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Abstract

This descriptive quantitative study explored the relationship of supervisory effectiveness and supervisory working alliance as rated by supervisor and supervisee. These constructs were assessed by two self-report measures: Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) and The Supervision: Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE). SWAI was used to gather information on the perceptions of the supervisor and supervisee actions of each other, how this affects the relationship, and the supervisee’s interaction with clients. The SAGE was utilized to allow for measurement of the facilitating effect the supervisor has on the learner as demonstrated by use of a range of supervisory techniques that are known to be effective. The selection of these measures answers a call from the literature to examine the supervisory process using multiple, methodologically sound measures.

A convenience sample of 42 counseling students and supervisors was drawn from students and supervisors at a CACREP accredited university in the Midwest. Participants had the option of completing the questionnaire in the classroom or at their discretion using the internet data collection service Survey Monkey.

Several important correlations were examined using a Pearson’s correlation coefficient: (a) between supervisee and supervisory perceived working alliance and effectiveness, (b) between supervisees perceived working alliance and effectiveness, and (c) between supervisors perceived working alliance and effectiveness. Positive correlations between working alliance and effectiveness ratings for supervision dyads were anticipated and supported. There was a strong, positive correlation between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees, \( r = .765, p \leq .01 \)
for supervisee reports and $r = .699, p \leq .001$. Internal consistency for these measures was also supported by Cronbach’s Alpha analysis. Correlations between supervisor and supervisee reports were anticipated but did not approach significance in this sample. Mean scores for the supervisor group were lower than the supervisee group for working alliance and effectiveness. Supervisor ratings on the SAGE are reflective of a significant difference ($p<.030$) between the contract and no contract groups. The mean score difference clearly illustrates this difference: the contract group ($m = 102.4$) versus the no contract group ($m = 79.1$).

These results indicated that supervisor and supervisee perceptions of working alliance and effectiveness in supervision are associated. Overall, supervisors rated the effectiveness of the supervisory process lower than supervisees. Supervisors who reported contract utilization rated the supervisory process as more effective. Implications towards effective supervision, the importance of working alliance, and suggestions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Supervision provides a safeguard for professionals and the people they serve. In the field of counseling, supervision is an intervention characterized by an evaluative relationship that extends over time which serves to enhance professional functioning, monitor the quality of professional services rendered, and provide gate-keeping for those who are to enter the field (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Yager and Littrell’s (1978) definition of supervision is used for the purposes of this research, as it is more applicable to the student supervisory experience: “The process by which counselor trainees or practicing counselors receive information, feedback, and support relative to maximizing their effectiveness with clients” (p. 2). The profession of counseling requires counselors in training to work under supervision. Inskipp and Proctor (1995) report that the alliance formed in supervision enables the counselor to gain confidence, ethical competence, creativity, and the compassion necessary to provide the best possible client care. The opportunity to explore the challenges that are presented during the therapeutic process reduces the vicarious trauma experienced by the counselor and therapeutic ineffectiveness (Lambert & Barley, 2001). Self-awareness is also enhanced during supervision, providing greater insight into counselor and client interaction (Borders, 1990; Raichelson, Herron, Primavera, & Ramirez, 1997). In a qualitative examination of supervision outcomes, Worthen and McNeill (1996) reported strengthened confidence, refined professional identity, increased therapeutic perception, expanded ability to conceptualize and intervene, positive anticipation to re-engage in the therapeutic struggle, and strengthened supervisory alliance. It is clear that the benefits of supervision can be
numerous and are of vital importance to the counselor and the client. With this in mind, we should consider the importance of understanding and evaluating the supervisory process.

Over the past two decades standards for counseling supervisors (Dye & Borders, 1990), a curriculum guide for supervisor training (Borders et al., 1991), and ethical guidelines specific to the practice of counseling supervision have been developed (Hart, Borders, Nance & Paradise, 1995). These changes have spurred a re-evaluation of the supervisory process and the supervisor training programs across the nation. The importance of the provision of more comprehensive supervisory training has been echoed by a large body of research (e.g., Britton, Goodman & Rak, 2002; Getz, 1999; Manzanares et al., 2004; Roberts, Morotti, Herrick, & Tilbury, 2001; Schultz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson, & Bardos, 2002). Fostering a positive supervisory relationship and efficacious supervisory outcome is the goal of clinical training programs. It is the duty of educators to make continued efforts to better prepare students to serve as supervisors and counselors. Having a broader knowledge of the influential components of the supervisory process will aid the preparatory training of counseling students and supervisors in training. Further, the supervision process is an important component of training that occurs in many different fields: nursing, teaching, medicine, engineering, and geosciences. Learning more about the relationship between the important components of the supervisory process will be beneficial across all of these fields.

**Statement of the Problem**

Generally, supervisory training programs equate supervisory effectiveness with
evidence of supervisee skill building. However, the literature on supervisory effectiveness has tended to be relatively narrow in focus: investigating primarily supervisee reports of satisfaction with supervision. Clinical training and research on effective supervision may have discounted the influence of the supervisory relationship and actual client outcomes. Use of such additional outcome measures might establish supervisory effectiveness beyond a focus on skill building and satisfaction.

Recent studies on the effectiveness of supervisory training programs suggest that there was little observable growth in affective areas of supervision (Baker, Exum, & Tyler, 2002). These findings were aligned with what Borders & Fong (1994) reported regarding challenges faced by supervisors in training dealing with relationship dynamics and issues of supervisee personal concern. Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Norem (2000) took an alternate approach to examining effectiveness in supervision by asking experienced counselors about their experiences with detrimental components of supervision. These counselor interviews revealed three general areas of ineffective supervision: (a) Organizational/Administrative, (b) Technical/Cognitive, and (c) Relational/Affective. The counselors interviewed were asked to report on nonproductive supervision experiences and to describe a “lousy” supervisor. Their reports were analyzed and categorized into the three areas listed above.

Reports from the technical/cognitive area indicated that poor supervisors were unskilled as practitioners, supervisors, and were unreliable resources. This addresses skill building and resources, as is typically reported in effectiveness research. The organizational/administrative area was explained as a failure to establish parameters for the process of supervision. Absence of the contracting process in supervision was
reported in this area as well. Finally, the relational/affective area reports pointed to the importance of creating a safe environment with recognition of the humanizing process that is present in effective supervision. This account of lousy supervision highlights the importance of examining the effectiveness of supervision more thoroughly. Moreover, this report offers support for improved supervision training programs.

The narrow focus of supervisory training programs on skill building may explain why there is little observable growth in research on the affective components of the supervision process. It also offers some explanation for the large number of disciplinary infractions of counselors in training, or unlicensed counselors. Handelsman (2003) examined disciplinary infractions of mental health professionals in Colorado over a six year period and reported that 42.1% of infractions were from unlicensed counselors. The unprecedented number of infractions by these unlicensed counselors under supervision further illustrates the need for specialized training to accomplish supervision competency.

The importance of the counselor-client relationship is emphasized in the counseling education curriculum and supervisory training. This relationship is considered the foundation for therapeutic effectiveness. It is not surprising that teaching students to work from a relational framework during the counseling process is a common practice. However, operating from the relational framework also proves useful in the context of the counseling supervision relationship. Gregory and Henderson (2008) suggested that working within a relational framework in counseling supervision could improve the quality of the relationship. Results reported by Vallance (2005) indicated that a high level of counselor confidence and congruence in the supervisory
relationship leads to increased confidence and congruence in the counseling relationship. These results suggest a parallel between the counseling relationship and the supervision relationship. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) noted the parallel process of the counseling and supervisory relationship as a central event of supervision. Despite these theoretical arguments for the importance of the supervisory relationship, Schwing, LaFollette, Steinfeldt, and Wong (2011) recently indicated that most current models of training and supervision do not directly incorporate a clarification of how the therapeutic relationship facilitates effectiveness of student supervision.

Why then is there limited emphasis in training and education on how best to promote the supervisor supervisee relationship? To broaden our understanding of supervisory effectiveness, the current study addressed this gap in the literature by focusing on the perceptions of the supervisor and supervisee of the relationship and effectiveness during the student’s supervisory experience. The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990) and the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE) (Milne & Reiser, 2008) were used to assess perceptions of the relationship (i.e., SWAI) and of effectiveness of supervision (i.e., SAGE). The SWAI, the relationship measure, examines perceptions of the supervisor and supervisee related to each other. This is one explanation for the use of the term supervisory relationship interchangeably with the term working alliance. The SAGE is an empirically-based instrument that evaluates effectiveness of supervision based on supervisor and supervisee performance related to common factors present in effective supervision, specific behaviors of supervisors that are known to support learning and areas of learning that are impacted by supervision.
Rationale & Significance of the Study

The premise behind my research is that the relationship between counselor and supervisor is the groundwork that supports the foundation for supervisory effectiveness. This will be the first study that examines the association between supervisor and supervisees’ perceptions of the supervisory working alliance and the supervisor’s effectiveness as measured through supervisee learning outcomes and supervision performance (as measured by the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation measure). The design and selection of the measures answers a call from the literature for the use of methodologically sound instruments in the examination of supervision (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Lambert & Ogles, 1997; Sexton, 1998; Milne, 2011). The evaluation of the supervisory process from both the perspective of the supervisor and supervisee provided insight regarding the congruence of their perceived supervision experience. Results on the similarities and differences indicated by the perceived supervisory experience were expected to have implications towards a more objective understanding of the present working alliance and effectiveness in supervision. It was expected that the results of this examination would allow for evaluation of the influence of the supervisory relationship on the effectiveness of supervision. Additionally, this study aimed to provide evidence of effectiveness for supervisory models that are relationship focused. A more comprehensive look at how relationship and effectiveness components of the supervisory process are related might well point to implications for improved counselor supervisory training.

