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Abstract

This study investigated changes among beginning supervisors as they gained experience. Over
three administrations in the course of an academic year, beginning supervisors \((N = 14, 57\%\)
female) and their supervisees \((N = 36, 58\%\) female) provided ratings that offered mixed support
for developmental changes among beginning supervisors. Significant increases were noted on the
Supervisor Evaluation Ratings (SER) for satisfaction with supervision, supervisor competence,
and efficacy of supervisor interventions. On the Level of Supervision Scale (LSS), supervisors
reported a mild preference for offering case conceptualizations in supervision and a mild
preference against using didactic instruction. Supervisors strongly preferred a collaborative style
over an authoritative style. On the Supervisor Style Inventory (SSI), beginning supervisors’ styles
were consistently rated as attractive and interpersonally sensitive. Supervisors rated themselves
as decreasingly task-oriented, but supervisees contradicted them revealing the impact of
supervision roles on perceptions. Beginning supervisors consistently chose interventions focused on the supervisee rather than on the client on the Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision – Form B, Revised (CICS-BR). The study did not find evidence for a "cognitive shift" from the counselor to supervisor role, but such a shift may have previously occurred as the result of training and not actual supervision experience. Age and previous training influenced supervisor ratings initially, but the importance of demographic variables became insignificant as supervisors gained experience. Overall, results were consistent with developmental theories that describe beginning supervisors as moving from an anxious, tentative and less active approach to increased confidence, activity and effectiveness.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Supervision is widely acknowledged to be an important role of psychologists, yet only recently has training of supervisors become a focus of research and education (Watkins, 1991). Several studies have revealed the neglect of institutions to train students as supervisors. In a survey of school psychologists, only 11.2% reported receiving training in supervision during graduate school (Ross and Goh, 1993). Hess and Hess (1983) surveyed 151 APA approved pre-doctoral internship sites and found that only one-third of interns reported receiving training in supervision. Several researchers still complain of a lack of systematic training for beginning supervisors (Borders & Leddick, 1988; Heath & Storm, 1983; Neufeldt, 1994; Taub, Porter & Frisch, 1988; Watkins, 1991). In response to this lack of research regarding the training of beginning supervisors, this study will investigate the developmental changes of beginning supervisors as they gain experience. It is hoped that in describing the development of beginning supervisors a more sophisticated technology of training supervisors might be developed.

The study of supervisor development is complicated. It is affected by multiple developmental processes. For example, novice supervisors are frequently trained in supervision practica with beginning counselors (Ellis, 1991). Therefore, both the supervisor and supervisee are in the early stages of development in their respective roles. The effects of counselor experience on supervisor behavior have been documented in several studies with advanced
supervisors. Miars, Tracey, Ray, Cornfeld, O'Farrel and Gelso (1983) used the Level of Supervision Scale (LSS) to survey expert supervisors regarding their behaviors and roles with different levels of supervisees. Supervisors reported a statistically significant difference between supervision with beginning practicum students and supervision with interns. Glidden and Tracey (1992) extended Miars, et al.'s (1983) research and performed a multidimensional scaling analysis of the LSS yielding four dimensions. Didactic Instruction (directive/didactic approach) was most prominent in the supervision of beginning practicum students and Dynamic Understanding (sophisticated conceptualization) was most prominent in the supervision of interns.

Worthington (1987) cites Raphael (1982) who classified verbal behaviors of experienced supervisors with students at two levels of practicum experience. Supervisor statements regarding students in their first or second practicum focused on the student's behavior in therapy, the student's feelings and thoughts about therapy, and the supervisory relationship. Supervisor statements regarding students with four or more semesters of practicum focused on the client, the client in therapy, and the supervisor. These findings indicate that supervisors teach specific behaviors to beginning counselors, who are insecure and lack confidence. However, according to a literature review by Worthington (1987), the finding that the supervisory relationship is a focus in supervision with practicum level counselors is inconsistent with most research findings. “Focus on the supervisory relationship usually is perceived to occur at internship level supervision. Focus on the client and therapist during therapy are often perceived to occur at the practicum level” (Worthington, 1987, p. 202). Because these studies investigated experienced supervisors, the
changes in supervision are presumably reflective of the supervisee's developmental level and not that of the supervisor.

In general, differences between developmental levels of beginning counselors are most significant between practicum students and interns (Holloway, 1987; Holloway, 1992; Worthington, 1987). Beginning practicum students are characterized as insecure, anxious, and requiring a more structured and supportive supervision environment. Interns are characterized as more independent of the supervisor with an interest in exploring advanced skills and transference issues (Holloway, 1987; Holloway, 1992; Worthington, 1987). Guest and Beutler (1988) report that beginning counselors value support, while more experienced counselors tend to prefer advanced technical guidance.

A second variable in studying supervisors is the level of supervisor development. Although a limited amount of research has directly addressed developmental stages of beginning supervisors, some research has helped to characterize beginning supervisors and will be described later. Therefore, at least two sets of variables are relevant in the development of the beginning supervisor, the level of the supervisee and the level of the supervisor. These variables inevitably interact in complex ways. Recognizing this interaction, some theories of supervisor development have also considered the potential hazards of beginning supervisors working with certain levels of counselors (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987).

Models of Supervisor Development

Early models of supervision arose from specific theoretical orientations (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992), but recent models are more cross-theoretical. Holloway (1992) described two
basic types of cross-theoretical models of supervision: developmental models and social role models. She noted that a limited amount of research has been conducted on social role models, but a growing body of research has focused on developmental aspects of supervision. Holloway cited at least 18 distinct developmental models of supervision. In fact, the large number of models has spurred some researchers to call for a moratorium on "new and improved" developmental models of supervision (Borders, 1989).

Watkins (1994) identified three basic assumptions of the developmental models: (1) supervisees develop through predictable, hierarchical stages, (2) supervisees' needs change as they develop, and (3) supervisors should adjust their supervision to meet the needs of the supervisee's developmental level. The assumptions of developmental models might also apply to models of supervisor development (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Watkins, 1994). Research has provided "limited but reasonably congruent support" for a developmental process of supervision (Worthington, 1987, p. 201). However, most of this research has primarily considered the development of the supervisee and the corresponding impact on supervision. Few studies have considered the developmental processes that may occur for a beginning supervisor.

Only four models of supervisor development have been clearly articulated. First, Alonso (1983, 1985, 1986) described a psychodynamic theory of supervisor development which considered a supervisor's professional life cycle. The supervisor moves through three stages including novice, mid-career and late-career. In each stage, the supervisor must work through three issues: self and identity, the supervisor/therapist relationship, and the
Second, Hess (1986, 1987) proposed a developmental model in which the supervisor moves through three stages and gradually becomes more engaged in the supervision relationship. In the beginning stage, the naive supervisor spends at least a month making a role status change, moving from the supervisee's chair to the supervisor's chair. Likewise, the new supervisor experiences a change in reference group, from student to experienced clinician. The beginning supervisor is often anxious and self-conscious and may want to appear as an expert with elaborate interpretations. Becoming concrete or teaching specific counseling techniques and skills may be another strategy for coping with this discomfort. The relationship is based on formal power, the ability of the supervisor to evaluate the supervisee. Supervisors will pull heavily from their past experiences in supervision for structure and techniques. In the second stage, exploration, the supervisor is able to differentiate between effective and ineffective supervision sessions and is beginning to modify behaviors to improve the impact on the supervisee. Supervision is now seen as an important professional activity and supervisors begin to study supervision research and increase their awareness of supervisee needs. Potential pitfalls in this stage are rigid adherence to a certain supervisory role or becoming too intrusive of the supervisee. The relationship is now based on informal sources of power (what the supervisor can offer), and the agenda of supervision shifts to the supervisee's learning needs. The final stage is a confirmation of supervisor identity. A consolidated identity as a supervisor includes enjoyment of supervision and increased levels of trust and confidentiality in the supervision relationship. Evaluation becomes
more informal and ongoing and the supervisee's learning agenda is the focus of supervision. In this final stage of development, Hess (1986) describes "less worry about the relationship, and more relationship per se" (p. 64).

Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) offer a third model of supervisor development. Three levels of supervisor development mirror development of the beginning counselor. In the first level, supervisors are either highly anxious or naive and tend to be concerned about doing the "right" thing. In supervision, they tend to be mechanistic and take on an "expert" role, though they are highly dependent on their own supervisor. Numerous difficulties may arise when a first level supervisor is matched with a counselor at a higher level. In the second level, the supervisor experiences confusion and conflict as the complexities of supervision are recognized. Motivation for supervision may waiver and the supervisor may get angry or withdraw from the supervisee. This level is usually short-lived and most supervisors reach level three where the supervisor is consistently motivated and interested in improving supervision skills. The supervisor embraces the professional role of supervisor, functions autonomously, and is capable of balancing personal needs with supervisee needs.

Finally, Watkins (1990, 1993) proposed the Supervisor Complexity Model (SCM) which describes the beginning supervisor as moving through four stages and developing in identity, skill, and effectiveness. The novice supervisor begins in the stage of role shock characterized by considerable anxiety, lack of confidence, tentativeness, feelings of being an impostor, and tendency to withdraw from supervision or become highly structured. Supervisor needs include direction, structure and support. In the second stage, role recovery and transition, the supervisor
forms a crude identity as a supervisor and gains some realistic awareness of his/her strengths and weaknesses. Feelings of anxiety, inadequacy, and incompetence persist, but are lessened, and the supervisor becomes more comfortable with ambiguity and risk taking. The supervisor's needs include continued support, but some encouragement toward independence. In stage three, role consolidation, the supervisor has an informed perspective on supervision and is more consistent in thinking and behavior in supervision. A self concept of "supervisor" has developed and the supervisor feels generally qualified as a resource for supervisees. The supervisor needs include a desire to explore personal issues as they affect supervision. The fourth stage, role mastery, is characterized by a sense of mastery and consistent, effective supervision. The supervisor is capable of using transference and countertransference appropriately and has developed a well-integrated and meaningful supervisory style.

Though some diversity exists among these models, overall they provide a fairly consistent picture of supervisor development. This is especially apparent in the models' descriptions of the beginning supervisor who must deal with anxiety, lack of confidence, and role confusion before finally incorporating "supervisor" as a professional identity. Most theorists characterized beginning supervisors as tentative to act and concerned about doing the "right thing" in supervision. Supervisors may compensate for their anxiety by trying to appear as experts or withdrawing from the supervisor role. Hess (1986) also suggested that the beginning supervisor may respond to internal anxiety by becoming concrete or teaching specific skills. In later stages, the focus of supervision moves from the client to the developmental needs of the supervisee.

**Research with Advanced Supervisors**

Research with advanced supervisors indicates that, after a certain experience level, supervisors change little with experience. Zucker and Worthington (1986) found that licensure status of a supervisor did not predict perceptions of the effectiveness of supervision. Worthington and Stern (1985) found that supervisees and supervisors did not rate quality of supervision differently for doctoral students and post-doctoral "expert" supervisors. Marikis, Russell, and Dell (1985) found that ratings of supervisor effectiveness did not differ between post-masters and post-PhD supervisors. "In sum, whether supervision is conceptualized as degree level, licensure status, or student faculty status, supervisors beyond the masters level do not appear to differ in effectiveness of supervision" (Worthington, 1987, p. 205). Although individual differences in supervisor skillfulness have been noted among experienced supervisors (Heppner & Handley, 1981; Worthington, 1984a; Zucker & Worthington, 1986) and among beginning supervisors (Black, 1990; Borders & Fong, 1994), it appears that supervisor effectiveness differs little beyond the masters level.

Research in other areas with advanced supervisors also found few differences among supervisors related to experience. Miars, et al. (1983) found no differences between levels of experience of counseling or clinical psychologists in their responses to how they would supervise different levels of supervisees. Drawing from 10 university counseling centers, Worthington (1984a) found no differences between pre-doctoral and post-doctoral supervisors on any of the 12
factor groupings of the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R). Goodyear and Robyak (1982) also used the SQ-R and found that experienced supervisors were generally similar in their supervisory emphases, while less experienced supervisors tended to vary in ways consistent with their theoretical orientation.

The finding that supervisors change little with experience after a certain experience level may indicate that changes in supervisors occur early in the supervisory career. Therefore, supervisors engaged in their first supervision experience are the most logical subjects of research in supervisor development.

Research with Beginning Supervisors

Research with beginning supervisors has considered many different areas including perceived effectiveness, supervisory behaviors, supervisory relationship, cognition and attributions about supervision, and supervisory issues/problems. Overall, this research has provided a picture of beginning supervisors that is generally consistent with the previously described developmental models. As will be discussed, beginning supervisors are anxious, tentative, lack confidence and focus interventions on the client.

Heppner and Handley (1981) found that doctoral level supervisors and their supervisees believed that supervision had only a minimal impact on the supervisee's personal and professional behavior. Impact of supervision did not correlate with supervisor nor supervisee ratings of supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Ratings of perceived supervisor attractiveness and trustworthiness correlated more highly than expertness with both supervisor's and supervisee's ratings of satisfaction with supervision and positive therapeutic supervisory
relationship. By contrast, Ellis (1991) reported that beginning supervisors felt they were relatively effective in delivering supervision and had an average impact on the supervisee's development. In conjunction with Heppner and Handley, this may indicate a trend toward decreasing self-perceptions of efficacy in the beginning supervisor. Such a trend might correspond to the middle stages of supervisor development articulated by Hess (1986, 1987) and Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987), where the supervisor gains a more realistic awareness of the limits of his/her competence and the ambiguities and complexities of supervision. However, these theorists suggest that self-perceptions rebound as efficacy is increased with experience.

Perceived effectiveness or impact of supervision is influenced by many factors. Holloway & Wampold (1983) studied advanced doctoral students chosen because of their expertise in supervision. They discovered that defensiveness or criticism by either supervisor or supervisee resulted in lowered evaluation of the supervisee. Supervisor requests for more information were evaluated positively by both supervisor and supervisee. And supervisors and supervisees both devalued the supervisor's performance when the supervisee responded to the supervisor's opinions with supportive statements.

Supervision research suggests that beginning supervisors offer less feedback than experienced supervisors. Marikis, et al. (1985) found that experienced supervisors were more verbal than "no experience" supervisors and supervisors with some experience were rated higher than those without experience. Novice supervisors are "less active during the supervision session, less willing to share their feelings, and less likely to be didactic" (Marikis, et al., 1985, p. 415). In a multiple case study, Borders (1991) found that novice supervisors were less active, used more
approval statements, and reported more affectively based thoughts. However, some researchers have reported idiosyncratic verbal patterns (Holloway, et al., 1989). Holloway and Wolleat (1981) used the Blumberg System for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction to look at beginning doctoral students (post-masters) in two different supervision interviews. Several variations in verbal behaviors were noted between supervisors and across interviews.

In another study related to supervision behaviors, Black (1990) developed the Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision-Form B (CICS-B) for assessing improvement of supervisors in their choice of interventions. Vignettes were compiled to reflect the basic components of good supervision based on the work of Dye and Pride (1987). Expert supervisors rated the appropriateness of each response to determine "correct" answers. Although reliability was problematic, Black (1990) concluded that the scale differentiated among several levels of supervisor experience. Borders and Fong (1994) administered the CICS-B at the second and fifteenth weeks of a supervision practicum and found no significant differences between administrations for total score. However, a pattern analysis suggested that beginning supervisors tended to choose clinical interventions over educational ones and tended to choose either confrontational or positive and supportive interventions. Beginning supervisors preferred interventions directed at the client rather than at the supervisee. Interventions concerning relationship issues, whether in the supervisory or therapy relationship, were particularly avoided. Overall, behaviors of beginning supervisors seem to be less active and less relational.

Supervisory style has been a popular way of measuring the supervision relationship. Ellis (1991) found that beginning supervisors were rated on the Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI;
Friedlander & Ward, 1984) as attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and relatively less task-oriented. Ward (1988) found a significant relationship between supervisory style measured by the SSI and the supervisor's theoretical orientation to counseling. She also concluded that supervisor behaviors depend on many factors that may include self-reported supervisory style.

In another study of the supervision relationship, Robyak, Goodyear, and Prange (1987) considered the relationships among supervisor gender, experience, and supervisory focus and supervisor preference for expert, referent, and legitimate power bases (French & Raven, 1960). Expert power relates to specialized knowledge or skills, referent power is related to interpersonal attraction, and legitimate power is the result of perceived trustworthiness. Supervisors ranging in experience from 1 to 40 months read a transcript of a female supervisee and selected one of three responses (each reflecting one of the types of power). Inexperienced and male supervisors preferred the referent power base. Other power bases were not related to experience level. Possibly, beginning supervisors prefer referent power bases because of their anxiety and discomfort with the supervisor role/identity (Hess, 1986, 1987; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Watkins, 1990, 1993). In general, the supervisory relationship with beginning supervisors is characterized by interpersonal attraction and sensitivity and is less task-oriented.

