the same place. You know, you moved into a different thought process. You're appreciative, you're happy to be alive, and before you were kind of grumpy, out of source... so what I become aware of just what transforms me.

Story III

Connecting, Sharing the Experience

Kelly, a supervisee, shared another anecdote with one of her clients that helped her understand how she, as a therapist, can share her experience and facilitate transformation in the therapeutic relationship as well as in the client's life.

One of my clients who I have been seeing... She was someone over weight and she told me, five months down the road, I guess we were talking about what had been helpful. She said that the most helpful thing was when I shared about my family; half of my family is hedonistic with food, how does it stresses [a person]; [one can become] compulsive about healthy eating, and I really struggled [with] the relationship and food, and she said that was the most important thing I could have shared with her. Because before that she had thought, this woman cannot ever understand me.
Story IV

Enlightenment and Opening up

Grace, another supervisee, stated that she had experienced transformation in her supervision session right before we had our interview. She was very excited when she shared her transformation story. When she was describing how she experienced transformation in her supervision, she was still making sense of how that happened to her. She stated that there was a sudden shift in her thinking that enlightened her and opened up a new door for her.

Here is Grace’s story:

Grace: I just had sort of a transformation in my previous conversation talking about working with an anger management group, and coming into it thinking that I need to control the level of anger, instead of possibly looking at it that some form of anger in a group might be helpful rather than hurtful. So, I was looking at, as any form of expression of anger would be negative thing, where in fact it could be a positive thing. So, it was transforming for me to look at a different perspective and be open to changing my mind about how I viewed it in the past. ... It is enlightening to look at that situation and think about using what could be negative in positive way, or even to consider that something is negative could be a positive. Well, and the transforming just personally - why I was looking at it to begin with, sort of transforming.

That’s the way I experienced it. It was more the supervisor opened up areas, a way to look at something differently. So, reframing it, opening up for me to look at it in a different way... was transforming. Because I am stuck looking at it from this way, the way I always looked at it, from one angle. Angle [about] anger and how you express it, and the level that you’ve expressed is negative [My] supervisor asked [a] question and it turned around to say that there is a possibility that expressing anger in a certain way can be a positive thing. So, having a certain amount of tension or anger within the group could be a positive and transforming thing for the participants of the group, instead of feeling that I need to control [or] it wouldn’t be O.K.... I went in thinking I have to control what was happening, vs. use that, stop it vs. use it. I don’t know, maybe I need to stop it. depends on context, to re-direct... and again, I
don’t know. The conversation allowed me to look at it in a different way. I came to you to find techniques to manage it, deal with it vs. ways of using it. It never occurred to me.

Dilek: What was about the conversation?

Grace: [The] supervisor listened to me from the beginning. I wish I could remember exactly what her question was. Oh, I can’t tell you what the question was, but she asked one question and it totally flipped... the way I was looking at [it]. It opened the doors... like an “aha!” moment...

Story V

Like A Butterfly

Lisa is the other supervisee who described her transformation process in becoming a therapist through a butterfly metaphor:

Lisa: I’ve experienced that too... There is a very difficult process that a butterfly goes through in order to emerge into this very beautiful being, and very fulfilled being. And so, I always thought that and I liked that concept, because when you start out and you’re in your cocoon, you feel very safe, and you are very safe then, you start to emerge and it’s a quiet struggle and you know those different stages that you go through. The only thing I think differently now in my idea of transformation is that it is more permanent, and a butterfly is permanent. And I feel the stages are more fluid and that’s what really changes rather than having one beautiful being without other changes that make that happen.

Dilek: You mentioned some stages for couple of times. Can you tell me what those stages are?

Lisa: Um, I think just everyday life. Stages of work, try to juggle and manage my family time and work, and then stages of my own emotions. I think that’s one stage of my life that I have to figure out, then I’ve got stages of my own emotions when I work with my clients, and stages of challenging myself as a therapist in my work... I said stages. because I thought a butterfly goes through stages, it’s very in connected, and it’s very fluid, in and out... Yeah... theatrical kind of stages... Yeah, create more of that.
Dilek: That’s so beautiful.

Lisa: That’s for me too, that’s all of my struggles and I am top of that. I am struggling to provide an environment to my client helping to create stories, but then to make changes within them. I personally think this is not very cut and dried. It’s not real easy to say these are the steps you need to take. For me, it’s to be able to say… and that’s where supervision helps me too. There is no clear-cut answer, to be able to say what about this? Have you thought about this and that?

Story VI

Giving Birth to Unknown

Elle, another supervisee, described her most important transformation experience when she became a mother.

Elle: I was not ready to have a child when I got my first child. I did not want to have a child. This was a transformative experience. I was not ready. I was in therapy the whole time. I did not want to do that. Literally sort of, it was attachment but more than that, I was instantly in love and instantly happy, secure… I remember my therapist calling me after the birth, and I said I don’t need you anymore. [laughs] and I meant it. No postpartum depression, nothing… I was just so open. There is like a spiritual experience, experience indescribable.

She was so open and animated when she told her story of transformation when she gave birth to her first baby. She also talked about a relationship with a client that she felt transformed her as a therapist. Here is her other story:

Elle: I do have a transformative experience with one more client… She had four children taken away from home by CPS. She is like my friend. She said, “Who give you a right to walk away from this?” That’s huge. I didn’t walk away.

Dilek: It helped to rethink about your life, [your] own decisions, and your work?
Elle: Yeah. Also, going back to school was such a transformative experience for me too. I could not be around freeways. My grandmother got killed on a freeway when she was driving. Within 3-4 years, I just stopped driving. I just was driving on one freeway. That was all. When I went back to school out North, I had no choice but to drive. My friends had to drive, but I had to go out, and they knew and they coached me once in three times, you know I had to, and now I am all over the area driving... I am not scared anymore. That was huge. I probably would not work out myself if I did not get Masters out of it. They were really good. They gave me confidence... And maybe this has been a slow transformation, but one thing I wanted also [to] try to tell... Well, it comes out of your actions, self-esteem... enjoying yourself, liking yourself, um, your mother can't increase your self-esteem. It's not [something] granted.

Story VII
From Hating to Liking

The youngest supervisee, Mel, described how she experienced being transformed in the way she looked at the world and in the way she saw herself in the world. She described her transformation story of becoming a therapist. She stated that she became a very different therapist than she ever thought she would be. Some similar characteristics in her process of transformation compared with those of Elle's story include not having a choice, doing more of what works, and not giving up. Here is Mel's story of transformation:

Mel: It just hit me one day like -I am gonna be [a therapist]. You know, I did not realize it. I think about clients differently, and I feel like I relate to them differently and see myself differently when I work with them. I just feel better about whole process.

Dilek: How did that shift happen for you?

Mel: I don't know how the shift happened. I think it could have been just by doing it more maybe. Not having a choice. I just had to do it. I was going to do and enjoy it. Therapeutically and professionally I just realized one day that it was different. And I don't know how that happened... I experienced it in a lot of different ways... A lot of times, I did not enjoy the clients. Just
really, not that I was afraid but just to hear other people talk about their clients, and I would say to myself: “I am glad I don’t have this client. I had no idea what to do with that client” then. I experienced it in the sessions before the clients because I was present where I hadn’t been before, connected to them where I hadn’t it before... One day I was just listening to somebody talking about a client, and I noticed it was. Just couple of weeks ago, somebody was talking about a client in CPS meeting, and I was sitting there as she was struggling trying to work with this client, I was thinking myself “I can do that.” I even did not realize it, but I was just thinking: “I know how I would do that, I know what to do about this, this is not a big problem.” And then afterwards, it hit me “Oh, my goodness.” You know, you’ve never done that before. So, that meant a lot to me... It definitely is a transformation, not a change because it stuck with me. I was not... [just for] that day, or that time.

Story VIII

Telling A Story

Nora, the youngest supervisor, described her transformation process in reference to her living in U.S., far away from her home country. She realized that people who know her here and back in her native country describe her in different ways. She stated that she’s been learning how to maintain these relationships in different locations and that she is still learning from that experience. According to her, this ongoing learning experience about who she is has transformed her.

Nora: An example of a history is that...this is a story of Nora -she is a researcher-. There is a joke [that] even my marriage will be a research [project]. [laughs] -and [that] she will find a [mate] researcher-. There is a whole story around [this] ... I like it [and] I enjoy it. Another story that I have... a skill to be able to take abstract notions and concepts and break it down, and explain [it] to them. We started a study group in [my] masters program and I was the one who did that for the rest of the group, and [that’s] how we used to study. One point in my life, when I came here, I started to feel that I [had] lost it. And I couldn’t access it... but these people who [share] the history with me could still see that, when I talked to them they said “Oh, you’re so good at that.” ...I am so abstract
right now. It's hard for me to put it [in words]. So, that's what happening in my personal life when I am talking about it... What you’re [one is] good at is that you [one] integrate theoretically in your [one's own] practice. So, I suddenly realize that both these parties were talking the same thing. They’re [people back in home] coming from a historical perspective, and they’re [people in Houston] coming from a present perspective, and suddenly I was like “O.K., maybe I am not experiencing it but people around me are experiencing it.”... It was the others' idea and I was just brought into it with the feedback. And [I] started saying that about myself afterward [but] I didn’t experience it and here I am experiencing it because someone else is saying it. I ask them like “O.K. give me an example of how I do that?” “What do you see me doing that is integration of theory and practice, or breaking down into concepts that I would understand that?” so, that kind of respect that I am transforming in one way of looking at it that I may have added into it at some point, or I just need[ed] to see it, or maybe they tell me...having that history helps. Have I transformed or not? I don’t know, but the transformation is in the piece of connecting all of that, and making a story about your self. Then taking it forward to “O.K., this is the transformational piece that I can see it”. saying: “Okay, this is what I am good at although I used it, and hence create a career from this for myself.” That’s the whole story about it. I mean just a story, and I just create a story. Okay, that’s what I need[ed] to do.

Dilek: The relationships, in that sense, how people relate to you. were different [experience] in the past, and in between, and present, and possibly in future you can imagine. Just to have that kind of a connection between times and connecting stories over time, and making sense of them...sounds transforming?

Nora: Yes, they are. All these things happened are relational in content, and that content what’s being important to me to connect [with] who I am through their eyes...another thing in transformation [is] that I am who I am, but they are also seeing me as someone in that. So, that creates more voices, more ideas about who I am. It’s like who I am in all people’s eyes... in Dilek’s eyes... in my friends’ eyes. All of those make me connect to -who I am, and to create a story about -who I am.

Dilek: How that informs you?

Nora: That’s an ongoing process of creating a future. It creates a past, and I take that into moment, and I start virtualizing of future
with that. I have always more sure about what I am good at and I would include that in that whole process. When I think about this whole story, then I create my future and again can create [a] reality. This is interesting one. I am fascinating with this. Wow.

After she finished her story, Nora had a surprised look and a victory smile. She explained that telling her story helped her to reshape the story about who she is. She also shared that this telling of her story which included the voices of people who know her, has helped her to create a future. Telling, as a shared human performance, shaped her identity and appeared to be transformative for her. During the member checks, Nora wrote a sentence as her reflection of telling this story: “Transformation is a story or narrative that one constructs in relationship.”

Postmodern Supervision

A Transitory Space of Transformation

Supervision is a transitory space where the participants of the supervision co-transform. During the interviews supervisees and supervisors addressed this theme around other topics such as definition of supervision and supervision relationship and supervisor’s role. Although supervisees and supervisors defined their supervision relationships differently, the features of the all supervision relationships at HGI were similarly collaborative, equal, non-hierarchical, non-judgmental, consulting, mentoring, challenging, self-affirming, encouraging and supportive.

Mary, a supervisee, shared her experience of supervision as a transitory space destined to another space in where also becomes transitory. She described her relationship with her supervisors as similar as to her relationship with her clients. She stated that her supervisors at HGI worked collaboratively with her and offered their perspectives on where her strengths and growth areas were. She also described her supervision relationship as
therapeutic which provided a safe and open space to explore multiple ideas and thoughts. This supervision relationship took a long time for her to build and maintain. She stated that supervision at HGI creates a transitory space for her. In this space, she decides the direction of the supervision. Once she arrives to the destination, that place also becomes a transitory space.

I feel my supervisors hold a place for me, where I am moving toward what we both agree is where we are headed. This includes them supporting, nurturing and challenging me to move in that direction. This direction is also transitory. Through the relationship we change the direction we are moving often and as seems appropriate. This is done with input from both myself and my supervisor... They are further along the path than me and hold an open place for me. Our paths or styles of therapy may be vastly different but the process is similar. Even if we do not do the same kind of therapy or the same interventions, the path of becoming a good therapist is similar. I also feel [as if] an important part of my relationship with my supervisors is my own responsibility. Supervisors just as therapists are not mind readers and may not be able to even observe my work... It is my responsibility to be open and honest in my concerns and worries with my work. It is important that I be aware of [different feelings such as] being uncomfortable, fearful, worried etc. and [I] bring them to the conversation so it can be explored. Without the safe environment and therapeutic relationship this [self awareness] would not be possible.... I like supervision that reminds me of being present and aware.

Being on the Pathway with A Sensei

Steve, a supervisor, used a metaphor, “sensei”, to define his role as a supervisor, and “pathway” to define supervision. Supervisor and supervisee are learners on the same pathway in which one is more experienced than the other.

I think the answer I really like to make, the use of a Japanese word for teacher, which is “sensei”. Japanese is a highly metaphorical language. So, it is usually usage of translating in English as
teacher. It has a broader meaning in Japanese. It literally translates to "One who is born (on this pathway) before. . . . Supervisor, by virtue of being, [is] further on this pathway. The supervisor knows in essence -I was once there-. . . . This Japanese concept of sensei assumes that sensei, a teacher, supervisor, is still a student, still a learner. . . . Supervisor is on the same pathway just further ahead from the supervisee.

Joy described her supervisor as a mentor who is concerned about her well-being and progress. According to her, a supervisor’s primary concern is how she doing as a therapist. She described this process as “a sharing”. When she defined her relationship with her supervisor, she stated:

I think it’s a relationship that gets fairly close... because you are really working on the core of what you’re doing, it’s a highfare, to me it is a vital part of the whole process... [When] I am just working with someone and they become my supervisor, the relationship changes. . . . It becomes more than a mentor [relationship]. They have a different way of looking at me and I have a different way of looking at them. . . . I guess it becomes very, very personal, very involved, and very warm. I think it can be [this way] if your supervisor is on site with you. [If] you just meet for an hour in a week somewhere the relationship will be very different.