Questions
• Is there a significant correlation among supervisor and supervisee perceptions of supervision effectiveness?

• Is there a significant correlation among supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervision working alliance?

• Is there a significant correlation between the working alliance and effectiveness perceptions among supervisors and supervisees?

• Are the working alliance values significantly predictive of the effectiveness value?

**Hypotheses**

1. There will be a positive correlation between supervisor effectiveness ratings and supervisee effectiveness ratings.

2. There will be a positive correlation between supervisor working alliance ratings and supervisee working alliance ratings.

3. There will be a positive correlation between working alliance and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees.

4. The working alliance variable set will be significantly predictive of the effectiveness variable set.

**Definitions**

The following review of terminology is an effort to operationalize the variables of this research. Note that the terms counseling and therapy are used interchangeably throughout this document.
1. **Supervisees:** Graduate level counseling students in training working with clients in applied settings and/or with fellow students in role played situations as part of their university training (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 1993).

2. **Supervisors:** Counselors who have been designated by the university to directly oversee the clinical work of counselors in training (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 1993).

3. **Supervision:** The process by which counselor trainees receive information, feedback, and support relative to maximizing their effectiveness with clients (Yager & Littrell, 1978).

4. **Supervisory Relationship:** For the purpose of this study, therapeutic relationship will be defined by the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, focusing on rapport, client focus, and identification subscales (SWAI: Efstation, et al., 1990).

5. **Effectiveness:** For the purpose of this study, effectiveness will be defined by the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (Milne & Reiser, 2008).
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

This chapter will offer an introduction to the theoretical framework relevant to the constructs and processes of supervision being evaluated. In addition, it will provide comprehensive account of the importance of supervision to training and clinical effectiveness. Essential factors in establishing a therapeutic relationship in counseling student supervision will be introduced. The chapter will review research that has explored factors that are important to promote effective counseling student supervision. Finally, it will examine measures that allow for the assessment of these factors during the supervisory process.

A large body of research supports the significance of supervision at the graduate and professional level. Since the first edition of the Counselor Education and Supervision journal in 1961, research and reviews are published quarterly. This is just one of many journals today that report on supervision in the social sciences (e.g., Counseling Psychologist, Clinical Psychologist, Clinical and Consulting Psychology, Social Work, Clinical Social Work, Mental Health Policy). The topic of research on counseling supervision spans over 60 years, and this review will not cover the entirety of this period. Current and landmark research regarding the outcomes of supervision, the therapeutic relationship in supervision, components effective of supervision, measures of relationship and effectiveness will be reviewed.

Theoretical Frameworks

An understanding of the interplay between the supervisory relationship (i.e., the working alliance) and what we know to be effective in supervisory approaches begins
with an understanding of theoretical frameworks. Beinart (2012) explains that these frameworks fall into three categories: developmental models, social role models, and integrative models. As expected, research findings both offer support and question the efficaciousness of these models. The Developmental Model, Systems Approach Model (an integrative model), and the Working Alliance Model are of greatest relevance to this study given their focus on relationship building and/or experiential learning.

In this summary a brief account of changes in supervisory models overtime is described, a context for the constructs of the supervisory relationship and the process of supervision are provided. Further, it highlights the transition from a focus on relationship in models for supervision to effectiveness in supervision that came with the popularity of the Developmental Model. The Systems Approach integrated these models, as well as components of Ecological Theory to provide a more comprehensive model for supervision, highlighting the supervisory relationship, contextual factors, and effective practices in supervision. The instruments selected for this study were developed with components of these theoretical frameworks in mind. Additionally, the Systems Approach is in line with the research questions of this study regarding the connectedness of relationship and effectiveness in supervision.

**Working Alliance.** In a landmark essay, Bordin (1983) introduced the application of the working alliance to the supervisory process. From Bordin’s perspective, the working alliance is a process that allows for relationship building, repair, and change. He highlighted the parallel between the counseling and supervisory process in his explanation of the three principles of the working alliance: mutual agreement on goals for the change process, mutual agreement on tasks for the change process, and a
bond between participants. Bordin’s conceptualization of the supervisory process is in line with a relational model for supervision. Drawing from therapeutic and didactic orientations, he recommended eight goals of supervision that allowed for the development of the working alliance in supervision.

Mastery of specific skills; emerging one’s understanding of clients; enlarging one’s awareness of process issues; increasing awareness of self and impact on process; overcoming personal and intellectual obstacles toward learning and mastery; deepening one’s understanding of concepts and theory; provide a stimulus to research; maintenance of standards of service. (Bordin, 1983, pp. 8)

He suggested that adherence to the principles and goals of the working alliance in supervision should allow for education on personal and technical issues, as well as provide emphasis on the importance of developing an emotional bond with the supervisee. Bordin was in agreement with Patterson (1974) on the inherent problem presented by the evaluative nature of the supervisory process and suggested that this obstacle is counterbalanced by the focus of the working alliance on the building and repair of relationships, which is made possible by the emotional bond. The significance of Bordin’s working alliance has been made clear by the way we use the term working alliance interchangeably with therapeutic/supervisory relationship. Further, much of the research that examines variables that may influence the therapeutic/supervisory relationship use instruments based on Bordin’s working alliance principles (e.g., Castonguay & Beutler, 2006; Castonguay, Norberg, & Shut, 2010; Horvath, 2006; Horvath & Greenberg, 1994). The literature review will highlight support for Bordin’s working alliance over the last 20 years, as well as the need for exploration of the impact
of the working alliance on supervisory outcomes.

**Developmental Model.** A number of authors have reinterpreted the developmental model (e.g., Littrell, Lee-Borden, & Lorenz, 1979; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997). For the purpose of this introduction, the developmental model will be reviewed in more general terms. This model is like developmental psychology in that it acknowledges the changing needs and abilities of the supervisee in a lifelong process towards competence. From the developmental perspective, the trainee transitions through different stages of competency over time and the supervisor focus is on meeting the changing needs during these transitions. In these models, the roles and tasks of supervision are described as they pertain to the stages of development. Developmental models are frequently referenced in supervision research and are often adopted by educators and supervisors, as research has demonstrated their merit. However, these models have also been criticized for a lack of attention to the diversity of counselors in training and the importance of the supervisory relationship across developmental phases (Hart and Nance, 2003; Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke, 1986).

**Systems Approach to Supervision Model.** Holloway’s (1995) integrative model of supervision, Systems Approach to Supervision, denoted the importance of understanding the developmental needs of the supervisee and at the same time the importance of the working alliance. Much like Bordin (1983), Holloway (1995) conceptualized the supervisory relationship as having three essential elements: Interpersonal Structure, Supervisory Contracts, and Phases of the Relationship. She described the interpersonal structure as suggestive of the dimensions of power and
attachment in the relationship, supervisory contracts as establishment of tasks and goals in the supervisory relationship and process, and the phases of the relationship as changing from formal to informal over time. Based on Holloway’s conceptualization of the relationship, the Systems Model is suggestive of an integration of the Working Alliance and Developmental Model. This is also suggested in other interpretations of the systems model (e.g., Curtis & Yager, 1981; Hawkins & Shohet, 1989, 2000).

The early work of Yager and Curtis (1981) elaborated on effective supervision using a systems model, highlighting the importance of selecting purposeful strategies under a conceptual framework with consideration for the relationship, assessment of learning needs, determination of focus, and goals of supervision. Hawkins and Shohet (2000) further advanced the complexity of the systems model introducing seven possible foci during supervision, with consideration for relational and contextual factors as well as tasks and functions of supervision. The Systems Approach Model (Holloway, 1995) addresses relationship and developmental factors in the unique characterization of the supervisory process similar to that of Ecological Counseling, as one that includes the supervisor, the client, the supervisee, and the institution, functions and tasks, as well as the way these participants mutually influence each other. Her spin on the systems model is less complex and more easily adopted by inexperienced supervisors. For this reason, Holloway’s systems model may be a good model for effective supervision in counselor and supervision training programs.

In general, the contextual approach of systems models allows for a more flexible supervisory strategy across developmental phases with consistent consideration for the importance of the supervisory relationship. The systems model is in line with what we
have learned from ecological counseling theory as it allows for training and supervision that accounts for the diversity of counseling students and clients (Yager, 2004). Ecological Counseling theory, as it applies to education and supervision, offers a more concrete illustration of specific training methods that align with the fundamentals of a Systems Approach Model and what we have come to understand about effective supervision. For this reason, lessons from the literature on Ecological Counseling related to effective supervision will also be included in this review.

**Importance of Supervision**

The importance of the supervisory process is clearly implicated by the combined requirements of CACREP and the State of Ohio, which result in the counselor in training completion of likely more than 4000 hours under supervision before being granted licensure as a professional counselor (Yager, 2004). In the interest of improving client outcome during these 4000 hours, we must focus on improving the supervisory process for students. The development of the Curriculum Guide for Training Counseling Supervisors is one example of an effort to accomplish this task (Borders et al., 1991). Using the “Standards for Counseling Supervision” by Dye and Borders (1990) as a framework the proposed curriculum included seven areas for supervision competency: (a) supervisory relationship, (b) models of supervision, (c) supervision methods and techniques, (d) counselor development, ethical, legal, and professional regulatory issues, and (e) administrative skills. In total, over 200 learning objectives were outlined in the curriculum. These objectives are said to encapsulate the knowledge of competencies required for effective supervision. Later, this curriculum was used to establish the guidelines for the supervisor credentialing. The comprehensive, perhaps exhaustive list
of learning objectives paired with the gate keeping in place for the counselor supervisor credentialing makes the importance of supervision from an administrative standpoint abundantly clear.

