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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The training of counselors is of major interest to graduate programs in the helping-related fields. At the national level, the American Psychological Association (1952, 1957) has presented guidelines for the training of doctoral level psychology graduate students. Included in the guidelines are recommendations for supervised counseling experiences, described as the counseling practicum. An integral component of the practicum experience and the training of the counselor, as a whole, is supervision. Although supervision theorists (Ekstein and Wallerstein, 1972; Mueller and Kell, 1971; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) have indicated the importance of the supervisory task, there is still considerable confusion as to its meaning and purpose. In attempts to operationalize supervision, the definition of the supervisory relationship varies with the theoretical perspective of the author (Seligman and Baldwin, 1972). In addition to the diversity of theoretical perspectives, the strategies of supervision vary along a continuum of didactic, structured training to supervisory counseling to a combination of both (Patterson, 1964). Therefore, without previous knowledge of the supervisor's theoretical orientation, style preference and, perhaps, a myriad of other supervisory variables, it would be impossible to determine what actually occurs within a supervisory relationship.
Conversely, supervisory research is quite focused on the evaluation of supervisory strategies. In particular, researchers have predominantly examined methods of acquiring Roger's (1957) core conditions of empathy, positive regard and genuineness (Hansen and Warner, 1978). Although supervisory research within the past decade has mushroomed (Matarazzo, 1978), the breadth of the research has sorely lagged behind the strategies and theoretical formulations. One initial step in broadening our understanding of the field is to describe what actually occurs in the supervisory relationship. One of the major purposes of this research project was to examine the supervisor's verbal behavior in a descriptive manner. However, in understanding the context of this study, the following is a general overview of the theoretical and empirical literature focusing on the supervisor as the major source of interest in this investigation.

**Supervisory Theory**

The origins of psychological supervisory theory can be traced to the psychoanalytic school in which the supervisory relationship parallels the therapeutic relationship. The psychoanalytic supervisor's goal is to work through the therapist's-in-training neurotic defenses and motivations for becoming a therapist. Ekstein and Wallerstein (1971) warned supervisors not to engage in analysis, per se, but to attempt to increase the awareness of the therapist via insight. The methods of helping the therapist-in-training overcome these motives is not clearly delineated by the theorists. The attributes of a psychoanalytic supervisor differ with the authors. However, Hogan
(1964) capsulizes the criteria in his description of the master therapist. The master therapist displays a vast awareness of himself/herself and others and has sufficient personal autonomy to be in independent practice. The master therapist is an artist and artisan who synthesizes the crafts and skills of psychotherapy with the creativity and ingenuity of an artist of interpersonal communication. With such a high level of consciousness, the master therapist has learned the gift of self-supervision within the therapeutic alliance. Unfortunately, Hogan nor other analytic writers lend insight into the development of this autonomous self-actualized therapist/supervisor. Nor do any of the analytic authors discuss the manner or style in which the master therapist teaches the trade of psychoanalysis. In summary, the psychoanalytic supervisor should be, first and foremost, a skilled therapist who is actively involved and immersed in his/her craft.

As with the psychoanalytic perspective, the client-centered theorists concur that the supervisor should be a highly skilled therapist. Using a skill based evaluation, the supervisor's major goal is to instill the core conditions (i.e., empathy, positive regard and genuineness) within the trainee. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) have described the process in which training should occur. First, the supervisor must present an atmosphere of high levels of the core conditions within the supervisory milieu. Second, the supervisor didactically trains the supervisee regarding the client-centered concepts. The supervisor teaches the core conditions by lecturing, modeling and role-playing how the core conditions should be used in counseling. Third, the supervisee should participate in personal and/
or group therapy to overcome problems in assimilating the necessary and sufficient therapeutic conditions. The client-centered theorists have the same shortcoming as the psychoanalytic theorists as they fail to describe how a counselor becomes a supervisor. It appears, however, that in addition to being a skilled therapist, the supervisor must be able to teach, model and role-play therapeutic skills. Finally, the client-centered supervisor must also evaluate the success of their interventions based on the quality of the acquisition of the core conditions within the trainee.

In the third theoretical model, the developmental approach emphasizes trainee growth in qualitatively different stages (Stoltenberg, 1979). The behaviors of each progressive stage subsume the previous stage's skills and experiences and, therefore, developmental growth is a cumulative process. Hogan (1964) presents a four stage counseling approach ranging from the dependent, anxiety-ridden beginner to the autonomous master counselor. The supervisor must assess the trainee's development and engage in appropriate skills for each level. For example, if the trainee is anxious about supervisory evaluation, the supervisor must provide support at level one and perhaps confront at a more advanced level. In general, the supervisory tasks are to be supportive; initially, and as the trainee matriculates through the developmental stages, the supervisor encourages autonomous behavior. By the time counselors achieve the skills and maturity of the fourth level, ideally they are independent practitioners. Most developmental theories seem to focus on the growth of the trainee and only minimally on the supervisor. Marikis (1979) and Cope (1980) have
both posited that supervisors may advance through a comparable developmental schema. In a similar fashion, the supervisor, initially, struggles with competence and confidence issues. The supervisor-in-training is initially anxiety-ridden and needs similar interventions as the beginning therapist. With experience, support and challenge, the supervisor works to develop and mature as an independent practitioner of supervision. Unfortunately the supervisory stage theories are, at best, embryonic in their development and have received very little empirical support. One of the primary purposes of this research was to describe possible stages of supervisor growth in a developmental framework.

Even with the diversity of views on counseling training, all theories converge on several concepts. One concept is that counseling experience is an essential ingredient in the counselor-trainee's development. No matter how much training occurs, the counselor must be given opportunities to use and consequently sharpen the skills obtained. Secondly, supervision is necessary to help the supervisee overcome obstacles faced in counseling and tap into his/her own resources. The assumption is that effective counseling cannot occur with experience alone. Supervision is necessary to guide the growth of the counselor. Assuming that, in fact, supervision is necessary to counselor training, the absence of the understanding of the supervisor is quite noticeable. Currently, there is no indication of any special skills or techniques needed to become a supervisor and, therefore, the supervisor is, at best, described as a master counselor with some teaching ability. As a whole, the development of the supervisory role
has been quite erroneously ignored. Consequently, the purpose of this
study is to examine the development of the supervisor by analyzing
both the planning behavior prior to supervision and supervisory verbal
behavior. Hopefully this research will provide information pertinent
to the supervisor's training and facilitate an understanding of what
transpires in a supervisory interview.

The context in which the research topic was formulated came from
previous research methodology. An overview of the research in super­
vision focusing on the supervisor will indicate the need to expand
our knowledge of the supervisor. Also, the brief review will lend
insight into the descriptive design used in this study.

Research on Supervision

Hansen, et al. (1976) reported that a considerable amount of
supervisory research has been published in the last decade. With the
increase of research in the area, Matarazzo (1971 and 1978) has noted
that the client-centered researchers have made the most significant
contribution to the field. Research of the client-centered approach
has been primarily on the evaluation of the components of the training
package. The package, described earlier, attempts to teach trainees
the effective use of Roger's (1967) necessary and sufficient conditions
(i.e., empathy, warmth and genuineness). In general, research has
indicated moderately positive effects of high level core conditions
within the supervisor on the trainee's learning of these skills
(Pierce and Schauble, 1970). Carkhuff (1965) has shown that the high
level skills can be maintained over a six month period. Other research
in this area supports the various aspects of the Truax and Carkhuff model. The results indicate the following: 1) the inclusion of personal therapy component leads to greater skill competence (Berenson, et al., 1966); 2) modeling of high levels of facilitative conditions results in better empathic responding than low leveled modeling (Perry, 1975) and 3) systematic desensitization facilitates the acquisition of core conditions (Fry, 1973). Critiques of the approach have challenged the validity of the core conditions (Gormally and Hill, 1974; Kurtz and Grummon, 1972). Matarazzo concludes:

In short the client-centered programs have not delivered all that they seemed to promise, but they have made a significant contribution. We cannot assume, however, that their dimensions of therapist skill are unidimensional or equally important with all clients and most assuredly, we cannot assume that they are the "sufficient conditions" for effective client change.

In conclusion, research in client-centered training has made a major contribution to supervision research. However, it is difficult to determine the efficacy of such skills as most of the studies have focussed on skill acquisition and not client improvement as an outcome measure. This finding makes generalization of the effectiveness of these skills in counseling as speculative.

Another major contributor to the skill acquisition model is Ivey's microcounseling in which a training model similar to the client-centered approach showed significant acquisition of various interviewing skills (Ivey, et al., 1968). The trainees maintained the skills in a ten day follow-up. Toukmanian and Rennie (1975) found that microcounseling trainees were more proficient at empathy skills which was attributed to the greater amount of practice in the microcounseling
approach than the client-centered model. A third area of research examined a behavior modification training model for paraprofessionals. In a comparable model to the other two skill based competency approaches, Levine and Tilker (1974) have indicated impressive results with parenting and marital communications. However as with the client-centered model, a general limitation is that the relationship between these skills and client improvement is yet to be determined.

As a whole, the most striking phenomena is the similarity of the research, predominantly focussing on skill building, technique-specific supervision. The skill based focus may, in part, be due to the subject population used in much of the research. Generally, the subjects are fairly naïve to the counseling process, as most are paraprofessionals or beginning graduate students. Mueller and Kell (1971) and Hogan (1964) have suggested that the beginner needs structure and didactic training in order to assuage his/her anxiety. This approach will provide a working knowledge base to foster independence and development of a counseling style. Therefore, the research deals quite effectively with skill building models but is ineffective in dealing with supervision beyond the early states of development. The question that is imperative to ask is "What happens beyond the very early stages of counselor training?" It is the opinion of this author that supervision in applied settings is much more than simply a skill building process. The dynamic qualities of becoming a counselor and the intricacies of interpersonal relationships in supervision lead one to believe that the supervisor's role is more than an instructor of counseling skills. Unfortunately, very few research efforts have
explored or described the supervisor or supervisory behavior. Since the intent of this research is to focus on the supervisor's role, a brief examination of the research on the supervisor will provide insight into the methodology of this research project.

Research on the Supervisor

Few studies have dealt with actual supervisor behaviors (Smith, 1975). In the psychoanalytic model, Goin and Kline (1974) videotaped "master" supervisors to descriptively define supervisory behaviors as contrasted to psychotherapeutic behavior. The results indicated a strong similarity between the two. The authors concluded that the processes were essentially identical and therefore the training of analysts should contain the essential ingredients of therapy. The behaviors which were identical in both supervision and therapy were insight, empathy and open-ended questioning. In the counseling field, Lambert (1974) compared counseling to the supervisory session and found that the two were vastly different. The supervisor didactically taught skills; whereas the counselor was less directive presenting a facilitative environment. However contrasting with Lambert's results, Pierce and Schauble (1970) indicated supervision and counseling to be a parallel process. In this brief overview, the results appear to be contingent on the theoretical orientation of the supervisor. Therefore, in discussing supervisors, the theoretical perspective would be an important determinant of what occurs in supervision. Smith (1975) analyzed supervisory behavior in a quasi-supervision relationship in order to examine experiential versus didactic approaches to supervision.
The approaches denote a humanistic, affective focus (experiential) versus a teaching, cognitive focus (didactic). Smith's results indicated no behavioral differences between the two approaches in the session. Smith concluded that the didactic and experiential distinctions are not useful when examining actual supervisory behavior.

The experiential and didactic comparison is predominant in the supervision literature as a stylistic measure. However, there seem to be a multitude of other, and perhaps more useful, comparisons which would increase the understanding of the effect of the supervisor in supervision. In an examination of theoretical orientations of supervisors, Demos and Zuwaylif (1962) found no differences in the verbal behaviors used in supervision sessions across orientations. These results are contrary to the previous studies of Goin and Kline (1974) and Pierce and Schauble (1970) suggesting that more research is necessitated in this area. Stone (1980) compared experience levels of supervisors in their planning behavior for a supervision session.

Using a content analysis system based on educational curriculum planning research, Stone found that the more experienced supervisor generated more planning statements than the inexperienced supervisor. Stone concluded that the more experienced supervisor presents a more enriched environment by "... providing more information and choices whereas inexperience tends to impoverish supervision models and restrict choices" (Stone, 1980, p. 88).

Using Stone's research for the foundation of this study, supervisory planning behavior across experience levels will be examined. However, supervisory planning may be much more useful when related to
actual supervisory behavior. Therefore, this research will also compare planning behavior with a simulated supervision session. With the addition of supervisory behavior, this line of research should increase our awareness of supervisors with varied experience levels in both planning and supervision and their interaction. With the description information of the planning and supervision sessions, the investigator will attempt to tie the results to a developmental model of supervisor growth.
Prior to an examination of the research literature, the models or "theories" of supervision will be presented. With an awareness of the foundations of supervision, hopefully the strength and weaknesses of the research will become evident. Since the developmental approach to supervision is more pertinent to the study than the client-centered and the psychoanalytic models, this review will predominantly focus on the developmental paradigms. Only a brief overview will be presented on the other two approaches.

In consolidating the diffuse psychoanalytic literature, the primary task of supervision, as with psychoanalysis, is to be facilitative of making the unconscious conscious and provide insight into unconscious drives and motives of the trainee (Langs, 1979). According to Langs the goal of supervision is to help the trainee self-supervise. Fleming and Benedek (1966) define the self-supervision aspect as an internal process which allows the therapist/trainee to examine and circumvent his/her own resistances to therapy. Ekstein and Wallerstein (1972) present a phenomenon called the parallel process which amplifies the insight-oriented focus of supervision. The parallel process occurs when the counselor-trainee exhibits similar characteristics in supervision as the client presents in psychotherapy. A supervisee may, at times, appear as depressed or lethargic in
supervision as the client did in the therapy session. Hence, the
supervisor's task is to provide the insight about the parallel pro-
cess when it occurs. The insight will amplify unconscious motives
and aid the therapist's awareness of that insight when and if it
occurs again. The process, although similar to analysis, should not
be a form of analysis. Ekstein and Wallerstein (1971) suggest that
transference relationships in supervision should be minimized in
their importance within supervision. If the trainee is in need of
therapy s/he should enter analysis with another therapist and attempt
to separate the supervision and the therapy relationships as much as
possible. As with analysis, the supervisory process has not been
accessible to empirical scrutiny, therefore the validity of the
approach can only be speculative.

In contrast to the vagueness of the psychoanalytic approach, the
client-centered theorists pride themselves on their accessibility to
empirical examination. Rogers (1957) and, later, Truax and Carkhuff
(1967) and Carkhuff (1969) explicitly define a training program which
utilizes three major components. First, the authors key in on the
supervisor who provides an ambience of client-centered conditions,
i.e., empathy, positive regard and genuineness. Second, the super-
visor teaches the trainee the facilitative conditions using lecturing,
modeling, role-playing and listening. Third, the supervisee partic-
cipates in group or individual therapy as a vehicle to enrich the
trainee's growth potential. The approach highlights the specific
skills that the therapist needs to learn; and the supervisor's tasks
of teaching these skills. Research in the area has confirmed very
clear and concise methods of training which are easily replicated in
a variety of settings. The field of supervision is quite indebted to
the contribution of client-centered researchers for their initial
attempts to define supervision.