On the other hand, Kelly needed more of a connection and feedback from her supervisor. She described her supervisor as “inscrutable in some ways. It’s difficult to understand what he is thinking or feeling. Potentially, that’s been constructed in the relationship because I would never know what effect my interactions have on him. I assume that’s relevant (for me)”. She also described her supervision relationship like a muscle-developer, sometimes confusing and sometimes lonely for her. This feature of the relationship is very similar to what Steve was addressing about being on the same pathway with a sensei.
Sometimes it's confusing to me. It changes sometimes. Sometimes it feels more connected, sometimes it feels like I am on my own and I appreciate that it gives me a lot of space to come up with my own answers. I do not have a concept of what his evaluation is of me. It is good because I always looked for affirmation. I guess, I am developing stronger muscles... and then sometimes I wonder, how he would describe our relationship. I would like to have more feedback about it.

An Incubation Process: Co-Transforming On The Pathway

The word "incubate" is defined as "(1) when a bird incubates its eggs or when they incubate, it keeps them warm until they hatch. (2) the time that an infection or virus takes to incubate is the time that it takes to develop and affect someone" in Collins and University of Birmingham English Dictionary, from Collins Birmingham University International Language Database (1991, p.284).

An incubation process analogically reminds me how similar the descriptions of the supervision relationships of the supervisees are during their interviews. This similar kind of a safe, warm and nurturing relational context for a supervisee facilitates his/her growth and well being as they become well-trained, self-reflective, and mature therapists in their own ways. This kind of nourishment in a supervisory relationship helps a supervisee to survive in the midst of difficult experiences and encourages the supervisee to become his/her best in her practice as a therapist.

Supervisors and supervisees described their experiences of supervision relationships, and their experiences of transformation along with their supervision relationships in very similar ways. They described the basic characteristics of a supervision relationship that facilitated transformation in them. These characteristics were safe, comfortable, calm, engaging, connected, intimate, healing, open, receptive, trusted, friendly, fun, being challenged, nurtured, self-affirmed, encouraged, and supported. Below, the reader will find
the thematic excerpts to describe this incubation-like relationship for supervisees and supervisors.

**Not Walking Journey Alone**

In his role of sensei, Steve also addressed how he thought that he might facilitate his supervisees' transformations via his sensei approach:

Steve: I am in further down the pathway. I wish to sort of connect with them. You know, help them down the pathway. You know, to do what I really think that metaphor, sensei, to help somebody to progress down the pathway cannot be happen where you at. You have to go where they are. How you do it [is] hand in hand and arm to arm. It evolves precisely out of blue.

Dilek: It is an experience to get; [it is] an action together?

Steve: Yeah. It is generated from moment to moment to experience as you go down the pathway.

Joy described her supervision relationship as being "very, very personal, very involved, and very warm." She described her experience of transformation along with not feeling alone and gaining confidence in her supervision relationship below:

I see transformation as growing in confidence. that's one transformation. [It is] becoming, more willing to experiment, more willing to try things that you might not have thought over. You might not be willing to really try. That is another. I guess, just sort of feeling like you're not alone in what you're doing. So, it's like a there is someone with you. It is a kind of transformation that you know you're not doing it alone. You see something, and later on you feel like you can try that. You feel like the other person is still with you in it. You hear someone else's voice with you. You take it from one setting and put it into another setting. What you take with you gives you the confidence to experiment. I really learn something from (it), and then I had an experience that kind of
makes me different. When I go into a different setting, I am not the same person. I am a different person in that setting.

Joy also stated that in her supervision relationship, the support she felt was helpful in facilitating her transformation. In addition to support, the epistemological questions that broadens her viewpoint, and encourages her to think contextually. Sharing, "just commiserating, you know, a kind of just sharing like this is what I did. -I had once like that [and] this is what I tried-" was also helpful for Joy. She stated "I think, that most helpful thing is that people have confidence in you and then you gain it for yourself." Joy described how a supervision relationship could facilitate transformation in its participants:

I think in supervision what I, (and) supervisor, try to open up is how you're thinking and seeing about your clients, you know, you kind of share that thought process, and so kind of open and vulnerable about "this is what I am doing in therapy" or at least, I thought (what) I am doing in therapy.... you know, you kind of share about whether a feeling is working or it is not working, what you think it's happening, and where you are in your feeling, all that kind of stuff. ...I think you can have a similar kind of aha!, because the supervisor depending how they can contribute to interaction in a way that you see other things that you didn't see or maybe, you just felt supported and that was enough to enable you to feel transformed next time you go back to something [that] you are very frustrated about. In supervision, you talk it out and have some new ideas, some new energy for it. That is a transformation. You can go back and something is different.

Kelly, a supervisee, found her supervision relationship is transformative. She thought that this was unique because transforming relationships are the ones she felt very connected.

Kelly: It's (the uniqueness of the relationship) definitely that he's teaching me. It's distant in some ways, but very helpful, informative. It has created transformation in me. That's unique because most of the people that effect me I have feeling more and more closer connections with.
Dilek: Okay. That’s different. (Kelly: Yes) It’s distant but at the same time it’s your transformation. (Kelly: Exactly) How were you able to do so?

Kelly: I don’t know. Okay, just a wild guess. I know he has a lot of training and be able to [holding it] when something does affect him he’s very good at holding it, and not letting it penetrate.

What makes Kelly feel transformed in her supervision relationship is varied from session to session. She described that she felt challenged, confronted, and nurtured throughout her supervision relationship:

I think it varies from session to session. Sometimes, it’s just his willingness to not to be affirming [me]. I have to sit with that. Like I said, my muscles grow. Sometimes, it is his willingness to be a little bit direct, confronting. A lot of times, it is his encouraging me to let the parts of myself. I always believed as bad, [bring out]. He always nurtured those parts and said that “Those are good parts and you need to bring out more of them. Don’t try to hide”. That is transforming.

Kelly also stated “It would feel safer like [if] I wasn’t walking the journey alone necessarily”. By supporting her view, Pam, another supervisor, stated that:

I think, what I experience that what I see they’re experiencing that they see each other as confident so I am not the only one who is confident. You don’t have to have twenty years of experience to have good ideas. And, I think it gives them some hope that they have some good ideas already. they can help each other. ...It is connection, but also it’s self-affirming too ...I am not just talking about the relationship I am also talking about their growth.

Elle, another supervisee, discussed the closeness of her supervision relationship at HGI. She described transformation can occur in this type of relationship: “It (transformation) could happen in any kind of relationships. ...With my supervisors, [the relationship] is very
calm, comfortable...I feel connected, which that’s really what makes it unique I feel very close to them.”

Nora, a supervisor, from a learner position, described her experience of receiving supervision as transformative in guiding her to approach her own supervisees in the same way. She described her supervision relationship with her supervisees as "friendly, fun, challenging, satisfying...(laughs) easygoing, challenging and I don’t mean that difficult. I enjoy that... supportive, respectful, open and that’s a big deal.” Mary, another supervisee, described the uniqueness of her supervision relationship in similar ways below:

I think the supervision I have now is unique in that it is focused on supporting me in my growth as a therapist and professionally. My supervisors bring with them a sense of expectancy and a space that is focused toward that goal. I like that and it extends beyond the hour of supervision. When I meet them in the hall or in a different meeting, I still have that sense from both of them that they continue to carry that belief and expectancy of me.

Entertaining Multiple Positions and Realities

Nora, a supervisor, described her experience of being supervisor in relation to her supervisees and her position in the larger systems. HGI and AAMFT define her role as a supervisor. By doing this, she offered her contextual and relational positions in different systems that eventually inform her actions as a supervisor. Nora also described her role as a mentor or consultant, and supervision as consultation when she referred to her own relationship with a supervisee:

My experience includes trying to understand where the person is learning where they’re going. Like with Elle, “Oh, I need you to push me there”. She didn’t say I need you to focus on my therapist skills, bla bla. Another thing is that I am part of a larger group HGI, AAMFT That also informs who I am as a supervisor, it validates me I am using the term mentor and consultant because people used that term, but those bodies define me as a supervisor.
...I am trying to do consulting, and use supervision to bring about a different voice. Then, I look at what their expectations were. I check in. That's what I need to talk about, relationship with the client, relationship with the husband, that changes. They're like transforming as a professional [and] a human. I am attending to what is going on in their lives such as personal effects [and] what is going on in their lives as a therapist. My experience of supervision, being mindful, is important for me. It's hard to talk about it because when I am outside of supervision I am still checking about that. I am talking about that and catching about that. I know when they come and talked about their feelings, we have numerous conversations...

Always Relating, Learning and Reflecting

Lisa, a supervisee, described how comfortable she felt during her supervision meetings. This comfort provided her a peer level, collaborative relationship experience that she described as being in a conversational mode instead of being expert and having a hierarchical position, being in a teaching mode.

When I am in conversation in supervision I am feeling more comfortable, so I can be more relaxed, hear more and be more receptive. Where I have been in situations like therapy, and I am thinking of the group I have, because of the circumstances I was positioning myself standing up and almost teaching and I did not like that position. Then, I backed out and got the kids around me. I relaxed and engaged them in conversation. When we were in conversational mode, whereas before the kids were looking at me as the expert, then the whole conversation was so different. ... [I was] encouraging them to converse and collaborate... and that's just amazing what they have inside of them. They must let them come out... But, even when you do a group you are a group leader. All of those traditional ways of looking at things... create a situation that you're the expert. But once you removed that and put yourself in a non-hierarchical, non-expert situation, what does come from that. That is very much how I think about my supervision, is a more peer level therapy relationship, not therapeutic but it's a similar to therapy relationship with my clients. It provides a much more relaxed, open conversation and collaboration.
Nora, a supervisor, stated that the need for supervision is the key for transformational opening. When a supervisor utilized this opening well enough, the supervisee might experience a tremendous shift about how s/he perceives her/himself in relation to what s/he brings to the supervisor, and therefore transformation becomes relational. She addressed that it is transformative to learn about her own self, and to act mindful to do more of what works for her. Being public and engaging in a conversation with the other facilitates transformation for her:

Yesterday, when I went to a PPT [Permanency Planning Team for parental rights] meeting, I said that I needed to talk with someone. The notion of supervision is consultation. In that sense I am always in supervision ... I think that's what is transformational. It is [being] relational. It is very hard to separate it even [when] you do for such a purpose from informal contexts. Yesterday, I suddenly realized I have been going to so many meetings and I found an area that I need to really focus on myself. So, I did. I asked Pam, "Do you have some time, even two minutes to talk?"

That is right there supervision, coming from this perspective she's being working with me on this case, so has Carla, another supervisor [who did not participated to this study] I talked to both of them. That is supervision, where and when I need to. ... That [talk] was transformational in that I have been here for years; seeing how Pam does meetings, how she talks about positioning herself that in that PPT [that] I've been caught up. [There] she came to my mind as a supervisor, not as a model of her voice. [I said to myself], -she might have gone on searching more and I need to go back to her [to ask] how to do that more in my life. That is an example of transformation.

Nora, also found this process is very similar to that of supervisees. As a principal, she would keep an idea or experience, anything meaningful to her as a voice in mind, and bring it later. "especially when I feel stuck, when I am thinking about what I am doing, how I am doing, how others doing. We do a lot of learning from each other. That is a principal in my
life, not just in supervision." Once she found an opening in conversation, she would respectfully bring it back into the conversation as a reflection. In relation to what Nora stated, Kelly, supervisee also found that the dialogues in supervision were transformative. She also wanted to learn more about her supervisor’s experience with her and more information about him. She stated that:

What is transformative [is] our dialogue. I wouldn’t have known what it was until we talked right now. I think this is. [He could have] given me more of his experience, just not to make me feel like so alone. …I want maybe some more feedback, a little bit more information.

Mary, a supervisee, talked about the relationship that transforms itself through the dialogues about how she, as a supervisee, progresses to where she wants to go:

Relational transformation in supervision happens. …If we add in other supervisees in the supervision then they act in some ways like the supervisor but more as witnesses and acknowledging the transformation, which I think can be very powerful. Also as the relationship is established and maintained our relationship changes. Generally and as I have experienced with the two supervisors I have currently, the relationship transforms itself. Both have become closer relationships. I have felt more genuine myself with both supervisors. The relationship has changed in that now [I] feel more powerful in the relationship…more equals. It feels less like the question [from] -Am I doing everything right?- to -How am I progressing to where I want to go?-

In addition to that, Steve, supervisor, addressed that his transformation is as less profound in comparing with his supervisees’. He explained this with being further on the path, having more experience, and how this being informs his process of transformation in relation with his supervisee’s transformation below:
Well, when you’re further down on the path, subtle changes are less profound. So, my transformation has been subtle. Changes like hers are, being in this profession, will be much more obvious, bigger. I believe that she has experienced and has been experiencing some difficult transformations in her identity, how she sees herself, as psychotherapist.

Another supervisor, Pam, talked about her learning experience in supervision that might facilitate transformation:

I don’t think I have ever not experienced transformation. I do see myself constantly changing. I am so in supervision as in my life. I have new experiences, and [I] experience myself differently… I think there are times in supervision when I think [about] what I am doing [and then] I found myself thinking, … I wonder [if] feeling the experience in same way means I am not transforming, but I don’t know that. I think this is punctuation. Um, that is a part of a bigger process. I know there are moments and times where I might be aware. In supervision for example, I would ask a question, wondering why we talk about what we have talked about before. That is not typical. … People bring new things [and] I bring new things. Our dialogues [are] about different aspects of themselves and different aspects of myself… Um, where is that transformation going, I can’t say. This year I was this, and I was this. That would be turning into a train, rather than an evolution [process].

Nora, another supervisor, explained the same process in relation to holding both positions of supervisee and supervisor. She stated that her experience of relational transformation happens when a relationship involves implementing and coaching that she believes that she is good at. She told the story about how she went to a masters program to be a trainer. Since then she has invested in books on training and training programs. She describes how everything is coming together recently when she supervises. She prefers to use a supportive approach as she exampled below:

It’s a double agent source because it has to do with both of us. I like to listen her [supervisee] and give her a feedback. but she is
not asking for feedback. ... That’s what I like [about] being a supervisor; listening for that [not asked yet], being able to give what they are asking for and anything else that might be helpful to ask them, to add to. In my supervision I didn’t ask them what they want [and] I haven’t been asked either. In our relationships like such, we all receive feedback from each other. All it comes out spontaneously. I would be careful about that in interpersonal relationships and I am learning that. Whenever she [supervisee] comes, we have a major conversation about that. She sees the different sides of it and keeps getting stronger and more comfortable with that. She comes with a deadline. I pop in her head and she is not ready for it. It is in a good way but she is not ready for that, not that she does want to but I give her time to think. ... In the personal, “we don’t have time lets go on, let’s go on” a this kind of a thing [with her]. That’s another transformational piece to architect what I am good at, especially in learning and balancing it in my personal life. That’s a key thing for me. I feel like I really need to do more of it.