Several studies have considered how beginning supervisors think about supervision. Worthington (1984b) researched supervisor attributions about supervisees at four different degree levels (post-doctoral, post-masters, pre-masters, and undergraduates) in response to a 10 minute audiotaped excerpt of a counseling session. As experience level increased, supervisors were less likely to make trait attributions about the therapist. Also, post-masters and post-doctoral
Supervisor cognition was investigated through examination of planning statements. Stone (1980) asked inexperienced supervisors (introductory psychology students), graduate student supervisors, and experienced supervisors to imagine a 30-minute supervision session and record a “think out-loud” procedure about how they would conduct the session. Experienced supervisors produced more planning statements than inexperienced or graduate student supervisors. Less experienced supervisors produced fewer statements that concerned the supervisee. Stone concluded that this was because inexperienced supervisors "may use up their energy in mastering unfamiliar content and in deciding on the appropriate strategy" (p. 87).

In a follow-up to Stone's (1980) study, Marikis, et al. (1985) looked at supervisors with "no experience" (first year doctoral students), "low experience" (advanced doctoral students with some supervision experience) and "high experience" (post-doctoral with 2-18 years of supervision experience). In contrast to Stone, supervisors did not differ in their planning behaviors, which most frequently focused on the supervisee. This may be due to different group selection criteria. Low and high experience supervisors made more statements and placed greater emphasis on themselves and counseling skills. Low and high experience supervisors were more liked and rated higher than no experience supervisors by their supervisees. Planning statements had little relationship to in-session behaviors. Although some differences exist in this research, beginning supervisors generally have fewer ideas (planning statements) about supervision (Marikis, et al., 1985; Stone, 1980) and may focus on the supervisee less than advanced supervisors (Stone,
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1980). When they do focus on the supervisee, they are more likely to make trait attributions than advanced supervisors (Worthington, 1984b).

A generally consistent pattern of supervisory problems and issues are reported by beginning supervisors. McColley and Baker (1982) found that beginning supervisors (less than 2 years of experience) had difficulties with supervisee resistance to supervision, not knowing how to intervene, not understanding the case, and lack of knowledge of techniques and research literature. Ellis and Douce (1994) described eight supervisory issues which occur in group supervision of beginning supervisors: supervisor anxiety, intervention choices, group cohesion, responsibility, parallel process, power struggles, individual differences, and sexual attraction. Employing a longitudinal design, Ellis (1991) researched supervisory issues in two different contexts. Beginning supervisors engaged in their first supervisory practicum experience were asked to describe critical incidents from each supervisor-counselor and supervisor-supervisor session. Supervisory issues of relationship, competence, emotional awareness, and autonomy were most prominent. Infrequently appearing issues included identity, individual differences, ethics, and personal motivation. Overall, beginning supervisors seem to struggle with anxiety, lack of confidence, and competence.

In a longitudinal study that considered many of the areas previously discussed, Borders and Fong (1994) enlisted graduate students enrolled in a supervision practicum to investigate evidence of a "cognitive shift" (Heath & Storm, 1983) from thinking like a therapist to thinking like a supervisor. Three measures were administered during the second and fifteenth weeks of the practicum. Choice of interventions, cognitive appraisal of the supervision, and content of
thoughts (using a thought-listing procedure in response to a vignette) were assessed. They found no significant differences in thought patterns between the two administrations, but scrutiny of individual profiles revealed an increase in the consideration of the parallel process dynamic and a decrease in negative thoughts. As was previously mentioned, Borders and Fong (1994) also found that beginning supervisors preferred clinical over educational interventions and were either confrontational or supportive. Beginning supervisors preferred interventions directed at the client rather than at the supervisee and relationship issues in any context were especially avoided. At the end of the practicum sequence supervisors tended to rate supervision as less difficult and they felt better able to cope.

Several have proposed understanding supervisor development in terms of a "cognitive shift" (Borders & Fong, 1994; Heath & Storm, 1983; Liddle, 1988). Bernard and Goodyear (1992) refer to this shift in terms of the supervisor giving up doing "therapy by proxy" (which is reinforced by a desire and "mandate" to monitor how the client is doing) and turning the focus of supervision to the developmental needs of the supervisee. This move from thinking like a therapist to thinking like a supervisor is a significant aspect of most of the supervisor development models (Hess, 1986, 1987; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Watkins, 1990, 1993). Significant to each of these models is the struggle of the beginning supervisor to change focus, identity, and role in supervision and to develop a sense of competence and self-efficacy in this new position. As some of the first to research these development processes with a longitudinal design, Borders and Fong (1994) suggest that the nature of this "cognitive shift" in supervisor development would be best studied through the supervisor's self-appraisal.
In summary, beginning supervisors have been described as anxious, lacking confidence, and less active than advanced supervisors. Their early supervisory relationship is based on interpersonal attraction and sensitivity. Their supervisory interventions are generally concrete and focus on the client rather than on the supervisee. According to developmental models, these characteristics will change as beginning supervisors mature with experience. Apart from Borders and Fong (1994), longitudinal research is notoriously absent from the literature (Watkins, 1995a, 1995b). However, longitudinal research is necessary to illuminate developmental processes (Holloway, 1987). While supervision research has provided a general picture of the differences between beginning and advanced supervisors, very little can be said about how supervisors change or develop. Supervision research suggests that supervisors change little after a certain experience level (Worthington, 1987). This study will investigate the development of beginning supervisors for 30 weeks (two semesters) during the course of their first supervision practicum.

Hypotheses

This exploratory study will utilize a longitudinal design to investigate developmental changes in the behaviors, roles, styles and self-perceptions of beginning supervisors. Consistent with supervisor development theory, it is predicted that maturation will result in measurable changes. The hypotheses of this study are that the following changes will occur as beginning supervisors gain experience. (1) Self-reported, in-session behaviors and roles on the Level of Supervision Scale (LSS; Miars, et al., 1983) will initially emphasize a collaborative style on the Authoritative vs. Collaborative dimension as well as emphasize viewing supervision as analogous to counseling on the Counseling vs. Supportive dimension. As supervisors gain experience they
will become more active in supervision resulting in increased endorsement of Didactic Instruction and Dynamic Understanding dimensions (Glidden & Tracey, 1992). (2) Supervisory style reported on the Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI; Friedlander and Ward, 1984) will increasingly show a Task-Oriented style as supervisors become more confident and active in supervision. Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive styles are expected to be valued consistently. (3) The focus of supervisory interventions on the Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B, Revised (CICS-BR) will initially be on the client and later on the supervisee. Finally, (4) ratings of supervisor competence, satisfaction with supervision and efficacy of supervisory interventions on the Supervisor Evaluation Ratings (SER; Ellis, 1991) will increase with experience.
Participants

Participants included 50 first, second and third year graduate students enrolled in a Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) program at a small university in the Northwestern part of the United States. Third year students were enrolled in a supervision experience as part of the program's practicum sequence. Third year students provided weekly supervision to first and second year students. The first year students conducted therapy with volunteer undergraduate psychology students and joined the weekly student supervision meetings in the second semester. Second year students conducted therapy at external practicum sites and were involved in weekly student supervision the entire year. Student supervisors participated in weekly faculty supervision of their work as supervisors. Student supervisors were not responsible for client welfare. Instead, qualified on-site supervisors served in the official supervisory capacity and all students also received weekly faculty supervision.

Beginning supervisors included 14 third year students (57% female) of which 11 provided complete data for all three administrations. Supervisees included 36 first and second-year students (58% female). Table 1 summarizes demographic variables and the training backgrounds of supervisors.
### Table 1  
**Age, Gender, Race and Previous Experience of Supervisors and Supervisees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Relevant Previous Graduate Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisors</strong></td>
<td>$M = 29.9$</td>
<td>6 male</td>
<td>11 Caucasian</td>
<td>$n = 6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(n = 12)$</td>
<td>$Md = 27.5$</td>
<td>8 female</td>
<td>2 African-American</td>
<td>$n = 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode = 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$n = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 24-42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hispanic-American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisees</strong></td>
<td>$M = 33.1$</td>
<td>15 male</td>
<td>35 Caucasian</td>
<td>Not Inquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(n = 36)$</td>
<td>$Md = 31$</td>
<td>21 female</td>
<td>1 African-American</td>
<td>Not Inquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode = 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Inquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range 22-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the theoretical orientations endorsed by supervisors during the first administration. Apart from Existential/Experiential, all theoretical orientations are represented with a broad distribution.

