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ABSTRACT

There is a paucity of research detailing what psychotherapy supervisors actually do to effect supervisee development. The present research utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to examine the effects of supervisor self-disclosure on perceptions of the supervisor and the supervision relationship. Thirty two graduate students participated in the present study. The primary hypothesis was that self-disclosing supervisors would be rated as significantly more facilitative and socially influential than non-disclosing supervisors. The results provide support for this hypothesis in that the analyses of variance performed for the condition of self-disclosure on all dependent variables yielded significant results. In addition, it was found that the self-disclosing supervisors were significantly more preferred than the non-disclosing supervisors.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Mental health professionals from various disciplines cite clinical supervision as the central ingredient for professional development (Watkins, 1997a). Fields such as psychiatry, counselor education, psychiatric nursing, social work, and psychology all employ supervision as the principle method for preparing future professionals for practice. Even with the appearance of new psychotherapeutic orientations over the last two decades, the process of supervision is the one element which remains fundamental to all (Lambert & Ogles, 1997; Shipton, 1997). Norcross, Prochaska, and Farber (1993) found that of all the activities engaged in by the members of the APA’s Division of Psychotherapy, supervision was ranked as the second most frequently performed. Similar results have been obtained in studies of counseling psychologists (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986) and social workers (Kadushin, 1992).

Definition

In light of the diversity which exists in psychotherapeutic orientation, it is not surprising to find a wealth of different
perspectives as to the definition and function of clinical supervision. Shanfield, Matthews, and Heatherly (1993) suggest that the primary function of supervision is to track the concerns of psychotherapy students. Vasquez (1992) accentuated the role of ethics training as the primary function of clinical supervision. The research performed by Stoltenberg & Delworth (1987) has largely emphasized the changing nature of supervision function based on the developmental level of each counselor. Holloway (1995) has offered one of the more comprehensive analyses of the function of supervision. She identifies the five distinct functions of supervision as (1) monitoring/evaluating, (2) instructing/advising, (3) modeling, (4) consulting, and (5) supporting/sharing. In addition, she suggests five tasks which are critical to the process of supervision: (1) counseling skill, (2) case conceptualization, (3) professional role, (4) emotional awareness, (5) and self-evaluation. Implicit in Holloway's analysis of clinical supervision is the suggestion that while the process of supervision contains the components of education, consultation, and counseling, it remains a distinct intervention.

As there exist many different interpretations of the function of supervision, so too is there debate over operationalizing this intervention. To avoid dispute over the essence of supervision, the present author has chosen the definition given by Bernard & Goodyear (1998). They define supervision as an "intervention provided by a more senior
member of a profession to a more junior member or members of the same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the client(s) she, he, or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession" (p. 6). The present definition has been chosen as most appropriate for the present study because it is inclusive and practical in nature.

Research

Notwithstanding the widely acknowledged importance of supervision to the process of therapist development, this area is in its infancy with respect to research investigation. Borders (1989) has suggested that it was only within the previous 15 years that counselor supervision emerged as an area of scientific inquiry. Although supervision issues recently have received increased attention, psychotherapy supervision research has continued to be plagued with limitations (Watkins, 1997b). In their review of psychotherapy supervision research, Russell, Crimmings, and Lent (1984) outlined numerous shortcomings of previous research and offered recommendations for future studies. Despite their admonitions concerning future attempts at supervision research, the review failed to prevent a new generation of researchers from avoiding many of their predecessors' pitfalls. Recent reviews of
supervision research again have identified many areas of concern in how scientists conduct studies in this area. Some of the more important findings include the following:

(1) There exists no research on standardized and empirically validated training programs for supervisors (Holloway & Neufeldt, 1995).

(2) There has been a failure to perform replication studies. Without these efforts it is impossible to ascertain which findings are real (Ellis & Ladany, 1997).

(3) The central premises of supervision's more popular theories are literally untested (Ellis & Ladany, 1997).

(4) There is a shortage of research on the effect of supervisor variables such as ethnicity and sex on trainees or clients (Neufeldt, Beutler, and Banchero, 1997).

(5) No studies have been performed which explore trainee development over significant periods of time (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1994).

(6) Little research has been conducted relating supervision variables to supervisee functioning and even less has directly linked supervision variables to client outcome (Holloway & Neufeldt, 1995).

In addition to the limitations listed above, none is more important than the fact that there exists little research detailing what supervisors actually do to effect supervisee development (Ronnestad & Skovolt, 1993). The primary purpose of the present study is to examine an intervention which is hypothesized to positively affect the nature of the
supervisory relationship [the sine qua non of successful supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Watkins, 1997a)]. The intervention explored will be supervisor self-disclosure.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following review of the literature provides an examination of the significant theoretical and empirical findings of the construct of self-disclosure. Special attention will be given to the areas of counselor, client, supervisor, and supervisee self-disclosure. In addition, an exploration of the literature on supervisee experience level and development will be addressed as it represents another dimension of interest in the present research.

Self-disclosure

The area of self-disclosure has been an important topic of psychological investigation for many disciplines including counseling psychology, social psychology, personality psychology, and interpersonal communication (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, and Margulis, 1993). Much of the earliest research in self-disclosure was conducted by Sidney Jourard (Jourard, 1964; Jourard, 1971) who defined self-disclosure as the process of "making yourself manifest, showing yourself so that others can perceive you" (Jourard, 1971; p. 19). He believed that self-
disclosure was a stable personality trait critical to the psychological health of an individual, an essential component of successful relationships, and accurately measurable by self-report. While inconsistent findings lead researchers to abandon the trait perspective of self-disclosure, Jourard's initial work inspired many to begin more theoretical and empirical exploration of this topic. For example, scientists have found self-disclosure to be central to the development and maintenance of intimacy in relationships (Fitzpatrick, 1987; Waring & Chelune, 1983). The type of self-disclosure and variants of it have been found to correlate with certain types of psychopathology (Meyer & Taylor, 1986; Carpenter, 1987). Self-disclosure has been found to yield positive psychological affects from catharsis of emotion (Glick, Weiss, & Parkes, 1974) and has also been positively correlated with increased self-understanding (Stiles, 1987). In addition to its psychological benefits, self-disclosure of distress has been found to be an important agent in avoiding physical illnesses such as cancer (Locke & Colligan, 1986; Coates & Winston, 1986).

Because psychotherapy supervision is an interpersonal process, the aspects of self-disclosure which have the greatest relevance to the present study are its interpersonal effects of relationship development and maintenance. The theoretical roots of this area begin with Altman & Taylor's (1973) theory of social penetration. Their theory of personality and relationship development offers self-disclosure as the primary
element governing the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of interpersonal relationships. Building upon this theoretical base, the most consistent empirical findings have focused on disclosure reciprocity and the disclosure-liking effect (Berg & Derelga, 1987).

Disclosure reciprocity is the tendency of those who have received self-disclosures to disclose themselves at levels of comparable intimacy (Cozby, 1973; Rubin, 1973). Based on the tenets of exchange theory, the finding that disclosure begets disclosure has been interpreted from many different perspectives. One explanation suggests that when an individual receives an intimate disclosure, his or her liking and trust for the discloser is increased. In order to demonstrate these feelings of increased trust and liking, the recipient is then expected to return the intimate disclosure at a comparable level (Davis & Skinner, 1974). Another explanation is based upon equity theory which states that social norms dictate that one is obligated to disclose at comparable levels of intimacy upon receiving a disclosure from another (Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1973). A third explanation focuses on modeling as the primary reason for disclosure reciprocity (Davis & Skinner, 1974). Evidence for all three of the above explanations have made it apparent that each has some role in contributing to the disclosure reciprocity effect (Berg & Derelga, 1987).

The most common disclosure-liking effect found in the self-disclosure literature states that people who engage in
intimate disclosures tend to be liked more than people who choose not to disclose or those who disclose at less intimate levels. (Derelga et al., 1993). A simple explanation for this effect holds that most people are generally more comfortable around people they know rather than people they do not (Berger, 1987). The fact that uncertainty is low and security is high when one knows another is a common sense explanation for this phenomenon. While this explanation has had some empirical support (Collins & Miller, 1991), there exist some important qualifications. The disclosure-liking effect can be mediated by factors such as the timing of the disclosure (Wortman, Adesman, Herman, & Greenberg, 1976; Altman & Taylor, 1973), the goals of the discloser (Stiles, 1987), the intimacy of the disclosure (Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969), gender of the discloser (Chelune, 1976), and the context of the disclosure (Hoffman-Graff, 1977).

The above findings in the areas of disclosure reciprocity and interpersonal liking provide theoretical and empirical evidence for the construction of the present study's hypotheses. They will be outlined in greater detail at the end of this chapter.

**Counselor Self-Disclosure**

Self-disclosure in psychotherapy has been an important topic of discussion since its inception (Freud, 1912). For the process of counseling to occur, it is necessary that clients be
willing to engage in this behavior. While client self-disclosure is seen by many to be the sine qua non of the psychotherapy (Cozby, 1973; Patterson, 1985), therapist self-disclosure has been a controversial topic. The subject was first addressed by psychoanalysts who placed a premium on therapist neutrality and anonymity (Freud, 1912; Basescu, 1990). By presenting the client a blank slate, the analyst enabled the analysand to project his or her conflicted feelings upon the analyst and begin working through them towards resolution. Any introduction of self-disclosure was seen as diluting this process. Conversely, humanistic and existential writers such as Rogers (1951), Sullivan (1953), Jourard (1964), and Bugental (1965) challenged the psychoanalytic perspective as impersonal and inauthentic. They regarded the therapeutic relationship as a "real relationship" between open and authentic individuals. Therapist self-disclosure was seen as promoting the "realness" of human relationship and demystifying the process of psychotherapy in general (Kaslow, Cooper, & Linsenberg, 1979).

Over the past three decades, therapist self-disclosure has been a frequent topic of interest with counseling practitioners and researchers (Watkins, 1990). As Cozby (1973) suggested in one of the first empirical reviews of self-disclosure, its use has important implications for the client-counselor relationship but in no way is it a simple psychotherapeutic intervention. Clearly demonstrating the complexity of self-disclosure are the equivocal results obtained by researchers (Sexton & Whitson,
1994). In some studies investigators found that various forms of self-disclosure enhanced clients' perceptions of counselors (Cash & Salzbach, 1978; VandeCreek & Angstadt, 1985). Hill's (1989) research of eight cases of brief psychotherapy suggested that although counselor self-disclosure was seldom employed during the session (1% of the time), clients consistently rated this intervention as most helpful and as enhancing their involvement in the process of therapy. In a more recent qualitative analysis, Knox, Hess, Petersen, & Hill (1997) found that therapist self-disclosure resulted in positive consequences including, increased client insight, balancing of power in the therapeutic relationship, normalizing of client concerns, and client reassurance.