**Collaborative Learning Community**

In addition to the incubational characteristics of the supervision relationship: making thoughts public, reflecting, having more voices, thinking and acting in the moment, shifting positions, learning, sharing, seeking openings, experimenting, exploring and becoming 'who we are' are the other performances that facilitated supervisees’ transformations. All these features were relational and interactional features that also define the collaborative learning community at HGI.

Both supervisees and supervisors addressed the supervision performances or practices, like reflecting, shifting positions and having more than one voice in the room, that facilitate transformation in supervisees. Transformation experiences of supervisors appeared not to be a focus for both supervisors and supervisees during supervision meetings. While supervisees described their transformations along with the supervision relationships as gaining confidence in what they do in therapy, as well as not being or feeling alone, the
supervisors described it as more in relation to the supervisees' growth toward using their own sources, and thinking broader and contextual instead of case-specific.

The reader will find the data about the HGI community below, including the organizational context of HGI, learning environment, and learners or supervisees' experiences of the community. The themes that emerged from the interviews are integrated under three separate topics: HGI as an organization, postmodernism and the theory of social construction, and the supervision culture at HGI. The participants also discussed hypothetically transformation-generating environments under the theme of 'transformative-generative' cultures and communities.

HGI As An Organization

HGI, the Houston Galveston Institute, expands its boundaries internationally. The HGI has over a hundred associates around the world, and twenty-seven individuals who actively work at HGI as faculty, interns, therapists, supervisors, and the associates. Nora, a supervisor, described HGI in a broader context, larger than its physical boundaries, including people and ideas around the world. She also discussed the evolution of HGI community and the family therapy practice through a glass vase metaphor:

HGI is bigger than that. There are more people with other ideas too. That's again why I can't talk for this group. Because right now, I think. HGI is going through what I consider like, imagine of a glass kind of like it comes to neck, comes through and then widens out. When they were in that phase, which I wasn't a part of. There may have been that kind of rendering social constructionism, [which] is always in a medal place. I just because know I does a narrative [therapy] ... In my experience is not everybody in this neck [social constructionism]. It is more wider [than that]
Pam, the other supervisor, described HGI as a postmodern, collaborative learning community. She also addressed her theoretical position, not knowing, which describes the community as well.

Well, the first comes to mind is the notion of the learning position that we are all always learning about different things at different times and learning about the different individuals that we are dealing with, whether is that a supervisee, a colleague, a client. I still work with people who I don’t know anything about, almost two years. This context here includes that longevity of being here people who have worked that in that longevity of time. First of all, the notion, you really don’t know anything or anybody.

**Postmodernism and The Theory of Social Construction**

The supervisees described the theoretical notions from their perspectives that inform their practices and relationships at HGI. A supervisee, Kelly, described how the culture of HGI community sometimes does not match with what postmodern and theory of social construction asserts. Regarding her experience in this community, Kelly talked about how she learned and utilized postmodernism and the theory of social construction to inform her learning.

The theories value to talk about the differences and different voices. The experience for me has not necessarily been that this place values that. This is not a place to value different ideas [outside of social constructionism]. It values postmodernism, if you’re not in that box you don’t speak up and that’s been my experience. So, how does this support transformation? I think, for me, from readings and sources, it supports multiple ideas and realities, and that was wonderful and gave me a paradigm or philosophy or whatever to appreciate that ‘Not knowing’ was very valuable. With [my] clients, at least, it helped me transform into someone who really believes there is not one right way to do things. The more I have conversations with people the more I am growing into believing there is no best way. It is like a tapestry and what we are doing is only a part of it. As far as bringing different ideas, that is apart. That has been my experience.
A supervisor, Steve, described himself collaborative. When I asked how postmodern notions influence him, he tentatively replied and took a “not knowing stance” to answer.

I certainly think that my style is being collaborative. I don’t know that… I don’t think necessarily adopting a metaphor “sensei” is collaborative. Its’ certain relational interactive understanding is built into if that would work. … I don’t know what postmodernism is. I am not sure how to answer that question.

On the other hand, Pam, supervisor, described how postmodern and theory of social construction inform her when she describes transformation.

Definitely the theory influences. For a long time, I have been influenced by change-based theory by non-homeostatic principles family therapy started with. Homeostasis was the basis and we have shifted along with the lot of in the field. And always noticing the change rather than states has been the focus for me. And then, you know I said, about the combination between the changes that are formulated by you, as a person in the midst of your relationships, is the social constructionist part of it.

Joy, a supervisee, described the contributions of postmodernism and the theory of social construction in her learning. She emphasized multiplicity and diversity of the voices as important as valuing the strengths of the individuals. She also described her theoretical stance incongruence with her style of providing therapy and living.

There is no one way… There is not a path there; isn’t a set way to go. It’s very fluid to me, more like a reality. I think that the postmodern collaborative part just allows that to happen more freely… I think because there is no model we follow, in that everyone’s strengths are valued because every therapist has different strengths, different personalities, different outfits.

... You are never going to get there, [smiles] but you are on the way there. Um, I think feeling congruent with more of your self
and therapy sessions. You feel less like [you are] wearing someone else's clothes. You are wearing your own clothes when you are in there vs. other kind of supervision, where you feel like there is one right way you are supposed to be. So, you are trying to figure out what outfit that is. You do not feel like yourself as much.

Kelly, different than the rest, focused on how the postmodern umbrella positively helped her to experience the transformation, except for a missing, unfulfilled piece for her.

A broad umbrella... I think has helped me see as a social construction. In CLS [Collaborative Language Systems], the idea of how powerful language is and be the transformative nature of conversations has never really been something I have thought of it before. I have never been so careful of the words. With my transformation, it is helping me to be much more aware of interchanges and how they work, and when they're appropriate. In the rest of the postmodern ideas. I liked the multiple realities. I do have a complaint about the postmodern approach which I am not sure is relevant. I am still looking for... something that captures the feeling piece in clients. [Postmodernism lacks] emotional... I have been reading about emotional focused therapy lately. Postmodernism leaves me very dry and this is kind of contrary to what they profess [here] to be. Let me be more like a clinician and a healer.

Postmodern Supervision Culture

Being A Learner

Joy, a supervisee, addressed her learning position as a supervisee at HGI and explained how comfortable and in synch she feels with the values in the community.

Well. I think there is like an edge of that you're always learning. you're always growing. and maybe one of them right now. I haven't exhausted the importance of conversation. here that [the conversation] is what dominant. That's felt very comfortable to me and maybe I will come to some point where I want to try something else. At this point, it's is fine for me because that's what I am in synch with and I am not really questioning it that much.
Grace, a supervisee, also talked about her experience of having graduated currently and how her position changed in relation to the Institute after the graduation.

I am so new to being in supervision in terms of having graduated. I think there is a difference between supervision in training and supervision after graduation, in working... I think my relationships with the Institute certainly changed from what it was. I am no longer a student and I am now working with them. The way I relate to the people here at the Institute has changed from the way it was before I took this position. Even though I am still a learner, I am a learner in a different way.

**Shifting Positions**

Joy described the different positions she takes with her supervisor such as being a co-therapist with her in different cases. Spending an entire day with her supervisor helps her to experience the supervisor in different ways and to do co-therapy with that supervisor. According to Joy, experiencing these multiple positions helped her to relate with her supervisor on different levels and facilitated her transformation.

It is a kind of funny because you are going like, "O.K. this is supervision and outside this is friendship, and this is a colleague... You are kind of jumping around and that is different. They kind a blend together very nicely I think. They just a kind of end up veining in and out... Um, but I think what it does [is that] you shut the door and this is supervision. I think she does that and I do that.

By taking different roles and acting on them in the appropriate contexts, supervisors and supervisees take multiple positions with each other interchangeably. This shift in the performance contributes to increasing their flexibility in and outside of the supervision meetings and facilitates transformation as they experience each other in different ways and in different contexts. She detailed this process further.
I think when we go into supervision we are more focused on that supervision. The rest of the time, the other types of roles take over. It is also hard to say where it is [happens]; transformation in supervision or... It is hard to pull it out and say, this was a part of supervision or this was a... It is hard to separate it whereas If I worked with someone and I always saw her once in a week for an hour, then I could definitely say that was in supervision.

**Multiple Supervisors and Instant Supervision**

Joy had a weekly supervision meeting at another site, in addition to her supervision meeting at HGI. In comparing both supervision experiences, Joy stated that she preferred having a supervisor at the site with her and sharing multiple positions with that supervisor.

I think that, one is once in a week and an hour, and it’s separate. There is not much relationship to bring into supervision. I think that it’s unfortunate in a way because you kind of miss the richness of the other pieces... At least I do. On the other hand, it seems like there is more, in the supervisee supervisor relationship once in a week, oh they must be the experts... I mean it is more of a hierarchy there. You are not ever doing much else... So, I store up questions, oh I got to remember to ask this. I have to remember I need to make a little list to remember. It is a more of a structure. In this setting [HGI], I can ask my questions to different people at the moment I need. That is another agony I have. In supervision, there are multiple people to reach out to.

**Polyvocal Consultations: Three In A Room**

Another characteristic of the supervision culture of HGI is to include more than one supervisee in supervision. There was one supervision team, which had two co-supervisors and two supervisees, and met biweekly for two hours. During the interviews, the participants focused on only the one supervisor-two supervisees structure, which is more common practice at HGI. Supervisees and supervisors expressed their experience of this supervision structure in different ways to describe how they thought that would facilitate transformation.
Supervisees stated no difference between one-to-one and one-to-two supervision structure. They valued their experience of collaboration between themselves and their supervisors and generally enjoyed having more than one supervisee in the room. Moreover, supervisors stated their beliefs in multiple voices that create an egalitarian, collaborative context in which different ideas could be generated.

Kelly, a supervisee, shared her experience of having a new supervisee with her in the room and how she experienced adjusting to the difference after the first supervision meeting. She shared how this addition influenced her focus of interaction.

After our first meeting I realized that Gosh, I always looked at my supervisor. I did not even look at the supervisee. I don't know why I did that. I am so programmed to look at the “what do you think?” I should have talked to both of them. I guess I really have struggled with that. I wanted to tell the supervisee afterwards, “God, I am sorry I don’t know why I am doing that. ... When it is two to one, a lot of times I think: “O.K. Am I taking too much time? Am I getting what I need?” A lot of time is [spent] figuring out [whether] I am getting too much or too little?“

Kelly stated that her experience of having another supervisee in the room was different depending on who the other supervisee was, how she related to the other supervisee, and how this supervisee contributed to the conversation. On the other hand, Joy, another supervisee, described her experience of including another supervisee from a learner position.

I am often observing the other supervisee and supervisor. That also adds to that... I see that as being very helpful as far as transformation and that is not my case or issue for supervision but I learned a lot and took a lot from that, to see other types of questions the supervisor asks to the other supervisee and that is helpful because I hear other kind of questions to ask myself. I think, one of the most helpful parts of supervision is what kind of questions [you] to come up with, like when the supervisor ask me questions. Then, those become the questions [that] I learn to ask myself at other times. So, that is a transformation of how to do
self-supervision maybe, from supervision you are evolving to a self-supervision.

When Joy described self-supervision, she referred to having dialogues with herself about how she works and how she thinks about her work. She described this process as a transformational piece she has experienced:

I hear the questions so I am listening from a different angle. When it is my case, I am more involved in the specifics. When it is someone else’s then, I hear more of the questions from more of a distance. I still think what is most helpful is just listening to the other in interaction. I find it really helpful.

Elle, another supervisee, described her experience of having her supervisors as co-therapists working with her. She described such an environment as facilitating good learning. This environment provided her a chance to reflect and talk after the session, about how each of them experienced the session in a different way. She highly recommends this type of the experience to beginning therapists.

Elle: Nora and I had a case as well as Carla [another supervisor who did not participate in the study]. I thought it was really good to have a case together. You have something in common. I am really glad that was a part of our supervision and I highly recommend to new people to have a case with their supervisors. We were both touched by one person. I mean, I had a whole different level of experience. It was really good.

Dilek: To touch to each other’s lives in different ways that might also expand the connections?

Elle: Yeah exactly. But even to talk about how we are touched. You sit in on the same session. My supervisor gets something out of it and I get something else out of it. It was just layering it, quilting it [the experiences].
Kelly gave another example of her supervision dialogue in which she felt relationally transformed through the other supervisee’s story. She stated that, whom she’s been having dialogues with, matters to her in terms of her own transformation through learning. She stated that she, as the other supervisee, sits in the passenger seat when the other learns.

I think it varies with whom I refer to. Like my experience with you, as being the other supervisee, my supervision has been very transformative, hearing from you and seeing that I am not alone. It is that I am learning through your dialogues with my supervisor, like the hatchet [the metaphor used in conversation]. I took that in. I am in the passenger seat when you learning

**Ongoing Conversation: Both/And Approach**

Supervisees and supervisors did not see any significant distinction between formal and informal supervision settings at HGI. Nora, supervisor, defined typical supervision settings at HGI, by emphasizing that any setting, formal or informal, could provide supervision.

Maybe I should just tell you what I consider formal and informal. In the CPS meeting that is formal supervision, all faculty are supervisors in there. I also consider [it] formal when they approach me and [ask] “Do you have a ten minutes I have to talk to you?” because they are coming to [me as] a supervisor and formally asking that. Maybe informal is not structured time to me, but that is a relationship of supervisor and supervisee that I make myself available for and be able to tell them if I am not available. So, even that is formal supervision to me.

When Grace, a supervisee, described how she experienced transformation in her supervision relationship, and explained the contextual features of the relationship, she also emphasized the difference we make in the language when we talk about our experiences
Grace: Obviously, I have had relational transformation. I think our relationship has changed to get to know more about my supervisor and about how we work; how she is with me in supervision, and certainly as we get to know each other better. It also has to do with how I think and how I process... She listened to me from the beginning. I wish I could remember exactly what your question was. Oh, I can't tell you what the question was, but she asked one question and it totally flipped the sides the way I was looking at it. It opened the doors... like an "Aha" moment.