A variety of training methods have been devised to address the need for improved supervisory practice. Britton, Goodman, and Rak (2002) proposed a one day workshop on supervision for community mental health counselors. Their workshop highlights the importance of relationship in supervision efficacy and effectiveness. Getz (1999) developed a curriculum for those training supervisors that places emphasis on the seven core supervision competencies. In this curriculum supervisors are directed to assess the relationship dynamics during the supervisory process. Inclusion of this assessment process in the curriculum denotes the importance of the relationship to effective supervision. Further, it reminds us that in education there is a need for periodic review of our curriculum and training practices.

In 2007, Wheeler and Richards were charged with the task of reviewing research evidence related to the impact of supervision. They reviewed published and unpublished work written in English from 1980 to 2006. For inclusion in the review the subjects had to be counselors or psychotherapists, the instruments used had to be evidenced as reliable and valid, and in the case of qualitative research a rigorous process of analysis needed to be present. Discursive articles, case studies, and research on family therapy were excluded for the purpose of their review. Eighteen articles were selected after author review of methodological quality. The majority of the articles were authored in the United States (14), with the remainder being authored in Sweden (2) and the United Kingdom (2). The authors noted that in the United States, the majority of research on
supervision focused on counselors in training and the group of research selected is reflective of this generalization.

Themes present in the supervisory impact research were used to categorize the findings of the compiled literature: (a) self-awareness skills, (b) self-efficacy, timing and frequency, (c) theoretical orientation, and (d) support and client outcome. Two studies reported supervisees gained self-awareness (Borders, 1990; Raichelson et al., 1997), which improved their application of skills during the therapeutic process. The review of skills development research included five studies: Borders, 1997; Patton and Kivlighan, 1997; Raichelson et al., 1997; Worthen and McNeill, 1996; and Ogren and Jonsson, 2003. This group of research indicated that both individual and group supervision were noted as improving the knowledge and application of counseling skills. Patton & Kivlighan (1997) reported that supervisees gained relationship building and maintenance skills as a result of supervision. Working alliance was found to have an impact on the type of learning that occurred during supervision (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). The research on timing and frequency included work by Couchon and Bernard (1984) and Steinhelber, Patterson, Cliffe, and LeGoullon (1984). The findings of Couchon and Bernard (1984) suggested that when supervision took place at different times the content of supervision was altered, and the application of concepts from supervision was greater in the client session when the supervision occurred the same day as the session. Steinhelber et al. (1984) indicated that client attendance was positively correlated with the frequency of supervision the counselor received. In the review of self-efficacy, Larson and Daniels (1998) were quoted as stating that counselor self-efficacy was “the primary causal determinate of effective counseling action” (p.180). The review of self-
efficacy literature indicated counselor report of greater self-efficacy while receiving supervision and this was further enhanced when supervision was rated as having a strong working alliance. In Wheeler and Richards’s (2007) examination of supervision literature related to theoretical orientation they found that early experiences in supervision still had an effect on theoretical position and methodological awareness several years after training occurred (Beutler, 1988; Milne et al., 2003). Supervision that presented challenge, offered support, and focused on the balance between these two components of the relationship facilitates counselor development was seen as more helpful (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). The work of Milne et al. (2003) and Vallance (2004) was reviewed to explore the client outcome category of supervision research. Milne et al. reported that there was appropriate thematic transference from supervision to session, as well as changes in therapy consequent to supervision. Vallance (2004) noted that client work is directly impacted by supportive supervision in that counselor distraction due to interpersonal emotional response was prevented from interrupting the therapeutic process as a result of supervision. The themes and findings in Wheeler and Richards’s (2007) review of supervision research highlight factors important in both supervision and therapeutic effectiveness.

As reviewed by Wheeler and Richards (2007), the impact of supervision included increased counselor self-efficacy, self-awareness, skills acquisition, knowledge base of theory and methodology, and client outcomes. The authors reported limited evidence to support client outcome improvement. However, given the noted impact on supervisees reported, it is likely that improved client outcomes would follow. The importance of supervision is illustrated in this review, which follows the general assumption that the
purpose of supervision is to promote learning and growth of the supervisee and thereby the client. This echoes the importance of improved understanding of effective student supervision in counselor education. While this review points to the significance of the supervisory process, relationship and client outcomes, none of the studies therein examined the relationship among these variables.

This gap in the literature was recognized by the editors of *Counselor Education and Supervision* in a special edition. In Sexton’s (1998) introduction to the *Counselor Education and Supervision* journal’s three part special feature highlighting scholarly reviews on clinical training, teaching, and supervision, we are reminded of the necessity to reexamine the fundamental assumptions of counseling education. As a central element of counselor education and practice, supervision was an area for review. Three barriers to this process of reexamination were identified by Goodyear and Bernard (1998): “definition confusion, the absence of efficacy research, and the excessive reliance on measures of supervisee satisfaction to determine successful supervision outcomes” (p. 6). Further, Goodyear and Bernard called for research that considers the role supervision plays in effective practice and effectiveness studies that highlight what works in supervision. This call for further research, to check our assumptions and practices regarding supervision, is in line with the goals of this research study. The assumption behind the present research is that the relationship between counselor and supervisor is the groundwork that supports the foundation for supervisory effectiveness. This assumption that an inadequate relationship lends itself to inadequate supervision is one that is consistently agreed upon in the literature (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Holloway, 1995). This study explores the supervisory process variables of relationship
and effectiveness for practicum students and their supervisors in an effort to highlight factors important to maximizing student learning and client outcomes. The instrumentation will be reflective of the role of the supervisory relationship as related to reports on supervision outcome that is not based on merely a supervisee satisfaction scale.

**Therapeutic Relationship in Supervision**

Over 50 years ago, we began a discussion on the parallel between the therapeutic and supervisory relationship (Arbuckle, 1962; Cottle, 1952; Doehrman, 1976; Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1958; Patterson, 1964). Provision of therapy and supervision is an interpersonal process with the common goal of facilitating a positive outcome for the client. Decades of research have indicated the therapeutic relationship as a robust predictor of outcome in treatment (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Castonguay & Beutler, 2005; Castonguay et al., 2010; Horvath, 2006; Horvath & Greenberg, 1994; Lambert & Barley, 2001; Norcross & Prochaska, 2002; Rogers, 1957; Orlinsky, Ronnestad, & Willutski, 2004). Many have said the same is true of the relationship in supervision (Beck et al., 1989; Ladany, 2004; Ladany, Friedlander, & Nelson, 2005; Martin et al., 2000; Patterson, 1964; Worthen & McNeil, 1996). When we consider this assumption with that of parallel process theory that transfer exists from supervisor, to supervisee, to client, we are reminded of the power modeling and contextual factors of the Systems Approach Model. As counselor educators, we must consider our treatment of the student supervisee as a model for client treatment. In a response to Veach and Ellis (2001), Nelson, Gray, Friedlander, Ladany, and Walker (2001) challenged us to provide skills training that promote management of supportive and evaluative relationships. They recommend that
training sites maximize the quality of the supervisory experience by maximizing the quality of supervisory relationships.

In an early exploration of the supervisory experience of students in counseling practicum, Patterson (1964) noted that the value of practicum depends on two things: “the number and variety of clients with which the student works … and the supervision which he receives” (p.21). Patterson described supervision as a therapeutic relationship in which the student learns. Conditions for this learning are described as those that are conducive to client learning. Patterson noted though, that, as with any interpersonal relationship, the supervisory relationship involves a perceived element of threat. If the supervisory relationship does not provide a nonthreatening, accepting, and understanding atmosphere, student defensiveness and resistance inhibit learning. The effectiveness of supervision in supporting the student’s understanding of and communication about the feelings and experiences of the client is thereby directly tied to the student perception of the therapeutic relationship.

Currently, much of the research related to the supervisory process focuses primarily on aspects that influence the supervisory relationship. Research in this area has focused on demographics, supervisory style, supervisor disclosure, and working alliance (e.g., Culbreth & Borders, 1999; Granello, 2003; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Ladany, Walker, & Melinoff, 2001; Ladany, Walker, Pate-Carolan, & Evans, 2008). In review of this research, some of the essential factors in establishing a therapeutic relationship in counseling student supervision will be explored. A common theme of communication ties these studies to the topic of relationship building and repair that was introduced by Bordin (1983), in his application of the working alliance to the supervisory
Demographic research explores the factors present in the supervisory relationship that cannot be controlled for by those involved. Granello’s (2003) investigation of the impact of age and gender on supervisor-supervisee interactions suggested that both are influential during the supervisory process. Supervisors of both genders were more likely to accept or build on ideas of female supervisees and ask more opinions from male supervisees. Female supervisees gave more support and agreement comments to their supervisors while males gave more suggestions. Males who were older than their supervisors were asked and gave their opinions more than any other configuration. Earlier research on the effect of gender in the supervisory relationship presented same sex pairings as resulting in a stronger bond (Behling, Curtis, & Foster, 1982; Worthington & Stern, 1985). These findings suggest that gender and age are influential in the communication that takes place in supervision. In counseling and supervision, communication is integral to relationship building and repair. The strength of the relationship supports the construction of plans that guide the change process and thereby influence the outcome of counseling and supervision.