Despite the above findings, other studies failed to reproduce the positive effects of counselor self-disclosure. (Curtis, 1981; Friedlander, Thibodeau, Nichols, Tucker, & Snyder, 1985). For example, Mallinckrodt & Helms (1986) found that therapist self-disclosure by itself had neither a positive nor negative affect upon clients' perceptions of counselor effectiveness. In addition, Cherbosque (1987) found that participants who had to choose between disclosing and non-disclosing counselors, a significant majority chose those counselors who did not self-disclose.

A probable explanation for these conflicting results is thought to be the existence of multiple factors which mediate the impact of self-disclosure (Hendrick, 1987; Sexton &
Whitson, 1994). Over the last 30 years in self-disclosure research, it has become clear that not all counselor self-disclosures are equal (Cozby, 1973; Hill, 1992). Watkins (1990) suggests that in addition to the amount of information shared and the time spent sharing it, counselor self-disclosure differs along four primary dimensions. The first dimension is positive versus negative self-disclosure. The valence of the disclosure is considered positive when the personal experience shared by the counselor involves favorable information, and negative when it involves unfavorable information. The second dimension is that of similar versus dissimilar self-disclosure. A similar disclosure would be one where the information shared by the counselor was consistent and relevant to the information disclosed by the client, whereas a dissimilar disclosure would be inconsistent with the clients' response. The third dimension is intimate versus non-intimate disclosure. An intimate disclosure is considered one which reveals personal information such as feelings, experiences, and emotions, whereas non-intimate disclosures contain mostly demographic information. The final dimension is that of past versus present disclosures. This dimension explores whether the information revealed by the counselor occurred in the past, or whether it reflects a current event. Also contained within this dimension of time are the many studies which have been conducted examining self-involving statements versus self-disclosing statements. Self-involving statements are those
which involve the counselor expressing his or her thoughts or feelings toward the client. Even though many studies have contrasted self-involving statements with self-disclosing statements, they are commonly considered just another form of self-disclosure (Watkins, 1990).

The nature of self-disclosure with respect to the above dimensions makes an important difference in how each self-disclosure will be interpreted. Since these mediating variables have been increasingly factored into the studies concerning the utility of self-disclosure, the question for many investigators is no longer whether to use counselor self-disclosure as a therapeutic intervention, but how and when it is appropriate to use (Hendrick, 1987; Knox et al., 1997).

Theoretical Perspectives in Counselor Self-Disclosure

One of the more common theoretical explanations for the effectiveness of counselor self-disclosure lies in its promotion of universality (Chelune, 1979). As many clients feel that they suffer alone and that the concerns they bring to therapy are abnormal and unusual, a therapist's self-disclosure about a related event is thought to provide the client with a sense of shared experience (Goldstein, 1994). Mathews (1988) suggests that therapist self-disclosure normalizes client concerns allowing them to feel less abnormal and helps to foster in them a hope for the future.
The Feminist theoretical perspective of counselor self-disclosure asserts that the structure of the traditional counseling relationship has been one of inequality and hierarchy (Brown & Walker, 1990). In order to reduce this differential, therapists can use self-disclosure as a way of balancing the power in therapy (Kaslow et al., 1979). The emphasis in feminist theory is away from the tranferential aspects (the unreal or fantasy) of psychotherapy and toward what Gelso & Carter (1994) call the "real relationship" (p.298). In this relationship, the therapist's role is not to portray herself as a model of perfection, rather a real person with emotions and experiences shared by most human beings. The relationship is characterized as egalitarian and collaborative. The willingness of the therapist to disclose is thought to be accompanied by an increase in respect for the therapist rather than a loss of status (Chelune, 1979).

Behaviorism offers modeling as another theoretical framework from which to view counselor self-disclosure (Rosenthal & Steffek, 1991). This perspective suggests that when a therapist displays self-disclosing behaviors, clients learn by example that these are acceptable and appropriate responses. In an interview of experienced psychotherapists, Simon (1988) found that clinicians cited modeling of problem solving skills, coping strategies, and assertiveness as the primary reasons for therapists employing self-disclosure as a therapeutic intervention. This perspective also is shared with
feminist theoretical conceptions of self-disclosure in which the goal of self-disclosure is to raise the consciousness of clients by providing role models who share similar experiences once thought to be unique. Kravetz (1976) views the therapeutic relationship as a consciousness-raising process in which the therapist assumes a more collaborative and egalitarian role by revealing vulnerabilities to the client.

In order to attain an understanding of whether clients experience self-disclosure as the above theoretical perspectives have hypothesized, Knox et al., (1997) conducted a qualitative analysis of therapist disclosure in long-term therapy. They found that counselor self-disclosures were rated as some of the most important events in therapy. In addition, when asked of the effects that these disclosures had upon them, clients stated that counselor self-disclosures (1) helped reassure them that their concerns were normal, (2) helped to balance the power in the therapeutic relationship, and (3) provided a model of appropriate self-disclosure which increased the frequency of client self-disclosure. This study was the first to provide qualitative evidence supporting the theoretical positions stated above.

The final theoretical perspective supporting the efficacy of counselor self-disclosure is Social Influence Theory (Strong & Claiborn, 1982). Strong (1969) asserted that the more a client perceives a counselor as attractive, trustworthy, and expert, the more power that counselor will have to influence the client.
He suggested that one of the ways in which to increase counselor attractiveness is to increase the similarity between counselor and client. Strong & Claiborn (1982) suggest that counselors can achieve this similarity by disclosing experiences that they share with their clients. Considerable empirical evidence has been obtained to support this social psychological position (Hoffman-Graff, 1977; Hoffman & Spencer, 1977; Peca-Baker, 1987). In addition, Peca-Baker & Friedlander (1989) found that disclosures in general and the similarity of information influenced client perceptions independent of one another.

**Supervisor Self-disclosure**

Empirical investigation in the area of supervisor self-disclosure has been nearly non-existent. The present review of the literature has located only one unpublished study which directly addresses this issue. Klink (1993) conducted an analogue study which tested participants' reactions to supervisors who cited self-disclosure as a primary intervention in their practice and supervisors who made no mention of the intervention. Participants compared the two supervisors on dimensions of social influence theory (expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) and facilitative conditions (empathic understanding, congruence, unconditionality, and willingness to be known). MANOVA and Chi Square analyses performed yielded no significant differences between
participant perceptions of self-disclosing and non-disclosing supervisors. There are, however, some plausible explanations for the lack of significance found. First, an audiotape containing a description of each supervisor's style was the only experimental manipulation offered in the study. It is possible that an example of the supervisor's work added to the manipulation would make it more potent. Secondly, Klink (1993) operationalized supervisor self-disclosure as an instance where supervisors share their work with supervisees in hopes of modeling appropriate supervisor responses. While this may represent a form of self-disclosure, it's emphasis on modeling effective responses may have been seem as a demonstration of one's work rather than revealing one's personal thoughts and feelings.

While evidence supporting the efficacy of counselor self-disclosure is lacking, there are instances of research which indirectly suggest that it may be an effective intervention. Nelson (1978) conducted a survey of trainees' preferences regarding various aspects of the supervisory relationship and process. One of the highest preferred supervisor characteristics mentioned in the study was self-revealing. In a phenomenological study of supervisees' positive and negative experiences in supervision, Hutt, Scott, & King, (1983) found that the more supervisors and supervisees self-disclosed to one another, the more involved both became in the process of supervision. Hutt et al., (1983) assert that self-disclosure by
both parties is an element in effective supervision and the lack of open, authentic disclosure is a contributor to negative supervisory experiences.

Notwithstanding the dearth of empirical investigation in the area of supervisor self-disclosure, there have been theoretical contributions about it. Coche (1977) postulated that it is necessary that supervisors model for trainees the qualities that make up effective supervisors. He cited interpersonal risk-taking as an example of such modeling. Coche asserts that "where the supervisor is willing to take risks in dealing with the student, in mode and degree of self-disclosure, or in willingness to try out novel techniques, he or she sets an example and conveys the message that, even though the consequences can at times be embarrassing or otherwise unpleasant, the rewards in deepening relationships are ultimately worth the risk" (p. 253). Regarding group supervision, Hawkins & Shohet, (1989) suggested that one of the most important personal qualities of effective supervisors is the ability and willingness to self-disclose. They assert that self-disclosure can feel safer if group leaders are willing to share their fears and insecurities rather than playing a role where it is incumbent upon them to be perfect and possess all the answers.

In their review outlining the theory of feminist supervision, Porter & Vasquez (1997) cite supervisor facilitation of supervisee self-examination by modeling
openness, authenticity, and reflexivity as one of the nine guiding principles of feminist supervision. They suggest that supervisors can "illuminate the process of self-examination by remaining open and nondefensive during reflexive dialogue and by self-disclosing in ways that benefit the supervisees" (p. 164). This focus on self-disclosure as an effective supervisory intervention can even be seen in some psychodynamic circles (Lederman, 1982; Black, 1988; Gediman & Wolkenfeld, 1980).

Coburn (1997) suggested that supervision must include a mutual verbal exploration of the experiences of both the supervisor and the trainee. In this arrangement, self-disclosure is central to the process of supervision whereas non-disclosure on the part of either participant is "stifling and stagnating" (p. 489).

**Supervisee Self-Disclosure**

While there exist different theoretical models of psychotherapy supervision, the fact that all rely heavily upon supervisees to disclose vital information about their experiences is common to all. Whether it is information about the client, the supervisory relationship, the therapeutic relationship, or personal information about the supervisee, exposure to the trainee's work experiences is essential to supervision (Alonzo & Ruttan, 1988). Even though some supervisors have access to audio and video tapes of supervisees' sessions, much of what is exposed of the trainee's
work comes directly from the trainee (Yerushalmi, 1992). Rarely are supervisors able to review every minute of every session and even when they do, a supervisor's access to the inner world of a supervisee is only granted when this information is volunteered by the supervisee. Recent studies have shown that supervisees' unwillingness to volunteer important information during supervision and their penchant for distorting it is a significant challenge to supervisory effectiveness. Ladany, Hill, Corbett, and Nutt, (1996) found that 97% of the 108 supervisees surveyed consciously withheld information from supervisors. Among the examples of nondisclosed content were clinical mistakes (44% of supervisees reported), negative reactions to clients (36%), and negative reactions to supervisors (90%). Yourman & Farber (1996) also explored supervisee nondisclosure and distortion and found that 30-40% of the 93 trainees indicated that they withheld information such as clinical errors at moderate to high levels.