Dilek: Have you been experiencing those moments in your supervision relationship so far?

Grace: Oh yes, every time I have supervision, I learn something or open myself to question the way I look at things, just supervision in itself is transforming, just a relationship... It sort of changes from being peers or colleagues to supervisor[y]. It is more like she is in [more of] an expert position than I am. I hate to make it sound like that. I do not mean it in a negative way. Expert means to me more experienced. That is what I mean by expert, not that she is in the role of [expert] or she presents herself in that way. I gain from her experiences, her way of looking at things. So, I put that inside and timber around, sometimes I stayed the way I was before. Most of the time, I come out different. That's very helpful... Like, the last time we had supervision, I had some personal stressors that were affecting how I relate to clients and it [conversation] opened up a space to transform that time together. It was O K. to talk about those things which was really important to me. I think that I felt like she needed to concentrate right then on X case and what I was going to do about it, and then it wouldn't be helpful. But in the way it happened, it was helpful. I was going to do a real short, little thing [talk] and it is turned out [big]. It was really, really helpful to me to be open about it. To me, use the supervision and know that personal things come into our professional lives and that is an O K thing to talk about in supervision.

**Reflection Process**

Pam, supervisor, addressed the reflection process as informative as it shapes her own growth and development as a supervisor. Reflecting informs her supervision sessions, and transforms her work in and outside of supervision contexts.
I think that it probably does inform my supervision and transforms what I do whether I do supervision or research. It may not even seem clinical such as writing an article, or going to a conference, or presenting in a conference. I think it keeps me engaged in a learning process which helps me relate to their learning process, because I know my own struggles with trying to write or trying to sort out what I am reading or what I am hearing at the conference or something like that and seeing on my own how I decide what I am hearing and how I extend it or how I put it into practice or how I take in what people are doing in supervision, what they are learning from a supervisor. That is really important as a supervisor to reflect on how you do that.”

Transformagenerative Cultures and Communities

The concept of transforma-generative atmosphere emerged during the interview with Steve, a supervisor. Not surprisingly, other participants also had talked about the concept of “a space” that any relationship can transform through its characteristics such as bright, open, non-hierarchical, non-critical, appreciative, dialogical, close, family-like, connecting, more sharing, welcoming differences, inviting multiple views and ideas, freeing.

Transforma-generative context or culture was described as a co-constructed environment in which a transformative relationship can evolve, be nurtured and experienced. This type of context encourages transformation to happen in whoever participates in that context.

Steve: I think there are certain environments that are certain practices and certain ideas that more easily generate transformation. For example, you have to create an atmosphere which one is free to be real, free to be himself, free to be vulnerable, and free to have doubts, questions. If you do that then, I believe consistent with the HGI model, transformation can develop in all circumstances. But I have been in professional environments where you know hierarchy in the place such that transformation always takes a back seat.
Like Steve emphasized above, hierarchical environments do not primarily allow for transformation. In such environments transformation of the members of the community may not be publicly acknowledged, valued or encouraged. This may reflect on the transformation process of an organization or community in a way that constructs appreciation, creativity, and efficiency in the context. Kelly, a supervisee, gave an example about how a transformation-generative context could be:

Kelly: Then, I think, is there a place that could exist that way...

Dilek: Non-hierarchical?

Kelly: Yeah. I went to interview with faculty in a university. They were from such different places from psychoanalytic to qualitative, narrative. I asked them -how do you do this? You are so different. How do you get along with each other? They said: “Well, when we go out to interview for faculty, we are looking for someone who is as different from us as could possibly be. So we love to have dialogues. It gets kind of boring when you don’t have anyone to have that kind of exchange of different ideas.

Dilek: Do you think that was also transformative to you?

Kelly: Yeah, I think it is experiencing the ideas that they talk about. In fact, you look for people that are as different as they can be and appreciate all of their voices.

Elle, another supervisee, addressed how a physical space helps her to feel calm, free and receptive to other inputs, and therefore transforms her. She also described certain physical environments helping her to feel more like herself, free her to be more creative and proactive.

I think I shut down totally in criticism. I am very mindful of it, very. I become miserable. I am not very good at handling it. [I] like this, windows, green, sunshine, people come in and out, meeting in different places. For some reason I did not think I would like Northwest [another office location], but I like it too. [There are] no
apartment garages. I hate apartment garages, walking distance to Fiesta. The little things like that. Those are real. real important to me.

Nora, a supervisor, described how having closer, family-like multiple connections, and having or building a relationship history with her friends and family members helped her to always be in a transformation generating environment in which she keeps it close to her life. For her story of transformation, please read “Story VIII” on page 76. In her story, she described how she could not access one characteristic of herself, and thought that she lost it. Her family members and old friends still perceived and described her in another way. In being in a connection to that community, and to what they were telling about her, helped her to access specific characteristic of herself and therefore transformed her. Nora stated that these people knew her in a different way and therefore more able to influence her story about “who she is” and “who she can become.”

They have a history with me where these people [at HGI] are building a history with me. A group is being them, and B group is the ones here. A group has the history and building the history, and B group is just building the history. I am thinking of an example of a friend from the College. She has the history with me of four years that you may not have, and you have a history of ten months. So, we all have a history but different kind of history.

Supervision As A Transformagenerative Pathway

The participants described the generative nature of the supervision for them. Supervisees wanted to hear more of their supervisors’ personal stories of transformation, and wanted to know their supervisors on different levels and wanted to share different experiences with them such as doing co-therapy. Supervisees stated that their supervisors did not state any occurrences of sharing their own stories of transformation, while supervisees were encouraged to share their own with the supervisors.
Steve, a supervisor, stated that they talked about transformation “*only when they come up in conversation.*” He also drew attention to the primary focus of the supervision that it is about supervisee, not the supervisor.

> You know, the nature of supervision is such that the primary focus is on supervisee. So, I think it tends to be more on the supervisee. But, you know, fairly often it seems appropriate to use that to specify on the experience of supervisee.

This primary focus on the supervisee, constructs a context in which the supervisee feels on the spot. When the relationship between two becomes a focus, the participants of the supervision are free from being on the spot. In addition to this, Kelly, a supervisee, addressed that sharing of oneself in the dialogue creates transformation in the other. She stated how she wishes to have her supervisor sharing his self a little bit more. In addition to Kelly’s statement, Joy, another supervisee, described her experience in addressing her supervisor’s transformation during her supervision.

> It has been very indirect in my experience. I mean I have not talked about [it] too much. I think, sometimes, I come back and say. Oh you know, I did this differently this time and I mean it. The feedback was more indirect. ... I do not think that we have talked about it. I think I am sure it goes on. I can’t think that it wouldn’t [smiles] and I would be very curious. But, I think we try to focus on supervisee than [supervisor] -So, how is the supervisor transforming today? [laughs]

When Joy described what she thought of her supervisor’s transformation, she mentioned her wish to hear her supervisor’s transformation more on a personal level. Being able to have different positions with her supervisor, Joy had more of a chance to hear about how her supervisor transforms in practicing, learning, and living in general. She explained this shifting in positions.
I think outside of supervision, that is shared more. Because, we share [it] on a lot of different levels... I think because we set aside like, O.K. this is supervision. This is for the supervisee to get what she needs in this hour. It is not set up for the supervisor to talk about herself. Those are the parameters of the meeting. Supervisor is doing a service to supervisee rather than sharing herself personally, although I can see that happening sometimes naturally... [However] They are usually related to the topic. They are not usually about how the supervisor is transforming.

She stated that it would have been helpful to hear supervisor’s experiences of transformation as well.

It would be helpful in the sense if I contributed in her life too... You know that sort of knowledge is good to have and helpful. As far as the goals of supervision, I am not sure if they are totally related. I think that is why we do not do it. Because it is like -O.K. we only have a short time [and] this is what we are here for. So, where do supervisors share that...? You know, do they have other avenues or places to go with that?

Generative Learning Communities

Steve, a supervisor, described that the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI) creates an atmosphere that facilitates and generates transformation in the community. The HGI people’s ability to be open and to embrace a multiplicity of voices and choices, create transformation in the community and in the individuals. He stated that:

HGI is explicitly about dialogue and the whole of multiple voices and multiple choices. We endeavor -sometimes in extreme ways-to enact that we are. I do not think they are perfect. There is so [much] hierarchy at HGI that probably has to be in any organization. I think that their ability to be open and embrace multiplicity makes it highly...transformagenarative atmosphere... [It means] generating transformation.
A supervisee, Lisa, stated that the focus on the relationships at HGI creates an environment in which individuals can relate with each other on more of an even level. This type of environment generates the ideas and thoughts that eventually transform people.

I think because HGI primarily stresses or focuses on relationships and then, creating an environment where you then relate more on an even level. [It is] a kind of challenge to the other person, not challenge, it is not the word, but creates more thinking or more ideas and thoughts... Yeah, I think generating is a better word... It [relationship] generates ideas and thoughts that you take home, you chew on them and then that alters or transforms the relationships. [Lisa]

Joy, another supervisee, described her supervision experience of looking for multiplicity of the experiences, ideas, and views instead of looking for right or wrong answers with her supervisor. According to Joy, this frees her to become who she is, which is also one of the important aspects of the supervision.

Joy: Because, I have not experienced supervision from someone who was not fairly postmodern, but I have had supervision with someone who was not. I found it more like they are looking for right and wrong vs. multiple views and possibilities. I think for me personally, multiple views or possibilities create more confidence. It creates more of a space to be yourself, which is more confident. So that is how I think about transformation vs. someone whose supervisee and supervisor is looking for a right and wrong. If you do not find the right one... you know.

Dilek: In terms of the transformation process, it is more like you are becoming more of yourself rather than someone else

Joy: Right, you are not trying to become like your supervisor. You are trying to become more of yourself. Right... I think that is what a supervisor is trying to do.
Reflections From The Supervisees

Supervisees talked about how feeling on the spot during supervision, a practice that occurs often in traditional supervision settings. It is similar to being in a hierarchical relationship. When supervisors do not publicly accept hierarchy in the supervision relationship, supervisees can still experience it as feeling on the spot. "I feel like with the supervisor who is not postmodern, that is not much in there. It is more like feeling on the spot. There is a little bit about it. That is a whole different feel to it."

Joy hoped to become more aware of the process during the sessions. She wanted her supervisor to help her focus on becoming more aware of the process. She suggested a supervisor could do that if s/he has an intention of doing it and making this intention and the thoughts s/he has public with her during the supervision. She would get help in supervision if she could focus on:

Remembering to be aware of what is going on in the session, sort of taking a process position or you're watching the process. Why you are involved in the conversation and how you do that, and so, just having conversations about that supervision might be helpful. you know.... I don't know exactly how to get there.... I picture it as an awareness... I think some of it comes with an experience and I think some of it comes with an intention, so then I guess what might be helpful in supervision that to know you have that intention so you then you talk about it, making it public.

Not all the participants reflected on how they experienced the interview and as a researcher, I also did not ask their reflections consistently. Some of the participants, like Joy and Kelly, found the interview transformative, while some others like Elle and Mary stated that they would like to repeat this as part of their supervisions.

Joy: Oh, I liked it. Yeah, and I think it in itself is transformative too. Because, I am trying to think about doing supervision... I am
sure we will have an effect on the next supervision because we have talked about it now.

**Reflecting with Kelly: A Transformative Dialogue**

In "Reflecting with Kelly", I spontaneously included my reflections in a dialogue with her at the end of our interview. This dialogue, naturally, reflects my own biases about the HGI community, and about the postmodernism, the theory of social construction in regards to my transformation experience as a learner and as a doctoral intern in the community. Making my thoughts public with Kelly helped me realize how I saw myself being in relation to how I experienced the people in the community, as well as how I related to their practices. With no more words, I present the dialogue of my reflections with Kelly's.

Dilek: Here at HGI the concept widely used is collaboration. I think with the term collaboration, I might limit myself in its definition in the way that is used here. Postmodernism is so broad and so unknown. You can be anything, very emotional or very much a thinker, but yet still be a postmodern. You can be chaotic or spiritual, but still be a postmodern. It keeps me from feeling limited. There may not be any structure to that but it is like I can be who I am in therapy and outside of it. But [to me] the connection part is missing [here]. It is there, you know. Harlene talks about 3Cs. Connect, collaborate, and construct. [I experience] In collaborative language systems, the connection part is fast forwarded like make it happen and go with the business part, deconstruct and construct whatever. In that sense, there is a more focus on collaboration and construction [at HGI] than connection. To me, it [transformation] occurs within the connection, through that connection in relationship we are able to deconstruct or construct.

Kelly: I had a thought when you were talking. I think that you are very easy to connect with and you connect with people easily. You said that is my bias. I was thinking that I am [also] easy to connect with and I connect with people easily. And that is my bias. I wonder if we pick the things that we are good at, and those are the things that we gravitate towards.
Dilek: That is possibly true. When I look at Harene’s work, she does work very, very close to what she writes. This is her style of doing therapy, so it is who she is. In that sense, working with a supervisee or a client as far as who you are will be similar. [Is there] anything else to add?

Kelly: I think, I had a breakthrough, a transformation. I mean just in the style of doing that, to be part of this. I think again, I am always looking for the right theoretical approach. ... Harlene works closely through her writings and that is her, and you [and I] like to connect with people and their feelings, and that is me [and you]. Not that we can’t do it differently. But I think I was probably going into a place of thinking that there was a right theoretical approach, but just from our discussion it has given me more to think about “Hey, that’s O.K., that’s Harlene; how she is, and that is what works for her” again the multiple realities.

Dilek: Yes, there is always a room for other things to grow for others and for your self. But doing that with a pre-set agenda, and only doing that all alone... It can be a natural comer, you know. For me it is very natural. I do not intentionally try to plan something. It just comes out of the relationship [for me] and I trust that it comes out in the relationship. I trust to the process. Well, I can go on and on and on [about this]...

Kelly: The part we talked about, the intimate connection at the beginning. Do you feel like there is a space for you with those beliefs and ideas in here [at HGI]?

Dilek: Well, that’s a good connection and question. I think there is a space for me here, but with those ideas... [Here] some ideas are valued more than the others. In terms of organizational structure, sometimes I feel like “What is this?” This is how it is and how you are. You know. some moments of disconnection. I had the same moments of disconnection with one of my supervisors and I explored that with her. It turned out to be always about me, me disconnecting. It is not. It is like if I experience something with a person in the room, [for me] it is together. Even if the person sits in the opposite corner of the room and does not talk with me at all. We are still together. I am still responsible for the relationship. I respect that relationship. I do not feel like I am always related to a person individually. It is about how you experience the relationship individually [when you are two in the room]. When there is a supervisor and supervisee, there is always one who is more experienced than the other. It is not individual it is relational. If
you believe in social constructionism, how you can leave yourself out from that disconnectedness. If I do experience and you are there, and seeing me doing that, you are [relationally] responsible for it too. Does it make sense?