Table 2
Supervisors' Theoretical Orientations at the First Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-Behavioral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential/Experiential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

Supervisor behaviors and roles. A modified version of the Level of Supervision Scale (LSS; Miars, et al., 1983), a 57 item self-report questionnaire, was employed to assess supervisors' perceived behaviors and roles (see Appendix A). The LSS items were based on the
supervision behaviors listed in Worthington and Roehlke (1979) and the supervision environments hypothesized by Stoltenberg (1981). Items assess supervisor perceptions of the importance, frequency, and time spent on specific supervisor behaviors or functions. In addition, perceptions of supervisor roles and behaviors as indicative to the supervisor are assessed.

Employing a five point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*), Miars et al. (1983) asked "expert" supervisors to rate their supervision with four different levels of supervisees: first semester of practicum, second semester of practicum, advanced practicum, and internship level. A significant difference was found only between beginning practicum students and advanced practicum students and interns. To obtain a reliability estimate, a subsample of the supervisors (n = 13) was administered the LSS again 5 weeks later. Because reliability varied across supervisee levels, an average reliability was calculated, yielding a mean test-retest reliability for each item. Of the original 57 items, 28 items had a reliability that met or exceeded statistical significance (r = .55, p < .05; range of r = .55 - .81).

Glidden and Tracey (1992) administered the 28 LSS items with adequate reliability to a sample of 69 supervisors and asked them to rate their supervision with beginning practicum students and interns. A 3-way multidimensional scaling analysis yielded a 4-dimensional solution accounting for 63% of the variance. The 4 dimensions include: (a) enhancing Dynamic Understanding (sophisticated conceptualization), (b) Didactic Instruction (directive/didactic), (c) Counseling vs. Supportive functions, and (d) Authoritative vs. Collaborative style. A more thorough explanation of each dimension is summarized in Table 3. Significant differences were found between supervisee levels on two dimensions. Supervisors perceived enhancing Dynamic
Understanding as most important with interns and Didactic Instruction as most important with beginning supervisees.

Table 3

Descriptions of LSS Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic Understanding</strong></td>
<td>&quot;emphasis on conceptualizing the dynamic process of counseling interactions [versus] emphasis on acting directly, like a teacher.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Didactic Instruction</strong></td>
<td>degree of &quot;directive, didactic supervisory approach.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling vs. Supportive</strong></td>
<td>&quot;contrasts the view of supervision as analogous to counseling with the view of supervision as providing directive support for the trainee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative vs. Collaborative</strong></td>
<td>&quot;a collaborative supervisory style with focus on the supervisee's own developmental efforts contrasted with a more authoritative style emphasizing the supervisor's teaching and tape-listening behaviors.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Quotations drawn from Glidden and Tracy (1992, p. 154).

For the purposes of this study, some minor alterations were made to the 28 item LSS instrument (see Appendix A). First, the instructions were modified to reflect the unique use of the instrument. Second, the spaces provided for writing in the rating of different supervisee levels were replaced with a copy of the five-point scale (previously described) so that supervisors could easily circle their response to each item.
Supervisory style. The Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI; Friedlander and Ward, 1984), a 33 item self-report inventory, was used to assess supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervisor's style of supervision (see Appendix B). The SSI contains 33 adjectives rated on a 7 point scale (1 = not very and 7 = very) measuring the degree to which each item reflects perceptions of the supervisor. Parallel forms exist for the supervisor and supervisee. A series of studies by Friedlander and Ward (1984) revealed three factors: Attractive (collegial; e.g., warm, supportive, friendly, open, flexible), Interpersonally Sensitive (relationship-oriented; e.g., invested, committed, therapeutic, perceptive), and Task-Oriented (content-focused; e.g., goal-oriented, thorough, focused, practical, structured). The Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive factors correlated significantly (range of $r = .52 - .61$). Cronbach's alpha for the three factors ranged from .76 to .93. Test-retest reliability for the factors ranged from .78 to .94 and was .92 for the combined factors. Instructions for the test were altered slightly to clearly indicate that ratings were to be on the student supervisor and not a faculty or other supervisor.

Focus of supervisory interventions. The Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B, Revised (CICS-BR) was used to assess the focus of supervisors' interventions on the client or on the supervisee (see Appendix C). The CICS-BR utilized three revised supervision vignettes from the Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B (CICS-B; Black, 1990). The original CICS-B consisted of nine vignettes constructed to reflect requisite components of a qualified supervisor (Dye and Pride, 1987) and actual experiences reported by doctoral student supervisors. The purpose of the CICS-B was to determine correct supervision intervention. The purpose of the CICS-BR was to assess for the preferred focus of supervision interventions. Five
multiple choice questions concerning the vignettes provided four intervention choices. Each intervention choice was constructed to be a sound supervisory response to the situation. For each question, two responses were client-focused and two were therapist-focused. Responses were scored 1 if they focused on the supervisee and 0 if they focused on the client. A total score (ranging from 0 to 5) provided information about the focus of the supervisor’s intervention choices. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .57 was obtained using data from all administrations. Test-retest between the first and second administrations was low ($r = .41, p = ns$). It is likely that reliability estimates were compromised by a small sample size. This instrument is only used to offer tentative inferences regarding response patterns.

**Supervisor evaluation ratings.** The Supervisor Evaluation Ratings (SER; Ellis, 1991) is a self report measure combining Worthington and Roehlke's (1979) three items: satisfaction with supervision, competence of supervisor, and contribution of the supervision interaction toward improving the supervisee (see Appendix D). Each item is rated on a 7 point scale (1 = totally unsatisfied; it could not have been worse, 7 = totally satisfied; it could not have been better). Ellis (1991) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .83 for an administration of the SER to counselors in supervision. This study also used a parallel form of the SER administered to supervisors for rating themselves.

**Demographic questionnaire.** A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix E) was used to gather information about the participants' age, gender, race, year in school, degree level, theoretical orientation, previous education/training, previous counseling (and related) experiences, previous supervision (and related) experiences, and faculty supervisor.
Procedure

Assessments were made at the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 15\textsuperscript{th} weeks of the first semester and the 15\textsuperscript{th} week of the second semester. For each assessment, all measures were completed by supervisors and the SSI and SER were completed by supervisees. Consent was obtained from all participants before the first assessment. Participant anonymity was protected by asking participants to identify themselves with their social security number.
Demographic Variables

Pearson correlations revealed significant relationships between several demographic and experimental variables. In the first administration, older supervisors and supervisees rated supervisors' styles as significantly more Attractive \((r = .39, p < .05)\), Interpersonally Sensitive \((r = .51, p < .01)\) and Task-Oriented \((r = .30, p < .05)\) than younger supervisors and supervisees. In the second administration, older supervisors rated higher on the Didactic Instruction scale \((r = .64, p < .05)\) indicating a tendency to describe their supervision as involving more teaching. Previous training in supervision for supervisors was negatively correlated with the Task-Oriented style in both the first \((r = -.67, p < .05)\) and second \((r = -.96, p < .001)\) administrations.

Previous training in supervision was further analyzed using \(t\)-tests to see if these variables significantly differentiated groups. Previous training in supervision significantly differentiated supervisors on the Task-Oriented scale in the first, \(t(11) = 2.97, p < .05\), and second administrations, \(t(9) = 10.50, p < .001\). \(T\)-tests were not performed for age because variance in age was broad and categorization would have been arbitrary.

Level of Supervision Scale

Repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted on LSS data from supervisors and no significant differences were found across administrations. Certain items were also analyzed for
their particular relevance to the hypothesis, but no statistically significant changes among these items were found. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for each administration of the LSS.

In general, supervisors rated themselves consistently across all three administrations. The means for the Dynamic Understanding scale indicate that supervisors report only slightly more directive teaching than conceptualizing of the counseling process during supervision. The means for the Didactic Instruction scale indicate that supervisors report mild preference against use of didactic instruction in supervision. The means for the Counseling vs. Supportive scale indicate a moderate preference for the directive support function of supervision as opposed to viewing supervision as analogous to the counseling process. Finally, the means for the Authoritative vs. Collaborative scale indicate that supervisors strongly endorsed a collaborative supervisory style over an authoritative one that would focus on teaching and tape-listening behaviors.
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of LSS Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative vs. Collaborative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling vs. Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Didactic Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic Understanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scales are based on a 5 point scale
Supervisory Style Inventory

T-tests comparing supervisor and supervisee ratings revealed differences for the Task-Oriented style in the third administration, $t(44) = -2.29, p < .05$. Supervisees viewed the supervisor's style as more Task-Oriented than did the supervisor. This difference was present in previous administrations as well, but not at a statistically significant level.