Although the client-centered theorists have defined the supervi-
sory or training process, they seem to be deficient in examining
the complexity of supervision and the trainee's growth as a ther-
pist. A more comprehensive group of approaches collectively named
the developmental theories present a sequential stage approach to
supervision. In a stage-model each progressive stage envelopes the
previous stages' skills resulting in qualitative and quantitative
differences emerging in the new stage. Rest (1973) and Perry (1970)
describe the stage development as an irreversible organizational change.
Although the supervisory developmental theories do not adhere to
classic stage theories, the approaches, as a whole, present unique
categories to mark the growth of the trainee.

Drawing on Mueller and Kell (1977) and Kell and Mueller (1966)
and his own clinical experience, Russell (1979) describes a three
stage supervisory theory focussing on supervisory goals and issues,
and the role and the techniques of supervision. The author will
rely heavily on Russell's approach due to the thoroughness of its
design. In addition, other theorists will be included to amplify con-
cepts in Russell's model. Russell describes the first stage at the
pre-practicum level in which the novice trainee, lacking in counsel-
ing experience, learns effective interviewing skills. In general,
the goal is to gather information about the art of counseling by
acquiring communication skills and learning about counseling theory and ethics. The issues of the supervisee are marked by anxiety about evaluation, competence, and career uncertainty. Hogan (1964) describes the neophyte as dependent and insecure "as any apprentice is insecure" (p. 65). The role of the supervisor at this level is primarily to teach and to provide information salient to counseling. Using Hunt's (1971) and Hogan's (1964) models, Stoltenberg (1979 and 1980) states the supervisor must also provide an atmosphere of autonomy. The supervisor must also attempt to reduce the confusion and uncertainty of counseling by providing structure within supervision. Bernard (1979) suggests that supervisors must define outcome measures leading to counselor competences. Supervisor techniques include role-playing, teaching, videotaping interviews and using an Interpersonal Process Recall (Kagan, et al., 1967) analysis. This type of analysis involves role-playing taped sessions and analysis of the counselor's thought processes at various points of the session. Most importantly, the supervisor must provide support and caring to assuage the supervisee's anxiety and provide a secure and sound basis for an effective supervisory relationship (Altucher, 1967).

Russell (1979) considers the second stage as the practicum level of training. The goal of the second stage includes the integration of interviewing skills into a personal style. Hogan (1964) states that self-awareness and independence are the key issues. Additional goals center on gaining information skills of clinical diagnosis and conceptualization. The issues at this level advances the trainee into an independence/dependence conflict. Hogan notes the therapist-
in-training fluctuates between extreme autonomy to extreme dependence causing a considerable amount of conflict for the supervisee. The supervisee is also gaining awareness of process issues in counseling; he/she begins to realize that there is a level of communication that transcends the content of the client's language. With increased awareness of the complexity of the task of counseling, the supervisee is also struggling with his/her therapeutic limitations. Stoltenberg (1979, 1980) highlights the fostering of independence as the major supervisory task at this stage. All theorists concur that support should continue with more challenge and confrontation of the ambivalence of becoming an independent practitioner. Russell suggests that the supervisor continues didactic training with regards to more specific issues (e.g., conceptualization and diagnosis). The supervisor must also help the supervisee begin examining process issues in both supervision and counseling.

As the supervisee enters the third level, the internship year, the goals include a greater integration of skills into the trainee's personal model of counseling. With the increase in confidence and identity integration, the counselor synthesizes various theoretical orientations and gleans useful skills from each. The counselor struggles with role definition and self-acceptance as a competent therapist. Contrasted to the self-confidence issues the therapist is also becoming aware of the limitations of therapy, as a whole. Hogan (1964) uses the term, conditional dependence, to define the supervisory relationship. The supervisee can function predominantly autonomously; however, when dealing with some issues, the supervisee reverts to a
reliance on the supervisor. The supervisor should attempt to foster independence but understand that help is sometimes needed. The intent of this goal is to balance the power differential among the supervisory dyad and change its nature to a collegial relationship. The supervisor must also make the counselor cognizant of the demands and responsibility of being in the helping professions. The supervisory techniques in this stage become less structured than the previous stages and rely more on the counselor's defined needs. In other words, the counselor begins to take more responsibility for what occurs in supervision.

Also, Hogan suggests that the supervisory dyad should attempt mutual exemplification with both reviewing and critiquing each other's supervisory and therapy behavior.

Although Russell presents a final stage, he does not define the characteristics. A final developmental level could be described by Hogan's master psychologist. The master psychologist is capable of critiquing his/her therapeutic interventions and can readjust goals when necessitated. The psychologist at this stage has developed sufficient autonomy to be aware of his/her own limits and can function independently within them. At this level, supervision is not often provided. However, if supervision is available, the relationship becomes more consultive with all participants having equivalent status.

Hockney (1971) provides a succinct definition of a consultive supervisory relationship. He states the focus of the supervisory relationship is on the supervisee's capability and willingness to express his/her own needs; correspondingly, the supervisor must be responsive to such requests. Delworth (1979) provides an overview of how master
counselors in a college counseling center can benefit from supervision. She posits that the "focus for post doctoral training is a self-initiated and self-monitored activity" (p.2). This is accomplished by providing a multitude of activities in which the senior staff personnel can select events salient to their interests and needs. The trust and the confidence displayed by the administrator that the post-doctoral counselors will engage in such activities will facilitate the success of these training methods. Therefore, the best judge of the needs of the fourth-leveled counselors would be the counselors themselves. It is the task of the administrator to present options from which the staff will choose training activities as needed.

In summary, the developmental theories or schemas provide a third and enlightening supervisory model. The approaches seem to accommodate the complexity of the supervisory issues, but, as Gelso (1979) indicated, success in external validity is certain to provide questions about internal validity, i.e., the bubble hypothesis. In other words, these approaches provide a face valid model to explain the phenomenon of supervision but the objectiveness of the concepts is quite undetermined. However, since these approaches are embryonic in their theoretical and empirical formulations, perhaps these approaches will become enriched by empirical findings and further theoretical embellishments in the near future.

One general limitation of most of the approaches is centered on the predominant focus on the trainee and his/her growth. Neglected in all but a few models is the understanding of the role of the supervisor. It is questionable whether the supervisor, due to his/her
counseling experience, will be competent in the task of supervision. The roles of teacher, trainer, therapist and consultant are associated with the supervisory tasks. In addition, Stoltenberg (1979) and Bernard (1979) state the supervisor must analyze the supervisee's needs and decide on appropriate interventions; therefore, decision maker and diagnostician can also be used to describe the supervisor. It would seem that the uniqueness of the supervisory skills may not be entirely inclusive of effective therapy skills. Perhaps there are a different set of skills necessitated to become an effective supervisor.

A second issue evolves around the question of supervisor skill development. Cope (1980) and Marikis (1979) have suggested that the supervisor's growth may also be developmental; that is, the supervisor may proceed through stages of development. Marikis (1979) suggests that the stages may parallel those of the counselor-in-training. Similar to Russell's (1979) or Hogan's model, the supervisor-trainee may initially be plagued with evaluation anxiety and fears of incompetence. With experience and, hopefully, training, the supervisor will establish a sense of identity and confidence. As the skills are integrated into a supervisory style, the supervisor may also blossom into a master supervisor with the ability to supervise independently, and to actualize the repertoire of skills necessitated by the various roles. However, at this time no theoretical formulations nor empirical studies have examined the development of the supervisor. An important goal of this current study is to examine supervisors across the experience levels to determine if any patterned or profiled differences emerge which may be suggestive of a developmental model.
understanding of the developmental, client-centered and psychoanalyt-
ical models, the task of the rest of the chapter is to present the
empirical findings in the supervisory literature. Hopefully, the
review of the theoretical formulations will provide the necessary
underpinnings to comprehend the state of the art within this field.

In order to organize and synthesize the plethora of supervision
literature, a model or schema called the Area of Research for Super-
vision Flowchart (Marikis, 1979; see Figure 1) will be used. The
model's categories form major components of supervision, i.e., the
supervisee, the supervisor, the supervisory process and outcome cri-
teria. Research will be analyzed in context with its location on the
model. In order to be able to use this model an understanding of the
categories and corresponding subcategories is necessitated.

The supervisee component includes research which focusses on the
supervisee as the element of analysis. Subsumed within the supervisee
category include supervisee level, type and theoretical orientation.
Supervisee level involves experiential levels of counseling, super-
vision, and education as well as the counseling developmental levels
discussed previously. Although presently unstudied the category of
the supervisee's theoretical orientation may provide insights into the
facilitation or impedance of assorted supervisory interventions.
Finally the supervisee type variable includes a miscellany of para-
eters ranging from demographics to personality aspects of the super-
visee. Within the supervisor component, the same variables of level,
type and theoretical orientation are included in the flowchart. Since
the definition of these are identical to the supervisee categories,
no further explanation is necessitated.

The process component contains the greatest quantity of supervisory research. A possible reason for the propensity of research may be due to the preponderance research dealing with skills training and psychotherapy teaching methods. Within the process component two variables, the relationship and technique, are described. Although treated as discrete entities, the variables seem to have considerable overlap and to appear to be interrelated. The relationship variable comprises literature focusing on the effects of the supervisory interpersonal dynamics on the satisfaction or value of supervision. It also includes descriptive studies attempting to track, monitor or define the nature of the supervisory relationship. The technique component of the process category contains two areas, didactic and experiential, which are usually analyzed simultaneously. Didactic or experiential technique subcategories contain a variety of training packages or individual skills salient to counseling. Also, included in these categories is literature dealing with facilitative or debilitative variables on the training packages. An example of research fitting into this category would be the effects of anxiety management on the acquisition of client-centered skills. The terms, didactic and experiential, are quite common in supervisory literature; unfortunately succinct definitions are much less common. The terms are used as exclusive categories with didactic referring to direct teaching of therapeutic skills, e.g., instructions, modeling or role-playing. The experiential can be defined as an approach which excludes the teaching as the process of supervision, and focuses on the
trainee's affect or emotional state. Research, in general, has not supported the exclusiveness of these approaches and therefore has not found explicit distinction between the two (Smith, 1975).

Although an integral component of supervision, outcome literature is essentially absent. A sparsity of research which does exist attempts to define potential outcome measures. Matarazzo (1978) presents the most comprehensive analysis of outcome alternatives. She posits two possible outcomes, skills improvement and client improvement, as the major choices. The technique oriented approaches usually use skills acquisition as the measure of choice. Therefore, success in supervision would result in skills acquisition and integration. Matarazzo suggests this measure is somewhat indirect in its actual intention. She states the purpose of improving in the various skills of interviewing is to evoke positive change within the client. Hence, a more direct and reliable outcome measure is the client improvement. A third measure offered by this author presents the prospects of developmental movement or growth which may be a useful consideration in research designs. Unfortunately, the utility of any of these outcomes is yet to be examined by researchers. Therefore no illucidating conclusions can be reached regarding their efficacy.

As mentioned previously, this model is intended to separate and define various units of the supervisory experience for a coherent experimental analysis. The exclusiveness of each category is entirely for the use of the reorganization and integration of the literature and not a reflection of the status of supervision research. The intercorrelations among the categories are probably quite profound.
The intent of this design is to define a nosology for the salient aspects of each of the studies. The author will divide the research into these categories and subcategories and summarize the results in each. At the conclusion of the chapter, the author will examine the results of this analysis and attempt to synthesize this sampling of the literature which will hopefully provide a cogent understanding of the origins of the current research project.

**Supervisee Level**

Currently no research has focussed on the developmental or educational levels of the trainee. One study was located for the counseling experience level. Therefore the research interest is quite limited in this subcategory. In an analogue study with empathic communication as the dependent measure, Crane (1974) examined the effects of experiential versus didactic supervisory styles on the experience level of the supervisees. Using fifteen undergraduates and masters-level students in counseling as the inexperienced group and fifteen third and fourth year Ph.D. candidates as the experienced group, Crane found that the didactic approach was preferred by all the groups. Also the didactic training modality increased empathic communication greatly for the inexperienced but not for the experienced counselors. There was no significant preference nor increased effectiveness with either of the approaches for the experienced counselors. The results suggest that perhaps the approaches and outcome measures of this study are useful for only the novice counselor and not useful for advanced therapists. The results lend support to the need for different
interventions for the experienced counselor than the inexperienced which is not of primary concern in the training packages in current use. The results suggest that perhaps the skills for advanced counselors are somehow different and more advanced. Emerging from these results might be the beginnings of a developmental schema for counselors.

In an examination of expectancies, trainees with various levels of experience completed the Supervisory Role and Function (SRAF) instrument developed by Gybers and Johnstone (1965). The purpose of the instrument is to provide information regarding the expectations and interests of the supervisory dyad. The results of the study indicated that beginning practicum students wanted more structure than the experienced supervisor desired to provide. The results of the two studies within this area suggest that structure and didactic training may be negatively correlated with the supervisee's experience level. Also the studies show a positive correlation with expressed expectations for a style of supervision and the increase of skills acquisition.

Because Crane (1979) and Gybers and Johnstone (1965) found interesting results, it would appear that research of the counselor experience may be productive. Unfortunately, few researchers have taken an interest in this area. Matarazzo (1978) has suggested that the inaccessibility of large samples at the greater experience levels has complicated the supervisee level analysis. Also, the homogeneity of the neophyte counselor versus the complexities of an advanced trainee's development would provide added difficulty in controlling
extraneous variables (e.g., amount of supervision and counseling or type and effectiveness of supervision). In critiquing supervision literature, Matarazzo's primary negative analysis is that since subjects of training and supervision research are predominantly beginning counselors and not counselors of various experience levels, the training packages "are not applicable to most graduate programs beyond the year of practicum training" (p. 942).

Supervisee Type

The supervisee-type category has proven to be of greater interest to supervision theorists and researchers than the previous category. However, it is difficult to conclude that the effects of the type of supervisee on supervision is any better understood. The typologies of supervisees vary widely among the authors. Mueller and Kell (1972) presented a nosology dealing with anxiety coping behaviors of the supervisees. They posit that anxiety is the primary mode for trainee growth. Therefore it is essential for the supervisee to conceptualize the manner in which the supervisee copes with anxiety. Based on their clinical experiences, three types of anxiety copers emerge: 1) anxiety approachers, those who confront anxiety directly; 2) anxiety avoiders, those who defend against anxiety by pushing the feelings away and 3) anxiety binders, those who are frozen and, therefore, controlled by the anxiety. Unfortunately, little research has focussed on this typology. However, in two analogue studies, Bowman and Roberts (1978) and Bowman, Roberts and Giesen (1978) have shown that anxiety measured by skin reactance, heart rate and self-
report occurs in counseling with greater proportions than in reading about counseling or in a non-counseling oriented conversation. The similarities between counseling and supervision might suggest that supervision may also be anxiety provoking. Therefore, anxiety may be an important analysis variable in supervision via Mueller and Kell's anxiety coping system.

In a different typology Bernstein and LeCompte (1979) using variables of field dependence and independence in the reception of feedback found that independents concurred with the feedback given more than did the field dependent participants. The independents responded more positively with congruent and negative feedback but the dependents responded more favorably with positive feedback. These authors conclude that the field dependence/independence of trainee's might effect the reception of feedback, an important aspect of supervision.