Kelly: I think so, yes.

Dilek: It again goes back to that western idea of individualized society.

Kelly: Objective?

Dilek: Objective, individualized, you have the strength, you can do anything you want…

Kelly: It’s exhausting.

Dilek: It is. Thank you [for participating the study]

Kelly: Thank you. I liked that. It helps me feel safe to talk.
CHAPTER VII

THE DISCUSSION

We’ve tried this, we’ve tried that, we’ve tried the next thing, and the next. We’ve become sophisticated, jaded. After all our searching, all the philosophy and science that we’ve labored on for centuries, it’s becoming very hard to find a story we can buy [italics added] (Hagen, 1997, p.115).

In this qualitative study project, the process of relational transformation with supervisees and supervisors was explored in a postmodern, collaborative learning community of family therapy, the Houston Galveston Institute (HGI). In this chapter, I present a summary and discussion of the results in relation to the theory of social construction and postmodernism, as well as in relation to the previous supervision research of family therapy. In addition, I address some of the implications of the results and offer some suggestions for possible future research in family therapy supervision.

During this study of relational transformation in the HGI community, the supervisees and supervisors shared many of their diverse ideas regarding their experiences of relational transformation. They told their own unique stories of transformation, described transformation generative relationships from their own experiences in and out of supervision. Below, I start with postmodernism and social construction theories. Then, I elaborate on the consistency between the theoretical ideas and the study themes or results. At the end, I reflect on the previous supervision research in family therapy, and list the implications of the study.
The Study Themes: Honoring Polyvocality and Diversity

In this study, I tried to include all the different voices of the participants, by acknowledging their unique voices through the excerpts in the transcripts. I presented their voices as co-existing with each other in the results chapter instead of making a hierarchical or categorical separation between supervisees and supervisors. The reader can find the discussion of the themes emerged from the interviews below through the lenses of the theory of social constructionism and postmodernism.

Postmodern and Social Construction Highlights

The theory of social construction emphasizes the importance of language and words in communally created social realities. These realities are constructed in a local culture or community of people who speak the same language and have similar understandings. The consensus the multiple meanings of any concept or a word socially agreed upon in that specific local community of people. Local meaning and realities are viewed as more relevant than universal ones. The theory informs people an ongoing critique of the language, the nature of language, and speaking the language in regards to the particular local context or community we live in or we visit. The scene of this study, the HGI, is known as postmodern collaborative learning setting in the family therapy field. The ideas of postmodernism and social constructionism have influenced the Institute’s training mission, philosophy and practices in therapy, training and research.

The focus on language in social construction theory and the HGI community emphasizes sharing a specific language in the community. As the realities are formed and informed in local setting, a universal understanding of any concept might be irrelevant. The meaning of any concept is based on a local negotiation among the members of the community in which a specific language has evolved. In this realm, learning is a recursive local performance of the language in which exchange of ideas, learning from each other, and
A personal and tentative assumption that emerged from this study is that language and the performances around any language hold a transformative potential and are therefore powerful. As Anderson, Cooperrider, Gergen, Gergen, McNamee, and Whitney (2001) stated, transformational dialogues stem from appreciative listening. These dialogues increase receptiveness and appreciation of individual differences and cultivate the exploration of our personal and organizational stories in a community.

This study attempted to hear the voices of supervisees and supervisors in relation to their experiences of transformation in the HGI culture. Appreciative listening can start or end with listening to one's own internal dialogue, or what Anderson (1997) called 'private' conversations. I was very passionate to hear if they wanted to share these particular private conversations about their experiences, which are summarized below.

A Summary of The Study Results

Ten participants, seven supervisees and three supervisors, described their experiences of transformation through their supervision relationships at a postmodern collaborative learning community, the HGI. All participants defined the concept of transformation and the process of relational transformation in reference to their own experiences. As they described their experiences of supervision, supervision relationships, and the HGI community, they shared their stories, addressing the characteristics of the learning community and its inhabitants that facilitate transformation in them. In addition, participants also hypothetically discussed how a learning community could become a relational, transforma-generative context that facilitates transformation in its members. In this case, the learners of family therapy. Some reflected on their experiences of the interview as a transformational context as well.
The participants in the study defined transformation as a major form of change that is intimate, spiritual, and uncontrollable. The concept refers to an unknown but desirable as well as drastic change in one's life. Participants describe this process of transformation as a major experience that occurs in relation to other entities such as people, objects, contexts, places, experiences, and ideas. The participants also stated that this kind of experience is not only limited to the supervisory contexts or relationships. They reported that any moment in life and any kind of experience with or without social relationships hold potential to generate transformation in the participants.

Transformation emerges from any experience that is meaningful to a person. Over time, this meaningful memory of the experience is carried over into other settings as an inner voice. Through this voice, a person can relate differently with her or his own perspective, paradigm, ways of thinking and feeling. S/he becomes someone different while still retaining the former self. Transformation is a process of adding on to who one is, therefore becoming a different person and experiencing one's self differently. One's self-definition expands and opens up possibilities for a life change. This process of relational transformation is an invisible flow occurring over time through relating with anything meaningful, including personal relationships. In short, the concept of relational transformation can be defined simply as change that occurs through experiencing one's own self differently.

While sharing their experiences, the participants described the characteristics of the learning community at HGI. The purpose of this community is to invite a multiplicity of voices and combine their individual experiences into learning. The supervisees and supervisors transcend the roles of teacher and student by positioning themselves as learners. The supervisors encourage supervisees to invite visitors into their sessions and supervision meetings. They share multiple visions about how they do therapy instead of looking for the right answer or perfect concept. In addition, reflecting teams provide more ideas during therapy sessions. In supervision a two-to-one ratio of supervisees to supervisor also allows
for more reflections as equals and lessens the hierarchical position of the supervisor. The
supervisors model multi-partiality as they invite each individual's voice into conversation
without valuing one more than the other.

The supervisees experience supervision as collaborative, supportive consultation.
During the supervision dialogues, the supervisor listens and explores various possibilities
with the supervisee, rarely offering his/her own ideas or self-stories unless the supervisee
asks about them. Supervisors are mentors who value the supervisee's strengths and resources
and guide them toward their individual goals. Supervisors described themselves as learners
of the relational process.

Postmodern supervision is described as a space for the conversational partners, the
supervisees and their supervisor, to entertain a multiplicity of ideas and explore possibilities
toward the not-yet-said. Listening for the not-yet-said is a stance of curiosity in the
collaborative approach to supervision at HGI. This stance is similar to the not-knowing
stance in family therapy. Listening for not-yet-said is a place to take a not-knowing stance to
hear, collaborate, and construct new ways of thinking, sharing, and performing. While
supervisors focused on the supervisees' growth and development as the core of the
supervision relationship, supervisees focused on their wish to listen to more of their
supervisors' stories. A few supervisees stated that hearing their supervisors' stories made
them feel more confident, hopeful, voiced and self-affirmed. Some stated that hearing more
of their supervisors' stories would help them to experience their supervisors on multiple
levels, possibly leading to transformation.

While supervisees' experience of supervision and supervisory relationships at HGI
varied, all of them experienced supervision as transformative. Descriptions of transformative
supervision relationships included adjectives such as collaborative, non-hierarchical, close,
warm, fun, mentoring, helpful, encouraging, and supportive. Supervisees liked to do co-
therapy with their supervisors because it helped them to experience their supervisors on a
different level and to relate with them more closely. While supervisees emphasized that these relational characteristics were of primary importance in facilitating transformation for them, the supervisors thought being a learner with a supervisee facilitates transformation.

Although they all describe HGI as a collaborative learning community, some of the supervisees also describe some experiences of conflict between the reality of practice at HGI and the postmodernism and social construction theories. Two of the three supervisors in this study are also in administrative positions, which meant that their relationships with the supervisees occur on multiple levels. One's definition of collaboration is subjective. In addition to that, it is only a speculation that this might be explained through the social construction idea of 'multiple realities', means how each person defines collaboration as well as multiple positions and, how each person relates with other individuals. The balance between collaborating and relating from a hierarchical position is a challenging task, but can become a good learning opportunity for the supervisees and supervisors.

Nevertheless, the supervisees experienced the HGI community as a transforma-generative or transformation generating culture. Creating a safe space, connecting to others in the community, appreciating relationships, inviting multiple and diverse voices, taking a learner position, listening respectfully with no agenda-setting, co-exploring multiple realities and possibilities, holding egalitarian consultations, doing co-therapy with supervisors, consulting with team members, generating more reflections, and hearing others' stories of transformation were primary characteristics of supervision in the HGI community that facilitate transformation in both the supervisees and supervisors.

The participants in this study also hypothetically pictured a transformation generating community that they called a 'transforma-generative learning community', which facilitates and encourages, therefore eventually generates transformation. Such a community’s first purpose is to create a more intimate, safe, and egalitarian context in which each individual, regardless of his/her position, can relate with others naturally and equally. This community
can provide people a spacious place to be, to act, to work creatively, and to actualize their own potentials and dreams. The participants expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to voice their opinions by participating in this study. Some of the supervisees also commented on how transformational the interview was for them and how much they enjoyed it, while others stated that they would love to have similar conversations with their supervisors in supervision.

Reflecting On Previous Studies In Family Therapy Supervision

In the family therapy field, there have been few studies conducted to explore supervision in family therapy in the postmodern era. In comparison with previous family therapy supervision research in the postmodern era (Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Bava, 2001; Lowe, 2000; Maggio, Marcotte, Perry, & Traux, 2001), this study's particular contribution is the exploration of the relational nature of transformation in family therapy supervision. This study contributed to the field of family therapy by presenting polyvocal voices of supervisors and supervisees in a unique way that might be helpful in developing creative supervision and learning practices in other training communities that value transformation and progress.

The supervisees and supervisors who participated in the study at HGI used a relational language from their collaborative, not-knowing stance in which constant negotiation and description of meaning occur. The transformation might be a spontaneous by-product of the collaborative and tentative attempts to understand their experiences of relational transformation. As a partner in conversation, I attempted understanding their realities and stories during the interviews. I hope that this study allowed all of us to reflect on how we invite and honor different voices in our daily practices that might become transforming for each of us as well as for our learning community.

When the relationships are the focus of interest, the individuals can grow spontaneously and creatively actualize their unique potentials. A literature search regarding
transformation and supervision relationships did not yield any studies regarding how supervisees and supervisors transform during their supervisory relationships over time. This study proposes to fill this gap in the family therapy field through a specific focus on postmodern, collaborative learning culture and its supervisory practices. As a result of this study, I hope that family therapy training programs will be constructed as relationship-based learning communities in the future.

Parallel to this theoretical stance, hearing and including both voices of supervisors and supervisees in regards to their experiences of relational transformation through their supervisory relationships is another contribution of this study to the field. I aimed to present co-existing voices of both supervisees and supervisors by calling it 'patchworking voices' in the methodology chapter. This kind of approach, patchworking the voices of supervisees and supervisors without any categorical separation, has not been applied before.

As a researcher, I did not aim to conduct research to follow previous research studies' recommendations for future inquiry in family therapy supervision. I did not start this study by doing an extensive literature review. I began this study by writing down my own experiences and ideas or biases about this process of relational transformation through supervisory relationships, then I completed my literature review and found that the need for such an inquiry was immense. This study helped to increase the few number of qualitative studies that existed in postmodern collaborative family therapy supervision research. All previous studies either focused on supervisee’s or supervisor’s perspectives, rather than looking at relational context of supervision (Anderson & Rambo, 1988; Bava, 2001; Lowe, 2000; Maggio, Marcotte, Perry, and Traux, 2001).

The literature search on family therapy supervision revealed several parallels between the findings of my study and those of Maggio, Marcotte, Perry, and Traux (2001). In both studies the supervisees emphasized the importance of a collaborative approach to learning by the supervisors and the faculty who teach and mentor in family therapy. Maggio et al. (2001)
also similarly found that modeling, collaboration, and supervision facilitate the development of effective and reflective family therapists. Likewise, Hines (1996) discussed the effect of offering trainers the opportunity to reflect on the voices of their own students periodically and to involve in ongoing dialogues with them throughout the learning process. Maggio et al. (2001) suggested that the dialogue between family therapy students and trainers in marriage and family therapy should actualize collaborative and active learning practices through maximizing ‘talking with’ the students.

Ham (2001) addressed a need to study opportunities for transformation in family therapy training programs. She described teaching in family therapy as a “relational act that encourages, guides, and facilitates bonding relationships among learner, educators, and communities” (p.31). Ham also recommended that family therapy supervisors or trainers participate in learning about their supervisees’ or students’ experiences of reality. In this way, supervisors can broaden the learning space for the supervisees. She further suggested that supervisors introduce supervisees to the idea of ‘multiple realities’ that emerge from social interchanges and ongoing conversations.

Collaborative learning practices require appreciative, respectful listening as well as exploring each other’s multiple realities in order to understand the experiences in learning. As Anderson stated, “the learning space is not about providing information or withholding it, or telling or not telling student what to do” (1997, p.248). In collaboration, trainers or supervisors become learners of the process. They value positioning themselves as curious listeners and participant learners. Supervisees and supervisors, students and teachers, create knowledge together in a social, collaborative interaction. Knowledge becomes a shared, communal product of the exchange of ideas in a learning community (Gergen, 1999; Shotter, 2000).

In my study, I found similar features in the climate of learning family therapy at HGI, both inside and outside of supervisory contexts. In a collaborative learning space, the
relationships of the individuals can become a relational context for change. The formal family therapy supervision relationship, the focus of my study, was one of these multi-relational contexts of learning. In this context, the relational space of conversation facilitates transformations of supervisees and supervisors of family therapy. This space, named a transforma-generative atmosphere, is a context where a transforming relationship can evolve, be nurtured, and experienced. This context encourages transformation in its inhabitants.

According to both family therapy and creativity theories, change-generating contexts require safety, optimal with support and challenge and flow of experience (Deacon & Thomas, 2000). My study demonstrated that the supervisees and supervisors experience similar characteristics in the HGI learning community. In addition, the participants enumerated other characteristics of a community that generate transformation, such as connecting or feeling close to other people, sharing one’s self or story and reflecting upon these experiences, relating in non-critical, non-hierarchical and appreciative ways, and welcoming differences and multiplicity of ideas.