Repeated measures ANOVAs revealed no significant changes across administrations of the SSI. Across all administrations, supervisors were rated as moderately Attractive, Interpersonally Sensitive and Task-Oriented. Task-Oriented was consistently the lowest rated style of supervisors. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations of the SSI scales for each administration.
### Table 5

**Means and Standard Deviations of SSI Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSI Scale</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonally Sensitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task-Oriented</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scales are based on a 7 point scale
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Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B, Revised

Supervisor responses on the CICS-BR were scored according to their focus on the client [scored as 1] or on the supervisee [scored as 2]. Means (with standard deviations in parentheses) for administrations 1 through 3 were 1.69 (0.28), 1.65 (0.26), and 1.73 (0.16), respectively. Supervisors preferred interventions that focused on the supervisee rather than on the client for each administration of the CICS-BR. Repeated measures ANOVAs revealed no significant changes across administrations of the CICS-BR.

Supervisor Evaluation Ratings

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations of the SER questions for each administration. Overall, supervisors were rated slightly above average. A noticeable decline in supervisee satisfaction with the supervisor and increased variance occurred at the second administration. Initially, no supervisees offered a rating below 4 on this 7-point scale, but three ratings below 4 appeared in the second and third administrations. However, the average of the ratings for the third administration returned to the level of the first administration.

T-tests comparing the ratings of supervisors to those of supervisees revealed differences in the first administration. Supervisees rated higher than supervisors in the first administration for satisfaction with the supervisor, \( t(29) = -3.84, p < .001 \), and competence of the supervisor, \( t(29) = -3.00, p < .01 \).
Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations of SER Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SER Item</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 1</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 2</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration 3</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items are based on a 7 point scale.
Separate repeated measures ANOVAs for supervisor and supervisee data were performed for the satisfaction and competence items because t-tests revealed significant differences between these groups. ANOVAs performed on data from supervisors revealed significant increases in supervisors' ratings of satisfaction, $F(2, 16) = 4.92, p < .05, \eta^2 = .38$, and competence, $F(2, 16) = 5.32, p < .05, \eta^2 = .40$, in their roles as supervisors. Increases were also noted on efficacy of supervisor interventions, but these changes were just below statistical significance ($p = .053, \eta^2 = .34$). Among supervisees, repeated measures ANOVAs did not reveal significant results. However, increases were noted between the first and third administrations for competence and efficacy of supervisor interventions. An ANOVA was performed on the combined data for the efficacy item because the t-test revealed no significant difference between supervisors and supervisees. The ANOVA on the combined SER data revealed significant increases in ratings for efficacy of supervisor interventions, $F(2, 38) = 6.41, p < .01, \eta^2 = .25$. 
Chapter 4

Discussion

The results of this study provided mixed evidence for developmental changes among beginning supervisors. The implications of this study are discussed for each hypothesis.

**Hypothesis One: Supervisor Behaviors and Roles**

An absence of detected developmental changes on the LSS may indicate that the factors measured by the LSS do not change with experience or that an insufficient sample size disguised the changes. Although not occurring at a statistically significant level, two trends among specific LSS items were apparent. First, supervisors endorsed the "Therapist/Counselor" role more in the second and third administrations than in the first. These findings seem to run counter to the idea of a cognitive shift from thinking like a counselor to thinking like a supervisor (Borders & Fong, 1994). Despite increasing endorsement of the "Therapist/Counselor" item, supervisors still preferred a directive support role over seeing supervision as analogous to counseling. Second, directive behavior was increasingly endorsed in each successive administration. This result is consistent with previous research suggesting that beginning supervisors are less active in supervision until they gain confidence (Ellis, 1991; Hess, 1986, 1987; Marikis, et al., 1985; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; and Watkins, 1990, 1993).

Glidden and Tracey (1992) found that advanced supervisors working with beginning supervisees emphasized the Didactic Instruction dimension. When working with intern-level
supervisees, advanced supervisors emphasized the Dynamic Understanding dimension. By contrast, the beginning supervisors in this study endorsed a balanced use of teaching and advanced conceptualization of counseling. The results suggest that beginning supervisors do not provide the type of supervision that advanced supervisors reported is preferable for beginning counselors. Primarily, beginning supervisors failed to provide active structure and teaching at the level that advanced supervisors reported. The relatively higher emphasis on Dynamic Understanding among beginning supervisors is consistent with Hess (1986, 1987) and Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) who suggested that beginning supervisors are anxious and may want to appear as experts with elaborate interpretations or conceptualizations.

Another distinction from Glidden and Tracey (1992) was the beginning supervisors’ tendency to provide directive support and conduct supervision in a collaborative style. Advanced supervisors (Glidden & Tracey, 1992) engaged in a style that was balanced between authoritative and collaborative. These differences in supervision with beginning supervisees offer support for developmental theories that describe anxiety and tentativeness in the beginning supervisor resulting in a refusal of an authoritative style.

Several demographic variables were significantly related to supervisor behaviors and roles on the LSS. Age correlated moderately with the Didactic Instruction dimension in the second administration indicating that older supervisors tended to employ more teaching behaviors than younger supervisors. Among this sample, older beginning supervisors conducted supervision more like the advanced supervisors in Glidden and Tracey’s (1992) study. This may suggest a type of “wisdom with age” factor that impacts the supervisory relationship.
Hypothesis Two: Supervisory Style

Developmental changes in supervisory style were not detected at a significant level. Supervisors' styles were consistently rated as moderately Attractive, Interpersonally Sensitive and Task-Oriented. The preference for attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles among beginning supervisors is consistent with theory and previous research. Robyak, et al. (1987) found that beginning supervisors preferred a referent power base founded on interpersonal attraction. The constancy of these results may suggest that supervisory style is a relatively stable supervisor factor not impacted during early developmental stages. However, the small sample size of this study does not allow for conclusions regarding statistically insignificant results.

Although not statistically significant, supervisors' decreasing endorsement of the Task-Oriented style was unexpected. By contrast, supervisee's ratings on this scale increased and supervisees consistently viewed the supervisors' style as more task-oriented than the supervisors. This difference was statistically significant in the third administration. These divergent trends make it difficult to assess the "true" style of the supervisor. However, previous research sides with the supervisee ratings. Ellis (1991) found that beginning supervisors were rated as attractive, interpersonally sensitive and relatively less task-oriented on the SSI. Marikis et al. (1985) also noted that novice supervisors are less active during the supervision session and less likely to be didactic. One explanation is that as supervisors became more comfortable with the "task" of supervision, they noticed these task behaviors less. This explanation is consistent with the description of "first stage" supervisors as tentative and anxious about their activity in supervision.
If, as Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) suggest, supervisors are worried about doing the “right” thing early on, they may be more likely to notice the task-oriented aspects of their style initially.

Several demographic variables correlated with the SSI scales in the early administrations. Older supervisors were rated as more Attractive, Interpersonally Sensitive and Task-Oriented during the first administration. This may reflect an increased confidence of older beginning supervisors and/or an appreciation for age maturity among supervisees. Previous training in supervision was strongly inversely related with task-orientation during the first and second administrations. This result is surprising given the results of Glidden and Tracy (1992) and the predictions of developmental theories (Watkins, 1990, 1993) that advanced supervisors are more active in supervision, especially with beginning counselors.

**Hypothesis Three: Focus of Supervisory Interventions**

Due to the previously unmeasured reliability of the CICS-BR, significant changes were not anticipated on this instrument. However, the supervisors’ consistent intervention focus on the supervisee was unexpected and counter to previous theory. Borders and Fong (1994) and Heath and Storm (1983) proposed that beginning supervisors experience a cognitive shift from thinking like a therapist to thinking like a supervisor. Hess (1986, 1987) theorized a role status change from supervisee to supervisor that would require about one month. Borders and Fong (1994) discovered a trend in supervisors’ choices of interventions on the CICS-B that supported this theory, but the results were not statistically significant.