The two studies outlined above suggest that supervisee distortion and withholding of information are common. While this may be true, the fact remains that when a trainee omits or distorts material, a supervisor's ability to understand the dynamics of the therapeutic situation is attenuated. In addition, it may lead to a diminished learning opportunity for the supervisee which may effect the efficacy of the treatment rendered. Among the most frequently cited explanations for withholding and distorting information given by supervisees in
both studies are shame and embarrassment. Alonso and Ruttan (1988) conclude that shame is a customary response in the experience of beginners. They cite the learning curve and the threat of supervisor evaluation as contributing factors in the development of shame. Even though many have written about shame as inherent in the supervisory process (Nash, 1975; Wallace & Alonzo, 1994; Yerushalmi, 1992), few have offered suggestions as to how it might be effectively managed. In light of the research on counselor self-disclosure, the present author proposes that through modeling (Simon, 1988), reciprocity (Walster et al., 1973), and normalization (Chelune, 1979), the intervention of supervisor self-disclosure may be one possible way to reduce the shame associated with supervisee disclosure and significantly increase its prevalence.

Supervisee Experience Level and Development

The area of supervisee experience level and development has been the subject of empirical and conceptual investigation over the past two decades (Hogan, 1964; Stoltenberg, 1981; Blocher, 1983; Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke, 1986). The assumption on which much of the investigation in this area is founded holds that counselors at varying levels of experience possess different needs in supervision. Largely inspired by cognitive-developmental psychologists (Piaget, 1965; Loevinger, 1976; Kohlberg, 1981), these theory driven models of counselor development assert that during their supervised
training experience, trainees undergo qualitative changes in their ability to differentiate and integrate their experience (Hunt, 1971; Hogan, 1964; Blocher, 1983; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). One may infer from this perspective that the most beneficial supervisory experiences are those which meet the particular developmental needs of trainees at each experience level.

Stoltenberg (1981) integrated the theoretical perspectives of Hunt (1971) and Hogan (1964) and created the Counselor Complexity Model of counselor development. It is explanatory and prescriptive in that it describes characteristics of trainees at each of four experience levels and suggests the optimal supervisory environments which enable them to progress from one level to the next. Supervisees at early levels of experience are characterized by high levels of anxiety, self-criticism and the need to imitate. The environment most conducive to growth at this stage is one of support and structure. Supervisees at the middle levels of experience have gained relatively more skill and confidence in their abilities and begin experiencing more ambivalence within the supervisory relationship between autonomy and dependence. The environment most conducive to growth at this stage is one of increasing support for risk taking behavior and decreasing amounts of structure. The most experienced supervisees are characterized by increased professional maturity in that they
are able to develop more complex client conceptualizations and comprehensive treatment plans and possess increasing levels of security and flexibility in their approach to counseling. With trainees at these levels, the supervisory environment becomes more collegial as the professional and personal identities of trainees have become more integrated.

While not all aspects of this model have been investigated, the primary tenets of developmental models of supervision in general have been empirically tested (Worthington, 1987). Among the most consistent findings supporting developmental theory is the presence of high levels of anxiety in beginning practitioners (Ronnested & Skovholt, 1993; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Skovholt & Ronnestad (1992) found that beginning trainees have "pervasive anxiety" as they test the validity of their career choice in an environment where supervisors are feared judges as well as admired teachers. They suggest that this high level of pervasive anxiety necessitates that supervisors be extremely attentive to this apprehension and its' effect on supervision. In a study comparing the experiences of beginning and advanced graduates, Reising & Daniels (1983) found that in addition to being more anxious, dependent, and technique oriented than their advanced counterparts, beginning students stated they were less ready for confrontation as security and support were among their most important needs in supervision.
If beginning trainees experience more anxiety than advanced trainees, they may benefit more from supervisor self-disclosure because it serves two important functions. First, a supervisor's self-disclosure can have the effect of normalizing a supervisee's experience. Beginning trainees who fear failure and self-criticize may welcome a supervisor's efforts to normalize not only the individual mistakes which make them apprehensive, but also the general experience of anxiety itself. A second function of supervisor self-disclosure may be the modeling appropriate behavior. The effectiveness of modeling as a method of facilitating supervisee growth and development has been demonstrated (Simon, 1988; Newman & Fuqua, 1988). Because imitation has been identified as a primary need for beginning trainees, supervisor self-disclosure could provide an example of how supervisors deal with challenges in their professional and personal lives. In addition, if supervisor self-disclosure increases the likelihood of supervisee self-disclosure, it may improve the quality of supervision in general.

Summary

Empirical support for various interventions of counseling supervision have been infrequent (Russell et al., 1984) and represent a gap in our understanding of supervision. The primary purpose of the present study is to examine the impact of supervisor self-disclosure on perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. Effectiveness will be defined as more facilitative,
more socially influential and more preferred. Except for the work of Klink (1993), no studies have been located. However, there is theoretical support for the effectiveness of self-disclosure in other contexts. The following hypotheses have been generated from the literature reviewed above:

1. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more facilitative than the non self-disclosing supervisors as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI-S). More specifically, disclosing supervisors will be rated as more empathic on the Empathy Scale (EMP) of the BLRI-S. Disclosing supervisors will be rated as more congruent on the Congruent Scale (CON) of the BLRI-S. Disclosing supervisors will be rated as more willing to disclose on the Willingness to Be Known Scale (WIL) on the BLRI-S. Disclosing supervisors will be rated as more unconditional on the Unconditional Scale (UNC) of the BLRI-S. Disclosing supervisors will be rated as having higher regard for supervisees on the Regard Scale (REG) of the BLRI-S. And finally, disclosing supervisors will be rated as more facilitative on the Total Scale (BLRT) of the BLRI-S.

2. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as having significantly more social influence than the non-disclosing supervisor on the Supervisor Rating Form (SRF-S). More specifically, Disclosing supervisor will be rated more expert on the Expertness Scale (EXP) on the SRF-S. Disclosing supervisors will be rated as more attractive on the Attractiveness Scale (ATT) on the SRF-S. And finally, disclosing supervisors will be
rated as having more social influence on the Total Scale of the SRF-S.

3. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more satisfying than the non self-disclosing supervisors on the Satisfaction Scale (SAT) on the Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF). Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more preferred on the Preference Scale (PRF) on the SAF. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more enjoyable on the Enjoyability Scale (ENJ) on the SAF. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more supportive on the Support Scale (SUP) on the SAF. And finally, self-disclosing supervisors will be rated significantly higher on anticipated satisfaction on the Total Scale (SAFT) of the SAF.

4. Self-disclosing supervisors will be rated as significantly more preferred than the non-disclosing supervisors on the Supervisor Preference Form (SPF).
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 32 graduate student volunteers which including 24 women (75%) and 8 men (25%). Participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 with a median age of 28.6. The ethnic background of participants is as follows: 53% Caucasian, 25% African American, 16% Asian, and 6% Hispanic.

Twenty (62%) graduate students reported a departmental affiliation with counseling psychology, nine (28%) students were from clinical psychology and 3 (10%) were from counselor education programs. Participants' graduate academic years ranged from 1 to 8 with a median of 3.7. Participants reported a range of clinical experience from 0 to 4000 hours with a mean of 516 hours. Nineteen participants (59%) reported that they had supervision experience while thirteen (41%) reported that they had not previously supervised. Table 3.1 provides a summary of the demographic data.

Procedure

All participants were recruited from graduate programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in Graduate School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>9.6 7.3</td>
<td>23 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Contact</td>
<td>516 873</td>
<td>0 4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Summary of Demographic Characteristics (N=32)
in counseling psychology, clinical psychology and counselor education. Sixty eight potential participants were contacted by letter (Appendix A) to volunteer approximately 50 minutes of their time to the study. Thirty two participants (47%) volunteered for the present study. Each participant received a packet containing all the experimental materials including instructions, audiotapes and all instruments. Participants were informed that their involvement would include listening to two short audio segments of supervision sessions and completing 5 short inventories. They were requested to participate in an environment where distractions (i.e., telephones, televisions, music, etc.) would be eliminated. In addition, they were instructed not to begin the experiment until they were confident that they could conclude it without interruption.

The supervisors (n=2) and supervisee (n=1) who volunteered to enact the audiotape scripts (Appendix B) were advanced graduates in counseling psychology. They were informed that their involvement would include (1) reading scripts describing theoretical orientations of supervision and (2) enacting a brief script of a supervision session. In order to control for possible gender effects of the audiotaped presentations, the supervisee and both supervisors were female. They were not informed of the experimental conditions and hypotheses of the study until the recordings were completed.
Presented below in Table 3.2 is a summary of the procedure for the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>03'</th>
<th>12'</th>
<th>10'</th>
<th>12'</th>
<th>10'</th>
<th>03'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>DQ or NS-D tape</td>
<td>S-D Audiotape</td>
<td>BLRI-S or S-D Audiotape</td>
<td>SRF-S or S-D Tape</td>
<td>BLRI-S</td>
<td>SAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>SPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DQ = Demographic Questionnaire  
BLRI-S = Barrett Lennard Relationship Inventory - Short  
SRF-S = Supervisor Rating Form - Short  
SPF = Supervisor Preference Form  
SAF = Supervisor Assessment Form  
S-D Audiotape = Self-Disclosure Audiotape  
NS-D = No Self-disclosure Audiotape

Table 3.2: Summary of Procedure

All participation by volunteer participants was performed individually. Each participant began the experiment by completing a brief demographic questionnaire (Appendix H). They were then given written and verbal instructions preparing them for listening to the audiotape. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the following experimental conditions: (a) Supervisor A with self-disclosure, Supervisor B with no self-disclosure; Supervisor A with no self-disclosure, Supervisor B with self-disclosure; Supervisor B with self-disclosure, supervisor A with no self-disclosure; Supervisor B with no self-disclosure, supervisor A with self-disclosure. After participants heard the first audiotape, they completed four instruments (BLRI-S, SRF-S, and the SAF). Next, the second audiotape was presented followed by a second set of questionnaires (BLRI-S, SRF-S, SAF, and the SPF). In order to
control for possible order effects, the inventories and the audiotapes were randomly ordered for each participant. After the completing the final set of inventories, each participant was given a debriefing which explained the purposes of the experiment.

**Dependent Measures**

**Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Modified for Supervisory Relationships-Short Form (BLRI-S; See Appendix D).** The BLRI-S (Schacht et al., 1988) is a 40-item instrument assessing five dimensions of the supervisory relationship: (a) level of regard (REG), (b) unconditionality of regard (UNC), (c) congruence (CON), (d) empathic understanding (EMP), and willingness to be known (WBK). Each participant responds to each of the items (e.g., "This supervisor would appreciate me") on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (I strongly feel that it is not true) to 6 (I strongly feel that it is true). Higher scores on the BLRI-S represent more positive attitudes toward the supervisory relationship. Three of the subscales (REG, CON, and EMP) contain 10 items while the remaining two subscales (UNC and WBK) contain 5 each. Cronbach alpha coefficients of internal consistency for the BLRI-S have been reported to range from a .72 for WBK Form M, to .92 for the Total Score of both forms M and L (Schacht et al., 1988, 1989). The BLRI-S was modified for the use of the present study in two ways: (1) the phrase "this supervisor" was added to each item, and (2)
present tenses were substituted for past tenses wherever appropriate.