As discussing the theory of social construction and the collaborative approach to family therapy training, Ham (2001, p.33) emphasized how collaborative and participatory learning experiences can ultimately create transformations both in the supervisors and supervisees, who are both learners in family therapy:

Unlike change that leads to a loss or substitution of ourselves, transformation draws from our own energy by retaining the essence of our being and then creating something new. ...We cannot anticipate our own transformations, but we will be able to retrospectively view them. Family therapy educators find themselves in a state of transformation as they introduce global consciousness and the politics of difference to their students. The process is reciprocal and reflexive. Family therapy educators and their students will be carried along together with mutual and interactive transforming experiences. How gratifying for students to learn with their mentors as they join together in these learning experiences (Ham, 2001, p 33)
Another study by McDowell and Fang (2002) addressed the need for transformation in graduate family therapy programs. One way of facilitating transformation is to enhance racial and social diversity in family therapy programs through promoting an ongoing process of therapist, trainer, and supervisor cultural and contextual self-awareness. This awareness can be increased through ongoing dialogues among faculty and students of family therapy. One of the conclusions of my study pointed to embracing a learning community that values and encourages diversity and multiplicity in ideas, ethnicity, cultures, and experiences. I found that embracing diversity and a multiplicity of experiences in supervision at HGI transformed supervisees, allowing them to become more self-aware by expanding the variety of interactions among learners. Having a diversified learning community at HGI further facilitated transformations through dialogues that honored curiosity and invited different voices. The experience of these different voices was often carried over to other contexts in supervisees’ and supervisors’ lives. The context of learning extended beyond supervision meetings; the different voices became interwoven with different experiences. Eventually, all intermingled in such incredible harmony that supervisees gradually transformed into therapists.

Laughlin (2000) qualitatively studied how a supervisor created a context that encouraged students to learn to improvise. After interviewing jazz improvisation teachers and then videotaping supervisee-supervisor conversations in supervision, she addressed family therapy supervision as a relational improvisational practice. The conversations between student and teacher in supervision co-evolved toward creating a therapeutic artistry. Laughlin’s study approached supervision as a relational practice. Although teaching improvisation in supervision was a different focus than mine, both studies in family therapy supervision focused on the relational nature of supervision. Surprisingly, in the HGI community there is a current focus on performative and improvisational psychotherapy.
practices, in doing and learning family therapy. Performance is seen as a form of discourse like language, and some faculty experiment with the ideas of improvisation in different clinical and research projects. Exploring improvisation in family therapy learning and supervision contexts would make an interesting topic for further research.

Previous studies (Allen, Szallos, & Williams, 1986; Black, 1988; Ellis, 1991; Galante, 1988; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Heppner & Roehlka, 1984; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Kaiser, 1992, Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987; Kniskern & Gurman, 1979; Patton & Kivligan, 1997; White & Russell, 1995) have focused on the relationship characteristics between supervisor and supervisee from either the supervisees’ or supervisors’ perspectives, but not both. As Veach (2001) suggested, I focused on both supervisees’ and supervisors’ perspectives of the supervisory relationship, as well as how they individually experience their own transformations along with their supervisory relationships.

Kaiser (1992) identified the following salient elements of the supervision relationship between a supervisee and supervisor: accountability, personal awareness, trust, and power and authority. Similar to Kaiser’s findings, supervisees in this study view the supervisory relationship as a crucial factor in their transformations. Similarly, the supervisees described their supervisory relationships in the HGI community as close, friendly, fun, collaborative, equal, non-judgmental, non-hierarchical, supportive, self-affirming, encouraging, and transformative.

Veach (2001) critiqued the supervisory relationship by asking -how strong does this relationship have to be in order to be effective? (p.399) While the meaning of efficacy is subjective and interdependently negotiable in language between supervisees and supervisors, if one chooses to use the effectiveness concept, then the focus of interest in the supervision literature would be different. This study does not focus on efficacy, although it is my bias that any transformational experience eventually might perturb the efficacy of family therapy and supervision practices. Goodyear and Bernard (1988) question whether supervision
should focus on skill development or personality reconstruction of the supervisee. The question is relevant, but the answer does not necessarily require an either/or approach. The results of my study show that taking a both/and approach in thinking, learning, teaching, and practicing family therapy invites and enables those with multiple views and realities to learn from each other and transform together.

O'Hare, Heinrich, Kirschner, Oberstone, and Ritz (1975) have addressed the issue of multiple supervision, i.e., having two supervisors commenting on the same clinical material at the same time. This model of co-supervision generates multiple views and perspectives on the same clinical material. The researchers also addressed doing co-therapy with the supervisees as a way of supervising them. Both of these approaches have been practiced in the HGI learning community. As mentioned earlier, the supervisees in this study stated that having a case together with their supervisors helped them to experience their supervisors on a different level, which in turn facilitated their transformations. In addition to this, having multiple supervisors in clinical team meetings and listening to their voices and perspectives are other ways of receiving supervision for the supervisees at HGI. Two out of seven supervisees also experienced a two supervisor-two supervisee format of supervision that occurred biweekly for two hours. All these different contexts offer supervisees multiple opportunities to meet their supervisory needs.

While not a focus of this study, informal settings that offer spontaneous supervision or supervision on-demand when the learner needs it are also found to be very transformative by the supervisees because their immediate needs are met. Campbell, Doane, and Guinan (1983) discussed instant supervision as a method for resolving conflicts between the supervisee and the client in the relational context that originally created the conflict. The goal of it is to provide consultation immediately at the time and in the relationship when help is needed, which is similar to the goal of the spontaneous format of supervision at HGI. The difference between the two involves their intentions. While the instant supervision format
provides consultation to offer strategic help for impasses, the spontaneous format at HGI provides consultation to help a supervisee explore her/his own resources to deal with the situation and opens up multiple ways of approaching the dilemma at hand.

Kaiser (1992) suggested that family therapy supervision research should examine the aspects of supervision that have the potential to influence the quality of a supervisee's work long after a particular supervision session has ended. My study attempted to fill this gap by studying the relational characteristics of supervision that create multiple possibilities for transforming not only the supervisees, but also the supervisors who are involved in practicing, teaching, and researching family therapy. My relational position in this study led me to include all individuals' voices involved in supervision. Similarly, current research trends in supervision for both counseling and family therapy have focused on the relationship and offered relationship-centered supervision (Ellis, 2001; Gray, Friedlander, Ladany, Nelson, & Walker, 2001; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Ham, 2001; Maggio, Marcotte, Perry, & Traux 2001; Veach, 2001).

According to Berkery (1997), the therapeutic relationship is a journey. Isomorphically, the supervision relationship is similar. Both can be pictured as a helix, bounded with the relationship. Supervisor and supervisee travel side by side. Unlike traditional supervisors, supervisors in postmodern collaborative practices are intimate and active participants in the transformative process. The supervisory relationship is a two-way street of transformation, offering a space that facilitates transformation in both conversational partners. Supervisors and supervisees can become passionate learners and practitioners in their journey as long as they continue their explorations of transformations, intentional learning, and ongoing search for feedback and supervision (Dlugos, 2000).
Implications and Inspirations for Future Inquiry

The words we choose, which are used to describe supervision, can make a difference. "Supervision" implies a power difference between two visions or ideas. One vision or idea is better than the other. The word "supervision" further constructs the supervisor's gatekeeper position in supervision. The literature review uncovered a variety of different names to substitute for the term "supervision", including meta-view (Wright & Coopersmith, 1983), multi-verse of realities (Kassis, 1984), behind-the-mirror treatment team (Boscolo, Cecchin, Hoffman & Penn, 1987), reflecting team (Andersen, 1987), and collaborative conversation (Anderson & Goolishian, 1990). In my experience, supervision evolves through co-visions of supervisees and supervisors who are always in the process of relational transformation through their relationship and experiences in conversation.

This study has several limitations in terms of its generalizability and transferability to other family therapy supervision practices. First of all, the Houston Galveston Institute is a postmodern collaborative learning community that specifically practices the theory of social construction and collaboration in family therapy. Therefore, the supervisees' and supervisors' experiences of transformation cannot be generalized to the rest of the HGI community or to the larger family therapy learning community in the U.S.A. The findings can offer an alternative way of thinking about supervision and learning that may be substituted for more traditional practices of teaching family therapy. In a learning community that prioritizes transformative relationships, individual and organizational needs can be pursued and met with appreciation; learning and generating knowledge can become shared, relational, and communal.

Nelson and Friedlander (2001) reported that administrative supervision issues usually precipitate the incidents damage supervision relationship. Veach (2001) recommended that supervisors and supervisees be better prepared in terms of the administrative aspects of supervision. After this study, I would suggest the creation of peer consulting groups to
discuss issues among supervisees and supervisors on a regular basis that suits the agency's or a family therapy program's needs. I agree with Veach's recommendation (2001) that supervisors receive more intensive training before they begin supervising other therapists. After completing this intensive training, I also would suggest that supervisor candidates become involved in reflecting groups, which include other supervisors, supervisor candidates, and supervisors of supervisors in a family therapy training community. Self-reflective exercises (Fine & Turner, 1991; Piercy & Sprenkle, 1988; Rambo, Heath, & Chenail, 1993; Taibbi, 1996), "as if" exercises (Anderson, 1990), and improvisational practices (Laughlin, 2000) in supervision with supervisees could become a part of this ongoing learning experience, helping to establish group coherency in the community of ongoing learners in supervision.

This idea of an 'ongoing learning project for supervisors' is based on some of my own experiences, which emerged from my learning about the theory of social construction, including (a) learning as an ongoing, communal project and process, (b) reflecting process (Andersen, 1987) as a verbal bridge to create a collaborative, working community of learners or supervisors in learning, who co-create this ongoing project, (c) improvising or performing relationship-based experiences of supervisors in their supervisions as a way of participatory, experiential and creative learning, (d) encouraging the use of a relational voice (Andersen, 1997) as a way of knowing during supervisory consultations, and (e) challenging the traditional ways of supervising (Veach, 2001).

Additional ideas that may inspire other researchers in future studies of supervision include the following:

1. A study on the historical stories of a specific family therapy training program to explore how transformative the telling of a story could be for the learners in the community
2. A longitudinal case study to explore a transforming relationship dyad in family therapy supervision
3. A multilevel story, oral or written, to explore the characteristics of a transformative relationship for each different position— the therapist, the supervisor, the client, and the director of the program or institution in which therapy and supervision services are provided.

4. A reflective study among supervisees who experiment with performance and improvisational exercises in their peer consultations, for example exploring the role of telling and reflecting on what is said and what is heard in the group.

5. An autobiographical and longitudinal study to explore how a supervisor candidate experiences her/his identity over time.

6. A descriptive survey about how supervisor candidates in family therapy learn to be supervisors.

7. An ethnographic study on how story telling shapes the identities of supervisors in a family therapy learning community.

8. A retrospective study on supervisors in training who would story their supervisors' stories told in supervision.

My Story Continues...

Great teachers and therapists avoid all direct attempts to influence action of others and, instead, try to provide the settings or contexts in which some (usually imperfectly specified) change may occur (Bateson, 1991, p.254).

I deeply appreciate the privilege of hearing the voices of family therapy supervisees and supervisors. I was humbled to hear the uniqueness and richness of their personal stories and experiences. By volunteering their time and effort, they allowed me to include all the active supervisees' and supervisors' voices at HGI at the time of this study.

Throughout the study, I was involved in hearing, transcribing, writing, and presenting these voices and stories without attempting to interpret their experiences of relational transformation. Most of our dialogues during the study interviews evolved into spontaneous and transformative verbal performances between the participants and I. In this study we all co-constructed our stories, co-researched our lives through conversation. The attempt to create a space to explore transformation with the participants was itself transforming for all
of us. The overall process led to other things, such as a more intimate relationship, more conversations about learning, supervision and HGI outside of the study.

Others have addressed this transformation through the idea of the hermeneutic circle (Gadamer, 1975), which focuses on how a new experience with another might broaden and even transform one's own pre-understandings, and eventually one's identities. Relationally, we were transforming as we attempted to understand another's experience or story. By doing that, in fact, we were retelling our stories in a different context to be retold for this study. I enjoyed this process and learned further about our inevitable, and natural relationality—the ground bridge for all meaning created in life as human beings. All we did was to reflect on our stories of transformation, to relate with each other's ideas and experiences, and perhaps to create a transforma-generative context for a new story to be retold and transformed.

My own ongoing transformation experience has made it easy to connect with the participants. Also hearing others' voices and stories similar to my own has been a validating and exciting process of coming to understand how transformative any relationship, including supervision in family therapy, can become. The voices of those who have participated in this study support the invention of the concept of relational transformation. I present 'relational transformation' as a part of postmodern, social constructionist terminology that substitutes for the concept of 'change', a traditional term used in the literature of family therapy.

As I conclude this chapter, I realize that I have not included as many of my own transformation stories as I intended. The topic of transformation is personally very relevant, as I have experienced transformation prior to this research as well as during the study period, and hopefully will continue to do so. Excerpts from my journal that describe some of these experiences have been interwoven throughout this text.

I began telling my own story with some excerpts from my journal and introduced my experience of relational transformation. Presenting my journal excerpts and poems at the
beginning and at the end of this text like bookends, I hope to stimulate some further openings in future inquiry. My story in this ongoing journey echoes.

Living like
In a tunnel with no end, no beginning...
Light might come when no one can see...
Each point is the same as the last you have already passed
Hearing voices with a blind mind,
It gets darker,
No vision further.
Besides you are a not-seen scene...
Only a fool would look for a step away.

You, stay there.
Listen to the songs.
They call you to the light.
Let them dance you.
Let yourself yield to its flow.
Once you allow yourself to be allowed by the unknown.
Not seen is not known who invites the others alike.

No hurry.
Time has already gone.
Let the silence of the interlude be your surrender.
Seeing is not thinking, you know.
Hey! I said stay, not stay still.
C'mon, let's play and dance (Tinaz, 2002).
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HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Form

| PI Last Name | Title of Project | Stories of Relational Transformation in Supervision: A Postmodern-Collaborative Inquiry |

Checklist for Attachments

The following are attached (please check):

13. □ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) the purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 18)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research
   d) if applicable, the location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

14. □ A copy of the consent form (if applicable)

15. □ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

16. □ Data-gathering instruments

17. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First contact</th>
<th>Last contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/20/2002</td>
<td>03/20/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month/Day/Year</td>
<td>Month/Day/Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

| 10/20/2003 |
| Month/Day/Year |

19. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of IRB Chairperson</th>
<th>Signature of IRB Chairperson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/26/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the PI or co-PI is also the DEO, a Dean signature authority must sign here.