By contrast, supervisors in this study consistently endorsed interventions focused on the supervisee rather than the client. These results are tenuous given serious reliability concerns for
the instrument. However, Marikis, et al. (1985) also found that “no experience” and “low experience” graduate supervisors did not differ in their planning behaviors and that these behaviors most frequently focused on the supervisee. Such evidence runs counter to the idea that interventions of beginning supervisors shift from the client to the supervisee.

Another explanation is that beginning supervisors may have completed this shift before they begin supervision. In this present study, students were required to attend a one-day seminar on psychotherapy supervision before they began their work as supervisors. The cognitive shift may have occurred at this training where students were educated about the role and focus of a supervisor. Future research should investigate the impact of brief supervision seminars to encourage positive role development for supervisors. Another factor in this study was that beginning supervisors were clearly informed that they were not responsible for the client’s welfare. Being freed from this responsibility could ease the shift away from “therapy by proxy” (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992) and promote supervisory focus on the supervisee.

Hypothesis Four: Supervisor Evaluation Ratings

The straightforward SER ratings of efficacy, competence and satisfaction in supervision revealed some of the most powerful results. Consistent with supervisor developmental theory (Hess, 1986, 1987; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; and Watkins, 1990, 1993), supervisors’ reported significant increases in satisfaction and competence in their roles as supervisors. Combined supervisor and supervisee data indicated a significant increase for efficacy of supervisor interventions. Where statistical significance was not achieved for all three areas, an increase of ratings was present between the first and third administrations for all items except supervisees’
ratings of satisfaction. Overall, the results confirm that both supervisors and supervisees experienced increased satisfaction, supervisor competence and efficacy of supervisor interventions as the supervisor gained experience.

Supervisee ratings, when taken alone, did not reveal significant increases on any of the SER items. The small sample size of this study decreased power to detect changes and future research may reveal such changes. However, it appears that changes occur more significantly in supervisors' self-perceptions than in the perceptions of the supervisees.

An unexpected result in the supervisee data was a reduction in satisfaction ratings from the first to the second administration. Ratings rebounded in the third administration, but not to the original satisfaction level. This differs from Marikis, et al. (1985) who found that "low" and "high experience" supervisors were more liked and rated higher than "no experience" supervisors by their supervisees. The difference might be a result of the longitudinal design of the present study. Initial supervisee ratings could reflect low expectations and good will toward the supervisor based on their relative lack of experience. In fact, initial supervisee ratings were significantly higher than supervisor ratings on satisfaction and competence. An inflated initial rating may have diminished the ability to measure increases. This problem might be addressed in future research by offering a new version of the SER which emphasizes that ratings should not be based on special allowances for the supervisor's experience level.

Summary of Supervisor Developmental Changes

Trends in this study correspond well with theories of supervisor development. The most significant changes among supervisors were increases in self-perceptions of satisfaction and
competence. Combined data also revealed significant increases in perceived efficacy of supervisor interventions. In both the eyes of the supervisor and supervisee, satisfaction with supervision, competence of the supervisor and efficacy of supervisor interventions all improved as beginning supervisors gained experience.

Beginning supervisors engaged in several behaviors that Hess (1986, 1987), Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) and Watkins (1990, 1993) describe as responses to early anxiety, tentativeness and lacking confidence. Beginning supervisors described less didactic instruction than advanced supervisors working with the same level of supervisee (Glidden & Tracey, 1992). Also, beginning supervisors described more advanced conceptualization of counseling, possibly an effort to take on the “expert” role, described by both Hess and Stoltenberg and Delworth. As was expected, supervisory style emphasized attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles. However, divergent ratings of task-orientation by supervisors and supervisees exhibited how roles in supervision can impact perspectives on supervision.

In contrast to the research of Borders and Fong (1994) and several developmental theories, this study found no evidence for a cognitive shift from “counselor” to “supervisor.” In fact, on the LSS, a preference was noted for directive support over the counseling role in all administrations. Although clouded by poor reliability, the CICS-BR revealed a consistent focus of supervisor interventions on the supervisee more than on the client. However, a cognitive shift may still have occurred. This research does not rule out the possibility of a rapid shift that could occur within the context of a one-day supervision training. Such a cognitive shift may not require actual experience as a supervisor.
Demographic variables differentiated supervisors early in their supervision experience. Age seemed to be an asset in the first administration as older beginning supervisors performed more like the advanced supervisors in Glidden and Tracey’s (1992) study and were rated as more interpersonally sensitive, attractive and task-oriented. Demographic variables became insignificant as supervisors gained experience and no discernable differences were noted by the third administration.

Suggestions for Future Research

The most fundamental gap in developmental research with beginning supervisors is a substantial lack of longitudinal studies (Watkins, 1995b). Watkins (1995a) noted, “the richest yet most untapped facet of the clinical supervision endeavor is psychotherapy supervisor development” (p. 34). The present study attempted to address this problem, but the power of the study was diminished by a small sample size and attrition. Future developmental studies may benefit from partnerships among graduate institutions to attain adequate sample sizes and counteract the impact of attrition.

Many developmental theories described internal emotional or cognitive etiologies for behaviors of beginning supervisors. Evidence for many of these behaviors exists, but solid connections to internal psychological factors are absent. Future research should examine emotions and cognitions of beginning supervisors in conjunction with resulting behaviors. Such research would improve our understanding of the psychological factors that influence behaviors of beginning supervisors.
Although this study did not identify a cognitive shift from "counselor" to "supervisor," this concept seems a logical imperative and is consistently proposed by developmental theorists. However, the bulk of this shift may occur quickly and be facilitated by specific education without requiring actual supervision experience. Accurate assessment of this shift will require assessment of beginning supervisors before any exposure to supervision training.

The end goal of supervisor research should be improvement in the training of psychotherapy supervisors. As more graduate programs turn their interest to training supervisors, efficacy studies will play an important role in shaping the educational technology. The influence of demographic variables in this present study suggests the need for consideration of these factors in understanding and training supervisors.

Finally, our understanding of the interactions between a beginning supervisor and his/her supervisee are infantile at best. This dynamic influence on the development of a supervisor has only recently entered the consideration of research. While beginning supervisors are usually assigned to beginning counselors, multiple factors such as personality, age, race, gender and the matching of these variables still need to be investigated before a solid understanding of supervisor development is achieved.
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Appendix A

Level of Supervision Scale
Supervision Survey

**Section I:** Please respond to the items using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Listening to supervisee's tapes is an important part of supervision. 
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I view the supervision process as analogous to the counseling process. 
   1 2 3 4 5

3. It is important to spend a good deal of time in supervision toward better supervisee self-understanding. 
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I view supervision as a collaborative experience between the supervisee and myself. 
   1 2 3 4 5

**Section II:** Please respond to the items using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I listen to all of each supervisee's tapes in their entirety before each supervision session. 
   1 2 3 4 5

2. I spend little time preparing for each supervision session. 
   1 2 3 4 5

3. My major focus of supervision is the supervisee's personal development instead of instructing him/her. 
   1 2 3 4 5

4. I encourage my supervisees to use tests. 
   1 2 3 4 5

5. I spend time directly teaching the supervisee. 
   1 2 3 4 5
6. With this level of supervisee, I use a lot of instruction.  
7. I spend a good deal of time giving the supervisee support.  
8. I tell supervisees what to do with their clients.  
9. I assign reading to my supervisees.  
10. I spend time centering on the supervisee's behavior with me in supervision.  
11. I find my supervisees imitate my style.  
12. I encourage my supervisees to experiment with other styles.  
13. I am directive in my supervision style.  
14. I try to help my supervisees integrate many different techniques into their own style.