Supervisory style is another component of supervision that has been under review that is commonly associated with establishing an appropriate supervisory relationship. Supervisory style, as explained by Munson (2002), is defined by the characteristics of an individual’s supervisory personality. More precisely, in practice it includes the manner and approach the supervisors use to communicate during supervision (Ladany et al., 2001). Given this explanation, supervisory style is a common variable examined in research of the supervisory process and relationship. An elevated understanding of
supervisory style is likely to improve the supervisory relationship, just as counselor awareness promotes relationship building in the therapeutic relationship. Awareness of and matching to student preferred supervisory style has been investigated as related to the developmental model for supervision.

Guided by the developmental models of supervision, researchers have frequently questioned how the experience level of the counselor in supervision impacts their reports on preferred supervisory style and interventions. Historically, results indicated that there were significant differences between what was preferred and or appropriate by entry level versus more experienced counselors (e.g., Blocher, 1983; Boyer, 1984; Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Worthington, 1987). Previous findings suggested that counselors in early stages of development preferred a more directive style of supervision. The work of Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke (1986) was among the first to present an alternative perspective.

Rabinowitz et al. (1986) offered support for the developmental model in its attention to building a working alliance, but reported that this remains important across counselor developmental levels. In their qualitative examination of the most important issues and interventions in supervision at different levels of training, they found that aspects of the supervisory relationship and style were important at all experience levels. This finding is implicated again in the work of Sumerel and Borders (1996).

In the work of Sumerel and Borders (1996), counselors at entry and advanced levels were compared on various aspects of the supervisory relationship. The participants completed questionnaires after viewing two videotaped sessions of supervision. During one supervisory session, the supervisor’s intervention focused on the personal feelings
present for the supervisee. The second supervisory session focused on the behavior of the supervisee. The first being more support oriented and the second being task oriented is in alignment with the distinction of supervisory styles being evaluated as supportive and or directive. Measures were taken and validated to ensure that each session was viewed as equally supportive. Additionally, it was confirmed that treatment one was counselor affect focused and treatment two was counselor behavior focused. The counseling supervisee’s completed an instrument packet following the viewing of the sessions that included: the Impact Message Inventory (IMI), which provided information on the supervisory style; the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), which measured rapport, client focus, and identification; and the Session Evaluation Questionnaire, which measured counselors’ perception of their post supervision mood and the supervision session. Appropriate statistical analysis procedures were used to explore differences between the perceptions across levels and supervision session focus. The results indicated that experience level did not significantly impact counselor ratings of the rapport, supervisory style, postsession mood, or quality of the supervisory session. Further, the intervention (focus on skills, or focus on personal issues) was rated similarly by both entry level and advanced counselors. These findings are in line with Rabinowitz et al. (1986) and Hart and Nance (2003) in that supervisory support is viewed as an important dynamic of the supervisory relationship and process despite experience level or supervisory intervention focus.

Hart and Nance (2003) noted that the underpinnings of supervisory style are support and direction. In an exploration of supervisor and supervisee preference of supervisory style and reported application of supervisory style, Hart and Nance (2003)
considered the impact of support and direction in the supervisory process. A convenience sample of 90 doctoral level supervisors who served 168 master’s level supervisees reported on preferences of supervisory style and supervisory style application. The Supervisory Styles Inventory was utilized to collect this data. A Spearman correlation coefficient was applied and generated significant correlations between supervisors and supervisees on which style was applied during supervision. A second analysis of correlation revealed that the preference for a high degree of support was present for supervisors and supervisees. A preference for a high degree of direction was also suggested by the results for supervisors and supervisees. Overall, the results suggest that supervisees prefer a supportive style over a consultative style. These results echo the importance of support and direction during the supervisory process and challenge the idea that beginning counselors view support as less important than direction. Moreover, the findings of Rabinowitz et al. (1986), Sumerel and Borders (1996), and Hart and Nance (2003) suggest that the integrative approaches of Holloway’s Systems model are a better fit for relationship building and communication than the working alliance or developmental model alone. Knowledge of the importance of support to both relationship building and the process of supervision throughout the development of the counselor needs to be considered when training supervisors. Matching for preference of style may strengthen relationships and thereby increase effectiveness, counselor competence, and client outcomes.

Strategic use of interventions, namely style and self-disclosure, may be valuable tools when working to build a therapeutic supervisory relationship. Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) first explored this in a study on the relationship between
supervisor self-disclosure and supervisory style and working alliance. One hundred and five counselors in training completed the Supervisor Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SSDQ), Supervisor Self-Disclosure Index (SSDI), the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI), the Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version (WAI-T), and a demographic questionnaire. Results indicated that supervisors reported using an attractive style had a greater likelihood of self-disclosing more frequently. Those perceived as interpersonally sensitive and task oriented style were not related to the frequency of self-disclosure. For the attractive style, the content of self-disclosure was most frequently neutral counseling experiences. The more interpersonally sensitive style present the less likely the supervisor would disclose neutral counseling experiences. The more task-oriented the less likely they would disclose counseling successes or personal issues. A greater frequency of self-disclosures was the greater the perceived working alliance. In turn, a greater frequency of self-disclosures related to counseling struggles resulted in a perceived stronger emotional bond. Overall, the content of self-disclosure was most frequently related to personal issues (73%), neutral counseling experiences (55%), and counseling struggles (51%). The authors suggested that disclosure of these content areas have the potential to increase trust and self-efficacy, thereby strengthening the therapeutic relationship. Interestingly, disclosure of content related to the supervisory relationship was reported by only 12% of respondents. This suggests a missed opportunity to capitalize on the parallel of supervision and counseling. Literature promotes the utility of modeling to encourage learning in relationships (e.g., Holloway, 1995; Ladany et al., 1999; Yager, 2004) and discussing the supervisory relationship during supervision offers a model for addressing relationship dynamics with the client. In addition to the results reported by Ladany et al.
(1999), self-disclosure may be used as a tool to reduce counselor vulnerability, model skills, and promote relationship building in supervision or counseling.

In response to the limitation presented by a one-sided account of supervisors from the counselor trainee perspective, Ladany, Walker, and Melinoff (2001) revisited supervisory style as related to working alliance and self-disclosure. One hundred thirty-seven supervisors of counselor trainees completed the previous study instrument packet; the Self-Disclosure Index was excluded because content of disclosure was not under investigation. Supervisors, who perceived they used a more attractive style, reported agreement on tasks and goals, and a stronger emotional bond. Those who identified as being more interpersonally sensitive or task oriented in their approach reported a greater agreement on tasks with their trainees. The more attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisors perceived themselves to be the more likely they were to perceive themselves as utilizing disclosure. Reports by supervisors as having a task oriented style did not result in a significant impact on perceptions of disclosure. These results suggest that supervisory style be utilized in a more flexible manner as each of the styles may promote a strong working alliance. The more flexible approach in supervision is also supported by the Systems Model (Holloway, 1995), which denotes that challenges in relationships and needs may wax and wane over time.

Beinart (2012) examined factors that predict the quality of the supervisory relationship with consideration to Bordin and Holloway’s models of supervision. Her research offered a quantitative and qualitative account of what supervisee’s perceive as effective supervisory relationships. The results of supervisee ratings indicated that the supervisee’s feeling supported by the supervisor, satisfaction with supervision, and
rapport were qualities of effective supervisory relationships. The qualitative results indicated by supervisee responses to open ended questions about the quality of the supervisory relationship resulted in categorization of nine qualities of the effective supervisory relationship: supportive, boundaried, evaluative, educative, collaborative, open, committed, sensitive to needs, and respectful. These results offer support for the relevance of both models in establishing an effective supervisory relationship. The categorization also offers support for some of the aforementioned components of therapeutic supervisory relationship building: willingness to disclose, flexibility of style, and attention to the working alliance.

**Limitations of Supervisory Relationship Research**

Much of the research on the supervisory relationship is descriptive, and based on the self-report of counselors or supervisors rather than the pair. This provides only half the information that is available on the supervisory relationship. Matching of information of supervisor and supervisee would add to our understanding of the supervisory relationship and process as a whole. This examination of the supervisory dyads is more in line with Bordin’s original presentation of the working alliance which emphasized alliance of the supervisor and supervisee perspective and Holloway’s regard for the contextual nature of the relationship. While the studies above emphasize the importance of the supervisory relationship, they fail to examine the relationship in the context of supervisory outcomes. In preparation for building an understanding of supervisory outcomes, I will review what the research has revealed about effective supervision.
Components of Effective Supervision

How do we conduct effective supervision? Like most open ended questions there is not one right answer to this question. In this review I will explore some of the answers by introducing components of effective supervision: supervisory behaviors, specific supervisory strategies, and good events in supervision.

In a landmark study of behaviors important to effective supervision, Worthington, and Roehlke (1979) examined reports from supervisors and supervisees on important supervisory behaviors. Beginning practicum supervisors \( n=16 \) developed the list of 42 behaviors and ranked them according to perceived importance. In turn, their supervisees rated the list and also provided data on supervisor frequency of behaviors, effectiveness of supervision based on supervision satisfaction, supervisor contribution to improvement in counseling ability, and supervisor competency. The results indicated that supervisors view effective supervision as providing feedback about counseling ability, while supervisees’ ratings indicate the importance of a supportive relationship, structured sessions, didactic instruction, and encouragement to try new skills. This is in line with the earlier work of Lanning (1971) that found counselors’ perceptions of the supervisory relationship were related to client reports on therapeutic relationships. Both of these studies suggest the importance of modeling relationship building in effective supervision.