20. Initial action by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Project approved</th>
<th>□ Pending Further Review</th>
<th>□ Project not approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Follow-up action by the IRB:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project approved</th>
<th>Project not approved</th>
<th>Project not resubmitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rick Sharp</th>
<th>Signature of IRB Chairperson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/26/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INVITATION LETTER

FROM: DILEK TINAZ, MA, Doctoral Candidate

TO: HGI COMMUNITY

DATE: 04/15/2002

MEMO:

INVITING YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN SUPERVISION RESEARCH:
"STORIES OF RELATIONAL-TRANSFORMATION IN SUPERVISION"

Dear All,

As some of you may know, I am beginning data collection for my dissertation study at HGI. I am interested in exploring how you describe "transformation", how you experience Collaborative-Postmodern Supervision as a supervisee and supervisor, and how you experience transformation (if any) that is connected to your unique, supervision relationship.

This research study can be an opportunity to meet for all of us, supervisees and supervisors, to share and explore our stories of transformation. If you have any kind of personal/professional transformation along with your supervision, join this study to share your experience. I hope, we can construct a Collaborative Research Community, a group of six persons, three supervision pairs. The participants will interview with the primary researcher, they will reflect on their supervisions three times, and they will meet once as a group to talk about their experiences of transformation and supervision.

Please contact me for further information and voluntary participation at:
Ph # 713-526-8390 (ext.325) OR, e-mail: ditinaz@iastate.edu

[Signature]

DILEK TINAZ, M A , Doctoral Candidate
Primary Researcher
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SIGNED, INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Please read carefully. If you agree the terms in italics sign the line below.

The purpose of the research study is to focus on supervisee’s and supervisor’s stories of relational transformation throughout the supervision process. Your name will be confidential under a nickname or you may choose to use your first name. After the data are collected, your name will be removed from the tapes and records. Your voluntary participation in this research at Houston Galveston Institute will be approximately 2 to 4 months. This time may be extended with your permission with a two weeks notice.

Thank you for your participation.

Dilek Tinaz, M.A., Doctoral Candidate at Iowa State University, Department of Human Development & Family Studies, Marriage and Family Therapy Specialization

Dianne Draper, Ph.D., Major Professor, Department of Human Development & Family Studies, 4380 Palmer, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-4380
Office: 515-294-4024 Fax: 515-294-2502

"By signing this form, I agree to participate to the research interviews that include individual, pair, and group interviews; to return self-directed and/or previously asked tasks such as keeping journals, writing self-stories. By signing this form, I give permission to the researcher to keep the video/audio/written records of these interviews and tasks “only” for the purpose of the researcher’s dissertation and future workshops in therapist/supervisor training. I give permission to the researcher to publish the data without disclosing my name. I have right to cancel this permission at any time during and after the data are collected. I will be informed about any changes that may occur in the research process and will be given a Modified Informed Consent Form to sign.

By signing this form, I understand all conversations and all data will be confidential. I have also a right to withdraw from the study at any time."

_________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of the Participant                  Date (MM/DD/YY)

_________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature of the Witness                      Date (MM/DD/YY)
APPENDIX D.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM: THE PARTICIPANT ESSAY

Your participant role: Supervisor ( ) Supervisee ( )
Year of birth:
Gender: Female ( ) Male ( )

Your current graduation year:
Your degree(s):
Your field of graduation(s):
Your licensure status(es):
When did you become licensed?:
Years of experience in doing therapy:
Years of experience in supervising:
Years of experience in providing supervision of supervision:
Please shortly describe your experience of:

➤ being a therapist:

➤ being a supervisor:

➤ supervision relationship:
APPENDIX E.
A SUMMARY OF THE PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Summary of Demographic Information</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of participants=10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female=9 Male=1</td>
<td>7 female</td>
<td>1 male, 2 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years after current graduation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of fully licensed participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of associate licensed participants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of being fully licensed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of being associate licensed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of providing therapy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of providing supervision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the average years of providing supervision of supervision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A SAMPLE OF THE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS

Interview with Joy, A Supervisee

Dilek: Thank you for coming. I have several questions I want to ask you. I do not want to have it like question to answer. Hopefully it'll be conversational for us. I am interested in transformations. How can you describe transformation? What does it mean to you?

Joy: Transformation, ohm... Let's see, sort of changing, ohm, sort of like opening up, seeing something new and different, seeing other possibilities, and just kind of, being able to take that with you and do something with it, rather than just think about it. Maybe how they go with you, be part of your actions. So you and be a part of you.

Dilek: So do you experience transformation in you as a person and therapist?

Joy: Yeah, yeah. lots of time. I think.

Dilek: How come?

Joy: I see like transformation in growing in confidence, that's one Transformation. uhm. becoming, more willing to experiment, more willing to try things that you might not have thought over, you might not willing to try really. That's another. Let me think... and also I guess, just sort of feeling like you're not alone in what you're doing. So, it's like a there is someone with you. It's kind of Transformation that you know you're not alone doing it. Does that make sense?

Dilek: Tell me more about this. I am curious what you mean.

Joy: Well, I think like when you see someone else, like if you're observing a therapy setting or something like and you see something, and later on you feel like I can try that. You feel like the other person is still with you in it, kind a take them with you. and the same thing with the conversations you know, the you hear like someone else's voice is being with you. You take it from one setting and put it into another setting.

Dilek: So. you take it with you, and kind of make it your own for you at some level.

Joy: Oh yeah, I mean, but it's...I think what you take with u gives u the confidence to, you know. experiment... you know.

Dilek: O.K. That is interesting. So, whatever you take with you then, somehow facilitates your own process of change or transformation?

Joy: Yeah I think so....Trying to think of any specifics.... And I am not coming up with a specific
Dilek: Ohm...

Joy: Yeah... I remember that it's just a feeling happens, that's kind of how it works..

Dilek: Is it some event, or something you take with you? or is it like a person with you, a thought, and idea, or...? What is it like? What do you take it with u?

Joy: Well, like... Ok, if I had a conversation that I feel like, oh, I really learn something from, and then I had an experience that it kind of makes me different. Then, when I go into a different setting I am not really the same person. And so, I am a different person in that setting.

Dilek: Okay. So, you connect the first experience with the next one, a kind of you relate with the 1<sup>st</sup> experience and then you continue to relating of this experience into other settings...

Joy: ya, ya...

Dilek: ... into other experiences. So, you carry on sometimes, maybe not the same thing, but some-thing- from that previous experience into the other ones...

Joy: right...

Dilek: ... and that makes you a different person...

Joy: right. Like I can think of. O.K....like, and this is like from a client, not...

Dilek: ohm

Joy: Ohm when a client, a kind of, shared a story that I have never heard before. I did not know that kind of life existed, I mean it was just like an opening up, oh my gosh, you know, this is some people actually live in this kind of a world...

Dilek: O.K...

Joy: And that was transformative for me, because I did not know that lives like that existed in the world. and so, then when I learned that, then when I go into another setting, I have more depth, more...you know, there is more there to drawn in the next setting.

Dilek: Oh gosh, that's amazing. So, as a therapist you put yourself in a risk of change as much as your clients do.

Joy: Oh, definitely, yeah, yeah.
Dilek: So, how about supervision for you? I mean it is the same or how is it different in supervision?

Joy: Versus being with clients?

Dilek: yeah.

Joy: Well, I think in supervision what I, you try to open up is ohm. how you're thinking and seeing about your clients, you know, you kind of share that thought process. and so kind of open and vulnerable about this is what I am doing in therapy or at least I thought I am doing in therapy....

Dilek: ohm

Joy: you know and, ohm, you kind of sharing about whether your feeling is not working or it is not working, what you think it's happening, and where you are in your feeling, all that kind of stuff...

Dilek: ohm

Joy: and ohm... I think you can have a similar kind of aha! because the supervisor depending how they work at can kind of interact with you in a way that you see other things that you didn't see, or maybe you just feel supported... and that's enough to enable you to kind of feel transformed... next time you go back to something you're very frustrated about. and then you, in supervision you kind of talk it out and you kind of have some new ideas. and some new energy for it. and to me that's a transformation and you can go back and then something is different.

Dilek: Ohm, so when you think about your supervisor and your relationship with her. how do you describe that relationship? What kind of process is for you? What kind of relationship do you have?

Joy: The word I think of is mentor. That's to me that word is kind like ohm, someone who is concerned about your well being and your progress...

Dilek: ohm

Joy: and... that's sort of the purpose of the meeting. rather than being just talking to a colleague about ooh I've got this tough case... their concern is not how are you doing as a therapist. it's a sharing. Sp is a kind of that concern is more primary

Dilek: Do you address these issues of transformation in supervision?

Joy: You mean directly?
Dilek: directly and indirectly...

Joy: It's been very indirect in my experience. I mean, I haven't talked about too much. I think, sometimes, I come back and say oh, you know, I did this differently this time and I think it, and you know, get feedback and it's been indirect more.

Dilek: Some people experience some kind of change during the supervision. Some people experiences out of supervision sessions, along with the supervision process. How is it like for you? Which one fits? Or another way?

Joy: Ohm... Let me think about that, because I haven't really thought about. Ohm. Sometimes I think it's both. I think there are times when it happens during supervision. Ohm, and sometimes it happens later, when you, oh you know. I remember, I think about it, and comes back. But. I think there are times when it's like a whole different door opens up.

Dilek: Can you tell me a little bit more about the relationship with your supervisor? What kind of relationship? How would you describe it?

Joy: as far as adjectives?

Dilek: Up to you. however you want to describe.

(a call interrupted)

Joy: ohm. ok we're talking about the describing the relationship?

Dilek: yes.... how do you describe and experience your relationship with your supervisor?

Joy: I think it's a relationship that gets fairly close.... because it's really, ohm... because you really working on sort of the core what you're doing, it's a high fare, to me it is a pretty vital of the whole process.. So the relationship it's... ohm, like I am just working with someone and, then they become my supervisor, it changes the whole thing in a sense, because it becomes more than mentor, so they have a different way of looking at me and I have a different way of looking at them.

Dilek: ohm

Joy: And then, ohm... So, I guess it just be very, very personal, very involved, and very warm. I think it can be, like if your supervisor is on site with you and you just meet for an hour in a week somewhere, so that'll be very different... a lot of depends of what else you do with your supervisor, you know...

Dilek: So, since you have that these multi-positions, or multiple hats to work with your supervisor, it's like more close, more personal kind of relationship than the other types of
relationships like you meet once in a week and talk about your clinical work. It’s more broader than that.

Joy: Right, right, right... I think because with my supervisor it’s also working, you know.

Dilek: How do you experience this multiple positions in your relationship with her. how that feature of the context at HGI informs you in your transformation?

Joy: Well, it’s kind of funny, because you’re going, ok this is supervision, and outside ohm, this is friendship, and this is colleague, and all this is... you know, you kind of jump around that’s being a different thing. And, they kind a blend together very nicely I think. I think it does. They just kind of end up veining in and out ohm, but I think it does, you know, you kind a shut the door and this is supervision, I think she does that and I do that.

Dilek: So, you take the roles, and act, perform the roles but outside of that hour, you’re very flexible to go different directions and different roles

Joy: yes.

Dilek: not just being in supervision time and room, but also outside of the supervision time... also kind of mentoring and facilitating kind of different types of transformations?

Joy: Ohm...yeah I would say that. I think when we go into supervision we’re more focused on that. I think that rest of the time the other types of roles take over it. So, it’s also hard also to say where is it: transformation in supervision or... it’s hard to pull it out and say, you know, this was a part of supervision or this was a... you know. It’s hard to separate it... whereas If I worked with someone and I always saw once a week for an hour. then I could definitely say that was in supervision. You know...

Dilek: I know you have a supervisor to work with in another setting. So, how do u describe the differences between the relationship in terms of your transformation?

Joy: I have got to think about that for a second. I think that, one is once in a week, and an hour, and it’s separate. There is not much relationship to bring into supervision. I think that it’s unfortunate in a way, because you kind of miss the richness of the other pieces... at least I do. On the other hand... ohm, well. It seems like there is more, in the supervisee supervisor relationship once in a week. oh they must be the expert. they must be the... I mean. its more of a hierarchy there. You’re not ever doing much else.

Dilek: You’re not experiencing the other positions of your supervisor. The only position you experience with her is supervisee and supervisor positions.

Joy: Right, right so. then ohm. yeah.. So, it’s much more a consultant. So, I store up questions, oh I got to remember to ask this. I have to remember, so I need to make a little list to remember. it’s a more of a structure...
Dilek: Structure, that was the word in my mind. It's more of a structure because you have an hour, so you have to be sure that you're covering what you need to cover. But, in this setting, more like you can go and ask anyone else if you need to.

Joy: Right. Yeah, yeah... And I ask... In this setting, I can ask my questions to different people at the moment I need... so that's another agony I have. In supervision, there is multiple people to reach out to.

Dilek: It's kind of informal supervision

Joy: Right.

Dilek: I am thinking about all thing you're talking about... Can you tell me any stories of transformation? If you have any?

Joy: ohm...

Dilek: at least a synopsis?

Joy: ohm... O.K. One thing I haven't talked about supervision that there is often another person, two supervisees and a supervisor... and that, ohm... I am often like observing the other supervisee and the supervisor. That also adds to that... I see that is being very helpful as far as transformation and that's not my case or issue for supervision but I learn a lot, and take a lot from that, you know, to see other types of questions the supervisor asks to other supervisee... and, that's helpful because, I hear other kinds of questions of to ask myself, you know, I think that's one of the most helpful parts of supervision is, what kinds of questions to come up with.

Dilek: to come up with?

Joy: Right. Right, like when the supervisor ask me questions, it's like oh, then those become the questions I learn to ask myself at other times. So, that's a transformation of how to do self-supervision maybe, from supervision you're evolving to self-supervision.

Dilek: Oh, that's very interesting. When you talk about self-supervision, and when you describe it like how to ask same type questions when I am alone. So, it's more like a self-dialogues about how you work and how you think about your working, and so, that's also a transformational piece you experience. Does it more likely occur with two supervisees than with one supervisee?