Section III: Using the following scale, to what degree do you focus on each of the following in supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Conceptualizing client dynamics.  
2. Ethical issues.  
3. Tackling client resistance.  
4. Tackling supervisee resistance.  
5. Examining countertransference/transference in the supervisee's relationship with the client.
Section IV: Using the following scale, please respond as to the degree to which the following items are indicative of your behavior in supervision or your role as supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behaviors (in relation to supervisee)**

1. Supportive
   - 1 2 3 4 5
2. Directive
   - 1 2 3 4 5
3. Interpretive
   - 1 2 3 4 5

**Roles (in relation to supervisee)**

1. Teacher
   - 1 2 3 4 5
2. Therapist/Counselor
   - 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix B

Supervisory Style Inventory (Supervisor and Supervisee Forms)
## Supervisory Style Inventory

Please indicate your perception of your style of supervision with your practicum student(s) on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. goal-oriented</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. perceptive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. concrete</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. explicit</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. committed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. affirming</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. practical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sensitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. collaborative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. intuitive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. reflective</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. responsive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. structured</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. evaluative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. flexible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. prescriptive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. didactic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. thorough</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. focused</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. creative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. supportive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. open</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. realistic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. resourceful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. invested</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. facilitative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. therapeutic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. positive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. trusting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. informative</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. humorous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. warm</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisory Style Inventory

Please indicate your perception of your student supervisor's style on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of him or her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not very</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. goal-oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. perceptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. concrete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. explicit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. affirming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. practical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. sensitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. collaborative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. intuitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. reflective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. structured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. evaluative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. prescriptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. didactic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. thorough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. focused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. creative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. realistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. resourceful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. invested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. facilitative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. therapeutic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. trusting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. informative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. humorous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B, Revised
Critical Incidents in Counselor Supervision - Form B, Revised

HIGH ANXIETY

This is the fifth weekly supervision session with this counselor who is in her first counseling practicum. She has been making some progress but has a very high anxiety level in the counseling and supervision sessions. She seems especially apprehensive about being observed. Her last client session was one in which she became silent for a period of time.

Counselor - I didn't know what to say or do. I just froze up. The client just looked at me strangely and didn't say anything either. I felt so awful. I'm just not sure that I'm helping this client. When I get anxious in a session then I'm just no good. If I could only relax a little. Those little rooms are terrible. I don't like sitting where I can see myself in the mirror.

1. What would you do in supervising this counselor?

   A. Disregard her anxiety and begin discussing her clients and their problems.
   B. Invite the counselor to discuss her present feelings as she talks with you.
   C. Explain that it's natural to be anxious while being observed and in discussions with one's supervisor.
   D. Ask the counselor to explain why she feels anxious.

ARTIST

The counselor is a white male with good counseling skills and the client is a black male student who is studying art. The counselor has been using restatement and the client seems irritated by this.

Client - I'm having trouble with my girlfriend. We've been together for six months and, lately, I've been catching her look at other guys.

Counselor - Your girlfriend is looking at other men.

Client - Yea, that's what I just said.

Counselor - And you've been having trouble with her.

Client - The trouble is her looking at other men. What's the matter? Can't you do any better than repeat what I say?
2. What would you do?

A. Advise him to shift from person center to RET in his approach.

B. Suggest that he address this client's resistance.

C. Address his lack of awareness regarding cross-cultural communication patterns during the next supervision session.

D. Assign supplemental readings.

FIRST SESSION

This is the counselor's first counseling session in her first counseling practicum. Previously, she has conducted three intake interviews. The client is a female, a sophomore in college who has come for career counseling. The intake report says that the client alluded to some secondary concerns that she might want to talk about later. The counselor asked a great many questions in the session and sometimes seemed to be jumping around randomly to different topics. Some questions were appropriate, but others were unrelated to the client's expressed concerns.

Client - I'm not sure what I want to do with my life.

Counselor - What kinds of things have you thought of?

Client - I always wanted to be a nurse or a teacher when I was little. Now, I keep thinking I would like to go into something to make some decent money.

Counselor - How much is "decent money"?

Client - At least $30,000. My brother just got a job at Hewlett Packard making that much. I want all the good things in life and to be able to buy things I need and not have to rely on a man.

Counselor - Do you have a good relationship with your brother?

Client - Yes, I guess so. He's older than I am. He's my dad's favorite and my parent's were so proud of him when he got this job.

Counselor - Have you ever had a job?

3. What would you do in your next supervision session with this counselor after having observed this interaction?

A. Immediately ask the counselor at least 5-10 questions successively, then ask her to critique your interviewing style.
B. Instruct the counselor to use other basic techniques such as restatement and reflection and to reduce her reliance on questioning.

C. Instruct the counselor to explore the importance of money in the next session to find out if that is what the client really wants.

D. Positively reinforce the use of appropriate questions and interest shown in the client. Say nothing about the overuse of questioning.

4. What seems to be the most important issue involved here?

A. The counselor is forgetting what she learned about listening skills.

B. The counselor is trying to get as much information as possible.

C. The client isn't giving the counselor very much information and so the counselor is having to ask for more.

D. An inexperienced counselor has not yet learned how to assist clients in disclosing.

ANGER

The counselor is a black woman, 35, who is in an advanced practicum class. She seems to have difficulty when her clients express anger or report feeling angry. This pattern has emerged with several clients over a period of about 8-10 weeks. It seems as though some of her clients are able to manipulate her because she becomes passive when they appear angry. She also seems to avoid operating in the "here and now" and does not express feelings. One of her clients is having issues related to the fact that the client is an adult child of an alcoholic.

Counselor - My client gets very angry when she talks about her father's drinking.

Supervisor - How do you respond when this happens?

Counselor - I usually ask her to describe the event. If she could understand the circumstances better, she would have more control.

5. As her supervisor, what would you do?

A. Suggest that she focus on the client's emotions during the next counseling session, encouraging the client to express her anger.

B. Ask her to discuss any similarities she may see between the client's background and her own.
C. State your opinion that the counselor may also have an alcoholic parent, then ask for confirmation.

D. Avoid discussion of this particular client, but assign some readings on ACOA patterns.

6. What is the most important issue between the counselor and the client?

A. There may be cross-cultural issues between the counselor and the client.

B. The counselor must be able to willingly discuss her own family background in supervision sessions if significant progress is to be made with this client.

C. As an advanced student, this counselor is ineffective. Remedial work should be assigned.

D. The counselor's inability to fully address the client's emotional response limits counseling effectiveness.

CLIENT PROGRESS

The male counselor is midway through his third practicum. You, as supervisor, have been meeting with him weekly to provide feedback and discuss his ideas and plans for working with his clients. For the past three weeks, you have asked him to come prepared to discuss each client's progress and his plans for the next session. He has indicated each time that he hasn't thought out all of the things he will do in the next session but plans to do so in the next day or so. When you have tried to engage him in a discussion in the supervision session about his intentions, he shifts the focus. You have made several suggestions for working with his clients. These have been acknowledged but not used. Overall, his performance is satisfactory, but there is room for change and improvement. The developmental process seems to have stopped.

During this present supervision session, you ask the counselor to discuss his plans for a particular client for the next counseling session.

Counselor - I think that my client is making good progress, and I thought I would just see what happens.

7. What would you say or do?

A. Ask what he means specifically by that statement.

B. Point out that he is resisting supervision and ask for an explanation.

C. Point out his recent behavior and ask for an explanation.
D. Initiate a conversation about your counselor-supervisor relationship and inquire whether this is affecting his performance.

8. What seems to be the major issue involved here?

A. The counselor is on a predictable plateau in learning.

B. This appears to be a case of burn-out.

C. The counselor's use of supervision has stopped for an unknown reason.

D. There is evidence of resistance to supervision.

DEPRESSED

A male client has been seeing a male counselor for three weeks and has said in previous sessions that he is very depressed and upset. The counselor has said very little in response to such statements. The intake report indicated that the client had been hospitalized a year ago for a suicide attempt.

Client - Things have been bad lately. I am tired and I want out of it all.

Counselor - You are considering leaving school?

Client - There doesn't seem to be any future any more.

Counselor - Well, maybe we can give you some more career tests to see if there is anything you might like better.

9. Which of these ethical dilemmas is of most concern to you?

A. The counselor doesn't seem to know what the client is talking about or what to do. You are concerned that inadequate assistance or services are being provided to this client.

B. It appears that the client may be suicidal and the counselor is not aware of this. You, as supervisor, may be held liable if this client should commit suicide.

C. You are concerned that the client may be suicidal and may be dangerous to himself or others and that he needs more immediate attention.

D. It is possible that the counselor has some personal issues that prevent him from working effectively with this client and you, as the supervisor, are wondering how you can approach this with the counselor without violating his personal privacy.
The counselor is male, 27, single, and in his first practicum. The client is a female, college freshman who has come in for counseling. She indicated she thought she might like to be a doctor but wasn't sure.

Counselor - You aren't sure you want to be a doctor? Have you ever thought about being a nurse?

Client - Yes, but I would rather be a doctor.

Counselor - Well, are you interested in having children?

Client - Eventually.

Counselor - Nursing would allow you to work part-time and be home with your children.