In analyzing characteristics of effective counseling, Jamsen, Robb and Bank (1972) analyzed supervisor effectiveness ratings of masters level counselors with respect to various characteristics. The results were categorized in an A-B-C rating scale of counselors with A's as the most effective and C's as the least effective counselors. The A's were most objective, least hypersensitive, most understanding and had the highest grade point averages of the three groups. The B's were less objective, more hypersensitive, less understanding and had lower grade point averages than the A's. The C's were progressively lower than the B's in the same direction on the same variables. The authors' main conclusion was that grades and
academic achievement may be an excellent and tangible measure for success as a helper. Intelligence also proved to be significant in several studies dealing with selection of students in helping-related graduate programs (Salizinger, et al., 1970; Rinn, et al., 1975; and Whitely, et al., 1967). However, selection techniques have been terribly global and non-specific (Garfield, 1977), questioning the efficacy of the selection measures. Holt and Luborsky (1958) found that there were no distinguishing characteristics from other successful persons in a comparison of psychiatrists to other professionals. Lastly, Kelly and Goldberg (1959) found no distinguishing characteristics between other psychologists and therapists. These results suggest that there are no effective measures for assaying the characteristics of a successful helper. In conclusion, anxieties coping styles, intelligence, academic advancement, objectivity, understanding, hypersensitivity and field dependence/independence are the characteristics which have been used to characterize the trainees. Although very few studies have determined the validity of these typologies and their impact on the type of supervision the supervisee has received considerable attention and could potentially be a very fruitful analysis in future research.

**Supervisee Theoretical Orientation**

Another supervisee variable, theoretical orientation, may also be a concept worth examination. If a theoretical alignment of the orientation is defined within the trainee, the impact of the supervision may depend on the congruency between the supervisory approach
and the counselor's theoretical approach. Conversely, discordant approaches may also add to difficulties in the supervisory relationship. However, as with the previous variables, no research has explored the effects of the supervisee's orientation on the supervision.

**Supervisor Level**

Peer versus doctoral level supervisors has been one research topic which has examined the supervisor's level. Wagner and Smith (1979) have developed a model of peer supervision at Temple University in which peer supervisors have the primary responsibility for teaching counselors the skills of psychotherapy. The practicum courses, under the supervision of a licensed psychologist, attempt to teach the peer supervisors supervisory skills and provide topical areas in dealing with supervisees. Feedback from both supervisors and counselors has indicated a stronger satisfaction and a greater sense of commitment than with doctoral level supervisors. However, no evaluative research has concurred with the report of satisfaction or success of the model. Seligman (1978) studied the effects of peer supervision on the acquisition of facilitative conditions. Master's level students were sampled and assigned as supervisors for beginning and advanced practicum students. Tapes of the supervisory sessions were analyzed for the quality of the client-centered skills (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). Also the counselors completed several questionnaires including the Supervisor Role and Function instrument (Gysbers and Johnstone, 1965) to evaluate the effectiveness of supervision. At the conclusion of the term, the counselors improved on the overall facilitative level
from 2.8 to 3.2 which is rated as minimally facilitative. The authors concluded that peer supervision may be a cost-efficient, helpful method for training programs. In a similar study comparing undergraduate peer supervisors to professional supervisors, Lamb and Clack (1974) examined the effects of empathy training on two groups of undergraduate psychology majors. No differences in the acquisition of empathy in either of the supervisory groups were found and both groups reported an overall effectiveness of skill acquisition greater than a nonsupervised control group. Similar to Seligman (1978), the authors concluded that skill training may be effectively taught by peer supervisors which may be more cost efficient for training agencies.

In a similar line of investigation, several researchers have examined the effects of supervisors with varied amount of supervision experience. Using the SRAF, Sunblad and Feinberg (1972) studied the expectancies of supervisors across experience levels. They found that supervisory warmth and personal attraction were defined as salient supervisory characteristics but, interestingly, genuineness and empathy were not. The results infer that several predominant traits of the client-centered model were not deemed as important in the supervisory relationship. Also, no differences in these findings were noted across the experience level variable. In a study which examined the imitative behavior of trainees, Dowling and Frantz (1975) using an analogue design, found that trainees were more likely to model the trainer or supervisor with high levels of empathy and respect than trainers with low levels of these variables. The two
studies suggest that perhaps supervisors need to have high levels of core conditions to promote imitative behavior of helping skills. However, the supervisee's expectations for supervision differ from what may promote the acquisition of such skills. A second finding of Sunblad and Feinberg (1972) suggests that the process variables dealing with both the counseling and supervision relationships are more important to training for the experienced supervisors than with less experienced.

Smith (1976) in a quasi-supervisory design examined actual behaviors versus the expectations for supervision with supervisors of varied experience levels. Smith's design included a supervisory session in which the counselor/confederate portrayed a beginning practicum student. The supervisor conducted a taped thirty-minute supervision session with the counselor. The audiotapes were transcribed and analyzed. The results of the study indicated that expected supervisory styles of experiential or didactic were not distinguishable in the actual behavior. The results suggest that supervisory styles of experiential or didactic may not have much bearing on what occurs in actual supervision even if the supervisors indicate a preference as to a particular style.

Stone (1980) studied the decision-making rationales for both experienced and inexperienced supervisors. Using ten undergraduates trained in reflective communication and ten experienced supervisors, the participants were required to plan for a supervision session. The planning technique devised by Clark and Peterson (1979) asked the supervisors to think aloud and record all of their planning thoughts
for a thirty-minute training session on increasing empathic communications. The Supervisory Planning Coding System, a modified version of a planning system for a curriculum planning devised by Peterson, Marx and Clark (1978) was used to code the supervisory verbal behavior. Stone found that experienced supervisors made more planning statements than inexperienced supervisors. In a general profile of all supervisors, supervisory process was the most frequent planning statement and the least frequent was supervisory goal statements. Stone concluded that the experienced supervisors provided the "more enriched environment" (p. 87) for the trainee than the inexperienced supervisor.

In summary, the literature on the level of the supervisor suggests that peer supervision may be as helpful as professional supervision when training interview skills. An interesting pair of studies (Stone, 1980 and Smith, 1974) have attempted to look at the effects of experience in designs unique to much of supervisory literature. They used quasi-supervisory designs rather than analogues and behaviorally measured what actually occurred in simulated planning and supervision. The results of Smith's and Stone's work suggests that when designs analyze the verbal behavior of supervisors on phenomena, such as supervisory style and peer supervision, the concepts seem less useful than in the analogue studies previously described.

Supervisor Theoretical Orientation

Arbuckle (1965) points out the importance of examining the effects of the supervisors theoretical orientation on the trainee's development. He suggests that theoretical orientation may have such
potent effects that trainees need to see a diversity of models to avoid dogmatism and rigidity in theoretical beliefs. Unfortunately research has not realized the importance of theoretical orientation as Arbuckle would predict. Demos and Zuwaylif (1962) compared supervisors with directive and nondirective counseling theoretical orientations. Their measure of analysis was the verbal responses to specific trainee statements. A second analysis examined the type of trainee statements which were reinforced by the supervisors. The results indicated no differences in either analyses across the theoretical orientations. Both groups responded positively to "understanding" statements and negatively to "evaluative" or "probing" responses. In a series of studies, Pierce and Schauble (1970, 1971, 1971b) examined the effects of client-centered supervisors exhibiting high and low levels of core conditions on the acquisition of empathic communication. The three studies found that the trainees learned greater levels of core conditions with the high leveled supervisors than the low leveled. The skills differential persisted at a six week follow-up study. Studies on theoretical orientation of the supervisor are quite sparse in number and in the scope of the theories explored. The existing literature suggests that various counseling approaches of the supervisors may not have much of an impact on the supervisory relationship. However, the Pierce and Schauble studies suggest that the quality of the performance of the theory's principles may indeed be quite influential to the trainee's skill acquisition.
Process (Relationship)

The supervisory relationship has received both theoretical and empirical analysis in the supervision literature. Mueller and Kell (1977) and Kell and Mueller (1971) describe the relationship as the most integral component to supervisee growth and development. These authors describe a model of supervision in which the relationship is essential in dealing with conflict and anxiety in both counseling and supervision. The supervisory relationship "must be founded on trust, openness, warmth and honest collaboration" (p. 7), like any effective and significant human relationship. However, the supervisory relationship is also a "special human relationship" (p. 11) in that it deals with the struggles and anxieties of the beginning counselor.

Several research projects have examined the compatibility of the supervisory pairings across several variables. Lemons and Lanning (1979) examined the similarities of the values systems as measured by the Rokeach Value Survey of supervisors and supervisees. At the conclusion of a twelve week practicum, the supervisory dyads were requested to evaluate their satisfaction with supervision and the level of communication within the relationship using the Supervisor Rating Scale and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, respectively. The results indicated no significant correlation between the satisfaction with the relationship or levels of communication and the overall satisfaction with supervision. Also, there was no correlation between values compatibility and satisfaction with the relationship nor the quality of the supervisory communication. The authors concluded that values compatibility may not be an essential component in the
supervisory relationship.

Stern (1976) analyzed the effects of supervisory compatibility on counseling competence. Using the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) as a measure of compatibility for the dyad, along with the supervisor's evaluation of the trainee, Stern found that compatibility was not related to competence nor supervisor satisfaction with the trainee. In the same regression analysis, trainee satisfaction was also not related to competence. The only significant correlation was that supervisor's satisfaction was positively related to trainee competence. Since the compatibility variable was not found to be significant with regards to the competence measures, Stern concluded that perhaps there was no clear relationship between the two variables.

Using a field study methodology, Worthington and Roehlke (1979) attempted to identify and examine salient or helpful supervisory behaviors. Sixteen supervisors and thirty-one beginning practicum students rated the use and importance of forty-two behaviors in supervision. The supervisees also rated the competence of the supervisor and the overall satisfaction with the supervisory relationship. A factor analysis of the supervisor ratings of the forty-two behaviors indicated the primary importance of positive and negative feedback on the counseling behavior. Of secondary importance to the supervisors were the manner in which supervisees discussed counseling and helping the trainees develop competence and confidence in their abilities. Of primary importance for the supervisees was a teaching or didactic approach to supervision within a supportive atmosphere. Didactic
training with a supportive supervisory relationship was also highly correlated with the effectiveness of supervision as rated by the trainees. The overall finding suggests that salient variables for supervision differ with respect to the supervisee and the supervisor.

In another field study examining the supervisory relationship, Hurnden (1979) examined the languages of three supervisory pairs over a ten week practicum. The analysis system, Computer Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS) developed by Pepinsky, et al. (1977) was used to analyze the structural and stylistic trends of the supervisory language during the ten week period. No definitive trends emerged in the language analysis except that the amount of speech proved to be a significant variable in the supervision language. In a closer examination of the amount of speech variable, Hurnden found that the trainee discusses more at the end of the term rather than at the beginning suggesting that the supervisee may be taking more responsibility for his/her training and has a greater or more enriched understanding of counseling and supervision.

Both the Worthington and Roehlke and Hurnden's studies have provided interesting methodologies in which to examine the supervisory relationship. Both used an applied setting which allowed a more authentic examination of the supervisory process. Both studies also attempted to describe the supervisory experience rather than to prescribe techniques or methods as in much of the literature. Therefore research which attempts to describe the supervisory relationship using actual supervisory pairings would seem to be a fruitful line of analysis in future research projects.
Process (Technique)

Matarazzo (1978 and 1971) has posited that the techniques of supervision and training are perhaps the most researched and best understood area of research. She concludes; "The most researched type of training is on basic aspects of interviewing skills such as facilitation of communication and the development of a therapeutic relationship..." (p. 448). This review of the techniques will focus on the literature dealing with didactic and experiential approaches to supervision as well as various topics such as modeling effects on the supervisory process.

Proponents of experiential models of supervision (Altuchar, 1967 and Patterson, 1968) have stated that the supervisory process is predominantly an emotional phenomena in which the goal is to support the growth of the trainee. The supervisor's task is to provide a supportive and emotionally enriched environment so that the trainee can integrate his/her own support mechanisms. Altuchar states the supervision should "open the door to learning in the face of discomfort" (p. 167). In many ways, the experiential approach is primarily trainee directed and gives the trainee the independence to actualize his/her own skills as a counselor. In the opposing viewpoint, Arbuckle (1965) and other didactic proponents (Matarazzo, et al., 1966; and Wohlberg, 1954) state that the supervisory relationship is more compatible to a student-teacher rather than a counseling relationship and, therefore, the trainee needs to be taught effective counseling skills.
In examining these two views, research appears to be more aligned with the didactic approach. Hector, et al. (1974) taught thirty master's level students to respond to negative emotions by exploring them more deeply and found that the didactic approach was more effective than a group of counselors who were not trained to deal with negative emotions. Stone and Gotlib (1975) found that direct teaching with a model of empathy skills exemplifying the techniques to be learned was more effective for paraprofessional than a textbook on empathic communication. In a study designed predominately to examine taped or programmed supervision versus individual supervision, Smith (1978) found that in either supervisory format the didactic methods were effective in teaching empathic communication. Therefore, the research on didactic training provides credence for its effectiveness in the acquisition of communication skills.

Research which compared the two approaches has indicated the didactic methods to be most effective. Payne, Winer and Bell (1972), using an analogue design, found that technique oriented supervision was significantly more effective in the acquisition of empathy skills than experientially oriented supervision with naive subjects. Payne, Weiss and Kapp (1972) also indicated the greater acquisition of empathy when didactic supervision was paired with audio modeling over an experiential approach and nonsupervised controls for paraprofessional counselors. Birk (1972) found that naive counselors benefitted more from a didactic or teaching approach than an experiential or emotionally supportive approach in the acquisition of empathy skills. However, when Karr and Geist (1976) used ninetenn actual supervisory
pairs in an applied setting, they found different results. The intent of the study was to test the validity of Carkhuff scaling (Truax and Carkhuff, 1966, Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967) of beginning practicum student's level of functioning as a counselor. The levels of functioning was measured by the quality of the empathic communication on a seven point scale. The variables which related to increased functioning were supervisor's concreteness, respect and genuineness. There was no relationship between the supervisor's stated style (didactic or experiential) on the counselor effectiveness. Therefore, data as a whole supports the didactic over the experiential model but when used in actual supervisory sessions the utility of the distinction is questionable. Perhaps these skills training approaches are more useful for the outcome of skills acquisition in training rather than client improvement in supervision.