More current research on “good” supervisory behaviors and events has frequently been evaluated from the perspective of the supervisee. Worthen and McNeil (1996) explored “good” supervision events by means of interviewing supervisees. The authors note that much of the research on good supervision is qualitative and has been based on supervisee satisfaction as related to the supervisory relationship and acquisition of
counseling skills. Participants were asked to describe a good psychotherapy supervision session, and then asked questions to clarify and elaborate to promote clarity. The eight videotaped interviews were transcribed and analyzed for themes. All eight of the supervisees remarked on the supervisory relationship in their description of a good supervisory experience. The themes included experiencing the supervisory relationship as one that was “empathic, nonjudgmental, and validating, with encouragement to explore and experiment; struggle normalize; sense of freeing consisting of reduced self-protectiveness and receptivity to supervisory input; nondefensive analysis; reexamination of assumptions; acquisition of a metaperspective” (p. 28). The descriptive themes of the outcomes of good supervision were explained as “Strengthened confidence; refined professional identity; increased therapeutic perception; expanded ability to conceptualize and intervene; positive anticipation to reengage in the struggle; strengthened supervisory alliance” (p.28). Many of these themes are similar to those of the quantitative variety which suggest the effectiveness of disclosure, working alliance, flexibility of style, and encouragement to try new skills. The phenomenological methodology of Worthen and McNeil (1996) was successful in offering more descriptive reports on supervision events perceived as “good,” however, it is insufficient in the provision of a detailed account related to client outcome.

Yager (2004) offers suggestions of specific training methods that promote effective supervision through relationship building, skills modeling and practice, and ensuring that diversity issues do not go unaddressed. As aforementioned these techniques offer a way to operationalize Holloway’s Systems Approach (1995). Yager’s technique suggestions include
• be open to new approaches;
• break down training efforts into small skill steps;
• use multidimensional role plays for practice;
• implement productive case presentations to guarantee needed feedback;
• keep in mind always the importance of trust;
• supervise with positive acceptance;
• use training and supervision to create counselors with diverse competencies and frames of reference;
• embrace the necessity to be political and advocate for clients and for the profession;
• expect ongoing personal growth and change as part of counseling training;
• model appropriate counseling behaviors, skills, and ecological awareness as supervisors.

While these suggestions have not been evaluated to establish an evidenced based approach to supervision, the themes related to them are commonly present in other evidenced based approaches: goal setting, skills practice, feedback, diverse competencies, relationship dynamics, and modeling. Additionally, Milne’s PETS (2001) and SAGE (2008), designed to evaluate the effectiveness of supervision based on experiential learning, also include these topics.

In an effort to more clearly define the work necessary to provide effective supervision, Milne and Westerman (2001) created and investigated an evidence based approach that centers on training supervisors to utilize experiential learning. They
compiled the work of others to broadly describe supervision as an interpersonally focused relationship that promotes lifelong learning, clinical accountability and self-regulation (Goodyear & Bernard, 1992; Lambert & Arnold, 1987; Wampold & Holloway, 1997).

The sample included three supervisors and three supervisees who were clinical psychiatric nurses in the UK. It was projected that this evidenced based approach would result in enhancement of supervisee learning and satisfaction with the supervision experience. Measures of “good” supervisory behaviors were taken at baseline, after supervision training, and during the maintenance stage of supervision. Their categorization of “good” supervisory behaviors can be seen in Table 1. Milne and Westerman measured the impact of supervision by assessing the frequency of “good” supervisory behaviors using the Process Evaluation of Teaching & Supervision (PETS) instrument in videotaped sessions, and by utilization of the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire that was completed by supervisees (Milne & Westerman, 2001). Results did reflect the anticipated increased utilization of “good” supervisory behaviors that emphasized experiential learning, but the effect was only moderate. A ceiling effect was evident in the results of the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire which made it difficult to discern improvement. Despite the modest effect of training for supervisors and small sample size, this research does offer support for continued efforts to improve supervision by improving supervisory training. Moreover, the PETS highlights some of the tasks and behaviors noted as effective components of supervision in counseling research.
Table 1

*Milne & Westerman (2001) Results on Good Supervisory Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's behaviours</th>
<th>Baseline (9 Sessions)</th>
<th>Study phases intervention (9 Sessions)</th>
<th>Maintenance (12 Sessions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Managing</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Listening</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supporting</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summarizing</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gathering information</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Checking theoretical knowledge</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Challenging</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Informing/educating</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Guiding experiential learning: modelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Guiding experiential learning: role play</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Guiding experiential learning: other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-disclosing</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Disagreeing</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Video observation</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Other</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of Supervisory Effectiveness Research

Much of the research on supervisory effectiveness does not actually utilize instruments that would demonstrate a counselor’s improved ability to help clients. Commonly, instruments of supervisory satisfaction are completed from the perspective of the supervisee without matching evaluative feedback from the supervisor. Supervisory satisfaction instruments have provided useful information about the process of supervision and effective elements in relationship building, they are not indicative of a therapeutic outcome, or supervisory effectiveness. This dependence on a single source for outcome data is another criticism of effectiveness research in supervision (Spence et al., 2001). There are literally hundreds of objectives identified in the curriculum guide for supervision (Borders & Bernard, 1991), and none of these are tied to supervisee satisfaction. Ellis and Ladany (1997) suggested that a lack of viable clinical supervision-specific instruments may be partially to blame for the use of measures with loosely evidenced construct validity, such as the use of satisfaction scales to indicate effectiveness. Bernard and Goodyear (1998) remarked on the difficulty presented by efficacy research due to a lack of supervision manuals/protocols on theory or models, and control groups. Lambert and Ogles (1997) reported that there is little research that suggests how elements of supervision, teaching, or practicum contribute to the development of an effective practitioner.

This study attempted to address the call for methodologically sound effectiveness research by examining the relationship between working alliance and supervision outcome. Matching of supervisor and supervisee dyads will allow for examination of conformity on relationship and outcome results, providing an additional source of outcome information. While there is no supervision working alliance or systems approach protocol, the theoretical work of
Bordin (1983) and Holloway (1995) appears to correspond to the content of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (Efstation et al., 1990) and the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (Milne & Reiser, 2008). The SWAI has been used frequently in other research. It was selected for this study because it is counseling supervision specific, allows examination from both supervisor and supervisee, and has been subjected to analysis to validate it as a methodologically sound instrument. The preliminary results of reliability and validity are suitable for use of the SAGE in this study. Studies using more than one instrument to evaluate the supervision process, specifically relationship measures, were also noted as an area for future research by the SAGE authors. Examination of working alliance and effectiveness with these methodologically sound measures may expand on our understanding of how counselor educators could contribute to the development of a more effective supervisor, and in turn practitioners.

**Measures of Relationship and Effectiveness**

The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory. (SWAI) was developed based on Bordin’s (1983) conceptualization of a model for therapeutic working alliance (Efstation et al., 1990). Efstation et al. (1990) were prompted to design the instrument by Holloway’s (1987) presentation that a supervisee’s developmental formation of a professional identity is not the primary mechanism for changes that occur in the supervisee. In Holloway’s review of developmental models she suggested that the relationship might be of more significance across the stages of counselor identity development than suggested by developmental theories. Efstation et al. were in agreement with Holloway, regarding the importance of the supervisory relationship, and determined that there was an absence of an instrument that allowed for methodologically sound, comprehensive assessment of the supervisory relationship. They
constructed SWAI in response to this need, allowing for the assessment of relationship dynamics within the supervisory relationship. The instrument examines supervisor and supervisee perceptions of each other’s actions, how these affect the relationship, and the supervisee’s interaction with clients.

The authors conducted a systematic examination of activities and tasks that occur in supervision in preparation for the design of the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990). The authors invited an expert panel of ten supervisors at an American Psychological Association approved counseling internship site to complete a task analysis in preparation for item writing. The task analysis was reflective of the authors’ ideas that the working alliance aspects of tasks and behaviors were specific to the supervisor and supervisee relationship. The items were designed to measure the quality of the supervisory relationship as related to the theoretical constructs of working alliance defined by Bordin (1983), as emotional bond, task agreement, and goal agreement within the context of the supervisory relationship. Once the list of 30 items was generated for the dyad it was subjected to a factor analysis, which identified two orthogonal factors present for the dyad: Rapport and Client Focus. In addition, the factor analysis yielded a third factor for supervisors that they labeled Identification. The Rapport factor was labeled as such because items were indicative of the supervisor’s effort to build rapport by offering encouragement and support, while the supervisee items represented their perception of supervisor support. The Client Focused factor reflected an emphasis on improved client conceptualization and understanding. Lastly, the Identification factor was suggestive of the supervisor’s perception of the supervisee’s identification with the supervisor. With an accurate picture of supervisory tasks and activities, the authors turned to examination of the convergent
and divergent validity of the instrument.

The authors noted the importance of constructing this instrument, as it is one of the few instruments that allow us to investigate how the relationship impacts each participant’s perception of the supervisory process, as it is associated with the supervisee’s behavior and training. In its final version, it is a 19 (supervisee) to 23 (supervisor) item instrument on a seven point Likert scale where (1) indicates almost never and (7) indicates almost always. The additional questions on the supervisor form are related to the identification factor (see previous paragraph) that was not included in the supervisee scale. The instrument can be seen in Appendix F.