**Supervisor Rating Form-Short (SRF-S; See Appendix E)**

The SRF-S is a 12-item instrument which measures a supervisee's perceptions of a supervisor's expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The SRF-S is a supervisory adaptation of the Counselor Rating Form-Short Form (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983; CRF-S) which is a revised, shortened version of Barak and LaCrosse's (1975) original Counselor Rating Form. Consisting of 12 bipolar items, the SRF-S contains 4 items within the trustworthy, attractiveness and expertness dimensions. Supervisees are required to rate the degree to which the supervisor demonstrates the characteristic of the stem adjective on a 7-point scale from *not very* (1) to *very* (7). Higher scores in each of the three dimensions indicates a more favorable evaluation of a supervisor's performance. Because direct reliability and validity data are not available for the SRF-S, these figures were gathered from studies reporting on the CRF-S. The CRF-S displays good internal consistency as inter-item reliabilities for this instrument range from .82 to .94 (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). Inter-item reliabilities for each of the individual dimensions range from .89 to .93 on attractiveness, from .82 to .91 on trustworthiness, and .85 to .94 for expertness. All reliability and validity information was gathered from community mental health centers and college student populations.
Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF: See Appendix F). The Supervisor Assessment Form (Klink, 1993) is a 5 item inventory designed to assess a supervisees' anticipated level of satisfaction with the supervisor being observed. Items (e.g., Overall, how satisfied would you feel with this supervisor?) appear on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from very satisfied (1) to not very satisfied (7). Because this instrument does not have a validated theoretical foundation linking its five items together, each item was also analyzed individually as a separate scale of the SAF. The five subscales are as follows: Satisfaction scale (SAT), Competence scale (COM), Enjoyability scale (ENJ), Support scale (SUP), and Preference scale (PRF). In the present study Preference, Support and Competence scales were expected to correlate with the scores on the SRF-S Expertness and BLRI-S Regard scales and the Supervisor Preference Form. Because this instrument was used only once prior to the present investigation, there are no validity and reliability data.

Supervisor Preference Form (SPF: See Appendix G). The Supervisor Preference Form (Klink, 1993) is a 1 item qualitative question assessing a supervisee's preference and the reason(s) for preferring a particular supervisor over another. As this instrument was used only once prior to the present investigation, no validity or reliability data are available.
**Audiotapes**

Each of the four audiotapes created for the present study (2 supervisors x 2 orders of presentation) included a brief introductory segment of supervisor theoretical orientation and an example of a supervision session (Appendix B). Except for the presence of supervisor self-disclosure and no supervisor self-disclosure both in the introduction and the supervision session itself, the audiotapes were similar in (1) content of the introduction, (2) supervisor facilitative conditions, and (3) duration of total tape.

A manipulation check was conducted to assure a sufficient difference existed between audiotapes on the dimension self-disclosure and a sufficient equivalence on the dimensions of audible clarity, supervisor believability, supervisor competence, and supervisor experience. Five expert raters listened to and then rated each tape on the variables listed above (See Appendix C). Results showed a significant difference between audiotapes on the dimension of self-disclosure and no significant differences on the dimensions of audible clarity, clarity of content, supervisor and supervisee believability, supervisor competence and supervisor experience.

**Analysis of Data**

The analysis of data will address the preliminary and primary analyses of the present study. The preliminary
analysis section will first calculate the means, standard
deviations and t-tests for the significance of sex difference in
all dependent variables. Correlations for all dependent
variables will then be calculated according to the condition of
self-disclosure. A Likelihood Ratio Test using the Chi Square
statistic will be utilized to test for the potential effects of
independent variables on each of the total scales of the three
primary instruments in this study (BLRI-S, SRF-S, and SAF).
The independent variables analyzed include the condition of
disclosure, the counseling experience of participants, the
race/ethnicity of participants, the gender of participants, the
order of the disclosing condition and the supervisor.

The primary analyses will contain sections for both the
quantitative and qualitative results of this experiment. The
quantitative section will consist of univariate analyses of
variance investigating the main effect of the disclosing
condition across all dependent variables. It will conclude with
a test of binomial proportions for the data gathered from the
Supervisor Preference Form (SPF).

The qualitative analysis section will code and analyze
those responses gathered from SPF. Participants' responses
will be assessed for the presence of significant trends and
themes.
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS - QUANTITATIVE

Means, standard deviations and t-tests for the scores of all the dependent variables by gender are presented in Table 4.1. The finding of no significant differences in the means of any of the dependent variables are consistent with findings of the meta-analysis conducted by Watkins (1990).

Table 4.2 provides a matrix of Pearson product-moment correlations among the dependent variables. Each correlation is displayed separately within disclosing and non-disclosing subsamples with non-disclosing above the diagonal and disclosing below. Expected correlations between the scales of Expertness (EXP) and Competence (COM), Trustworthiness (TRT) and Congruence (CON) and Attractiveness (ATT) and Regard (REG) were all indicated by these results.

The variable of primary interest in the present study is that of supervisor self-disclosure. In order to assure that the variance accounted for by the dependent variables was due
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MALE (n=8)</th>
<th>FEMALE (n=24)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to known</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLRS-Totals</td>
<td>181.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF-S-Totals</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyability</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-S-Totals</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Means, standard deviations, and t-tests by gender for all dependent variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(EMP)</th>
<th>(CON)</th>
<th>(REG)</th>
<th>(UNC)</th>
<th>(WIL)</th>
<th>(ATT)</th>
<th>(EXP)</th>
<th>(TRT)</th>
<th>(SAT)</th>
<th>(COM)</th>
<th>(ENJ)</th>
<th>(SUP)</th>
<th>(PRE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathic</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyability</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.94**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.1

Table 4.2: Correlation Matrix for Dependent Variables.
to the experimental condition of self-disclosure rather than to other variables (order of instruments, order of condition of self-disclosure, supervisor, counseling experience of participant, race/ethnicity of participant and gender of participant), a Likelihood Ratio Test (LRT) using the Chi Square statistic was conducted for the total scales of the three primary instruments {Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory- Short Form (BLRI-S), Supervisor Rating Form- Short Form (SRF-S) and the Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF)}. The full mixed effects model contained the condition of supervisor disclosure, experience of participant, race/ethnicity of participant, gender of participant, order of disclosing condition, supervisor, and the interactions of self-disclosure with gender and experience. The reduced model consisted of only the condition of disclosure. The null hypothesis stated that the full model would fail to explain significantly more variance in the dependent variables than the reduced model containing only the condition of supervisor disclosure. The Likelihood Ratio Tests for all three dependent variables failed to yield significant Chi Square statistics suggesting that the null hypotheses may be valid (Chi square =.36, p<.99; Chi square =.50, p<.99; and Chi square =.80, p<.99; for BLRT, SRFT, and SAFT respectively). Because the LRT failed to show that the additional independent variables explained significantly more variance in the dependent variables compared to the reduced model, they were eliminated from the analysis. This allowed proceeding with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>NSD (n=32)</th>
<th>SD (n=32)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to known</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLRS-S Total</td>
<td>175.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>200.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRF-S Total</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyability</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF-S Total</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** NSD = No self-disclosure; SD = Self-disclosure

Table 4.3: Means, standard deviations, and t-tests by condition of disclosure for all dependent variables.
self-disclosure as the primary independent variable and utilize one-way ANOVAs with each of the dependent variables. Table 4.3 provides means, standard deviations and t-tests for all dependent variables by the condition of supervisor self-disclosure.

**Primary Analysis - Quantitative**

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Short Form (BLRI-S) is a measure consisting of five scales which measure a supervisee's perception of whether a supervisor has provided the facilitative conditions of empathy, unconditionality, congruence, positive regard, and a willingness to be known. Univariate analyses of variance for these five dependent variables in addition to the BLRI-S total score were performed using the condition of supervisor self-disclosure. Table 4.4 indicates that all six of the variables analyzed yielded significant main effects for the condition of supervisor self-disclosure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (EMP)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence (CON)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard (REG)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional (UNC)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to (WIL) be Known</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale (BLRT)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Analysis of Variance for the condition of self-disclosure on the BLRI-S Scales.

The Supervisor Rating Form-Short Form (SRF-S) is a measure consisting of three scales which measure a supervisee's perception a supervisor's expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Univariate analyses of variance for these three dependent variables in addition to the SRF-S total score were performed using the condition of supervisor self-disclosure. Table 4.5 indicates that the variables of attractiveness, trustworthiness and the SRF-S total score yielded significant main effects for the condition of supervisor self-disclosure. The dependent variable of expertness did not produce a significant main effect for the condition of supervisor self-disclosure.
The Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF) is an instrument measuring a supervisee's anticipated satisfaction for a supervisor. Each of the five questions on the SAF address preference, competence, support, enjoyability and satisfaction with the supervisor. For the purposes of the present study, responses to each of the five questions were analyzed as separate dependent variables in addition to the total score. Univariate analyses of variance for the five dependent variables in addition to the SAF total score were performed using the condition of supervisor self-disclosure. Table 4.6 indicates that the variables of satisfaction (SAT), preference (PRF), enjoyability (ENJ), support (SUP) and the Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF) total score yielded significant main effects for the condition of supervisor self-disclosure. Similar to the Expertness Scale of the SRF-S, the dependent variable of
competence did not produce a significant main effect for the condition of supervisor self-disclosure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (SAF)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence (COM)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyability (ENJ)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (SUP)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference (PRF)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale (SAFT)</td>
<td>1, 63</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Analysis of Variance for the condition of self-disclosure on the SAF-S Scales.

The Supervisor Preference Form (SPF) is a qualitative questionnaire designed to assess a supervisee's preference and reason(s) for preferring a particular supervisor over another. From a total of 32 participants, twenty one preferred the disclosing supervisor while the remaining eleven preferred the non-disclosing supervisor. A test of binomial proportions was conducted to test for a significant difference in participant choice of either the disclosing or non-disclosing supervisor.
The analysis revealed that the disclosing supervisor was significantly more preferred than the non-disclosing supervisor ($Z = 1.86, p > .03$).

**Primary Analysis - Qualitative**

In order to assess whether each participant's responses contained significant themes and commonalities, each was qualitatively analyzed by the three categories of self-disclosure, no self-disclosure and other (Klink, 1993). Most prominent among the participants' responses were six themes. For all participants regardless of supervisor preference there were two central themes. The first theme represents those individuals whose responses were directly related to the condition of self-disclosure. Fifty percent ($n=16$) of the participants cited self-disclosure as central to their preference for either supervisor. The second theme represents those individuals whose responses were directly related to the view that both supervisors were comparable in competence and skill. Thirty one percent ($N=10$) of the participants used phrases such as "very good," "competent and expert," "warm and skillful" and "difficult choice" to describe both supervisors.