10. What is the most important issue involved here?

A. This client will not receive adequate counseling service from this counselor.

B. The client demonstrates career indecision and unrealistic ideas about having a family and career.

C. The counselor is seriously deficient in understanding gender issues.

D. The counselor is probing into areas not clearly related to the client's concerns.

11. What would you do?

A. Directly confront the counselor's sexist behavior in the supervision session.

B. Model non-sexist behavior during supervision sessions without direct discussion of the counselor's behavior.

C. During the next supervision session, discuss with the counselor his views about the role of women in society.

PERSONAL PROBLEMS

The female counselor is in her sixth week of her first practicum. During your weekly supervision sessions, she has indicated that she thinks she is not doing as well as she would like because stressful events are occurring in her personal life. She has talked about adjusting to graduate school, problems in her job and concerns about her relationship with her boyfriend.
Counselor - I'm finding it difficult to help my client with her concerns about her career decisions and whether she should marry her boyfriend because I'm having similar concerns right now. I don't like my job right now, and I'm having trouble deciding how intimate I want to be with Jerry, my boyfriend.

12. What seems to be the most important issue involved here?

A. I must decide whether to provide counseling for her personal concern.
B. Is she too distracted to learn and perform well in practicum?
C. She has not yet learned to put personal concerns aside when counseling.
D. She is avoiding supervision by presenting personal concerns.

13. What would you say or do?

A. Acknowledge her concern, but insist that supervision conversation be related to clients and counseling activity.
B. Advise that she get counseling assistance for her problems if she wishes to continue in practicum.
C. Acknowledge her problem, then explore how each may be influencing her counseling activity.
D. Suggest that she seems to be avoiding supervision and ask for an explanation.

14. What do you see as the most important ethical concern in this situation?

A. The counselor is inviting discussion of personal concerns but to discuss them in supervision might be an invasion of her privacy.
B. Is the counselor focusing on her own well-being to the detriment of her clients?
C. Are client needs made subordinate to training needs if the counselor is permitted to remain in practicum?
D. Is the counselor providing at least minimally adequate service?
Appendix D

Supervisor Evaluation Ratings and Theoretical Orientation

(Supervisor and supervisee Forms)
Evaluation of Supervision
(Supervisor Form)

Please rate the following areas concerning supervision with your practicum student(s).

1. Your satisfaction with yourself as a supervisor:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very dissatisfied  very satisfied

2. Your competence as a supervisor:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   very incompetent  very competent

3. Your supervisory interactions with your student improved his/her therapy abilities.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   strongly disagree  strongly agree

Please respond to the following:

Check the item which best describes your theoretical orientation (please check only one).

   ____ Psychodynamic
   ____ Cognitive-Behavioral
   ____ Family/Systems
   ____ Existential/Experiential
   ____ Eclectic
   ____ Undecided
Evaluation of Supervision
(Supervisee Form)

Please rate the following areas concerning supervision with your student supervisor.

1. Satisfaction with your student supervisor:
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very dissatisfied  very satisfied

2. Competence of your student supervisor:

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   very incompetent  very competent

3. Interactions with my student supervisor improved my therapy abilities.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   strongly disagree  strongly agree

Please respond to the following:

Check the item which best describes your theoretical orientation (please check only one).

   ____ Psychodynamic
   ____ Cognitive-Behavioral
   ____ Family/Systems
   ____ Existential/Experiential
   ____ Eclectic
   ____ Undecided
Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire (Supervisor and Supervisee Forms)
Supervisor Form

Please provide the following information:

Social Security Number: ________________________________

Age: ______

Sex: _____ Male    _____ Female

Race: _____ African-American    _____ Asian    _____ Hispanic

          _____ Native-American    _____ Caucasian

What year are you in this program (circle one)?  1st   2nd   3rd   4th   5th

Have you completed the M.A. requirements for this program?    _____ Yes    _____ No

Who is your faculty supervisor this semester?  

          _____ Bob Buckler
          _____ Clark Campbell
          _____ Wayne Colwell
          _____ Michelle Dykstra
          _____ Kathryn Ecklund
          _____ Brad Johnson
          _____ Loye Ryan

Please describe any previous graduate studies in psychology, counseling, social work, education, or other related field (include field and degree earned, or number of courses completed):
Please describe any previous training in supervision, *not* received at this program (include length of training):

How much psychotherapy/counseling work experience do you have (*not* including practicum in this program)?

___ 1-6 months
___ 6-12 months
___ 1-2 years
___ 3-5 years
___ 5-10 years
___ >10 years

How much experience as a psychotherapy supervisor do you have (*not* including practicum in this program)?

___ 1-3 months
___ 3-6 months
___ 6-12 months
___ 1-2 years
___ 3-5 years
___ 5-10 years
___ >10 years
Supervisee Form

Please provide the following information:

Social Security Number: __________________________

Age: ____

Sex:  ____ Male  ____ Female

Race:  ____ African-American  ____ Asian  ____ Hispanic
       ____ Native-American  ____ Caucasian

What year are you in this program (circle one)?  1st  2nd  3rd  4th  5th

Where are you in the practicum sequence?  ____ Prepracticum  ____ Practicum

Who is your faculty supervisor this semester?
       ____ Bob Buckler
       ____ Clark Campbell
       ____ Wayne Colwell
       ____ Michelle Dykstra
       ____ Kathryn Ecklund
       ____ Brad Johnson
       ____ Loye Ryan

Please describe any previous graduate studies in psychology, counseling, social work, education, or other related field (include field and degree earned, or number of courses completed):
How much psychotherapy/counseling work experience do you have (not including practicum in this program)?

___ 1-6 months
___ 6-12 months
___ 1-2 years
___ 3-5 years
___ 5-10 years
___ >10 years

How much psychotherapy supervision have you received (not including supervision related to practicum in this program)?

___ 1-3 months
___ 3-6 months
___ 6-12 months
___ 1-2 years
___ 3-5 years
___ 5-10 years
___ >10 years
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Informed Consent
Consent to Participate in Research

This study will investigate developmental changes of beginning supervisors as they gain experience. It is performed as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the researcher's Doctor of Psychology in Clinical Psychology at George Fox University.

There are no foreseeable risks with this research. If any discomfort should arise regarding material addressed in this study, participants can contact this researcher with questions or to discuss feelings.

I agree to participate in this research project and I understand that:

1. The time required for this study is about 25 - 30 minutes for each of the three (3) administrations.

2. The nature of my participation includes completing four (4) self-report measures and a background information sheet. The four (4) measures will be administered three (3) times: in the second (2nd) and fifteenth (15th) weeks of the first semester, and in the fifteenth (15th) week of the second semester.

3. My participation is entirely voluntary. I may terminate my involvement at any time without penalty.

4. All my data are confidential and faculty will not be given access to data.

5. All data are for research purposes only and will not affect my course grade or any aspect of practicum evaluations.

6. If I have questions about the research, or need to talk to the researcher after my participation in the study, I can contact the researcher by calling (503) 620-4780 or writing to:
   Mark D. Nordlund, M.A.                                           Michelle Dykstra, Ph.D.
   10751 S.W. Mary Place                                           Dissertation Committee Chair
   Tigard, Oregon 97223                                           George Fox University

Thank you for your help!

Print Name: _______________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________ Date: ______
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Raw Data Tables
### Explanation of Raw Data

<p>| Column 1: | Supervisor/Supervisee Distinction |
| Column 2: | Administrations Completed |
| Columns 3-6: | Supervisee Identification Number |
| Columns 7-10: | Supervisor Identification Number |
| Column 11: | Gender |
| Column 12: | Age |
| Column 13: | Race |
| Column 14: | Year in Program |
| Column 15: | MA Degree Completion |
| Column 16: | Previous Graduate Education in Psychology |
| Column 17: | Previous Training in Supervision |
| Column 18: | Previous Experience as a Supervisor |
| Columns 19-46: | First Administration of LSS |
| Columns 47-51: | First Administration of CICS-BR |
| Columns 52-84: | First Administration of SSI |
| Columns 85-87: | First Administration of SER |
| Column 88: | First Administration Theoretical Orientation |
| Columns 89-116: | Second Administration of LSS |
| Columns 117-121: | Second Administration of CICS-BR |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columns 122-154:</th>
<th>Second Administration of SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columns 155-157:</td>
<td>Second Administration of SER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 158:</td>
<td>Second Administration Theoretical Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 159-186:</td>
<td>Third Administration of LSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 187-191:</td>
<td>Third Administration of CICS-BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 192-224:</td>
<td>Third Administration of SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns 225-227:</td>
<td>Third Administration of SER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 228:</td>
<td>Third Administration Theoretical Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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