**Studies using the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory.** Many of the studies already mentioned examine working alliance utilizing Efstation et al.’s version of the Working Alliance Inventory (Beinart, 2002; Efstation et al., 1990; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Patton, 1992; Patton, Strozier, Kivlighan, & Thoreson, 1993; Sumeral & Borders, 1996). However, there are a number of instruments designed to measure this construct: Working Alliance Inventory Trainee (Bahrick, 1990); Working Alliance Inventory (therapist version: Horvath & Greenberg, 1989), Working Alliance Inventory Short Form (therapist version: Tracey & Kokotovic, 1989). Typically in research, the working alliance is determined based on the supervisee self-report, that provides a singular perspective on the construct. Efstation et al.’s version of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory has been selected in part due to its inclusion of both the supervisee and the supervisor. Further, the instrument is supervision-specific and has been subjected to analysis to establish it is methodologically sound. This study will examine supervisory dyads using methodologically
sound instruments to offer a more comprehensive assessment of the supervisory relationship and effectiveness.

**Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation Short Form.** Milne and Reiser (2008) developed the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation Short Form (SAGE) in an effort to provide an empirically-based instrument to evaluate the effectiveness of supervision. Milne (2009) explained the rationale behind this instrument was drawn from Kolb’s (1984) explanation of learning as a process that includes action, reflection, conceptualization, experiencing and experimenting. The same authors constructed the original version of the SAGE in 2007, and modified the format to yield a less complex and costly instrument implementation. Milne reports that the scale evolved from earlier attempts at creating a psychometrically sound instrument for the evaluation of supervision which resulted in the Teacher’s PETS (Milne, James, Keegan, & Dudley, 2002) and the CBT STARS (James, Blackburn, Milne, Freeston, & Armstrong, 2005). He explains that these scales required extensive training to administer and were incomplete due to the lack of a competency assessment.

The SAGE is designed to allow for measurement of the facilitating effect the supervisor has on the learner as demonstrated by use of a range of supervisory techniques that are known to be effective. The items allow for report on common factors present in effective supervision, specific behaviors of supervisors that are known to support learning, and areas of learning that are impacted by supervision. After revision of the SAGE to create the short form, the instrument consisted of 23 items that use a seven point Likert scale where (0) indicates the absence of a feature, or highly inappropriate performance and (6) is indicative of excellent performance or
very good even in the face of difficulties. The instrument can be completed by an independent observer or by self-rating.

Preliminary investigation of the validity and reliability of SAGE has been conducted by its authors. The content and face validity of the items is reported by the authors as resultant of systematic reviews of the supervision literature and by reference to expert consensus (Milne et al., 2011). The panel of four expert reviewers evaluated content and face validity based on Anastasi and Urbina’s (1997) explanation of content and face validity being related to readability, reader comprehension, serving to raise standards in the field, and overall validity. Results from the panel were indicative of “good” content and face validity ($M = 2.67$, $S.D. = 0.49$). Construct validity was assessed through factor analysis and yielded only one factor “supervisory competence,” which did not support the author’s three factor prediction. The internal consistency of the self-rated version of SAGE was .98. Inter-rater reliability among observers was $r = .815$, $p = 0.001$.

The author’s explored discriminant validity by use of the instrument when three distinctly different approaches to supervision were employed: cognitive behavior therapy, systemic, and psychodynamic supervision (Milne et al., 2011). Three professionally videotaped sessions that were reflective of each approach were rated to evaluate the discriminant validity of the SAGE. The CBT and Systematic supervision sessions were rated as including all but one of the SAGE items, while the Psychodynamic approach corresponded to only a few items on the SAGE. Further, the percentage of occurrence of SAGE items rated as included in the sessions suggests that the SAGE contains theoretically congruent supervisory behaviors, which equate to the SAGE items in a differentiated way. Interestingly, the ‘other’ category on the SAGE was not
indicated by the reviewer for any of the approaches offering further evidence of discriminate validity.

The preliminary results of reliability and validity are suitable for use of the SAGE in this study. As noted earlier, the SAGE addresses some of the common measurement problems in supervision research. It allows for a more credible evaluation of effectiveness in supervision than a skills assessment or satisfaction scale, and it is easy to administer. Studies using more than one instrument to evaluate the supervision process, specifically relationship measures, were also noted as an area for future research by the authors. Use of the SAGE in this study will allow for a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of effective practices in supervision, as well as the relationship these practices have to working alliance.

Summary

This literature review acknowledges some of the most common theoretical frameworks in the field of supervision: Working Alliance, Developmental Model, and Systems Approach. Each theory built on the one that came before it in hopes of establishing a more exact, effective approach to supervision and training. Research in the field frequently touches upon aspects of these models in reference to the importance of relationship building and effectiveness in supervision. While the integrative approach of the Systems Model seems to reflect the strengths of the Working Alliance and Developmental Models that came before it, we cannot conduct true outcome research on effectiveness to support this notion due to the ethical dilemma that is presented by having a control group (i.e., a group of trainees without supervision). When we cannot test a model, we move to assess results. However, our attempts to assess the effectiveness of supervision from a more generic perspective have commonly resulted in one
sided reports on skill attainment or supervisee satisfaction. Fortunately, research and application of these models has allowed for a better understanding of the supervisory relationship and methods that improve counselor learning and client outcomes. This has allowed for the design of more methodologically sound instruments to assess working alliance and effectiveness. In conclusion, the present research study allowed for assessment of working alliance and supervisory effectiveness with instruments that, according to the research, are based on sound theoretical models. It allows for a more thorough examination of the supervisory process as data is being gathered by supervisees and supervisors. It will also examine the predictive relationship between working alliance and effectiveness reports. Finally, it stands to offer further support for integrative models and approaches to supervision and training.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This chapter will provide a detailed account of the methodology selected to carry out this research study. Participants are described and the instruments will be explained to clarify their psychometric properties. The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) is used to gather information on the perceptions of the supervisor and supervisee actions of each other, how this affects the relationship, and the supervisee’s interaction with clients. The Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE) was utilized to allow for measurement of the facilitating effect the supervisor has on the learner as demonstrated by use of a range of supervisory techniques that are known to be effective. A demographic questionnaire was administered to collect information on the study background variables that may be influential to the supervision process and generalizability of the results. Data collection procedures will be further explained. The statistical analysis used to analyze the data will be overviewed briefly.

Participants

The sample for this study included graduate level counseling students and their respective supervisors. All participants needed to have participated in four or more supervision sessions as part of their practicum and/or internship experiences. Supervision dyads that had met less than four times were excluded, as they had not had adequate time in the supervisory process to report on relationship and effectiveness components. A large number of supervisors included in the sample were also graduate students, as is customary in the supervision of beginning skills classes within graduate counseling training programs. This sample does not include participants of any identified vulnerable group. The composition of this sample is common in counseling relevant
quantitative research. A content and sample analysis conducted on quantitative articles published in the *Journal of Counseling and Development* between 1991 and 2000 revealed that 23% of quantitative samples were comprised of counselors in training and professionals (Nelsson et al., 2007).

A convenience sample was drawn from current students and supervisors at two local universities in Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati and Xavier University. While the field of psychology and counseling is commonly criticized for overuse of convenience student samples that are not generalizable to a broader population, such a sample is both necessary and appropriate for the purposes of the present investigation. The universities selected for inclusion are similar given their proximity and the fact that both are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Inclusion of a private and a public university was a practical tactic to increase sample size and heterogeneity within the pool of participants. A total of 50 voluntary participants were invited to participate from Xavier University. A total of six actually participated. Unfortunately, these six participants did not result in any supervision dyads (i.e., there was no match between a supervisee and his or her supervisor) so they were not included in the sample. Approximately 90 potential participants were invited to volunteer for the study from the University of Cincinnati’s Counseling Program. Fifty-six individuals participated in the study from the University of Cincinnati, and from that number of individuals, the researcher was able to establish 21 supervisor/supervisee matches. The general rule of thumb for establishing effect when applying a multiple regression for analysis is 10 participants for each variable in the multiple regression, this suggested the sample size was adequate for the planned analysis (Heppner & Heppner, 2004).
As was anticipated the majority of students were women \((n = 40)\), limiting the heterogeneity of the sample. This is consistent with national averages on gender in counseling training programs (Day-Vines et al., 2007). The sample was comprised of adults ranging from 21 – 70+ years old. The majority of participants were between the ages of 21 and 30 \((n = 35)\). All of the supervisees who participated were between the age of 21 and 30, 15 of the supervisors were also within this age range. Again, the gender and age of the sample is representative of national averages for counseling training programs, which suggests generalizability of this study’s results to these programs.

Several demographic questions were asked to ascertain the level of education and experience participants had with supervision. Given the inclusion criteria all of the supervisee’s were master’s students. The education status of the supervisor group included 14 master’s students, one doctoral student, and six with completed master’s degrees. In regard to licensure, the supervisee group included ten students without licensure and 11 students with counselor in training status (CT), a designation of a student trainee by the Ohio Counselor, Social Worker, Marriage and Family Therapist Board. Among the supervisor group, there were 13 with counselor in training status and five with professional counseling licensure status.