Several other researchers have questioned the utility of distinguishing the two styles. Bernard (1979) states that the supervisor must be adept at both techniques and must make choices as to when to use either or both at what points in the supervisory relationship. Silverman (1972, 1973) studied perceptual differences of counselors-in-training with regard to their supervisor's style. He found that neither the counselor's nor the client's perception of counseling differed as a result of the supervision style. In a field study, Ross (1976) found no differences on the effectiveness of the counselor based on either a didactic or an experiential style of supervision. Pearson (1974) also studied the effects of the approach to supervision in a field study. Using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory
(Barrett-Lennard, 1962) Pearson found no differential effects on the supervisory relationship from either the supervisor's and the supervisee's perspective with regards to either an experiential or a didactic style. In two similar field studies, Lewis (1970) and Harmachek (1971) found that high quality didactic or experiential approaches both produced increased counselor effectiveness in empathic communication as rated by the supervisors. Most of the studies in examining didactic, experiential or a combination have used empathy as the outcome measure. Goldfarb (1978) posits that other outcome measures such as the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory or the Counselor Evaluation Inventory (Linden, Stone and Shertzer, 1965) may be effective tools to analyze the effects of supervisor style. Using these two instruments as a measure of facilitating responses, Goldfarb attempted to teach thirty inexperienced undergraduate counselors basic skills in a fifteen minute supervisory session. He defined four conditions of high and low levels of didactic or experiential approaches in combination and found that the high levels of both were most effective followed by high directive with low experiential. The high experiential approach was not as effective as either of these and was not any more facilitative than the non-supervised control group. The results of the Goldfarb study and most of the others mentioned indicate that the didactic approach and a combination of didactic and experiential approaches are most facilitative of empathic communication.

Another area in the technique of supervision includes research dealing with the supervisory modeling of therapeutic skills. Bandura (1969) has advocated the use of modeling as an integral aspect in
social learning which can be controlled and manipulated to evoke desired behavioral changes. In relating modeling to the supervisory relationship, the supervisor's modeling of desired counseling skills may be advantageous to their acquisition within the trainee. Researchers, as a whole, have supported this notion in a variety of studies. Dalton, Sunblad and Hylbert (1973) have found that modeling may be an effective teaching method for empathic communication. The effects seem to persist in a one-month follow-up as well. Butler and Hansen (1973) replicated Dalton, Sunblad and Hylbert's results when they used modeling in conjunction with a combined didactic and experiential supervisory model. They also found that the trainees retained the skills at a one-month follow-up. Uhleman, Lear and Stone (1976) found that the most effective instruction occurred when modeling preceded the didactic instruction. The results concluded that the trainee focussed on salient components of the model when instructions were given prior to its viewing.

Ronnestad (1978) compared modeling, feedback and experiential understanding in the acquisition of empathy. He used forty naive counselors and found modeling to be more effective than feedback or experiential understanding. Feedback techniques increased skill acquisition greater than experiential understanding modality, as well. Using a Counseling Tacting Response Leads (CTRL; Delaney and Eisenberg, 1973), Robinson, Froehle and Kurpius (1979) examined the effects of sex differences in modeling. CTRL were defined as counselor responses intended to increase specificity in the client statements. The researchers used nineteen male and forty-six female master's level
counselors in responding to a male or female model and found no sex differences in the effects of CTRL output. They did find, however, that both the groups viewing the written and audio-visual models evoked greater CTRL production than the group viewing no model but no significant differences between written or audio-visual were noted.

Perry (1975) studied the effects of the quality of empathic modeling on the acquisition of empathy skills using a taped counseling session. The low quality models resulted in a reduction of empathy skills; whereas the high-leveled models produced a greater amount of empathic communication as compared to a no-model control group. The researchers suggested that these results indicate the importance of the supervisor's skill level in teaching empathy.

O'Toole (1978) studied the associated effects of the practice of facilitative skills and viewing a model performing the skills. Using the results on the effectiveness of practice (Horan and Baker, 1975), O'Toole's results concur with the previous research in that the practice did increase skill training. He supplemented their findings by showing that practice is even more valuable when it is associated with a specific model in teaching various therapeutic skills.

In summary, modeling has proven to be one of the most clearly effective elements in the teaching of empathy and other counseling skills. Modeling is an excellent facilitator of learning when using a variety of supervisory techniques. In addition, modeling has also been effective with various modes of presentation, e.g., written, audio, or audio-visual. Therefore, the addition of modeling to most any training package should improve the chances of effective skill
acquisition.

The techniques variable of the research flowchart, as a whole, has received the most attention. Matarazzo (1978) concludes that researchers have an excellent conception of how to implement supervision. As psychologist, we are aware that the didactic or teaching method and didactic with experiential techniques provides an efficient, effective way in which to teach beginning trainees such facilitative skills of empathy and specificity. Also, the inclusion of modeling and practice enhances the learning of these skills. We also have learned that the didactic presentation of skills prior to a model exhibiting the desired techniques may further fortify its acquisition. However, Matarazzo also maintains that the skills learned or skill improvement may only be a useful outcome if it relates to client improvement (Mintz and Luborsky, 1971).

Outcome

Wedeking and Scott (1978) have examined the effects of supervision on practicum trainees in an applied setting. The trainees were beginning practicum students and the analysis of trainee behavior compared the skills from the beginning of a semester-long practicum to the conclusion of the term. The results suggested that no significant increase in empathic communication occurred during the term. In fact, no verbal behavior differed in taped counseling sessions through the term. In a personality analysis, the only significant change occurred with regard to competence in cognitive flexibility. The authors concluded that personality changes such as the
increase in cognitive flexibility suggest that supervision has a greater influence than most of the coursework of the graduate student. In a similar study Loganbill and Marikis (1979) examined the effects of a semester-long practicum on twelve practicum students and found no personality differences as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Ostrand (1978) measured graduate students in a counselor education program on the California Psychological Inventory at the beginning and end of a counseling practicum. The only significant finding was that the practicum students increased in the dominance scale. Ostrand concluded that a supervised counseling practicum increases well-being as compared to other teaching experiences.

No attempt was made to differentiate the three outcome variables; i.e., skill acquisition, client improvement and development movement, in the preceding literature review. This was due to the lack of specificity and quantity of research in the area. In summarizing the findings, there seems to be a slight indication that some personal changes occur in beginning practicum students dealing with cognitive flexibility and dominance characteristics. Little research has examined the constructs of skill improvement as a valid outcome for supervision. Research in the past decade has brought into question the validity of constructs of the facilitative skills (Matarazzo, 1978). Therefore, using skills acquisition as an effective outcome in supervision is suspect when the skills such as empathy have not lead to client improvement (Blaas and Heck, 1975; Wallston and Weetz, 1975; Chinsky and Rappaport, 1970). Unfortunately, no research to date has attempted to use the client improvement outcome in a
supervision study. However, ultimately all supervision outcome measures should eventually relate to client improvement. Hence it may be advisable to circumvent indirect measures and deal with this concept whenever possible. Another problem arises when attempting to define a useful, valid client improvement measure as is attested in outcome research in psychotherapy (Garfield, 1978). However a more detailed explanation of the psychotherapy outcome literature is well beyond the scope of this examination.

In synthesizing the diverse and confusing literature, several previous reviews will be beneficial to this endeavor. The synthesis, as a whole, is a very difficult task due to the plethora of research scattered across a multitude of areas. The flowchart has generally facilitated an understanding of the breadth of the topic and helped organize the various types of supervisory literature. This synthesis will present the positive and negative aspects of the body of supervisory research.

It seems that the methods of teaching therapeutic skills are most clearly understood. Matarazzo (1978) states that the teaching methods are probably the best researched topic in the supervisory literature. If the variables are clearly defined, there seems to be a consensus that all of the training packages studied do provide greater skill acquisition than non-trained control groups. Usually, however, when comparing one training package to another, results are less clear. Generally, didactic training is an integral part of any useful training package and has been shown to be more effective than experiential or counseling based training. Also the combination of
experimental and didactic training has proven to be as effective as didactic and more effective than experiential approaches in skill development.

Modeling of therapeutic skills in written, audio or audio-visual modes by skilled supervisors has clearly proven to be facilitative of teaching the beginning trainee. Modeling has also amplified the learning process for trainees. In addition, when instruction precedes modeling, the trainee focuses in on the salient features of the models which aids in learning facilitative conditions.

In general, Hansen, Pound and Petro (1976) and Hansen and Warner (1971) have posited that supervisory research increased in rigor through the middle 1970's when compared to the research design guidelines set forth by Campbell and Stanley (1963) than in previous years. This conclusion also transcends more current research and is exemplified by several studies that focussed on the supervisory relationship. Studies such as Worthington and Roshlike (1979) and Hurnden (1979) have attempted to examine actual supervisory relationships and glean important information in understanding what actually occurs in the supervisory process. This certainly seems a more useful trend in increasing the external validity in the findings of this area. Also studies such as Stone's (1980) research have facilitated a greater understanding of how supervisors think and plan for supervision which provides the field with a clear window on the processing of the task of supervision.

On the negative side, supervisory research has dealt minimally with the supervisor and supervisee components in this flowchart. Research on the supervisee has been predominantly on the beginning
trainee. When research has varied trainee levels, the training packages described above have been shown to be ineffectual. Matarazzo (1978) concluded that the training and supervision studies have been predominately geared for the beginner and, therefore, most of the results of these studies are only useful for the first year of training. Matarazzo attributes this lack of research in both these dimensions to the difficulty in obtaining samples large enough to have sufficient statistical power. Because neophytes are more available in greater numbers to test such research packages, the inferences from the results are skewed to accommodate this limitation. Also, the impact of the supervisor on the relationship is quite unknown. It seems that in order to make treatment packages useful to actual supervisory relationships, researchers will need to understand who the supervisor and supervisee are and how they respond in the supervisory relationship. In other words, more descriptive studies on the important aspects of supervision are necessitated.

Another shortcoming of the research is the lack of valid and useful outcome measures. Since research in the past few years has questioned the efficacy of the core conditions on client improvement, the use of these conditions as outcome measures is suspect. Also, since no developmental approaches have advanced the concepts to such rigor, no useful outcome measures for developmental growth have emerged. The final measurement of client improvement appears as the most valid measure for successful supervision but, as mentioned previously, a useful measure is yet to be developed. Outcome is clearly one of the most valuable areas of research but one which is hampered by numerous
extraneous variables.

A final critique deals with the fragmentary nature of the research. Much of the current literature is presented piecemeal with little theoretical underpinnings. Only the client-centered researchers have examined aspects of their theoretical approach to training. Hansen, Pound and Petro (1976) have determined that 17 of 25 studies reviewed from 1971-1976 dealt with facilitative conditions. Their conclusion suggests that more theoretical and empirical conceptualizations are needed to add to the breadth of the literature. The developmental theories may be a source to enrich the field of research but as of yet no researchers have pursued such avenues.

Summary

This chapter provided an amplification of the research and theory relevant to the current study. Clearly the review is not inclusive of the expansiveness of supervision literature but is intended to provide a sampling of the literature in which to further understand the purposes and intentions of this study. Accordingly, the study can in no realistic manner expect to transcend the problems noted in supervisory research. However, many of the limitations have been taken into consideration in the current research project.
Subjects

The supervisors involved in the study were graduate students and faculty members in Counseling Psychology and Counseling and Guidance programs at Ohio State University, the Psychology program at Ohio Dominican College and the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Missouri. The investigator screened supervisors for the supervision hours requirement and obtained thirty participants, ten for each of three supervisory experience levels. (Definitions of each group will be described later in this chapter.) The no experienced group had not given any supervision but had completed one counseling practicum offered through the doctoral program at Ohio State University. The counseling practicum involves ten weeks of counseling with approximately two clients under the direction of two supervisors. Therefore, the no-experienced group had received supervision but had never supervised prior to their involvement in this study. The seven women and three men that comprised the no experienced group (ranging from thirty three to forty-one years old) were all first year graduate students in the Counseling Psychology Doctoral program at Ohio State University. The inexperienced group had all received their master's degree in counseling psychology or in a related field and had two to seven years of counseling experience. This group had
supervised counselors-in-training from sixteen to one hundred hours. The six female and four male members of the inexperienced group ranged from twenty-four to thirty-two years in age and are all currently in doctoral programs in the counseling field. The minimum number of hours for supervision for the inexperienced group was ten and the maximum was one hundred. All of the experienced supervisors have received Ph.D.'s in Counseling Psychology or a related field and nine of the participants were faculty members in a counseling field while one was an administrator/practitioner in a local community mental health center. Six women and four men comprised the group and the supervisors ranged from twenty-five to sixty-seven years old. The supervisors varied from four to twenty-five years of counseling experience with two to eighteen years of supervision experience. The experienced group had done at least five hundred hours of supervision with no upper level limitation on the number of hours.

**Client and Counselor Roles**

The client was a twenty-seven-year-old female who portrayed a college student having problems maintaining relationships. The role was characterized by troublesome and stormy heterosexual relationships lasting brief periods of time. In the counseling session the client expressed her dissatisfaction with the outcome of these relationships. Interpersonally, the confederate client depended on the counselor for assistance and she asked frequently for the counselor to tell her what to do about her problem. She, however, was never satisfied with the counselor's responses and would insistently ask the counselor to
provide alternate solutions.

Although the confederate client rehearsed and practiced her role to facilitate its enactment, the counselor was given no previous information or instructions except the client's biographical data form. With the intent to promote realism, the counselor was asked to perform his counseling skills in an initial interview to the best of his ability and try to simulate an authentic counseling session. The counseling session lasting thirty minutes was audiotaped. Of the thirty participants, twenty-nine stated that the session sounded authentic during a brief follow-up interview. The one participant who thought it was less than authentic was able to use the tape to supervise the counselor.

The counselor, a twenty-six-year-old male, had a Bachelor's degree in social work and is a case manager in a social service agency. Although his training had been primarily in administration, he has had limited experience in one-to-one counseling and has had didactic training on interviewing skills offered through the School of Social Work at the Ohio State University. Therefore, his experience and general knowledge of counseling was similar to that of first year graduate students in the Ohio State University's Counseling Psychology program during their first counseling practicum.

In addition to making the counseling stimulus tape, the confederate counselor received supervision from all thirty research participants. Accordingly, the counselor was given minimal prompting as to what to expect from the various supervisors and was simply told to be responsive to the supervisor's remarks. The intent of this
behavior was to maximize the supervisor's statements such that a sample of supervisory verbal behavior would be obtained. A second and final directive for the counselor's behavior indicated that the supervisee request help as to what to do with this particular client. If the supervisor asked the counselor his opinion regarding counseling this client, he stated his desire for answers as to how to help the client. If the supervisor did not give an opportunity to respond in such a manner, the counselor was requested to directly ask the question, "What should I do with this client?" The intent of this counselor behavior was twofold. First, the counselor was to parallel the client's need for answers in order to examine how the supervisors would respond to what psychoanalytic trainers describe as the parallel process (Ekstein and Wallerstein, 1972). The parallel process occurs in supervision when the counselor displays similar characteristics to those of the client in counseling. Also a second intent was to analyze the specific response of the supervisors to a standardized counselor statement as a measure of the supervisee-supervisor interaction. In post-research interviews with the participants, all agreed that the counselor had accurately performed the directives. The participants perceived the counselor to be comparable to a first term practicum student in ability and attitude towards counseling. Also, the counselor was debriefed regarding the specific design and given results of the Counselor Evaluation Form completed by all of the supervisors.
Instrumentation

Prior to listening to the counseling tape, all supervisors completed a consent form (see Appendix A) and a Biographical Data Form (see Appendix B) requesting demographic, counseling style, supervisory experience, and supervisory style information.