Among those participants preferring the disclosing supervisor, there were three primary themes. The first theme represented participants who viewed the disclosing supervisor as more genuine and honest in comparison to the non-disclosing supervisor. Fifty three percent ($n=11$) of these
respondents mentioned this theme as important to their preference. A second year student wrote "I felt she was honest and trustworthy—these qualities are much more important to me than years of experience, knowledge and friendliness. A first year student responded that the disclosing supervisor was "warm and genuine.....allowing for personal growth. A third year student reported that "Dr. Johnson seemed much more genuine and seemed genuinely interested in her supervisee and her experiences and emotions."

The second theme represented participants who viewed the disclosing supervisor as more willing and adept at exploring supervisees' emotions. Forty seven percent (n=10) of these respondents mentioned this theme as important to their preference. Dr. Johnson seemed more genuine and interested in her supervisees' feelings....sure to fully explore affect and to be supportive." A second year student responded that "Dr. Johnson stayed with the supervisee better and helped her process her experience. A sixth year student responded that Dr. Johnson was more "willing to deal with feelings in supervision."

The third theme represents those participants who cited the condition of self-disclosure as most important to their preference of the disclosing supervisor. Sixty one percent (n=13) of these respondents focused primarily on this theme. One fifth year student wrote "Dr. Johnson seemed to care more......normalized supervisees' feelings and connected by
sharing her own struggles." A third year student wrote "I feel her use of self-disclosure was very effective with this counselor." A fourth year student responded that her thoughts of the supervisor/supervisee relationship mirrored those of Dr. Johnsons in that "it was one of equals with the supervisor sharing her experience and expertise in respectful, authentic and encouraging ways.

Among those participants preferring the non-disclosing supervisor, there were two primary themes. The first theme represented participants who preferred the supervisor to focus more on client issues versus supervisee concerns. Fifty four percent (n=6) of those preferring the non-disclosing supervisor mentioned this theme. One third year student responded that she "would want to focus somewhat more on the client and the process rather than my feelings." A first year student stated that "Dr. Williams was more concerned with the client's issues and the mechanics of the process......I chose her because I'm much more of an outcome person." A fourth year student commented that "Dr. Johnson would make me feel valued, but I wouldn't feel as though I'd gained any insight as to how to address the issues raised by the client." A first year student wrote that the disclosing supervisor seemed to be counseling the supervisee while the non-disclosing supervisor "focused more on the client and what to do." She continued by stating that she would find the disclosing supervisor "to be frustrating."
The second theme represented participants who cited the displeasure with the nature and frequency of self-disclosure by Dr. Johnson as a primary reason for their choice of Dr. Williams. Thirty six percent (n=4) of the participants choosing the non-disclosing supervisor mentioned this theme. One second year student wrote "I sometimes appreciate my supervisor to self-disclose about their experiences, however, if it occurs frequently, I feel that we are getting off track." A fifth year student wrote "My preference was for Dr. Williams because I felt she'd be more willing to let my concerns fill our supervision period rather than attempt to make me feel better via self-disclosure."
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to explore the nature and influence of supervisor self-disclosure upon the perceptions the supervisors. This chapter will discuss and interpret the major findings of this research with respect to the four hypotheses outlined in chapter III. In addition, this chapter will include a discussion of the limitations of the study, its implications for the field of psychotherapy supervision and suggestions for future research.

Supervisor Self-Disclosure and Facilitative Conditions

The present study first hypothesized that the self-disclosing supervisor would be perceived as significantly more facilitative than the non-disclosing supervisor as measured by the BLRI-S. The results provide support for this hypothesis in that the analyses of variance performed on all six scales of the BLRI-S yielded significant p values ranging from .041 to .0001. ANOVA results in terms of the BLRI-S subscales may be
interpreted in light of previous research on self-disclosure. Significance for the Empathy scale (EMP) is consistent with the studies discussed in Watkins (1990). Counselors who displayed negative self-disclosures that were similar in content to the clients' responses were rated as significantly more empathic (Klein & Friedlander, 1987; Peca-Baker & Friedlander, 1987). Analyzing the nature of self-disclosure contained in the audiotapes of the present experiment, three of the primary self-disclosures were similar in content to the supervisees' responses as well as negatively valanced.

The significant findings for the ANOVA performed on the Congruence Scale (CON) indicates that participants viewed the disclosing supervisor as more authentic, open and honest. This result is consistent with Jourard's (1971) early research in self-disclosure which found that self-disclosers were rated as significantly more authentic. More recent studies of self-disclosure also have supported this relationship between self-disclosure and ratings of congruence, honesty and openness (Fox, Strum, & Walters, 1984; Klein & Friedlander, 1987).

The significant results for the ANOVA performed on the Regard Scale (REG) indicate that participants felt the disclosing supervisor held the supervisee in higher regard compared to the non-disclosing supervisor. This finding is consistent with the research of Collins and Miller (1994) who found that people
tend to self-disclose to people that they like versus people they do not.

And finally, it is important to mention that because the Willingness to Be Known Scale (WIL) is considered a direct measure of a supervisor's tendency to self-disclose, its significance (p < .0001) is important to the primary condition of self-disclosure.

**Supervisor Self-Disclosure and Social Influence**

The second hypothesis of the present study stated that the self-disclosing supervisor would be rated as having significantly more social influence than the non-disclosing supervisor as measured by the SRF-S. The significant result found on the ANOVA using the SRF-S total score demonstrates overall support for this hypothesis. However, when one examines the ANOVA results from the three subscales, any claim of support must be qualified by the lack of significance found for the Expertness Scale (EXP).

The significant results for the ANOVA performed on the Attractiveness Scale (ATT) and the Trustworthy Scale (TRT) indicate that participants perceived the disclosing supervisor as more attractive and trustworthy than the non-disclosing supervisor. These results are consistent with numerous studies conducted over the last three decades (Collins & Miller,
1991; Archer, Berg, & Runge, 1980; Taylor, Gould, & Brounstein, 1981). Many of these investigators explained their results using two popular theories. Social Influence theorists suggested that self-disclosures which increase similarity between counselors and clients enhance counselors' perceived trustworthiness and attractiveness and thereby increase the degree of their social influence. An alternate perspective is that of Social Exchange Theory (SET). In SET, self-disclosure is viewed as a positive outcome of growing intimacy and trust in a relationship. Therefore, people tend to be more attracted to those who provide them with rewarding exchanges.

While there is theoretical and empirical evidence to explain the significance in the relationship between self-disclosure and the variables of attractiveness and trustworthiness, the present author has been unable to locate previous research that specifically compares disclosing and non-disclosing subjects on receivers' ratings of expertness. The few studies which utilize expertness as a dependent variable investigate differences between the conditions self-involving and self-disclosing subjects. Despite this lack of empirical investigation, the mediating variables of self-disclosure contained in the present experiment suggest a possible explanation. Three of the self-disclosures given by the supervisor were similar to those of the supervisee in content.
and negative in nature. It is possible that many participants viewed these disclosures as signaling a lack of expertise on the part of the supervisor versus interpreting them as normalizing the supervisee's concerns. In addition, it may be reasonable to conclude that ratings of expertness were lowered as some participants reported that the self-disclosures in our 10 minute segment were too frequent. These findings will be addressed in the discussion of the qualitative results.

**Supervisor Self-Disclosure and Anticipated Satisfaction**

The third hypothesis of the present study stated that participants would have significantly higher ratings of anticipated satisfaction for the self-disclosing supervisor versus the non-disclosing supervisor as measured by the Supervisor Assessment Form (SAF). The results for the ANOVA using the SAF total score demonstrate overall support for this hypothesis. However, when one examines the ANOVA results in terms of the five individual questions or subscales, any claim of support must gain be qualified given the lack of significance found for the Competence Scale (CMP).

It must be reiterated that the decision to include the SAF was based primarily upon its potential to cross-validate the other dependent variables in the study. Therefore, the findings that the results obtained from the Preference and Anticipated
Satisfaction Scales corroborated the results of the Supervisor Preference Form (SPF) and the results from the Support and Enjoyability Scales buttressing those obtained from the Regard and Unconditional scales on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory were anticipated outcomes. While a significant result for the Competence Scale of the SAF would have been interesting, such a finding would have been inconsistent with the results obtained for the Expertness Scale on the SRF-S. It may be reasonable to expect these two scales to be highly correlated as any plausible definition of competence is likely to include at least some of the variables measured on the SRF-S Expertness Scale (i.e., supervisor skill, preparedness, experience and expertise). Therefore, the lack of significance found for the CMP scale is consistent with the results obtained from the Expertness scale on the SRF-S.

**Supervisor Self-Disclosure and Preference-Quantitative**

The fourth hypothesis of the present study predicted that the self-disclosing supervisor would be significantly more preferred than the non-disclosing supervisor as measured by the Supervisor Preference Form. A Binomial Proportions Probability analysis revealed that the disclosing supervisor was significantly more preferred (ratio of 21:11) than the non-disclosing supervisor ($Z = 1.86, p < .03$). This finding supports
the results obtained from the Preference and Anticipated Satisfaction Scales on the SAF.

**Supervisor Self-Disclosure and Preference-Qualitative**

An analysis of the qualitative results revealed that the most frequent responses cited by all participants were those which mentioned supervisor self-disclosure as important to their preference for a particular supervisor (n=16). Of those respondents, seventy six percent (n=13) preferred the disclosing supervisor. Both findings suggest the possibility that as much as any other factor, the condition of supervisor self-disclosure may have been responsible for the differences found in the dependent variables.

Additional support for this assertion can be found in the lack of significant differences between disclosing and non-disclosing supervisors on variables of competence and expertness. This suggests that participants' preference for the self-disclosing supervisor was not due to a perceived incompetence on the part of the non-disclosing supervisor but to the condition of self-disclosure and/or other contributing factors. The qualitative data further support this conclusion. Nearly a third of all participants (n=10) directly acknowledged that both supervisors operated at a comparable skill level.
If the differences found were not due to unequal supervisor skill, then to what might they be attributed? One possible answer could be related to the finding that fifty three percent (n=11) of those participants preferring the disclosing supervisor viewed her as more "genuine" and "honest". It was the second most frequent response given by all participants and it is consistent with the results of the Barrett-Lennard Congruence scale. It may be reasonable to assume that participants interpreted the self-disclosing supervisors as more open and honest because of their willingness to disclose potentially unfavorable experiences.

Another contributing factor to the effectiveness of the self-disclosing supervisors may have been the experience level of participants. It was proposed in chapter one that beginning counselors with little experience may find supervisor self-disclosure helpful in reducing the shame involved in making mistakes and in normalizing their concerns (Reising & Daniels, 1983; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). By using client contact hours as an indicator of experience, the majority of participants (n=24) could be considered as having low experience. An analysis of participants' qualitative responses reveals that six participants made comments supporting the theory stated above. A sixth year student commented that "earlier in my training, I would have preferred MJ (the disclosing supervisor),
but I don't feel I need so much support now and want to be challenged...." A fifth year student remarked that "segment 1 (disclosing supervisor) would be better for a beginning counselor, segment 2 for a more experienced one." These responses may provide limited support for the argument that supervisee experience may be a mediating variable guiding the effectiveness of supervisor self-disclosure.