Interestingly, the report on contract utilization yielded conflicting data. Six members of the supervisee group reported contract utilization, while ten members of the supervisor group reported contract utilization. Tables 2 and 3 provide more detailed information regarding the demographics of both the supervisee and supervisor samples.
Table 2

*Frequencies for Gender, Supervisory Age, Level of Education, Licensure Status, and Contract Utilization for Supervisees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisee Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisee Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor in Training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Utilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Reported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contract Reported</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Frequencies for Gender, Supervisory Role, License Status, Level of Education, and Contract Utilization for Supervisors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Student</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensure Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor in Training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Counselor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contract Reported</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Utilization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Reported</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contract Reported</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

Initially, this research project was announced to students and supervisors via the counseling program list serve at UC and Xavier (Appendix A). Following this announcement, the principle investigator (PI) visited the students under supervision in their respective clinical counseling courses to give them more information about the study and to invite them to participate. Supervisors were invited to participate through contact from the PI by email or within their university course on supervision. During the classroom recruitment visit, the PI delivered a verbal presentation based on the approved recruitment script informing potential participants of the research opportunity (Appendix B). Following the classroom visit, the PI sent a follow-up email to potential participants that, once again, encouraged their participation, if interested (Appendix C). Three additional emails were sent to invited participants to remind them of the research participation invitation and to inform these possible volunteers of the decision to extend the data collection period.

The email to potential participants provided a detailed introduction to the study and included the informed consent process. The use of an internet data collection tool requires modification of the typical informed consent procedure. The informed consent or information sheet became visible to participants after they selected a web link included in the email (Appendix D). This information sheet had the same content as the traditional informed consent but it did not require a signature. Submission of the completed questionnaire indicated participant consent. This process for informed consent was approved by the institutional review board.

The use of Survey Monkey as a data collection tool yielded only 6 responses during the
initial data collection timeframe of two weeks. After a two week extension of the data collection period, only 15 responses were included in the Survey Monkey sample. In order to increase the sample size, the PI returned to counseling skills classes at the University of Cincinnati and distributed the information sheet and questionnaire in a hard copy format. Delayed response from Xavier did not allow for replication of the in person data collection measure. The final sample included 21 supervision dyads; three of the completed pairs (i.e., three supervisors with three matching supervisees) were collected by Survey Monkey and 18 were collected through the completion of hard copy surveys from the students.

The PI served as the contact person for questions about participation in the study. The information sheet that potential participants read encouraged participants to call the PI with any questions. Contact information for the PI, faculty advisor, and IRB were provided in the information sheet.

The research questions regarding the relationship between supervisor and supervisee perceptions preclude complete anonymity. Collection of names from participants was needed in order to examine the congruence of reports among supervisor and supervisee pairings. After pairing of student and supervisor questionnaire sets, names were deleted from the dyads in order to provide a measure of confidentiality. Once data was received the information was kept on a password-protected computer. The research data will be stored in a locked file cabinet for three years at conclusion of this study and then will be destroyed by shredding.

**Instruments**

Participants were asked to complete either an online questionnaire (Appendix E) or a hard copy version of the same questionnaire. The instrumentation for this study included a
demographic questionnaire, the Supervision Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), and the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE). The SWAI examines perceptions of the supervisor and supervisee toward one another, how this affects the relationship, and the supervisee’s interaction with clients. The SAGE was designed to allow for a report on common factors present in effective supervision, addressing the specific behaviors of supervisors that are known to support learning, and assessing the areas of learning that are impacted by supervision. The demographic questionnaire was designed by the principle investigator with consideration for factors that may be influential to the supervision process and generalizability of the results. This questionnaire collected information on the study background variables: age, gender, level of education, licensure status, number of years of professional experience, number of years of supervisory experience, and supervision contract utilization.

The SWAI has been acknowledged as a valid and reliable instrument (Efstation et al., 1990; Patton, Brossart, Gehlert, Gold & Jackson, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). Efstation et al. (1990) explain that correlations with the Supervisory Styles Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) offer evidence of the SWAI’s convergent and divergent validity, supervisor scales correlations ranged from \( r = .23 - .26 \) and supervisee scales correlations \( r = .47 \). These results also prompted the authors to remove items from the supervisee form related to the identification scale that is included in the supervisor form. The original study on the factor structure of the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990) was replicated by Patton et al. (1992) suggesting that it was appropriate for use by supervisors and supervisees of different experience levels and backgrounds. In the replication study, the SWAI was compared to the Personal Reactions Scale Revised (PRS-R: Holloway & Wampold, 1984) and results offered further evidence of
concurrent validity. In this study, correlations on the trainee forms suggested convergence (rapport scale, $r = .85, p < .001$, and client focus scale, $r = .52, p < .001$). Further, the SWAI was reported as offering a more differentiated assessment of the supervisors’ perception of the supervisory relationship than the PRS-R (Patton, Brossart, Gehlert, Gold, & Jackson, 1992). Good internal consistency reliability was also reported by both studies, ranging from $r_{xx} = .67$ to .79.

Reliability and validity of the SAGE has been examined by quantitative and qualitative methods. An exploratory factor analysis was used to identify significant factors associated with clinical supervision (Edwards et al., 2005). After the significant factors were identified for inclusion in the questionnaire a full replication study and final factor analysis was conducted. The reliability coefficient for the total scale was .86 (Edwards et al., 2005). The correlation coefficient for test–retest reliability was above .93. The internal consistency of the self-rated version of SAGE was .98. Hyrkas, Appelqvist-Schmiedlechner, and Oksa (2003) examined the content validity of the scale and found that it was demonstrated through triangulation of data from an expert panel and content validity index. Results from the panel were indicative of “good” content and face validity ($M = 2.67$, $S.D. = 0.49$).

**Pilot Testing**

The demographic questionnaire was designed by the principal investigator and had not previously been used for data collection. A group of six student supervisor and supervisee pairs were invited to participate in the piloting of the demographic questionnaire. All of the supervisors who were contacted participated but only one of the supervisees participated. It should be noted that despite the singular contribution of this supervisee, all of the supervisors
who participated are practicing as counselors under supervision, thus they too are supervisees. One expert in the field of counselor supervision was invited and provided feedback during the initial phase of the piloting.

Participants were asked to review the content of the demographic instrument, and the directions/administration process (Appendix C). After the written feedback was obtained the principle investigator met with the participants for a panel discussion. The written and oral feedback from the panel focused on instrument packet formatting revisions. Due to participant responses, the format of the demographic questionnaire was altered in order to simplify the response process.

**Data Analysis**

The IBM SPSS Statistics package was used to conduct all analyses. Preliminary data analysis was conducted to examine descriptive statistics on the demographic information of the sample. Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities were run for each of the scales (for both supervisees and supervisors).

The major data analyses involved the use of the Pearson Product Moment correlation statistic. Employing the bivariate correlation procedure in SPSS resulted in a Pearson’s correlation coefficient. These variables were analyzed for correlations: (a) between supervisee and supervisory perceived relationship (both measured by the SWAI), (b) between supervisee perceived relationship and evaluation (the relationship between the supervisees’ report on the SWAI and SAGE), and (c) between supervisor perceived relationship and evaluation (the relationship between the supervisors’ report on the SWAI and SAGE). A significance test was conducted to determine if obtained correlation coefficients were significantly different from zero.
These analysis provided answers to the questions regarding the significance of the relationship between supervisee and supervisor perceptions of effectiveness and the supervisory relationship. The use of a multiple regression analysis for prediction of effectiveness from the relationship measure was planned but was not implemented given earlier correlational results. Finally, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to determine if the supervisor’s perception of the existence of a supervisory contract was associated with differences in either the SWAI or SAGE (as rated by both supervisors and supervisees.) Findings were reported in aggregate form to illustrate the comparison of supervisor versus supervisee groups, and dyads.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The findings of this study are presented in four sections (a) data screening, (b) participant demographics, (c) internal consistency reliabilities for primary instruments, (d) results of correlational analysis, and (e) summary. This chapter offers data screening information, descriptive data on the demographics of the sample, and analysis of the data related to the hypotheses.

Data Screening

Initially, data were checked for errors and corrected before further analysis was conducted. Linear trend analysis was used to address missing data for items on the questionnaire. In order to ensure the inclusion criterion of participation in four or more supervisory sessions was met, descriptive statistics for the demographic question on inclusion were executed. Results indicated that all of the participants, who completed the questionnaire, met this inclusion criterion.

Participant Demographics

This study included 42 participants (i.e., 21 supervisors and 21 of their supervisees) who had participated in four or more supervisory sessions. Six participants from Xavier University completed the questionnaire but did not result in a supervision dyad. Therefore, they could not be included in the sample. Tables 2 and 3 illustrate the frequencies of the sample for gender, age, level of education, licensure status, and contract utilization. The representation of males ($n=2$) and females ($n=40$) was unequal but typical of counseling student research. Licensure status among the group was not much more evenly dispersed with 57% being Counselors in Training
and 1% licensed counselors. The sample was comprised predominantly of master’s level students (83%). Contract utilization was reported at a rate of 28.6% by supervisee’s and 47% by supervisors.

**Internal Consistency Reliabilities for Primary Instruments**

The initial step in the analysis of the results involved an analysis of each of the four primary instruments related to their reliability. These instruments included: (a) the supervisees’ responses to the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI-Supervisee), (b) the supervisees’ assessment of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE), (c) the supervisors’ responses to the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI-Supervisee), (d) the supervisors’ assessment of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE).

The results of these analyses are found in Table 4. All reliabilities were impressively high, ranging from $r_{xx} = .885$ to $.971$.