Each participant concluded his/her involvement by responding to several brief evaluation forms. The Counselor Evaluation Form (Loganbill, 1978), an evaluative tool for practicum students at the University of Iowa Counseling Service, was used as a measure of evaluation of the counselor's behavior (see Appendix C). The Supervisory Evaluation Form (Supervisor) and the Supervisory Evaluation Form (Counselor), developed by the investigator, were implemented to evaluate and describe the supervisor's verbal behavior from the supervisor's and the counselor's perspective, respectively (see Appendix D and E). At the time of this research, no reliability nor validity correlations were available for any of the instruments. Therefore, the data analysis of the instrumentation was limited to descriptive information and will be reported in the next chapter.

Procedure

Prior to any involvement in the research, each participant met with the experimenter. The experimenter briefly explained what would be required of them and obtained verbal consent for their participation. A schedule was coordinated with the confederate counselor, participants and experimenter. The supervisors participated in a varied sequence based on the amount of supervisory experience. That
is, a rotation of the order of participation was used to circumvent the counselor's response set for a specific experience level. The research setting for the entire project was various offices in Arps Hall, the building in which the Counseling Psychology program resides and the involvement time ranged from approximately ninety to one hundred twenty minutes. The same counselor was supervised by all the participants; however no more than two subjects participated in one day. The procedure, will be described into five distinct components: 1) Orientation, 2) Tape Listening, 3) Supervisory Planning, 4) Supervision and 5) Debriefing. At the beginning of each component explicit instructions and information (see Appendix F) were provided by the experimenter.

Orientation

All of the participants were screened to determine if they were to be included in one of three experimental groups. The three categories: no experience, inexperienced, and experienced, determined by the experimenter with the assistance of Dr. Richard Russell, Dr. Corinne Cope and Dr. Don Dell, were defined by the number of hours the participants had supervised counselors-in-training, i.e., no hours of supervision for the no experience group; greater than ten hours but less than one hundred hours for the inexperienced group and greater than five hundred hours for the experienced group. The groups were also defined by their educational level, as the no experienced group were graduate students in a counseling field prior to
completion of their master's degree, the inexperienced group attained master's degrees but none had completed his/her Ph.D. and the experienced group had completed Ph.D.'s in counseling psychology or counselor education. If the participants met the criteria and agreed to participate, the experimenter described briefly the listening, planning, supervision and debriefing stages and estimated the time required to complete the research. If the perspective participants did not meet such requirements they were rejected as subjects and debriefed about the specific design. The participants who met the requirements and agreed to participate signed the consent form and completed the Personal Data Form. The investigator interviewed 40 supervisors; 30 of which met the criteria and had time to participate.

**Listening**

Prior to listening to the 30 minute audiotape of the counselor and client, the experimenter informed the supervisors that the session was simulated. In order to promote realism, the participants were asked to try to put themselves in the role of the supervisor for the counselor. They were encouraged to take notes and follow the session carefully because they would be asked to supervise the counselor. In post-research interviews all stated that they could easily put themselves in the supervisory role. They also perceived the counselor to be quite realistic as a beginning practicum student. Some of the supervisors were disappointed that they could not continue the supervision relationship with the counselor beyond the single half hour session. The supervisors were also informed of the skill level
and training of the confederate counselor, i.e., a Bachelor's degree in social work with only didactic training in interviewing skills and limited one-to-one counseling experience. In order to understand the steps taken to promote realism in the counseling simulation, the supervisors were told of the manner in which the tape was constructed. The counselor and client did not rehearse the session and the counselor had no previous information regarding the client except a Biographical Data Form and statement of the problem used by the Student Consultation Service of the Ohio State University Counseling Psychology program. Upon completion of the listening phase, the supervisors contacted the investigator. The investigator provided detailed instructions for the planning phase, the third component of the research procedure.

**Planning**

After listening to the tape, the investigator provided the participants with a thirty minute blank audio cassette which was used during the planning stage. The investigator encouraged the participants to try to keep their thoughts about the counseling interview to themselves until the completion of the research. They then were asked to plan for the supervision session, the task of this phase of the investigation. The method of planning consisted of verbalizing and recording their thought regarding the plans for supervision of the counselor. They were asked to include what they perceived to be integral in the supervision of the counselor both for the ensuing supervision session and pertinent issues for supervision of the
counselor which may be impossible to discuss in the thirty minute interview. No further directions were given to the participants, because the investigator was interested in how the supervisors defined the task and decided what was to be included in the planning session.

Of the twenty participants who have had previous experience in supervision, none of them had planned for their supervision sessions in this manner. Seventeen of the twenty had found this to be helpful and twelve of the seventeen anticipated doing planning in this manner in their actual supervisory sessions. Although three of the twenty supervisors did not find this approach helpful for their supervision with the counselor, none of them perceived the task to be detrimental to the supervisory process. The supervisors were told to continue this procedure until they felt finished and were prepared to supervise; however, they were also informed that only the first thirty minutes were analyzed in the study. Only two participants used the entire thirty minutes in the planning stage. Before the supervisors began to plan, the investigator left the office and requested that the supervisor contact the investigator upon completion. At that time the supervisor would receive additional instructions for the supervision phase of the investigation.

Supervision

Prior to supervision with the counselor, the supervisor was reminded that the session should be limited to thirty minutes. Therefore, the participant should try to end the session in the thirty
minute mark which was the length of the audiotape cassette. Five of the thirty participants talked longer than the thirty minute tape but only thirty minutes could be used for analysis. The supervisors were asked to replicate their style of supervision as much as possible and to include what they felt was important in effective supervision. As with the planning stage, very little structure was provided for the conduct of the supervision. The manner in which the supervisors structured and conceived the supervisory task was analyzed by the language used. The counselor had no prescribed role or style to follow except to be responsive to the supervisors' questions and to request help in dealing with the client's concern. (The purposes of these behaviors have been described.) A separate analysis was used to examine the supervisor's response to the counselor's question. After instructions for the supervision was completed, the investigator introduced the counselor to the supervisor, at which time the supervision session began. When the supervision was completed, the investigator returned and distributed the Counselor Evaluation Form and the Supervisory Evaluation Form (Self) to the supervisor and the Supervisory Evaluation Form (Counselor) to the counselor. When the counselor completed his evaluation, his involvement had ended and the supervisor was debriefed and interviewed after filling out the two questionnaires.

Debriefing

All the participants were informed of the purpose of the study and were debriefed on the methodology and independent and dependent variables within the study. They were also informed of the specific
hypotheses entertained by the experimenter as to the effects of the independent variable on the dependent measures. After a brief discussion on supervision research and the study, the experimenter asked the participants to evaluate the utility of the study. In general, the participants found the study to be interesting and quite challenging. Ninety percent stated that they would be interested in their results of the study. Five of the thirty suggested that the supervision component evoked considerable apprehension and evaluation which was unanticipated. They did feel, however, that they overcame those feelings as the session progressed. Their recommendations and suggestions have been interspersed throughout the chapter and will be included in Chapter 5 as well.

**Independent Variable**

One independent variable was manipulated in the analysis of this study. The variable was the amount of supervisory experience of the supervisors. The variable is defined by the number of hours of supervision given to counselors-in-training and was divided into three levels: 1) the no experienced supervisors with no supervisory experience; 2) the inexperienced supervisors with less than one hundred but more than ten hours of supervisory experience and 3) the experienced supervisors with greater than five hundred hours of supervisory experience. The intent of this grouping was to facilitate generalization to practicum students, masters level supervisors with less than one year of supervision and the Ph.D. level supervisor with at least three years of supervision in academic settings, respectively. Excluded
from the supervision hours variable were hours receiving supervision. Although important in the development of the supervisor, the investigator perceived the reception of supervision as less relevant to this current research than the provision of supervision.

**Measures**

All of the planning and supervision tapes were transcribed into typescripts by the investigator and research assistant. When the typescripts were completed, the investigator divided the text into sentences using Auld and White's (1955) rules or guidelines for dividing interviews into sentences. The guidelines include ten basic rules which attempt to unitize conversation into independent clauses containing a subject and predicate. In attempting to take into account the intricacies of human conversation, Auld and White detail the unitizing process to include verbal utterances, silences, affirmations or negations, and false starts. In amplifying their procedure, Auld and White present brief psychotherapy interchanges and unitize the transcripts. The results of the unitizing is used in a reliability test of the rules for sentence division. The results of their reliability study of a psychotherapy case across nine sessions range from 93% to 99% with two independent raters. Lennard and Bernstein (1960) modified the Auld and White method by unitizing multiple predicates as separate units. The modification was used by the present investigator. The modified Auld and White method was tested by the investigator in a pilot study of supervision transcripts using a test-retest reliability method. The latency between test and re-test was
one week. The resulting reliability score was 96% agreement from
test to retest. In the actual study, a similar test-retest reliability
method was implemented over a four week delay from test to retest.
The results are listed in TABLE 1. The table is read as follows:

Test-retest indicated an agreement of 1992 statements with 127 state-
ments in disagreement from test to retest resulting in a 94% agree-
ment rate. In the supervision statements, 5475 supervisor's state-
ments were in agreement from test to retest with 431 units not in
agreement resulting in a 92.7% agreement rate.

After the typescripts were unitized, each unit was analyzed using
a Modified Supervisory Planning Coding System (Stone, 1980). Stone's
system was based on Peterson's et al. (1978) research on curriculum
planning in education. Peterson and Clark (1978) attempted to vali-
date the procedure in their examination of teacher behavior. Stone
adapted the curriculum planning analysis to accommodate supervisory
planning statements. His analysis system included nine variables
listed in TABLE 2. Stone used his system in a study examining the

planning for a supervision session. Stone's reliability results
indicated that the variables were highly reliable ranging from 87%
to 96% agreement between two variables. The Subject Matter; Higher
Order variable had reliability scores in the low 60% range, which
indicated a lower reliability than the other variables. Therefore,
### TABLE 1
Rate of Agreement for Planning and Supervision Statements in A Test-Retest Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement types</th>
<th>Total number of agreed on units</th>
<th>No. of statements w/disagreements</th>
<th>% of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>5475</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
Supervisory Planning Coding System: Variables and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Outcomes of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>Skill development directly pertaining to a psychological theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>Skill training unrelated to psychologica logical theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Activity or strategy of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Materials in the supervisory environ ment (e.g., tests, tape recorder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Skill level, abilities, fears and concerns of the supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Skill level, abilities, fears and concerns of the supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Does not fit anywhere else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Number of total statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the category was collapsed with the Subject Matter; Lower Order variable for this analysis. Another modification in Stone's system used in this research was an addition of client statement category. Stone asked his supervisors to plan to teach a supervisee empathy skills with neither a defined nor designated supervisee or client. In the present study, the investigator had a very specific stimulus, i.e., a tape of a simulated counseling session. It would seem likely that the supervisor would respond to the client. In the pilot study using this coding system, numerous statements were directed at the client. Hence, a category which deals with statements regarding the client was used in this analysis. TABLE 3 summarizes the modified version of the

Insert Table 3 about here

Supervisory Planning Coding System used in this study. The analysis of the unitized data was accomplished by examining each statement and determining which category best fit the essence of the statement. All statements were coded in only one of the above categories necessitating decision rules developed during a pilot testing of the analysis system. The data was transformed into frequency tables for the variables in planning session tapes, supervision tapes and the response to a standardized question with the supervision session (interaction tapes). The data were rated independently and the interrater reliabilities were calculated for both the planning and supervision data. No reliability measure was calculated for the interaction as it is subsumed in the supervision data. TABLES 4 and
TABLE 3
Modified Supervisory Planning Coding System: Variables and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Outcomes of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>Counseling skills and skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Activity or strategy of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Materials in the supervisory environment (e.g., tests, tape recorders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Skill level, ability and development of supervisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Skill level, abilities, fears and concerns of the supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Client's emotional behavior or cognitive framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Does not fit anywhere else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>Number of total statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 relate the reliability statistics. The reliability coefficients seem to be in a similar range as Stone's research and would lend support to the overall reliability of the Supervisory Planning Coding System.

**Design and Analyses**

A univariate analyses of variance across groups was used to provide descriptive information for the three experience levels on the various instruments completed. The focus of the analysis of the instrumentation was to profile characteristics common to each group's membership.

With regards to the planning session, the supervision session and the supervisors responses to a specific counselor question, interaction, proportions were determined by dividing the total number of responses into the number of responses of each variable for the eight content measures in the planning, supervision and interaction conditions. Three multiple analyses of variance analyzing the three conditions examined group differences of the proportions (Bock 1975). A separate univariate analysis of variance measured the difference between the total number of responses in each condition. Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Hays, 1973) was the post hoc test used to test comparisons within each MANOVA.

A canonical correlation procedure examined the overall linearity and correlation between the planning and supervision variables in the
TABLE 4
Interrater Reliabilities of the Planning Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Content Variable</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject Matter</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Process</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Materials</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisee</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisor</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Interrater Reliabilities of the Supervision Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Coding Variable</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goals</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject Matter</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Process</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Materials</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisee</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervision</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coding system. A matrix was constructed for the interrelations among the nine variables for both the supervision and planning conditions. The scores were based on three matrices examining each of the three experimental conditions. Fisher's $R$ to $Z$ transformation (Cohen and Cohen, 1975) explored a comparison of correlations across groups. Selected correlations were used for this post hoc analysis.

**Hypotheses**

Due to the exploratory nature of this research, several hypotheses were advanced. In comparing this research to Stone's (1980) research on supervisory planning, several predictions were made. First, both the type and amount of supervisory and planning verbal behavior should differ across levels of supervisory experience. Second, the length and type of response to a standardized trainee statement (i.e., the interaction component) should vary with each group of supervisors. Third, a correlation should exist between the development and the implementation of a supervisory plan or strategy of intervention; that is, a relationship between the planning stages and the supervision is expected to occur on a number of content variables. Also, one major purpose of the research is to present descriptive information as to what occurs in supervision and how supervisors devise strategies prior to supervisory sessions. Examining supervisory profiles at three levels of experience, may lend insight into a developmental progression of supervisory skills and possible directions for the training of supervisors. Therefore, the investigator will attempt to amplify and expand these hypotheses with a presentation of the data.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will contain four major sections. The first will describe the biographical information and the counselor and supervisor evaluations. The data will be presented as descriptive representations of the three experience levels in supervision. Following the data, an interpretive discussion will be presented.

The second section deals with the analysis of the language in the planning, supervision and interaction components of the research. The results will be presented as an analysis of the language across experience levels and also as profiles of typical supervisory language of the three types of supervisors represented in this study. A discussion of the meaning of these results will conclude this portion of the presentation.

The third section will present correlational data on the language of supervisors from planning to supervision. The analysis will include an overall linear comparison and, also, a comparison among the individual content variables. A discursive analysis of the data will conclude this data presentation.

The final section will include a synthesis of the data in these various analyses. Inferential interpretations of the results will highlight the overall impressions perceived by the investigator. It is also understood that since the data are descriptive in nature,
some of the results will not fit together cogently. Hence, no attempt will be made to force together the results without prior precautions to the reader.

**Self Description of Participants**

The Biographical Data Form (see Appendix B) gathered information on demographic, counseling experience and style, supervisory experience and style, and educational experience. An analysis of the age variable showed that the experienced group averaged 35.8 years old, the no experienced averaged 28.7 years old and the inexperienced group averaged 27.3 years old. The comparison between the groups' ages was insignificant at the .05 level with the F (227) = 2.79, p < .0790.