Joy: Right. Yes, but it's not my case so much, but I hear the questions so, I am listening from a different angle. Because when it's my case, I am more involved in the specifics. When it's someone else's then I hear more of the questions little bit more distance. I find it really helpful.
Dilek: How about the supervisees’ contributions to your own case, when you talk with the supervisor? If the other supervisee has something to say for your case, how that influences your experience of transformation?

Joy: Ohm. I am trying to think, ohm, I think it’s similar to, yeah, and then also I am also asking other supervisee questions...sometimes and then, so I can almost, or maybe not asking questions as much as sharing just similar situation, you know. whatever, process. you know something that, I think, related or may be helpful. But, I still think what is most helpful is just listening to the other in interaction, kind of being in a mood.

Dilek: What has been helpful to you in your transformation in your supervision relationship to facilitate transformations?

Joy: I think it’s... I think I would say I bet, the support; because that’s sort of loosing the confidence, from the support I gain the confidence. Okay, that’s one. And then, the kind of questions ohm... just kind of broaden by viewpoint. So, that’s really helpful.

(noise from outside interrupts, laughs...)

Joy: Never fails. I had a client... you get to barely talk... Anyway, ohm. I think this support and kind of questions, ohm. I think what kind of questions. ohm. questions help me think about what you’re thinking about.

Dilek: When you think outside in conversations, out of the questions, sometimes we talk with each other, we don’t have too many questions but we do have things to share. So, in that context, as if we have that context in supervision, in that context, what kind of relational characteristics, except the questions. would facilitate your transformation?

Joy: The characteristics of the relationship?

Dilek: Yes.

Joy: O.K. Like the supportive sort of. I am hearing you... Just commiserating, you know. ohm, kind of just sharing like this is what I did. I had once like that, this is what I tried... This is whatever... I am trying to think of other types of... sort of what it is look like...

Dilek: And you don’t have to be specific about sessions to since you’ve talked about multiple positions. I keep it broad.

Joy: O.K. I think the most helpful thing is that people have confidence in you and then you gain it for yourself.

Dilek: What else would you like to see in supervision for your ongoing transformation?
Joy: That’s a good question…. I guess what I am hoping for myself is to become more aware; just able to be more aware of like during sessions. So, what in supervision may have maybe more aware and that’s I am just trying to answer, just thinking out loud because I really don’t know.

Dilek: so, you want to know more about.. what you do?

Joy: I guess, yeah, right or what could help me to focus on remembering to be aware of what is going on in the session; sort of taking a process position, or you’re watching the process. Why you’re involved in the conversation and how you do that. And so, just having conversations about that supervision might be helpful, you know, or just ohm. I don’t know exactly how to get there…

Dilek: Can you say becoming self-reflexive or self-reflective?

Joy: Yaa. I think that’s part of it. I pictured as awareness… I think some of it comes with an experience and I think some of it comes with an intention, so then I guess what might be helpful in supervision that to know you have that intention so you then you sort of chatting and talking about it; making it public.

Dilek: A question about this postmodern collaborative context, how this supervision context facilitates your transformation?

Joy: How do postmodernism. and collaboration contribute to that?

Dilek: Yeah.

Joy: I think it has a lot to contribute to, because there is no like one way that this supervisee is… there is not a path there is not a set way to go. It’s very fluid, to me that’s more like a reality. So, I think that postmodern collaboration part just allows that happen more freely. Because, I have not experienced supervision from someone that wasn’t fairly postmodern collaborative, but a little bit I have had supervision with someone you know was. I found it more like that they’re looking for right and wrong vs. multiple views. and possibilities. So, I think, for me personally that multiple views. possibilities create more confidence. Because you know that it creates more ability to be yourself. which is more confidence I think. And so that’s how I think about transformation vs. someone whose supervisee and supervisor is looking for a right and wrong. If you don’t find the right one… you know.

Dilek: In terms of transformation process. more like you’re becoming more yourself rather than someone else.

Joy: Right, you are not trying to become like your supervisor, you’re trying to become more yourself. Right.

Dilek: That’s interesting.
Joy: I think that what supervisor is trying to do is also that.

Dilek: To become who you are.

Joy: Right, right.

Dilek: How do you know you get there, or you're getting there?

Joy: Yeah, right right, you're never going to get there. (smiles) but, you're on the way there. Ohm... I think feeling congruent with more yourself and therapy sessions. You feel like more like it's less like wearing someone else's clothes, you're wearing your own clothes when you're in there vs. other kind of supervision you feel like there is some right way supposed to be, so you're trying to figure out what outfit that is, you know, so doesn't feel like yourself as much maybe.

Dilek: You have to fit to outfit...

Joy: Right

Dilek: But in this approach you can fit it to yourself in any outfit, it's like, you can shape the outfit, and you have a mutual contribution?

Joy: Yeohm... I think because there is no model we follow that everyone's strengths are valued, because every therapist has different strengths, different personality, different outfit.

Dilek: What do you think about the dominant voices in this approach, which like conversation has a big value to be heard, to talk about things, multi-partiality? Those kinds of things in PM approach have a lot of value... I guess my question is that how do you see yourself as a person in this culture of postmodern collaborative training setting, including those characteristics of the approach, but still becoming who you are? That also can become an outfit. How do you manage to utilize and make those things your own and also to become yourself?

Joy: Well, I think there is like an edge of that you're always learning, you're always growing, and maybe one of them right now. I haven't exhausted the importance of conversation, here that is what dominant. Okay. That's felt very comfortable to me, and maybe I will come to some point where I want to try something else. You know, I want to...you know. I think it'll be Okay. At this point, it's is fine for me because that’s I am in synch with that value, and I am not really questioning at that much. I think there could come a time, you know there are other ways to do this, but don't value conversations as much.

Dilek: So, you are comfortable with the culture and values in this approach then you use in the process of transformation?
Joy: Yeah. Does that make sense?

Dilek: (thinking) yeah. I am kind of thinking about who you are that context can facilitate to become who you are, that can make you to go another direction too..

Joy: Right, right. right. So. I think I don’t have a...

Dilek: Very flexible.

Joy: Yeah. yeah...

Dilek: What do you think about your supervisor’s transformation in supervision?

Joy: I don’t think that we’ve talked about it. I think I am sure it goes on. I can’t think that it wouldn’t. (smiles) and I would be very curious. But I think we try to focus on supervisee than you know, and okay, so how is the supervisor transforming today? (laughs)

Dilek: Do you think when you say transformation do you mean clinical practice?

Joy: No.

Dilek: more is a personal.

Joy: yeah, definitely.

Dilek: Do you find your supervisor is kind of keeping her trans hidden or out of the conversation?

Joy: I don’t get the feeling. I wouldn’t know I guess if she were. I don’t feel like. I just feel like it’s just a short time. But, I think it’s a need topic sometime. I would wonder with my other supervisor too, you know.

Dilek: What about outside of supervision? You have different positions, and multiple roles outside.

Joy: I think outside of supervision. that’s get shared more. yeah, because we share in a lot of different levels.

Dilek: What do you think about that? Why do you think it happens in that way?

Joy: Himm. I think, because we set aside like. Okay this is supervision. this is for the supervisee to get what you need in this hour. It’s not set there for the supervisor to talk about herself. That’s kind of parameters of the meeting. Supervisor is being a service to supervisee rather than sharing her personal, although I can see that’s happening sometimes naturally.
Dilek: What kind of experience you have when it happens in terms of your transformation?

Joy: They’re usually related to the topic. They’re not usually about how the supervisor is transforming. Is that what you mean?

Dilek: Yeah.

Joy: So, I can’t say I really had in supervision. I haven’t have experience of learning about the supervisor’s transformation.

Dilek: Would you be interested in learning about it?

Joy: Ohm I think so. I think it’s like I don’t know what would that be different.

Dilek: If you are interested in learning, how would you ask to your supervisor about it and how would that related to your own transformation?

Joy: Ohm, I am not really sure. I have to think about it. I think it’s... it would be helpful in the sense of I contributed in her life too... you know that’ sort of knowledge is good to have, and know, helpful, but as far as the goals of supervision I am not sure if they’re totally related. I think that’s why we don’t do it because it’s like ok, we only have a short time this is what we are here for, so where do supervisors share that if they do not in supervision? You know, do they have other avenues or places to go with that?

Dilek: They have their own supervision of supervision. They talk about these issues in there. Like how do I do my clinical practice with my clients is a supervision issue and how do I do supervision with supervisees is a supervision of supervision issue.

Joy: and supervisors who are not under the supervision, where would they go?

Dilek: (explains about becoming supervisor according to AAMFT)

Joy: So, somewhere to process

Dilek: yes. Approved by AAMFT supervisors. And then they become supervisors. (explains little more) I think ok I am almost done. I am just thinking about... Okay, what made this relationship unique for you in terms of your transformation?

Joy: I have had three supervisors. All were unique relationships. Each supervisor brings all different whole different background, whole different set up values, whole different... .Even they’re all collaborative it’s very, very different. I mean that isn’t, you know, it’s a common thread. That isn’t. I think the common thread is to be collaborative. They kind a say how do you want to supervision to go? How would you like to learn? What do you, you know... and I think so. I shape it a lot myself, but what each one brings is unique. And I think, as far as I don’t know if you want me to compare or just focus on one of them, or what?
Dilek: Focus on the current one, and the ones here at HGI. If you want to you can compare too. How do these relationships made you transformed?

Joy: O.K., I think definitely, and in the beginning was just basically building confidence, that was a transformation that occurred at the beginning of internship. And, as far as then continuing on switching supervisors is different, because different ages. C is older than me, and DT younger than me in that way it’s a different flavor, makes it unique. You are from a different country, and DT has a different set of experiences than C does. And C has obviously years of… that’s very rich to me to get all different kinds of voices… Ohm. I think like with DT, you’re saying my relationship?

Dilek: ohm

Joy: it’s very, very open and comfortable. It’s very... I don’t even... I don’t feel like I got to come and have something to say today. it’s just kind of naturally whatever comes up. I feel like how does it help me in my transformation? I am just trying to answer your question as much as I can, as much as I am aware of. I know it does but... I don’t know but it’s hard to remember why and when. I mean. I think a lot of it is like I was talking at the beginning about taking the questions or the conversation with you to the next, whatever in kind of varied in the background, they in your mind with you.

Dilek: they’re still voiced.

Joy: right, the voices there.

Dilek: Voices and voiced voices with you...you take whatever works for you and fits to you, and then you have those voices with you. (Joy: right) the more about the experience transforms, and then that’s connected to your experience of transformation

Joy: right, right, it really isn’t that there is an idea or a specific suggestion. Okay try this... you know, maybe if you try this bla bla bla... it doesn’t work quiet like that, it’s more like in the conversation about a case. Ohm. I tend to get at ease about it. I mean it usually brings about things that are difficult, so in conversation, sometimes there is a sense of ease comes about, just because you brought in to and opened up, you know two of us, then there becomes oh, sort of at ease, yeah I can go back. and I feel... I feel more at ease in the actual therapy then. that how I see the transformation. maybe I was stuck and then feel unstuck

Dilek: so more freedom. It frees you from being stuck, and opens up possibilities?

KY right. right.

Dilek: what do you think about the idea of relational transformation? How would you describe it? Do you think that something occurs during supervision?
Joy: I do, because it's the sort of the comfortableness of the setting and the relationship is what makes it possible to bring up the difficulties. You know, and issues... because without the relationship, you can kind of hold them, you know that you are not going to be judged as a terrible therapist just because you bring up difficulties, you know and, that's sort of holds the whole thing, and then in the conversation, something will loosen up. at least you have heard about it if nothing else, and you have more ease. So, I think that's a lot to do with the relationship, you know, because I don't think that kind of sharing can happen without a holding relationship. And I feel like with the supervisor, that's not postmodern, that is not much there, it's more like ohm, feeling on the spot. There is a little bit about it in there, you know that's a whole different feel to it.

Dilek: So, we do share the experience together (right), we do co-create something in the room (right). So, there is possibility to contribute each other. (Joy: Right, right) That's what you did?

Joy: Yeah, I think so.

Dilek: That's very interesting, even in this moment we do relate with another, and describe our beings according to this relating. Does it make sense? Right now, I am taking about hierarchical supervision relationship, and I do position myself according to frame of relationship to try to describe how my experience is, so that's to me also a relational transformation. Because when I do that, I do transform in relation to another...

Joy: [relating to] another style? Ok, that's interesting.

Dilek: Ohm, I don't think that's only occurring for me in relationships. That sharing is also relational and creates transformational, for example my inner conversations can become a vehicle to continue my transformation too...

Joy: ok, ohm.

Dilek: So it's strange feel like as a supervisor, as a human being, person I do think that's happening in not only person to person relationship, but person to a being, a object, event/idea... it can transform you if it's meaningful to you.

Joy: Ohm.

Dilek: I am not sure. What do you think?

Joy: the word you "relate to", I think that. It's sort of the words and, how you're using them.. most people think of relation is only human to human (ohm) and a relationship... Yeah, you can have a relationship with a plant, with a house, you know...

Dilek: When does it become transformative for you?
Joy: I think when you are aware of any change, you know, when this ... I sort of see ... You mean that when these non-human relationship?

Dilek: for you?

Joy: for me, if something has a meaning, and I think it’s because I let it into my awareness in a deeper level than I had it before. Him, like ... I am trying to think an example of ... You know, think that you’re walking down the street, and you’re just walking down the street. And another day, you’re walking down the street, and you see this tree how beautiful it is, and just reminds you of life. And, then all these bigger bigger things, and then, you know it’s transformative. It takes you out of, maybe you’re upset that they, and maybe you see this tree that reminds you meaning of life, and all of a sudden you’re not in the same place. You know, you moved into a different thought process, you’re appreciative, you’re happy to be alive, and before you ever kind a grumping out of source... I mean, you know, I think it happens so what I become aware of just what transforms me.

Dilek: do you describe as just cognitive process? Just becoming aware of?

Joy: yes it comes into the senses, I mean, but you couldn’t see anything unless your brain process, you know but I guess it is, to me it’s cognitive.

Dilek: Is there anything you would like to say about?

Joy: Let me think. (laughs) These are big questions, it’s fun to think about, but it’s not like I thought about it whole lot.

Dilek: How is your experience of this?

Joy: Oh, I liked it. Yeah, yeah, and I think it in itself transformative too. Because, you’re trying to think about doing supervision...you know. I am sure we have an effect on next supervision because you know, we’ve talked about it now.

Dilek: that’s interesting. Maybe we can tape the next supervision. (laughs) well, thank you very much.

Joy: you’re welcome.
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