Another contributing factor to the effectiveness of the self-disclosing supervisors may have been the way in which they chose to deal with supervisee's emotions and thoughts. Forty seven percent (n=10) of those participants preferring the disclosing supervisor indicated that they viewed the disclosing supervisor as more willing and adept at exploring supervisee feelings and thoughts. A closer examination of content of both supervisors responses reveals that while both supervisors explored the emotions and thoughts of supervisees, the disclosing supervisor's exploration was deepened considerably with the use of self-disclosure. These supervisors used the intervention of self-disclosure to increase supervisee affect and to normalize and validate their concerns in a caring and empathic way. This interpretation may explain some of the difference found between the disclosing and non-disclosing supervisors. However, an alternate interpretation may also be plausible. This interpretation would view the more frequent
and thorough exploration of emotion not as an added benefit of self-disclosure, but as an intervention distinct from self-disclosure. If this were true, then differences that attributed to the condition of self-disclosure would need to be analyzed by taking into account the effect of supervisor exploration of emotion.

In addition to the themes expressed by those preferring the disclosing supervisors, there were common responses among those who preferred the non-disclosing supervisors. Fifty four percent (n=6) of these participants mentioned that they chose the non-disclosing supervisor because they preferred a supervisor to focus more on client versus counselor issues. The content of these participant's responses seem to suggest that they may be related to the disclosing supervisor's tendency toward more frequent and thorough exploration of supervisee emotion. If so, it might be further argued that supervisor exploration of emotion may be a condition confounding the results of the present study.

Another common theme among those preferring the non-disclosing supervisor was related to the frequency of supervisor self-disclosure. Thirty six percent (n=4) of these participants viewed supervisor self-disclosure to be utilized too frequently. A fourth year student stated that "I sometimes appreciate my supervisor to self-disclose about their
experiences, however, if it occurs too frequently I feel that we are getting off track. A fifth year student commented that "Dr. Margaret Johnson seemed a bit overbearing at times- perhaps self-disclosure in more moderate doses would be better."

Because there were five supervisor self-disclosures during the ten minute audiotape session in addition to a one minute discussion of this technique contained in the introduction, it may be that the same number of disclosures spread out over an entire counseling session could have been viewed as more effective by those individuals preferring the non-disclosing supervisor.

Limitations of the study

When interpreting the results of the present study, certain limitations must be considered. These limitations are: 1) generalizability of results based on the nature of the sample; 2) potential differences in content of experimental manipulation; 3) restricted instrumentation and reliance on self-report inventories; 4) the analogue design of the study; 5) exclusive use of female supervisors; 6) context of supervision self-disclosure. Because this was an exploratory study examining an intervention relatively unexplored in a supervision context, the following limitations should be viewed with this in mind.
Similar to much of the supervision research published to date, the current sample size is relatively small thereby decreasing statistical power and increasing the likelihood of Type II errors. A larger sample of participants may have enabled the researcher to exclude from the overall model potentially influential variables with more confidence. More specifically, the influence of variables such as gender, experience and race/ethnicity could not be sufficiently explored due to this limitation.

Generalizability of results can be further challenged as the majority of participants were Caucasian females with either beginning or intermediate graduate student status. There exists a possibility that more advanced graduates or even post-doctoral psychologists possessing more diversity with respect to gender and ethnicity could have responded to the experiment in significantly different ways. Although the researcher obtained participants from clinical psychology, counseling psychology and counselor education programs of other universities, it must be noted that a potential bias exists in that the majority of participants were graduate students from one Counseling Psychology Program.

The content of the disclosing and nondisclosing audiotapes may pose a threat to the validity of the experiment. While care was put into both the design of the experiment and
the content of the audiotapes (i.e., randomization of supervisors and treatment conditions, the similar length, tone, and supportiveness of both the nondisclosing and disclosing audiotapes, etc.), it is possible that the confounding nature of these variables and others were not accounted for by the experimental design. The possible confound of the condition of self-disclosure with that of exploring supervisee emotion must be addressed in future studies.

Another limitation is the lack of cross validation with respect to the dependent variables of social influence and facilitative conditions. While effort was made to provide such validation, more thorough validation may have further buttressed or challenged the findings of the present research. In addition, a wider variety of instrumentation could have been utilized thereby making the investigation of other variables possible. Also, a related limitation is that the present study relied upon self-report questionnaires to measure the experimental constructs. Because these inventories are vulnerable to socially desirable responses, results obtained from them must be viewed from with caution.

Despite efforts to approximate the conditions of a supervision session, the analogue nature of the research could be considered a limitation. The use of actual supervision
sessions would have made for a more potent experimental design and thereby increased the generalizability of the results.

In an attempt to control for the effects of supervisor gender, only female supervisors were chosen to participate. This exclusive use of female supervisors further limits the generalizability of the results. It is important to assess the influence that supervisor gender has upon supervisee perception.

The final limitation to be noted is the context of the experimental condition. The present study's manipulation examined a supervisee who was experiencing distress due to a recent counseling session with a challenging client. One cannot be sure that under different circumstances a supervisee's perception of self-disclosure would be the same. Therefore, generalization of results to other situations outside of the context of supervisee distress cannot be made.

Implications for Counseling Supervision

The purpose of the present study was to explore the perceived effectiveness of supervisor self-disclosure. It is an attempt to validate a supervision intervention so that it may be more effectively utilized in the practice of supervision. The results of the present study strongly suggest that supervisor self-disclosure may be an effective supervision intervention,
especially when used with supervisees working with challenging clients. More specifically, the results suggest that supervisors may be perceived as more empathic, congruent, trustworthy and attractive when they use self-disclosure appropriately. In addition, participant comments indicate that self-disclosing supervisors may be viewed as more effective in validating and normalizing concerns of supervisees.

Despite the overall favorable evaluation of supervisor self-disclosure, the qualitative findings suggest that some individuals will react strongly against the intervention. For example, some individuals perceived the incidence of supervisor self-disclosure in this study as too frequent. It is important that supervisors begin to determine what is the optimal level in which to make self-disclosures. In her qualitative study on the therapeutic relationship, Hill (1989) found while the intervention of self-disclosure was the least utilized by practitioners, it was rated as the most effective of all interventions.

Another example of a strong reaction against the self-disclosing supervisor is that some participants viewed this supervisor as focusing too much on counselor rather than client concerns. This implies that supervisors must be cognizant of how the use of self-disclosure shifts the focus of supervision. In addition, it is important that supervisors discern when and
how such a change would be appropriate. Future supervision studies could examine mediating variables and how they contribute to the effectiveness of self-disclosure in the supervisory relationship.

The results of the present study also suggest that a supervisee's level of experience may be an important mediating variable with respect to supervisor self-disclosure. Several participants mentioned supervisor self-disclosure would be most appropriate for supervisees in the initial stages of their development. If so, supervisors would do well to consider the level of development of their trainees before employing self-disclosure. As the majority of trainees in the present study were considered to be less experienced (below 400 hours of client contact), the present findings are consistent with the view that supervisor self-disclosure would be more appropriate when employed with less experienced trainees (Reising & Daniels, 1983; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992).

Another implication that may be drawn from the findings of the present study is that the quality of the supervisor/supervisee relationship may be enhanced by appropriate use of supervisor self-disclosure. It is reasonable to expect that as supervisees perceive their supervisors as more trustworthy, authentic and attractive, the quality of closeness in the supervisory relationship will be enhanced.
Again, it is necessary that supervisors make decisions about the use of self-disclosure on an individual basis keeping in mind the many variables which mediate its effectiveness.

Numerous participants mentioned both a quantitative and qualitative difference in how supervisors explored supervisee affect. Despite their differing preferences for this intervention, most participants agreed that the disclosing supervisors were more focused on addressing supervisees feelings. One possible implication drawn from these results is that self-disclosure may facilitate a more frequent, if not effective exploration of supervisee emotion.

Future Directions of Research

The present study represents an initial attempt to explore supervisor self-disclosure. Because of its exploratory nature, further research is needed to study a more diverse sample of participants and investigate variables such as gender, experience, race/ethnicity and theoretical orientation.

Future studies can enhance generalizability by using actual supervision sessions. Notwithstanding the efforts made to create an analogue study which limits various threats to internal and external validity, it cannot rival the credibility of results obtained from an experiment conducted in authentic supervision sessions.
Future research would also benefit in creating an experimental condition which examines supervisor self-disclosure in other contexts. As previously mentioned, the present study explored self-disclosure from the context of supervisee distress. While this situation is a relatively common one when working with beginning supervisees, there exists a multitude of contexts where self-disclosure by supervisors may or may not be effective.

The present study employed both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. While the qualitative data gathered aided in understanding the participants' reactions to the experiment, it lacked specificity. More specific questions may have allowed for exploring areas which have traditionally been unavailable to quantitative investigation.

The qualitative data suggested the possibility that there may have been too much self-disclosure by supervisors. A consistent theme throughout the responses of participants not preferring self-disclosing supervisors centered around there being too much focus on the supervisor and not enough on the supervisee (i.e., how they could best intervene with their clients). This feedback could be significant given the fact that during the 10 minutes of the self-disclosing supervision example, there were 5 instances of self-disclosure by the supervisor. Future investigation of supervisor self-disclosure
may benefit from extending the length of the treatment condition (i.e., a full supervision session) thereby spreading out the use of self-disclosure more judiciously.
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APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION FOR PARTICIPATION
Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Alex Higdon and I am a 4th year doctoral student in counseling psychology at the Ohio State University. I am writing to solicit your participation for my dissertation research on psychotherapy supervision. The aim of the study is to explore the effectiveness of particular supervision interventions. I realize that your time is valuable and that is why I worked very hard to keep this study brief. The experiment should be completed within 55 minutes. In addition, your participation in this experiment will enter you in a contest to win 60 dollars.

If you are willing to participate in this experiment, allow me to thank you for your participation in advance. I appreciate you for taking the time out of a very busy schedule to assist me in this collection of data. The return of your completed survey by May 3rd will serve as your consent to participate. Enclosed in the experiment materials is a form to enter the contest for 60 dollars. Please fill this out as I will need your information in order to send you the prize.

If you are interested in the results of this study, please leave your name and address on the back of the demographic questionnaire and I will be glad to send you that information as soon as it is available. Once again, thank you so much for your participation.

Sincerely

Alex Higdon
Primary Investigator
(614) 793-0013
higdon.2@osu.edu
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APPENDIX B

SUPERVISOR AUDIOTAPE TRANSCRIPTS
Hello. I'm Dr. Margaret Johnson - I've been a counseling psychologist for 6 years now and I'm employed in a university counseling center. I'd like to say just a few words about how I view the supervisory process and then share with you a brief sample of my work.