In terms of counseling information, TABLE 6 summarizes both the descriptive and comparative data. In a post hoc analysis using the Duncan's Multiple Range (Winer, 1971) the experienced group had significantly more years of counseling experience (p < .05) than either the inexperienced or no experienced groups. The inexperienced and the no experience groups were not significantly different. The counseling style variables listed in the table indicate the percentage of the time that the participants used the style in their counseling. With the client-centered counseling style the same post hoc analysis indicated that the experienced group preferred the client-centered approach significantly less than the other two groups and the no experienced group used the style significantly more than the other two.
**TABLE 6**

*Supervisor's Counseling Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of counseling experience</strong></td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>10.033</td>
<td>12.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic Counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gestalt counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client-centered counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reality counseling style (%)</strong></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other styles (%)</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Group 1 = no experienced supervisors (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced supervisors (N = 10); Group 3 = experienced supervisors (N = 10).*

*p < .05, **p < .001*
In terms of the supervisory information TABLE 7 presents the information from the Biographical Data Form. Comparing the groups in a post hoc test, the three groups differed significantly \((p < .05)\) in the number of years receiving supervision with the experienced group receiving the most supervision; followed by the inexperienced group and finally the no experienced group. Also, the experienced group has supervised significantly more years than the other two groups but no difference was found between the inexperienced and the no experienced groups. The number of supervisees trained by the three groups also was significantly different. The experienced group supervised more trainees and had a significantly greater number of supervisory hours than the other groups. There was no significant difference between the no experienced and the inexperienced groups on either category. These findings, essentially, confirm the selection process defined by the investigator.

**Evaluations of Participants and Counselor**

The following data was collected at the conclusion of the study. The participants completed an evaluation of the counselor, the Counselor Evaluation Form (Loganbill, 1978) and of themselves, the Supervisory Evaluation (Self). The counselor, also, evaluated the supervisor's performance by completing the Supervisory Evaluation (Counselor). The following will be a report on results of these instruments. TABLE 8 presents both the comparative and descriptive data on the analysis of
### TABLE 7

**Supervisor's Supervision Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Category</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of years receiving supervision</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>24.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of years giving supervision</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of supervisees</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>6.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours giving supervision</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>2143.0</td>
<td>7.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic supervisory style (%)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential supervisory style (%)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling supervisory style (%)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback supervisory style (%)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced supervisors (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced supervisors (N = 10); Group 3 = experienced supervisors (N = 10):

**p < .01; ***p < .001**
the counselor's behavior as evaluated by the supervisors in the Counselor Evaluation Form. Since none of the analyses of variance proved to be significant, no post hoc analysis was implemented with this instrument. The analysis of the results indicated consistent evaluations of the counselor across all groups.

In TABLE 9 the data from the Supervisory Evaluation (Counselor) instrument which surveyed the counselor's evaluation of the supervisor's behavior and analysis of the content of the supervisory session are presented. In the post hoc analysis of the significant ANOVA on the overall rating of the supervisor, the two groups with supervisory experience were rated significantly higher by the counselor than the no experience group. However, the counselor did not perceive any difference between the inexperienced and the experienced groups in overall performance. The counselor found no supervisory group to be significantly more helpful in dealing with the client. Also, the counselor did not perceive any differences between the groups regarding the percentage of time spent discussing various areas in supervision.

The final instrument, the Supervisory Evaluation (Self), is analyzed on TABLE 10. The only significant variable in the supervisor's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual patterns</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual flexibility</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual hypothesis generation</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate understanding</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client trust</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client's language</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondefensiveness in the supervision</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor responsibility</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not deferent</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question types</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client responsibility</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced (N = 10); Group = experienced (N = 10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helped with client</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time discussing client</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling skills</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling relationship</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory relationship</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced (N = 10); Group 3 = experienced (N = 10).

**p < .01
### TABLE 10

**Supervisor's Self Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical of style</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful to supervisee</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhered to the plan</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time discussing client</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling skills</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling relationship</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory relationship</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced (N = 10); Group 3 = experienced (N = 10).

*p < .05
evaluation of their behavior was the percentage of the supervisory session discussing the counseling relationship. In a post hoc analysis of group differences, the no experienced group spent significantly more time than either the inexperienced and experienced supervisors (p < .05) discussing the counseling relationship. No significant difference was noted between the two groups with supervisory experience. No other questions on the evaluation differentiated the supervisory groups.

Discussion of Instrumentation Findings

In a discussion of the results of this instrumentation, several precautions are noted. First, since no actual validity or reliability studies have examined the efficacy of the instrumentation, it is difficult to interpret the meaning of the results obtained. However, the instrumentation has face validity based on the analysis of the investigator and several of his colleagues. A second precaution deals with the statistical procedures used with the data. In using a series of univariate analyses, the probability that any given differences in the items being significant by chance alone is equal to the alpha level of significance used, i.e., p < .05. Therefore some of the significant findings may be due to chance. The reader must keep in mind the limitations of the data and the analysis in interpreting the findings.

In examining variables which may only also contribute to the group differences in addition to the amount of supervisory experience, a group of variables emerge. That is, such variables as the supervisor's
age, amount of counseling experience, amount of supervision received, the counseling style and the supervisory style may also contribute to the differences between the groups in addition to the amount of supervision experience. In terms of the age of the supervisors, the findings suggest that the variable is not a mediating factor in the differences between the groups. However, the amount of counseling experience and the amount of supervision received do significantly separate the groups. The results indicate that the most experienced group had significantly greater counseling experience than both the other groups; however, no differences were found between the other two groups in counseling experience. A second confounding variable is the amount of supervision received, as the findings suggest that the experienced group received significantly more than the other two groups and the inexperienced group received more supervision than the no experienced group. In addition to supervisory experience, these results suggest that the findings of the study may also be due to the amount of counseling experience and the amount of supervisory reception. However, the differences noted in these variables may also be simply descriptions of practicum peer supervisors, masters level supervisors and Ph.D. level supervisors in academic settings. Therefore, in addition to experience levels, these three groups may differ on these variables which may be a clearer definition of the various types of supervisors available in training programs.

In the findings of counseling style, the no experience group predominant styles are client-centered (37.5%) and cognitive (26.0%)
approaches. The inexperienced group blends the client-centered (23.0%), the cognitive (23.5%) and the behavioral (23.0%) approaches in their predominant style. The experienced group's counseling style blends the cognitive (33.0%) with the behavioral approaches (24.0%) as the major counseling styles. In comparing across groups, the client-centered group was the only distinguishing style with the no experienced group significantly greater in their usage of the client-centered style than the other two groups. Also, the experienced group associates with the client-centered approach less than the other two groups. It would seem that there is a move away from the client-centered techniques as a counselor becomes more experienced in counseling and supervision. Based on the results achieved in this analysis, the counselors seem to adopt a behavior approach to counseling. An alternate interpretation deals with the type of training and coursework completed at the various levels of training. In the early stages, counselor-trainees receive basic skill training which includes predominantly the client-centered skills. As the trainees develop, they are introduced to a wide variety of new techniques which are tested and examined for their personal style of counseling. As the integration of techniques occurs at the Ph.D. level, the counselor focusses in on several techniques which accommodates their view of counseling. This process described in Chapter 2 may account for the results achieved from the counselor style item.

The stylistic differences between the groups may also have an impact on the manner in which the groups would conduct their supervision session. If this were the case, then the counseling style
would be an indicator of group differences in addition to supervisory experience on the dependent measure. Previous research would indicate that stylistic differences in counseling have no effect on supervisory behavior (Demos and Zuwaylif, 1962). Also, in the analysis of stated supervisory approaches of the three groups, the findings indicate no differences in the group's stated supervisory behavior. Therefore it would be reasonable to conclude that the counseling style differences should have little or no appreciable effect on the group's planning and supervision behavior.

On the Counselor Evaluation Form, the results reveal no significant differences across the groups in their ratings of the counselor's performance. The results suggest that the counselor's ability was perceived to be similar across the three supervisory groups. In examining the data, supervisors rated the counselor slightly higher (from approximately 3.5 to 4.2) in the counselor's supervisory behavior than in his counseling behavior (2.4 - 3.2 on a 5.0 scale). The results suggest that the counselor appeared non-defensive and open in supervision but less competent in his counseling. From the investigator's experience as a supervisor, openness in supervision with the low skill levels in counseling is typical of first year counseling practicum students which is supportive of the role that the counselor was portraying.

In both the Supervisory Evaluation (Counselor) and the Supervisory Evaluation (Self), very few significant results emerge. However, in the counselor's evaluation of the supervisor, the counselor rated the experienced and the inexperienced supervisor significantly
higher than the no experienced group on overall performance. However, there was no difference between these two experienced groups. The results suggest that the counselor was more satisfied with supervisors with previous supervisory experience than the group with no experience. The results seem to be somewhat contrary to the efficacy of the peer supervision model in comparison to professional supervision. The results suggest that previous supervision does make a difference in the counselors rating of overall performance. In the analysis of supervision time, the counselor perceived that all three groups predominately discussed the client, supervisee, and counseling skills in the supervision session. None of the comparisons across groups in the analysis of the use of supervision time was significant.

However, in the supervisor's self-analysis, the percentage of the supervisory time discussing the counseling relationship differed among the groups. The no experienced group said they spent significantly more time than the groups with supervisory experience discussing the counseling relationship. However the perception of the counselor was somewhat different than the supervisors' self perception in that regard. It is difficult to define or describe why the no experienced supervisor would perceive that they discussed the relationship; no explanation will be ventured for the results. As a whole the supervisors across the groups were quite similar in their evaluations of themselves. Also, in general, the supervisors perceived that they accomplished what they had planned and performed fairly well in the supervisory session.
Content Analysis of the Supervisors Language

The main portion of the study's analysis deals with the three content analyses completed on the planning, supervision and interaction components of the research. Each of the multiple analysis of variance will be detailed and described and will be followed by a discursive analysis of the meaning of the three analyses.

In the analysis of the Supervisory Planning Coding System for planning for supervision, no overall group effects were found as Wilkes criteria indicated $F(18, 38) = .73; p(F) < .7634$. Table 11 describes the results for each of the planning coding content variables. The MANOVA analyses examined the proportions for all but the productivity variable. On a separate analysis of variance, productivity resulted in no significant group effects; $F(2, 27) = .20$ and $p < F = .8163$.

In the analysis of the language of the supervisors in the thirty minute session with the counselor, an overall group effect was significant as the Wilkes Criterion indicated $F(18,38) = 2.59$ and $p(F) < .0098$ with significance at $p < .01$. Table 12 presents the means, mean proportions and the F-Statistic for the supervision categories.

The Duncan's Multiple Range Test for the subject matter variable indicated that the two groups with supervisory experience evoked significantly more statements than the no experienced group ($p < .05$).
### TABLE 11

Planning Session Analysis:
Means, Proportions and F-Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced, Group 2 = inexperienced; Group 3 = experienced
### TABLE 12

**Supervision Categories Analysis**

Means, Proportions and F-Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>3.72*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced; Group 2 = inexperienced; Group 3 = experienced.

*p < .05
However no significant difference was found between the inexperienced and the experienced groups. In the post hoc analysis, the experienced and inexperienced groups stated significantly more supervisor-oriented statements than the no experienced group.

The final significant variable, productivity, revealed the inexperienced and experienced groups made significantly more total statements than the no experienced supervisors ($p < .05$). Also the no experienced supervisors stated significantly fewer total statements than the inexperienced supervisor ($p < .05$).

The Multiple Analyses of Variance for the response to counselor's request for assistance (interaction) indicated no overall group effects with the Wilkes criterion indicating $F (18,38) = .70$, $p (F) < .7874$. TABLE 14 presents the mean; mean proportions and F-Statistic; for the interaction analysis. Even though no overall group significance in

| Insert Table 13 about here |

the MANOVA, post hoc comparisons were tested with no significant results. In the univariate analysis of variance of the productivity variable the results revealed significance with $F (2,27) = 3.67$ and $p (F) < .0389$. In the Duncan's Multiple Range Test for group difference the inexperienced and the experienced supervisors stated significantly more total statements than the no experienced supervisors ($p < .05$). In addition, the no experienced groups stated significantly fewer statements than the inexperienced group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced; Group 2 = inexperienced; Group 3 = experienced.

*p < .05
Discussion of the Planning, Supervision and Interaction Content Analyses

The major analysis of the supervision language reveals numerous striking findings. In attempting to extend Stone's (1980) research, it appears that these results in no way replicate his research results. Stone had found that the more experienced supervisors stated more total and more supervisee responses than either of his inexperienced or graduate supervisors. He also found that the predominant planning statement for all groups was the process statements. In this research, it appears that the planning statements did not differentiate for the groups and, further, the most frequent kind of statement for all the groups was a supervisee-oriented statement. The process-oriented statement in the planning session was the fourth most frequent statement with client and subject matter-oriented statements second and third, respectively. The results suggest that when presented with a very specific stimuli, i.e., a counselor and a recording of a counseling interview, rather than verbal instructions as in Stone's research, the supervisors perform quite similarly regardless of experience level. Since the specific stimulus is more similar to an actual supervisory session than verbal instructions, a possible conclusion is that the planning statements of supervisors are quite similar when faced with a more realistic supervisory stimulus. An alternative explanation for the findings is that since planning was a new experience for all the participants, the novelty of the task may be the cause of the lack of significance.
In comparing the results of the planning statements to the supervision statements, supervisee oriented responses appear most frequently in all but in the inexperienced group’s supervision. The no experienced group’s most frequent category was the subject matter followed by the supervisee variable. The next two most frequent categories for both planning and supervision modes are subject matter and client statements. This overall descriptive finding suggests that no matter the quantity of the supervision experience, all of the supervisors plan and implement the plan in a similar fashion. The amount of experience seems to have little effect on how the supervisor devises and adheres to a strategy for supervision. In comparison to the developmental model presented in Chapter 2, it would seem that at least in terms of the quantity of the types of planning statements, no developmental stages can be described from these results. One possible explanation may be that perhaps developmental differences in supervisory strategies cannot be measured by a quantity of statements but of the quality of the statements. Undoubtedly, the content analysis used in the current research project describes the statements in terms of frequency. Since no research has examined the relationship of the quantity of statements to the quality, it is difficult to determine if the quality of the planning language is not included in the analysis.

In the analysis of the language in the supervision phase of the investigation, several significant differences in the groups emerge. Both the subject matter and the supervisor statements differentiate the groups with supervisory experience from the no experience groups,
although no significant differences are found between the inexperienced and experienced supervisors on these variables. The results suggest that those with supervisory experience facilitate self disclosure and direct teaching of therapeutic skills more than those with no supervisory experience. One might infer that the more experienced supervisor blends the didactic skill building model with personal revelation which is consistent with the blending of didactic and experiential techniques described by Patterson (1964). In a developmental analysis, one might also infer that as the supervisor attains confidence and competence in his/her supervisory skills, the supervisor is more willing to provide an enriched model of supervision. The enriched model includes personal disclosures regarding the supervisor's growth as a counselor and a supervisor and training of therapeutic skills necessitated as the foundation for effective counseling interventions. The blend of the supervisor's personal statements and didactic skill-building would seem to facilitate an effective supervisory relationship as described by Mueller and Kell (1971) in their description of the supervisory process.