First I'd like to say that I believe the most critical component of great supervision is the quality of the supervisory relationship. I view the supervisee as both a colleague and collaborator. I work to balance power in the relationship while being mindful of the unique boundary issues present in supervision. My primary focus is on listening for supervisees' needs and providing developmentally appropriate interventions.

I also believe strongly that one of the critical dimensions in the supervisory process is the dimension of self-disclosure as it relates to my work with supervisees. In the hope of shedding some light upon a supervisees' current challenges in therapy, often I'll share similar experiences both past and present of my own work with clients. I feel it's an important intervention for a couple of reasons. First, trainees often have high levels of performance anxiety and are particularly vulnerable to shame during the first few years of working with clients. I believe that by
sharing my failures and stuck points as a practitioner I can help normalize supervisee concerns and de-mystify the whole process of treatment. Secondly, I feel it is important to reveal to supervisees that I am not a model of perfection--that experienced counselors make mistakes and that growth is a never-ending process of examining ways to be more effective. And finally, because I believe that trainee self-disclosure is critical to our success in supervision, I see appropriate self-disclosure as a source of modeling effective supervisory behavior.

Finally I'd like to say that I feel it's important to be encouraging in my interactions with supervisees. Because much of the work that we do when beginning anything new can be discouraging, I try to counter trainee frustration by accentuating the positive aspects of each trainee's development.

Well, I hope this brief outline gives you a sense of how I view the process of supervision. Now I'd like to share with you an excerpt of a recent supervision session where I worked with a second year supervisee struggling with some difficult therapy issues.

S'or- How ya doing?
S'ee- Doing alright.
S'or- Well....where would you like to begin?

S'ee- I think I'll start with my client Karen Tucker. We've had 6 sessions now and I feel like we've made little if any progress. Today was a really difficult
session. We processed the previous week's homework assignment and she was giving one word answers— I could tell she was getting frustrated. So I asked her "What's going on for you right now?" and she said that she didn't know. But I knew something was up so I said that she seemed frustrated and asked her if she was frustrated with me. She paused for a moment and then said she was. And then she started saying some harsh things... basically she was in a bit of a tirade. She said she was not getting what she needed in therapy.....that she felt like I wasn't with her.

S'or- What does that mean--You weren't with her?

S'ee- Well...she said that I was just saying what counselors say. All you did was reflect back what she said. She that she knew how she felt and that she needed some answers once in a while. Basically she said that I hadn't been very helpful. Things that I already knew.

S'or- It must've been hard to hear that?

S'ee- (pause) Yeah. I've never had that happen before.

S'or- I wonder, what was that like for you when she said all that?

S'ee- (Pause) I was shocked....I felt exposed.

S'or- (Pause) . . . .Can you tell me more about that?

S'ee- Well, I felt exposed... . . . .like I'd been discovered. Like I really didn't know what I was doing. (Pause).... I also felt a little embarrassed... . . . .like part of what she was saying was true and we both knew it.

S'or- So you're feeling like you haven't been very helpful.

S'ee- The fact is I haven't been. We've been on the same topics for 6 weeks now. At first I thought I hadn't been empathic enough. Maybe she felt I really didn't understand her. So I made more of an effort to understand and active listen. When that didn't seem to work I took a more behavioral approach by structuring the sessions more and making suggestions for homework and outside activities. None of it went well.

S'or- Sounds like you feel nothing you to do seems to work?

S'ee- Yeah. It's been frustrating. (Pause-Big Pause)..... I'm also a little embarrassed that I'm having these feelings. Part of me thinks if I were more
secure within myself I wouldn't allow this to get to me so much.

S'or- You think a more secure counselor would be less affected?

S'ee- Yeah ....I guess I do.
S'or- Well.... I know how much time and thought you've put into this client--it must really be discouraging to feel like nothing is helping. I even became frustrated while watching the tape of you two a couple of weeks ago. This is a really challenging case! I must tell you that I admire you for your perseverance and patience with this whole situation. I think you've done a good job of putting into play many of the ideas that we've generated from supervision. Not to say that this situation isn't a setback and not that we can't learn a lot from this situation. . . .but I'm wondering about your expectation level.

S'ee- What do you mean?

S'or- Well, I think this is a really tough client. Frankly, I'm not sure how much better I could do under the same circumstances.

S'ee- Do you think my expectations are too high?

S'or- Well. ..I am interested in what you think. This is your second year seeing clients right?

S'ee- Yeah.

S'or- Well, what are your thoughts?

S'ee- I don't know. I guess I don't know how to expect less

S'or- Do you have a sense of how it would it be for you to expect less?

S'ee- I'm not exactly sure. Maybe I feel that I wouldn't be as competent as I think I should be.

S'or- Well, that would certainly help to maintain those expectations. (Pause) Maybe we should spend some time discussing your expectations and what might be fair or reasonable to expect.

S'ee- That's fine. I've just never heard of anyone who's had this happen before. I'm sure that I'm not the only one in the world who's had this happen to them but I got the feeling that it's usually therapists who aren't very competent.
S'or- Sounds like you feel what happened to you is exceptionally rare!

S'ee- Well... in a way I do. S'or- I can tell you that from my own experience it isn't rare. When I was on my internship—not in my second year mind you—but on my internship I had a similar experience with a client almost to the word. There I was on my internship-supposed to be the end of my training and the client is telling me I wasn't helping. He resisted all my attempts to help. He was struggling with issues related to depression but it felt like all he wanted to do was battle me. It was a really difficult time for me. I think what made it worse was that I began to question whether I was even in the right profession.

S'ee- Well, it's crossed my mind too. It just seems as though I should be more effective at this point... much farther ahead.

S'or- One thing I have learned from my work with clients and from my years of working with trainees is often treatment expectations, especially at the beginning of training can be a bit unreasonable. The type of pressure brought on by these expectations can be enormous and sometimes harmful. I'm just wondering if you are feeling this kind of pressure you are putting yourself under?

S'ee- Yeah. You're probably right. I guess I just need to realize that this is not some test I'm going to ace. I need to keep reminding myself of that.

S'or- Exactly! That might be really work. There's no cookbook of change. It's often a very slow process. Not always, but many times this is the case. When I entered this field I had a grand conception about what I could do and be for clients. I felt if only I knew more and had better technique that could help almost anyone. But my experience has changed my perspective. It's like a marriage...you can't do it alone. Both partners have to be ready and willing to move forward. Do you know what me?

S'ee- Yeah.

S'or- Your concerns about this situation are real and important, but they're not unusual—One might say even developmentally inevitable. I've known many clinicians who've worked in this field and who've been driven to the point of seriously questioning their career choice. In fact, I might be worried about someone who wasn't seriously challenged by this work. (Pause) What's going on with you right now? S'ee- Well, it's helpful to hear you say that! (Pause) I think it would be helpful to examine my expectations.
I do feel a lot of pressure to perform and I'm sure it's getting in the way somehow.
S'or- I think you'd be surprised how similar these experiences are to most clinicians if they had the vulnerability to disclose them. That's one thing that I want to reinforce with you--the fact that you had the courage to share this situation and your feelings about it. With the previous incident that I was sharing I never told my supervisor. Because of that I never had the opportunity to directly learn from that experience and fully contribute to that client. It takes some courage to share your work. Do you know what I mean?

S'ee- Yeah, I do.

S'or- Don't get me wrong. I'm not saying that there isn't some important feedback here that we can use to make you a more effective counselor. The whole issue of responsibility and also utilizing the process dimension more effectively are some areas that we can work on. But I just feel that it is important to keep in perspective on where you are and how far you have come.

S'ee- I just have to keep reminding myself that this is only my second year seeing clients.

S'or- I agree. You're really just beginning this journey. (Pause) Well....why don't we shift gears and look at those issues of responsibility and process.

S'ee- Okay.
Hello. I'm Dr. Jennifer Williams - I've been a counseling psychologist for 6 years now and I'm employed in a university counseling center. I'd like to say just a few words about how I view the supervisory process and then share with you a brief sample of my work.

I think that the most important aspect in good supervision is the type of relationship the supervisor and supervisee establish and maintain. I try to develop relationships with supervisees that emphasize collaboration and open communication.

Another important factor in the supervision process is that of closely listening to supervisees and responding to their needs. I believe if I am genuinely concerned with listening to the supervisee, we can create a focus and agenda for supervision that is both important to the supervisee and helpful to the client.

I also work to be encouraging in my communication with my supervisees. I try to remind them of the unique strengths that they possess and encourage them to spend equal time focusing on what works in addition to what can be improved.

I also believe strongly that one of the critical dimensions in the supervisory process is tracking where
my supervisees' are developmentally. For me, the most beneficial supervisory experiences are those that meet the particular developmental needs of trainees at varying experience levels. For example, a supervisee who is a beginning therapist may require more structure in supervision and a stronger emphasis may be placed on skill building at that level -- whereas a more advanced therapist may need more autonomy and benefit more by addressing issues of conceptualization and self-evaluation.

Well, I hope this brief outline gives you a sense of how I view the process of supervision. Now I'd like to share with you an excerpt of a recent supervision session where I worked with a supervisee struggling with some difficult therapy issues. She is now in her second full year of seeing clients.

S'or- How ya doing!
S'ee- Doing Alright.
S'or- Well, where would you like to begin? Any issues that seem most important?
S'ee- Well, I've had an incident that's really been bugging me.
S'or- Okay, lets start there.
S'ee- Well......I had a really difficult session with a client from practicum...Karen Tucker. I feel like we've made little progress over the last 6 weeks and today I was asking her some questions about her homework and she wasn't giving me any answers.

S'or- What exactly was the subject you two were talking?
S'ee- Well, she's been struggling in session to identify her feelings. When I ask her questions to get her to identify them she's unable. She's had a history of denying emotions stemming back to her relationship with her parents......they always invalidated her feelings and it seems she has also denied herself any emotional freedom. So in order to help her get in touch with her emotions I suggested a feelings journal. I got a sense from her answers to my questions about her homework that she made little effort to do it. So I began exploring whether it was helpful or not and she barely responded. I thought she might be frustrated so I asked her about it and she said she was. She told me a whole bunch of things but what I remember the most is that she felt our sessions hadn't been helpful.......that all I do is parrot back what she says and ask her about her feelings.

S'or- Wow! (Pause) I'm wondering if she had been giving you some signals before this--some clues to her frustration that you were not responding to or was this reaction out of the blue?

S'ee- Well...a little of both probably. I think if I look back I'm sure I could find some places where I could have caught her frustration processed it but on the other hand she has never quite been so angry.

S'or- (Pause) You said that there may have been some clues in your past interactions. I'm wondering if you can identify some specific incidents in your past which might have given you a clue?

S'ee- Well (pause)...I don't know.....that's hard. I think I'd really need to think about that.

S'or- Okay. Take a minute and see if you can come up with some. I really think this it an important area.