In addition, the analysis of the supervision language revealed that inexperienced and experienced supervisors provided more total supervision statements than the no experienced supervisors. The results suggest that experience may have a parabolic effect on the amount of supervisory talk. Insufficient and too much supervisory talk is unsatisfactory to the counselor. However, a range between these two extremes appears to be preferred by the counselor. The no experienced supervisor presents a limited, somewhat impoverished
model of supervision to the counselor as Stone (1980) has suggested. As the supervisor gains more experience she/he enriches the supervisory session with personal statements and didactic training for the beginning practicum student. As the supervisor consolidates a supervisory style, the need to talk is lessened. The experienced supervisor may have found a balance between too little and too much expostulation in the supervisory session. Also the quality of the experienced supervisors statements may also differentiate them from the other two groups but would not be evidenced from this analysis.

In combining the results of the supervision session, it appears that the experienced supervisor has achieved a balance with the amount of talk facilitative to the supervisee's growth. With the balance of the amount of talk, the experienced supervisor may spend more time discussing the tasks of becoming an effective counselor with the expression of personal issues which may increase the intimacy of the supervisory relationship. The self-disclosures may also model effective communication patterns for the counselor-in-training to use in the counseling relationship. Developmentally the beginning supervisor initially gains confidence in his/her supervisory skills to discuss him/herself and therapeutic skills in the supervisory relationship. As the supervisor integrates the newly found supervisory skills in his/her supervision identity, the need to relate as much information becomes lessened. Perhaps in a sense, the experienced supervisor has learned to provide the appropriate amount and type of communications in which to be effective.
In the final analysis of the language used in response to a specific counselor request for assistance, no overall significant group difference was found. This suggests that as a whole the supervisors did not differ on the type and amount of statements they made in response to the counselor's request. The type of response for all groups focused on the counseling skills, supervisee and client which is consistent with the most frequent type of responses in the planning and supervision sessions. As a whole, it appears that the supervisors responded by providing an answer for the counselor's request for assistance. In psychoanalytic supervision, the supervisors paralleled the counselor's behavior with the client in providing didactic information upon request.

One significant variable in the interaction analysis deals with the productivity of the specific response to the counselor. The results indicate that the experienced and inexperienced supervisors stated more responses than the no experienced supervisor and the no experienced supervisor talked significantly less than the inexperienced supervisor. The results imply that the no experienced supervisor provides a limited, less involved response. With small amounts of supervision, the inexperienced supervisor is expansive in his/her response to help the supervisee. With more experience and perhaps a greater sense of a supervisor identity, the experienced supervisor has learned to provide a significantly longer response than the no experienced but not as much as the inexperienced supervisor. Again, the quality of the experienced supervisor's response may also differentiate the groups.
Correlational Analysis

The third analysis included a canonical correlation to analyze the overall relationship of the planning to the supervision statements. Also correlation coefficients for every combination of variables for each group will be described. The canonical correlation analysis was designed to examine the overall linearity between the planning and supervision categories. The canonical analysis lists the maximum correlation and tests the significance in a chi-square analysis. The most significant vector in the analysis resulted in a canonical correlation of .909 with a chi-square of 95.35 at 81 df. The chi-square was insignificant as $p \text{ (chi-square)} = .1317$. Therefore the overall correlation between the two sets of variables was insignificant. With overall insignificance, the separate category to category correlations must be interpreted with great caution. TABLE 14 presents the correlations and their probability levels for the no
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experienced group (see Chapter 3 for definitions of the variables). Only the significant correlations will be listed in each of the correlation analyses for the three groups. In the analysis most of the relationships are strongly and moderately strong positive correlations. The planning counseling skills with the supervision supervisor oriented categories is the only negative correlation in the analysis, with the correlation coefficient ($r = .72071; p < .05$). The planning and supervision goals statement are the only significant correlation of the same categories across modalities ($r = .63927; p < .05$).
TABLE 14

Correlations Between Planning and Supervision Sessions of the No-Experienced Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Planning Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Supervisee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.639*</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>-.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>-.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.645*</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>-.721*</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.674*</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.409</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.828**</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01 (N = 10)
Table 14 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15 represents the correlations of the inexperienced supervisory group (M = 10). See definitions of each variable in Chapter 3. The results indicate a variety of strongly and moderately strong correlations between the eighteen variables. Only the planning process is significantly correlated with the same variable in the supervision modality (r = .72237; p < .05).

In analysis of the experienced supervisor the significant categories are listed in TABLE 16. As with the two previous analyses, a mixture of strongly and moderately strong correlations exist in the content analysis categories for the experienced supervisors. The only correlation between the planning and supervision modalities of the same category is the goal-oriented statements (r = .76; p < .05).

Using an r to z transformation (Mendenhall and Ramsey, 1973) to test the differences between significant correlations of the same variables across the planning and supervision sessions, no significant differences were found (see TABLE 17).

Discussion of the Correlational Findings

In discussing the results of the correlational analysis, a precaution must be repeated. Since the overall correlational analysis
TABLE 15

Correlations Between Planning and Supervision Sessions of the Inexperienced Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Planning Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Supervisee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.722*</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>-.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>.827**</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>-.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.681*</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>-.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.470</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>-.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01 (N = 10)
Table 15 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-.419</td>
<td>-.403</td>
<td>-.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.485</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.844**</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.354</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01 (N = 10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Planning Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Supervisee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.759*</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05
Table 16 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>-.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.417</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-.579</td>
<td>-.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.758*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05
TABLE 17

Correlational Difference Tests for Significant Common Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p (1+2)</th>
<th>p (1+3)</th>
<th>p (2+3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST STAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST STAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Group 1 = no experienced (N = 10); Group 2 = inexperienced (N = 10); Group 3 = experienced (N = 10)
was insignificant, the results of the five hundred thirteen correlations must be analyzed with great caution. Perhaps the results are at best suggestive of patterns in the relationships of the variables rather than information on the actual correlation of variables. As a whole the results of the correlational analysis suggest that there is very little if any direct correlation between the same categories in the planning and supervision. Only the goals category for the no experienced and experienced supervisors were positively correlated. In the inexperienced category, the process variables were positively related. This would suggest that the planning tasks do not correspond to the supervisors verbal behavior in supervision regardless of the experience level. These results suggest that the same categories of the planning and supervision session are minimally correlated. The planning statements do not mirror the statements that occur in supervision. This leads to several possible conclusions. First, the supervisors may be ineffectual in implementing any plan devised which would indicate that there is very little relationship between their cognitions regarding supervision and their actual verbal behavior in the sessions. A second inference suggests that the number of positively correlated variables common in both supervision and planning may not be an accurate outcome measure for successful implementation of a supervisory plan. Perhaps there are other relationships between the variables which would be more suggestive of successful implementation. It is difficult to determine which of these conclusions are more accurate for the current data. Suffice to say, the relationship between the planning and supervision variables was not evidenced in
this data and that the experience level of supervisor hours was not an influential determinant.

In comparing the correlations of the three groups, a general finding indicates that the number of correlations decrease with the increased amount of experience, i.e., twenty four correlations for the no experienced group, twenty one correlations for the inexperienced group and seventeen for the experienced supervisors. Also, the number of planning variables related to supervision variables decrease with the amount of experience; six for the no experienced, four for the inexperienced, and three for the experienced groups. These results suggest that perhaps the planning and supervision activities are more independent events for the more experienced supervisor. A plan for supervision may have less effect on what occurs in supervision, as the experienced supervisor may have less need to devise a plan to be effective. In a developmental schema, the supervisor might initially need to use a plan for supervision. As the supervisor gains mastery over the supervisory task, the supervisor is less apt to be limited to a plan devised prior to supervision. This result may suggest that the more experienced supervisor becomes more responsive to the counselor and therefore can be more authentic and less rigid in the supervisory relationship. Although this analysis is speculative, the area of supervisory responsiveness may be a fruitful line of future inquiry.

In summarizing the results of the correlational analysis, no clearly defined relationship existed between the planning and the supervisory statements. The experience level seems to have only a meager effect on this finding; as with greater experience, the
Supervisor is less likely to relate to a plan for supervision. Again, the results of this analysis are at best suggestive and should be interpreted with great care.

Summary

The most striking results of the study are the differences found between the experience levels on the language of supervision. More specifically, the differences occur in the subject matter, supervisor and productivity categories (for definitions, see Chapter 3). Supervisors with greater experience tended to increase the number of statements in these three categories than supervisors with no previous supervision experience. Although no clear outcome for successful supervision was used; the counselor's evaluation indicated the greatest satisfaction with the experienced and inexperienced supervisor. Therefore, as the supervisor develops the skills of supervision, she/he is more willing to provide didactic training along with revealing him/herself to the counselor which may increase the counselor's satisfaction with supervision. In terms of the supervisor's development, the supervisor gains confidence in his/her abilities and can provide personal information along with the necessary skill training. In line with Stone's (1980) finding the experienced supervisor also provides a more enriched environment by increasing the supervisor productivity then with the no experienced supervisor. However, the stages of becoming an effective supervisor suggest that the novice supervisor presents too much information and although more helpful than too little to the trainee, the inexperienced supervisor has not effectively learned
the amount of talk that leads to greater trainee satisfaction. The experienced supervisor has learned to provide a more enriched environment than the no experienced supervisor but not too enriched as, perhaps, the novice supervisor. Also, the results indicated the greater the supervisory experience the greater the number of statements in response to the counselor's question for assistance.

Unlike the results of the Stone (1980) study, supervisors with three levels of experience were not differentiated by their planning behavior. This may be suggestive of the differences of the planning tasks of the two studies. As the planning becomes more realistic to an actual supervision session, the experience level of the supervisor has less impact on the type and amount of the planning language. Therefore, planning appears to be less distinguishing of the growth and development of the supervisor.

Another result which does not provide clear information regarding the development of the supervisor is the correlations between the planning and supervision behaviors. Actually no clear distinction can be drawn as the overall correlation for each of the groups was insignificant. Suggestive data indicates a very low number of correlations with the same categories in both the supervision and planning verbal behaviors. Some speculation of the results suggests that the experienced supervisors is more responsive in the supervision session and less limited to structure of a supervision plan.

Summary results, however, suggest that all the supervisors talked predominantly about the supervisee, the counseling tasks and the client in both the supervision and planning. Overall, the supervisors
adhered to their plans quite well and that all the supervisors responded quite similarly in both modalities.

In summary, the research presents suggestive information that experience in supervision differentiates the verbal behavior in supervision but not in devising a plan. This finding may also reveal a step-wise developmental schema for the growth of a supervisor. As the supervisor learns the craft of supervision, she/he has the confidence and competence to present personal information as well as an increased amount of skill training. This didactic-experiential melding may be the most effective manner in which to supervise the beginning counselor and may be the result of the growth of the supervisory identity.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The burgeoning interest in supervision has been indicated by the amount of supervision research occurring within the past decade (Matarazzo, 1978). The American Psychological Association (1957) has issued mandates for the requirements for effective supervisors in the field of psychology. Theories of supervision present models in order to explain this important task. The client-centered theorists (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) stress the counselor's training to be aware of his/her own feelings and incorporate the necessary and sufficient conditions (e.g., warmth, empathy and genuineness). The psychoanalytic theorists (Ekstein and Wallerstein, 1971) emphasize the need for psychoanalytic trainees to gain awareness into the resistances which impede psychotherapeutic effectiveness. An emerging group of theorists (Russell, 1979 and Hogan, 1964) have posited the need for trainees to matriculate through various developmental stages to attain sufficient skills in becoming an autonomous counselor. Research in the field has predominately been supportive of training packages in their effectiveness of teaching various counselor skills (Hansen and Warner, 1978). As a whole, the manner in which to conduct training has become quite well developed with well defined variables and structured training packages (Matarazzo, 1978).
Although a variety of studies have reported the efficacy of the training packages, less information is available on an integral component of training and supervision, i.e., the supervisor. The supervisor's tasks range from support (Rogers, 1957) to insight (Hogan, 1964) to teaching (Altucher, 1968). Supervisory styles have also been examined and results suggest that teaching along with affective support leads to the best acquisition of counseling skills. However, when examining the stylistic dimension, in actual settings (Smith, 1974), the supervisor's techniques and styles were less distinguishable.

In an examination of the cognitive processing of supervision, Stone (1980) found that supervisors with varied amounts of experience differed on the amount of processing done in a supervisory planning session. The supervisor's experience may also be a means by which to define a model for supervisor development. Cope (1980) describes a developmental schema which is comparable to that of the trainee's growth as a counselor. Research on the experience level of the supervisor has been quite meager and still less have attempted to define developmental stages in accordance with varied amounts of experience.

The purpose of the current study was to examine supervisory experience as a means to describe developmental stages of supervisors.

The study used a quasi-supervisory and planning session as the major component of the design. The supervisors varying in experience and training were divided into three groups: no experience, inexperienced, and experienced. The no experienced group was comprised of ten first year graduate students in counseling psychology with no supervisory experience. The inexperienced group were predominately post-
masters graduate students in the counseling field with less than one year of supervision. The experienced supervisors were Ph.D.'s with two or more years of supervisory experience. All subjects listened to the same thirty-minute audiotape of a counseling session. The counseling session was simulated by a confederate counselor and client. At the conclusion of the tape, the supervisors planned for an ensuing supervision session with the confederate counselor by "thinking aloud" on an audiotape. The participants concluded the study by conducting a thirty-minute supervision session with the counselor. All supervisors completed several brief questionnaires and were interviewed by the investigator regarding the efficacy of the study. The planning and supervision audiotapes were analyzed using a modified Supervision Planning Coding System (Stone, 1980). Using a series of three multiple analyses of variance (i.e., planning, supervision and interaction), the study examined the effects of supervisory experience on the language within the planning and supervision sessions.

The primary findings was the overall significance of the language in the supervision session and the lack of significance with the language in the planning session across experience levels. Contrasted to Stone's (1980) results, the planning variable did not significantly differ in the supervisory groups and consequently was not a useful determinant of the effects of experience in supervision. One potential explanation for this finding was that the planning stage of the present study used a very specific stimulus, counselor and counseling tape, as compared to the Stone study. Therefore, when planning for a specific task, the supervisor's experience plays little significance as to the content and quantity of the activity.
In the supervision phase of the project, the groups with supervision experience made significantly more statements about themselves, counseling skills and in total than the supervisors with no experience. Also the counselor was more satisfied with the experienced and inexperienced supervisors than no experienced participants. These results suggest that a combination of self-disclosures and didactic training provide a more productive and enriched supervisory experience. In developmental terms, the novice supervisor is somewhat reluctant to share personal insights and deal with the teaching of counseling. However, as the supervisor attains experience and perhaps a sense of security in the role of the supervisor, she/he will be more willing to self-disclose which may enhance the intimacy of the relationship. At this stage the supervisor also provides direct training regarding the counseling skills necessary for the beginning counselor to be effective. This finding supports the need for structure for the beginning counselor which several authors suggest is essential (Russell, 1979 and Hogan, 1964). The findings also indicate that the combination of didactic with self-revelation which may be comparable to Patterson's (1967) blending of didactic with experiential supervisory style may be best received by the supervisee. Therefore, in training supervisors, the integration of the teaching of counseling with relationship-enriching personal disclosures will lead to the greatest satisfaction for the novice counselor.