S'ee- (Pause) I think the reason why it is hard to come up with something is that I thought she always seemed a little testy and judgmental. I guess I just wrote it off as that.

S'or- By that you mean to say that it seemed just a function of her personality rather than unusual circumstances.

S'ee- Yeah. I think that's right.

S'or- Okay...well, you mentioned her being angry.....I'm wondering if she was screaming at you or irate....anything like that?
S'ee- No... she wasn't screaming She said she was not getting what she needed in therapy.....that she felt like I wasn't with her.

S'or- ?How does that square with your perception? ?Do you feel that the two of you haven't been on the same page sort of?

S'ee- Umm.....that's a good question...I didn't feel that we were that off base. (Pause) I have felt like the last couple of sessions that we have been........well, we've got less and less done. I've given her some homework assignments the last couple of weeks and she brought them back but really didn't get into them-----

S'or- ?What does that mean....she didn't get into them at all?

S'ee- Well, I got the feeling that she really wasn't being honest with me...that she kinda halfway did them. She wasn't really trying. That was my sense of it....but it's hard to know exactly. I've felt that she's been more distant with me these last couple of sessions.....but I've never really felt a tremendous connection with her throughout our relationship.

S'or- It sounds as if the more invested you are and the harder you push the less you get back from her .....is that accurate?

S'ee- Yeah...It feels more and more like that. I feel like I've tried to adjust my session with her to try to meet her needs.

S'or- ?Do you feel a pull to do something?

S'ee- Yeah...I feel like it.

S'or- And when you do you don't get much back?

S'ee- Or when I do I get a lot of resistance.....she gets this exasperated look. Not that she's getting angry but....frustrated. Like nothing I say or the places we go are right for her.

S'or- So again you feel caught between...on the one hand help me--but when you try to make suggestions or when you give homework assignments it's sorta "yes butted" ...taken in a real half hearted way.

S'ee- Exactly. That's the way it's been.

S'or- So what are you feeling about this?
S'ee- Well, I guess after this event...after the things she said I felt like I didn't know where to go......I felt embarrassed. When she said that all I was doing was repeating what she was saying versus giving her more of my opinions, I could see what she meant by that. Here I am trying to reflect...doing some active listening and she's feeling like that process is phony....that I'm just trying to be a counselor...trying to play some role.

S'or- And that's where the embarrassment comes in?

S'ee- Yeah... I guess it felt like what she was saying partly true.

S'or- Like you'd been caught?

S'ee- Yeah. Exactly...Like I'd been caught. Because I'm honestly confused as to how I could be more effective with her. I really want too. Here I am trying to be present and she's saying that I'm not present. I can see what she's saying...

S'or- It's sounds really frustrating.

S'ee- Yeah. It is. I'm just not sure where to go w/her. (pause).

S'or- Well, let me ask you something. You seem to feel a lot of responsibility for where the sessions go...am I hearing that right?

S'ee- (Pause) Yeah..I do feel some responsibility. I feel my job is to make a difference with my client....and to provide the best environment for growth possible.....and I feel like if nothing else...I really haven't been able to get her to really look at what's going on.

S'or- Do you feel that level of responsibility more with her than with most or all of your other clients?

S'ee- (Pause) I don't think so. I think the difference with her and other clients is that she is the only one who has given me such harsh feedback.

S'or- Is there something about her pattern of interaction....her style of interaction...her way of being that has sort of hooked you in a way that other clients haven't?

S'ee- I don't think so. At this point I just feel I don't know what else to do.

S'or- This is difficult. I'm sure it would be easier if she expressed her pain as many do by becoming either
depressed or anxious. Her way of dealing with her pain seems to be striking out at others.

S'ee- (Pause) Yeah.

S'or- Do you have any thoughts on how to get past that....to get through that frustration and connect with her?

S'ee- (Pause)....At the level that you are talking about? Beyond her anger?....

S'or- Exactly.

S'ee- I guess just process that more with her. Ask her what's underneath that frustration--try to get to her hurt and disappointment. But as I say that I'm thinking "well.... that's where I've been trying to go in the past." (Pause) Well, maybe not. I've gone there on issues related to the ones we're talking about. Maybe if I got more to the heart of her pain she would respond differently.

S'or- I agree......Maybe we could take a little time now and talk about how you might do that. How you might get beneath that anger. Does that sound good to you?

S'ee- Okay.
APPENDIX C

RATER EVALUATION OF SUPERVISOR AUDIOTAPES
AUDIOTAPE EVALUATION

Please complete this form by circling the responses which best represent your perceptions of the audiotape you just heard.

1. The audiotape was audibly clear and could be easily heard.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

2. The supervisee on this tape was believable/credible.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

3. The supervisor on the tape appeared experienced in supervision.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

4. The audiotape possessed a high degree of supervisor self-disclosure.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

5. The supervisor on the tape appeared competent.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

6. The supervisor on the tape presented her views on supervision in a clear manner.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

7. The supervisor on this tape was believable/credible.
   Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree
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APPENDIX D

BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY—SHORT FORM
Please rate on the following scales the supervisor you just listened to on the audiotape. Circle the number to the left of each item which corresponds to how strongly you feel each statement is true or not true according to the key below. Please mark every item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I strongly feel it is not true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel it is not true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel it is probably untrue: more untrue than true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel it is probably true; more true than untrue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel it is true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I strongly feel it is true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 (1) This supervisor would respect me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (2) This supervisor would understand my words but not the way I feel.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (3) This supervisor would pretend that she liked me or understood me more than she really did.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (4) This supervisor would talk only about me and not at all about herself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (5) This supervisor would like seeing me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (6) This supervisor would be interested in knowing what my experiences meant to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (7) This supervisor would be disturbed whenever I talked about or asked about certain things.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (8) If I would feel negatively toward this supervisor she would respond negatively toward me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (9) This supervisor would appreciate me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (10) Sometimes this supervisor would think that I felt a certain way, because she felt that way.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (11) This supervisor behaved just the way she would be in our relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (12) This supervisor would freely tell me her own thoughts and feelings when I wanted to know.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (13) This supervisor would care about me.
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This supervisor's own attitudes toward some of the things I would say or do would stop her from really understanding me.

I do not think this supervisor would hide anything from herself that she felt with me.

Sometimes this supervisor would be warmly responsive to me and other times cold or disapproving.

This supervisor would be interested in me.

This supervisor would appreciate what my experiences felt like to me.

I felt that I could trust this supervisor to be honest with me.

This supervisor would adopt a professional role that would make it hard for me to know what she was like as a person.

This supervisor would not really care what happened to me.

This supervisor would not realize how strongly I would feel about some of the things we discussed.

There would be times when I would feel that this supervisor's outward response would be quite different from her inner reaction.

Depending on her mood, this supervisor would sometimes respond to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than she would at other times.

This supervisor would seem to really value me.

This supervisor would respond to me mechanically.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (27) I don't think that this supervisor would be honest with herself about the way she felt about me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (28) This supervisor would want to say as little as possible about her own thoughts and feelings.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (29) This supervisor would feel deep affection for me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (30) This supervisor would usually understand all of what I said to her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (31) Sometimes this supervisor would be not at all comfortable but would go on outwardly ignoring it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (32) This supervisor's general feeling toward me would vary considerably.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (33) This supervisor would regard me as a disagreeable person.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (34) When I would not say what I meant at all clearly, this supervisor would still understand me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (35) I felt that this supervisor was being genuine.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (36) This supervisor's feelings and thoughts would always be available to me, but never imposed on me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (37) At times this supervisor would feel contempt for me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (38) Sometimes this supervisor would respond quite positively to me, at other times she would seem indifferent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (39) This supervisor would not try to mislead me about her own thoughts and feelings.

1 2 3 4 5 6 (40) This supervisor could be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them herself.
APPENDIX E

SUPERVISOR RATING FORM-SHORT
INSTRUCTIONS

Please rate several characteristics of the supervisor you just listened to on audiotape. For each characteristic on the following page, there is a seven-point scale that ranges from "not very" to "very." Please mark an "X" at the point on the scale that best represents how you view the supervisor just observed. For example:

FUNNY
not very: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

WELL DRESSED
not very: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

These ratings might show that the supervisor does not joke around much, but was well dressed.

Though all of the following characteristics are desirable, supervisors differ in their strengths. We are interested in knowing how you view these differences. Remember, your responses are totally anonymous.

Please complete the following ratings.
FRIENDLY
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

EXPERIENCED
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

HONEST
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

LIKEABLE
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

EXPERT
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

RELIABLE
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

SOCIABLE
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

PREPARED
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

SINCERE
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

WARM
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

SKILLFUL
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very

TRUSTWORTHY
not very ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: very
APPENDIX F

SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT FORM
SUPERVISOR ASSESSMENT FORM

Please complete this form by circling the response which best represents your reaction to the supervisor you just viewed.

1. Overall, how satisfied would you feel with this supervisor?
   Very Satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Dissatisfied

2. Overall, how competent do you feel this supervisor would be?
   Very Competent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Incompetent

3. Overall, how enjoyable would it be to work with this supervisor?
   Very Enjoyable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Unenjoyable

4. Overall, how supported would you feel with this supervisor?
   Very Supported 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Unsupported

5. Overall, to what degree would you want to work with this supervisor?
   Very Much 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not at all
Supervisor Preference Form

Please indicate the supervisor you would prefer to work with by marking an "X" on the line that indicates the supervisor you have selected.

_____ Dr. Janis Williams (Audiotape segment #1)

_____ Dr. Margaret Johnson (Audiotape segment #2)

Please briefly indicate the reason for your choice of supervisor.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX H

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Age: ______

Gender:  F  M  (Circle one)

Race:  ____Asian-American  ____African-American  
____Caucasian  ____Hispanic  ____International Student  
____Other (specify)____________________

Year in graduate school (post-B.A./B.S.) _____

Field of study: ______________________________

Estimate total number of hours of direct client contact: ___

Total number of clinical supervisors:  0_______
  (check one)  1-3_______
          4-10_______
          11+_______

Please briefly describe any counseling or related clinical activity including type of activity, setting, and approximate number of hours of experience (e.g., practicum, psychology clinic, 15 hours client contact).

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Have you functioned as a supervisor?  ____Yes  ____No  If yes, please describe this experience (setting and approximate number of hours).

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please use the back of this questionnaire if your need additional space.
APPENDIX I

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

April 1, 1999

Dear Participant,

Thank you very much for your participation. This experiment was designed to assess the potential effectiveness of a particular supervision intervention. More specifically, the intervention of supervisor self-disclosure in the context of feminist supervision was examined. If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this experiment, or if you have specific questions regarding the nature and/or outcome of this experiment, please feel free to contact me by phone at (614) 793-0013 or by email at higdon.2@osu.edu. Once again, thank you very for your participation.

Sincerely and appreciatively,

Alex Higdon, M.A., M. Ed.
Primary Investigator
(614) 793-0013
higdon.2@osu.edu