As with any research project, the results must be hedged by the limitations of the design. One of the limitations worth noting is the sample size within the cells of the various statistical procedures.
With an N of ten per cell the statistical power of the tests was lessened. Due to the lower power, for example, the lack of significance within the planning procedures may be partly a function of insignificant cell size rather than the experience variable. In Matarazzo's (1978) critique of training research, she states that low sample size of experienced counselors has forced many researchers to use only beginning trainees as participants. The result of this exclusivity of sampling has limited the breadth of application of teaching packages. In the current research project, the investigator was confronted with the same difficulty, but amplified, with supervisors. However, in weighing the cost-benefit of pursuing this line of research, it was concluded that the limitations of small samples was less important than the implications of the research design, as a whole.

A second limitation deals with the utility of the Supervisory Planning Coding System which may be less appropriate for analysis of the planning and supervision than for educational settings for which it was originally designed. As with any content analysis system, the process of unitizing conversation and denoting frequencies of various types of statements results in limiting the richness of the language in supervision. As an initial step in examining supervisory language the procedure may be helpful but with greater sophistication in content analyses, perhaps the richness can be gleaned out of the language. Also, since the specific analysis system originated in secondary school curriculum development, the transfer to the supervision relationship is clearly not defined. Hopefully, as a result of studies such as
this, useful components of the design along with additional factors may facilitate greater sophistication in the analysis for the language of supervision.

The necessity of planning behavior in the supervision provides another limitation of the study. The planning behavior was quite unknown to most of the supervisors within this study. It is difficult to determine the effect of an event such as planning on supervision. Perhaps the planning adds an artificial stimulus which may have affected the supervisor's language within supervision, further limiting the generalizability to actual supervision. Also the relationship between thinking aloud and actual planning before and during supervision is also unknown. Even though the impact of planning is unknown, the interviews of the majority of the participants found the task to be helpful and stimulating.

A final limitation of the study is evidenced in the overall design. The investigator attempted to parallel the supervision paradigm of the Ohio State University's Counseling Psychology program. The intent was to stimulate an actual supervision session which would occur in the beginning stages of a counseling practicum. Using an extrapolation of Munley's (1974) quasi-counseling designs, the investigator devised a "quasi-supervision" design in order to increase the external validity of the results. However, the attempt to increase the external validity is purely speculative. In other words, the generalizability of the study is limited to the extent which "quasi-supervision" replicates actual supervision sessions. Therefore in making inferences to applied settings, the manner in which supervisors in the study
differed from supervisors in actual supervisory relationships represents the limitations of this design. However, in examining the merit of the study relative to the literature, the design offers a unique bridge between field studies and the psychological experiment.

In context of these limitations, the following recommendations for future research and current training and supervision practices appear pertinent. The first recommendation addresses the sample size issue. Since most training programs are comparable to Ohio State's with the number of supervisors at various experience levels, perhaps sampling various colleges or training centers, e.g., Veteran's Administration Hospitals or community mental health centers might provide additional supervisors for increased statistical power. In addition, sampling different populations will increase the generalizability to the population of supervisors. Overcoming the sampling program may be easily managed by locating various supervisory populations available for research.

The question of the validity of the Supervision Planning Coding System is somewhat more difficult to respond to than the sample size issue. The data of the two studies using this content analysis system (i.e., Stone, 1980; and the current study) suggests that the system may be useful. However, future studies may need to eliminate several categories such as materials and goals and add categories more relevant to supervision (e.g., client or counseling process statements). Also, in order to expand the richness of the supervisory data, additional content analyses including relationship measures may highlight the design. Such analyses as the Computer Assisted Language Analysis
System (Pepinski, et al., 1974) may add to the qualitative analyses of the current design.

The utility of the planning variable has yet to clearly be determined. Stone's (1980) findings are quite contrasted to those of the current study which questions the utility of the pre-session planning. Also, the impact of the planning on supervision is also undetermined. Recommendations for future research should include studies which compare supervision analyses with and without pre-session planning to determine its impact on supervision. Also, further studies comparing planning with various types of stimuli (e.g., written instructions for empathy training versus an actual counseling session) appear relevant to determine the impact of the event which is to be planned.

Another research recommendation examined the design implemented in this study. Since analogue studies usually increase internal validity and field studies amplify external validity (Gelso, 1980), the quasi-supervision design bridges the gap between the two design paradigms for supervision research. Hopefully the design has greater internal validity than the field study and greater external validity than the analogue study. Although, it is difficult to discern the actual differences in these research paradigms, future supervision projects comparing field, analogue and quasi-supervisory methodologies would be productive. Also, extending the planning-supervision methodologies in applied settings may test the applicability of this approach to supervision research. The uniqueness of the planning-quasi-supervision modality may provide a new avenue of research which may transcend the myopic view of the current supervisory literature.
A final research recommendation deals with the style of the current research design. Since most of the previous supervision research attempted to prescribe techniques in which to enhance the acquisition of skills, very few studies have attempted to describe what occurs in supervision. Hurnden's (1980) study of the supervisory relationship, Worthington and Roehlke's (1980) study of supervisory expectations and Stone's (1980) research of supervisory planning are studies which provide descriptive information about supervision. Various analyses in addition to the Supervision Planning Coding System may enlighten the description of the supervisory process.

The client-centered approach has initiated a comprehensive group of studies examining the training models used in Carkhuff and Truax's (1967) human resources training. In innovating various evaluative studies, many of the researchers have seemed to follow suit and also examine methods of the client-centered model. Unfortunately, few researchers have attempted to break away from the continuation of these type of analyses with client-centered concepts. One promising area which was highlighted in this research project was the developmental theory of supervision. Attempts to map the stages in descriptive studies may be an important initial step. Further designs may examine techniques or methods in promoting developmental growth, as well as evaluating the efficacy of the developmental model. Hopefully this study has highlighted a manner in which to begin a new body of theoretically-based research.

An implication for training of this study suggests that, perhaps, supervision is more than simply teaching skills. Although counseling
skills training has been shown to be an integral finding in this study, the importance of supervisor self-disclosures suggest that the traditional teacher-model of supervision may be somewhat limiting. Supervisors who are integrating personal disclosures with skills training to the supervisee tend to lead to greater supervisee satisfaction. Experience appears to be the integral variable for supervisors to be able to accomplish this integrated style. Perhaps in addition to experience, supervisors could be trained to be more inclined to self-disclose in working with beginning practicum counselors. The concept implied in this recommendation is that supervisors may need training for supervision in a similar fashion received by counselors. A comprehensive examination of the unique skills necessitated for supervision must be determined. Also an examination of the existing skills of the supervisor may provide useful information about the skills already obtained. Supervisory training packages should be completed in which to provide skill acquisition of the salient ingredients for effective supervision.

However, outcomes for effective supervision as with effective counseling are quite unknown and undefined. Therefore, one major goal for supervision researchers is to explore potential variables which are salient to successful supervision. Another recommendation for training would be to explore and assess the meaning of effective supervision. Examine the goals currently in use and evaluate their validity for supervision is the goal suggested for future training models. When the outcome for effective supervision is determined, using descriptive studies such as the current project with the outcome
measures, should reveal salient supervisory behaviors leading to successful supervision. In general, the process-outcome methodology would provide the information in determining what are essential skills for the teaching of supervision.

Finally, in devising training packages for the supervision, one caution must be noted. The training of supervisors must not follow in the footsteps of the training packages for counselors. The approaches should attempt to integrate a more dynamic approach to supervisor development than simply skills acquisition. The supervisor's training must also take a developmental focus. In which case, the supervisor must be encouraged and assisted to take risks and challenges which may facilitate growth and help the supervisor progress through the developmental stages.
APPENDIX A

PERSONAL DATA FORM (Supervisors)

1. Sex ____________

2. Age ____________

3. Number of years of counseling experience (one quarter equals one third year) ____________

4. Approximately what percentage of each of the following approaches would characterize your style of counseling? (should sum to 100%)

   _____% Behavioral
   _____% Cognitive
   _____% Analytic
   _____% Gestalt
   _____% Client Centered
   _____% Reality
   _____% Other (please describe) ____________________________

5. Number of years you have been supervised for counseling? (one quarter equals one third year) ____________

6. Number of hours per year you have given supervision. (only include hours you have supervised individual counselors and prepared for supervision. Do not include pre-practicum seminar and other related training.

List each year you have given supervision and please complete the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of weeks per year giving supervision</th>
<th># of supervisees per year</th>
<th>Approximate hrs. per week giving supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What percentage of each of the following types would characterize your supervision style when working with a first term practicum student? (sum to equal 100%)

   _____% Didactic Training
   _____% Experiential Learning
   _____% Counseling
   _____% Feedback/Critique

8. If you are a student:

   a. How many years of graduate school have you completed? (Do not include counseling labs or related seminars.)

   b. How many quarters of supervised practicum have you completed? (Do not include counseling labs or related seminars.)
APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM

The Ohio State University

Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research

I consent to participating in a study entitled Supervisor's Pre-
session Planning and Supervisory Verbal Behavior Across Experience
Levels. Don M. Dell or his representative has explained the purpose
of the study and procedures to be followed. Possible benefits of the
study have been described as have alternative procedures, of such
procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional
information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised
have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that
I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue partici­
pation in the study without prejudice to me. The information obtained
will remain confidential and anonymous unless I specifically agree
otherwise.

Finally I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the
consent form. I have signed it freely and voluntarily and understand
a copy is available upon my request.

Date: ___________________________ Signed ___________________________

(Investigator) (Person Authorized to Consent
for participant—if required)
APPENDIX C

COUNSELOR EVALUATION FORM

Directions: Answer each item on the form according to the following scale: (Please note, the counselor is relative to a first term practicum student.)

1 = far below average
2 = below average
3 = average
4 = above average
5 = far above average

I. Conceptualization skills
   _____ 1. Ability to see systematic patterning in the client's dynamics.
   _____ 2. Ability to be flexible in conceptualizations.
   _____ 3. Ability to generate hypotheses regarding client.

II. Relationship with Client
   _____ 1. Ability to communicate understanding to the client (empathy).
   _____ 2. Ability to gain client's trust.
   _____ 3. Ability to use client's language.

III. Relationship with Supervisor
   _____ 1. Freedom from defensiveness, willingness to admit mistakes.
   _____ 2. Willingness to assume responsibility in supervision.
   _____ 3. Does not inappropriately defer to supervisor.
IV. Technique

1. Ability to employ basic interviewing skills, including beginning and ending the interview.

2. Ability to use a variety of questions (e.g., open, closed).

3. Ability to encourage client to accept responsibility in counseling.

*Adapted from the Evaluation of Counselor Form (Loganbill, 1978).*
APPENDIX D

SUPERVISORY EVALUATION (Self)

Please evaluate your behavior in the supervisory session.

1. My behavior was typical of how I do (would do) supervision.
   - Strongly
   - Disagree
   - Agree

2. I helped the supervisee better understand his client.
   - Strongly
   - Disagree
   - Agree

3. I adhered to the plan I had devised for supervision.
   - Strongly
   - Disagree
   - Agree

4. Approximately what percentage of the supervisory session did you discuss each of the following: (sum to equal 100%)
   - % Client
   - % Supervisor
   - % Supervisee
   - % Counseling Skills
   - % Counseling Relationship
   - % supervisory Relationship
   - % Other (please describe) ___________________________
APPENDIX E

SUPERVISORY EVALUATION (Counselor)

Please evaluate the supervisor along these dimensions.

1. The supervisor helped you better understand the client.

   Strongly Agree
   Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

2. Overall rating of the supervisor.

   Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

3. Approximately what percentage of the supervisory session did you discuss each of the following: (sum to equal 100%).

   _____% Client
   _____% Supervisor
   _____% Supervisee
   _____% Counseling Skills
   _____% Counseling Relationship
   _____% Supervisory Relationship
   _____% Other (please describe) _____________________________
APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this research is to examine how supervisors think and act in supervision. The study is not in any way to evaluate your behavior as a supervisor but to generally describe how supervisors think and behave. The research design is quite straightforward and no deception is used in any way. I will ask you first to listen to a 30 minute audiotape of a simulated counseling session. Second, I will ask you to record your thoughts about the session on audiotape and third, you will then be asked to supervise the counselor in a 30 minute supervisory session. Lastly, I will ask you to complete several short questionnaires about the study and I will debrief you about the specific design. Your entire involvement should be approximately 90 minutes. More explicit instructions will be given at the beginning of each stage of the investigation. Please be assured that all your responses will be kept confidential. You are requested to not put your name on any of the questionnaires nor state your name in the audiotapes. The tapes will be transcribed and erased so that only an experimental number will differentiate subjects. Your experimental number is ___. Please write this number on all of the instruments used. You will also have the option of terminating your involvement at any time you desire. Any questions?

I would like to begin by having you sign a formal consent form and completing this biographical data sheet.
Statement to subjects for tape listening (Stage #2)

You will be listening to a simulated initial counseling session. It will last approximately thirty minutes. Even though this is a simulation, the counselor (Kim Smith) has had no previous information regarding the client besides this biographical form. Therefore, the session you will listen to will in most ways be identical to a real counseling interview. Only the client's role will be rehearsed. Please try to put yourself in the role of the supervisor for this counselor. The counselor is equivalent to a first term practicum student with about a year of counseling experience in social work. Kim is currently a caseworker at a local social service agency. He is working toward a master's degree in social work and city planning. In his college career, he has had didactic training in interviewing skills but has not had pre-practicum training.

I'll turn on the tape recorder for you and then I'll be in the lounge. Please contact me when you are finished and we will begin the next stage. Any questions? You may want to jot down notes about the session to help you in your supervision.

Statement to subjects for planning behavior stage

Now that you have listened to the tape, I would like you to plan for the upcoming supervision session with the counselor. The process of planning is a "think aloud" technique, i.e., thoughts regarding how to conduct the following supervision session. I would like you to verbalize all your planning thoughts. It doesn't matter about the order or clarity of your statements. Allow yourself to free associate
if it will help. I would like you to plan the supervision session, and also plan some general issues regarding supervision with Kim. Please try to make all your planning thoughts verbal. I will put the blank tape on the recorder; so please speak into the microphone. The tape is 30 minutes long so try to limit your planning to that length of time. If you have any problems with the tape, just get hold of me, I'll be in the lounge. Continue until you feel you are finished, come to the lounge and we'll begin the next phase. Remember verbalize all your thoughts. Any questions? Please speak loudly as the tape recorder is not terribly sensitive.

Instructions for the final stage

The last part of this research is to supervise Kim in approximately a thirty minute session. Please try to enact your style of supervision within this session as much as possible. Now all of us are aware that this is a simulation but since Kim is a social worker, the feedback will be helpful to him in his work. Also, the structure of the supervision is in most ways comparable to a supervision session that you have given and/or received as in Arps practicum. Please try to limit the session to about thirty minutes. At the conclusion of the session, I would like you to fill out a short questionnaire and then I'd like about five minutes for debriefing and feedback on the research. Shall we get started? Again try to speak loudly so the recorder will pick up your voices. I'll get Kim and make the introductions.
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