**Results of Correlational Analysis**

1. **There will be a positive correlation between supervisor effectiveness ratings and supervisee effectiveness ratings (i.e., Supervisor SAGE ratings correlated with Supervisee SAGE ratings).**

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to assess the relationship between supervisor effectiveness ratings and supervisee effectiveness ratings. Overall, there was no significant correlation between supervisor and supervisee perceptions of effectiveness [$r = -.019, p < .93$]. This offers no support for hypothesis one. Table 5 shows the composite results of correlations among the groups.

Given the large disparity between the mean scores on the SAGE among
Table 4.

*Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency reliability estimates, means, and standard deviations for each of the four primary measures (i.e., Supervisor and Supervisee Perception of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory and Supervisor (SWAI) and Supervisee Reports of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Perception of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108.44</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee Report of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115.63</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Perception of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>128.94</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Report of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

*Intercorrelation matrix for the supervisee and supervisor responses to the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) and the supervisee and supervisor assessments of the Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation (SAGE)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAGE Supervisee</th>
<th>SWAI Supervisor</th>
<th>SAGE Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAI Supervisor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; ) (Signif. 2-tailed)</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE Supervisor</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; ) (Signif. 2-tailed)</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI Supervisee</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( p &lt; ) (Signif. 2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisors \( (m = 90.2) \) and supervisees \( (m = 115.6) \) a paired \( t \) test was used to determine if the mean scores were significantly different. The results illustrated that the supervisees perceived the effectiveness of supervision (i.e., the SAGE) as significantly higher than supervisors \( [t (20) = 3.93, p < .001] \).

2. *There will be a positive correlation between supervisor relationship ratings and supervisee relationship ratings.*

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to assess the relationship between supervisor relationship ratings and supervisee relationship ratings. There was no significant correlation between supervisor and supervisee ratings on relationship, \( [r = - .136, p < .55] \). This result offers no support for hypothesis two.

Given the lack of correlation for hypothesis one and two, supplemental data analysis was conducted. In addition to the above analyses, the relationship between supervisor and supervisee working alliance and effectiveness ratings were examined for relationships with background variables. First, supervisor-participant reports on years of professional experience \( [r = .168, p < .237] \) and years of experience in supervisory roles \( [r = .165, p < .476] \) were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation with the SAGE (for Supervisors). The correlations with the Supervisors’ perceptions of the working alliance (SWAI) yielded similar results for professional experience \( [r = .394, p < .077] \) and experience as a supervisor \( [r = .009, p < .967] \). Thus, these analyses resulted in no significant correlations. The results of this supplemental analysis suggest that reports of experience do not offer explanation for the lack of correlation between supervisor and supervisee reports.
Next, the multivariate analysis of variance (i.e., ANOVA) was applied to examine the relationships of contract utilization to the all dependent variables as a package. This analysis resulted in no significant relationships between the set of dependent variables and the reported implementation of a supervisory contract.

Interestingly, despite the overall lack of a multivariate effect, the supervisor ratings on the SAGE were reflective of a significant univariate difference \([F (1,19)= 5.49, p < .030]\) between the contract and no contract groups. The mean score clearly illustrates the difference: the contract group \((m = 102.4)\) perceived their effectiveness on the SAGE as higher than the group that did not have a contract \((m = 79.1)\). The overall results of this supplemental analysis suggest that reports of contract utilization do not offer explanation for the lack of correlation between supervisor and supervisee ratings.

3. There will be a positive correlation between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was utilized to assess the relationship between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees. There was a strong, positive correlation between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees \([r=.765, p < .001]\) for supervisee reports and \([r=.699, p < .001]\) for supervisor reports (See Table 5). These results offer support for hypothesis three.

4. The relationship variable set will be significantly predictive of the effectiveness variable set.

The use of a multiple regression analysis for prediction of effectiveness from the relationship measure was planned but was not employed given prior lack of any relationship
approaching significance for the SWAI and the SAGE in the perceptions of both supervisors and supervisees. Hypothesis four was not supported indicating that the relationship values were not predictive of the effectiveness values in supervision

**Summary**

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations yielded no support for hypothesis one or two. There was no correlation between supervisor and supervisee ratings of working alliance and effectiveness in supervision. Results from the paired $t$ analysis of SAGE mean scores indicated that the supervisee report was significantly different from the supervisor report on effectiveness. Supplemental analysis of background variables was conducted to explore plausible explanation for the lack of correlation among supervisor and supervisee ratings. The supplemental analysis yielded no significant correlation. Reports on experience and contract utilization do not offer an explanation for the lack of correlation among supervisor and supervisee perceptions.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations yielded support for hypothesis three. There was a strong, positive correlation between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees. This suggests that participant ratings for the SWAI are associated with participant ratings of the SAGE.

The lack of correlational evidence for supervisee versus supervisor ratings limited further analysis. A standard multiple regression analysis was not performed as it would not yield any new information. Hypothesis four was not supported.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

This chapter will provide a discussion of the results as related to the hypotheses and previous research. Next, field implications will be introduced. Finally, limitations and future research recommendations will be reported.

Summary of Results

The strongest finding of this study is that participant reports on the SWAI and SAGE were positively correlated. In other words, supervisee ratings on the SWAI were associated with their reports on the SAGE. The same is true within supervisor reports on these measures. This finding supports hypothesis three, which states there would be a positive correlation between relationship and effectiveness ratings for supervisors and supervisees. This finding was anticipated given the multiple suggestions from the literature that the supervisory relationship is a crucial component to the provision of effective supervision (e.g., Beinart, 2012; Holloway, 2000; Lanning, 1971; Worthen & McNeil, 1996; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979; Yager, 2004). These results offer some merit to my initial premise that relationship is an important facet of effective supervision. The relationship between reports on the SWAI and SAGE also offers support for the use of an integrative model, as it denotes the importance of understanding the developmental needs of the supervisee and at the same time the importance of the working alliance in effective supervision. A replication of this research is needed to validate these findings with a more heterogeneous sample.

The supplemental analysis on contract utilization also yielded several important findings. We know from the literature review that the use of a contract can be a valuable tool in
supervision (Holloway, 1995, 2000; Magnuson et al., 2000). At most, ten of the supervision dyads, in this sample employed a supervision contract. Further, the report on contract utilization, from supervisor’s and supervisee’s, was not congruent. Naturally, if both parties are not agreeable as to whether said contract exists, it is likely to be of less help. This too may be attributed to the sample’s lack of experience in supervision.

Another point of interest is the 23 point difference in the mean scores on the SAGE, between contract and no contract, supervisor groups. This suggests that the supervisors are knowledgeable about the value of contract utilization. Moreover, the higher scores on the SAGE for the contract group are reflective of their perceived greater competence in supervision. This offers support for the comments from Magnuson et al. (2000) regarding the absence of contracts in “lousy” supervision. In turn, it offers support for the use of the integrative model in supervision, given that Holloway (1995) conceptualizes the supervisory contract as one of three essential elements of the supervisory relationship.

This study was the first to examine working alliance and effectiveness from the perspectives of the supervisor and supervisee. The finding that the relationships between supervisor and supervisee reports on the measures were nonsignificant was unexpected. This finding may have been influenced by the lack of experience the participants had with the supervisory process. Eighteen of the 21 supervision dyads included first year counseling students, suggesting limited experience with the supervision process. However, supplemental analysis on reports of experience did not account for the lack of correlation. The research of Sumerel and Borders (1996), Rabinowitz et al. (1986), and Hart and Nance (2003) also examined the effect of experience on facets of self-report regarding the supervision process and found no
significant results. The range of experience for supervisee’s and supervisors is very narrow, one year or less was reported by most participants ($n = 37$). This should be considered when looking at the analysis on experience level.

The lack of supervision experience in the sample may have also been a contributing factor to the difference in the mean scores reported by the groups. The high scores of the supervisees may have restricted the range of the scores to the degree that limited the chance for a significant relationship in the dyad correlational analysis. Overall, the supervisors reported lower scores on both measures than the supervisee’s. The mean for supervisees’ SAGE ratings was 115.6; for supervisors, the mean was 90.2. Supervisees perceived the effectiveness of supervision (i.e., the SAGE) as significantly higher than supervisors [$t (20) = 3.93, p < .001$]. These $t$ test results are of interest because the supervisor scale has more items than the supervisee scale. Yet, the supervisors mean results were still lower than the than the supervisees. This may be partially explained by the student supervisors having slightly more experience and as a result, a different perception about the supervision process than the supervisees.

**Implications**

One of the goals of this study was to address a gap in the supervision literature regarding the supervisory experience based on reports from supervisors and supervisees. While there was no correlation between supervisor and supervisee ratings, we still gained knowledge in that the study resulted in an account from both perspectives. The mean scores of the supervisor versus supervisee group suggested that the supervisors viewed the process as less effective than the supervisees. The lack of correlation for supervisee and supervisor ratings also reminds us of the importance of contextual factors. Two people, rating the same process and relationship, can
yield unrelated reports on the experience. This was certainly unexpected, but giving consideration to the unique subsystems each participant is involved in it is not hard to believe these results.

A second goal of the study was to supply some indication of areas for improvement in supervisory training programs. The narrow focus on skill building in supervisory training programs ignores both relationship and contextual factors that are influential to counselor development. The importance of the provision of more comprehensive supervisory training has been echoed by a large body of research (e.g., Britton, Goodman & Rak, 2002; Getz, 1999; Manzanares et al., 2004; Roberts, Morotti, Herrick, & Tilbury, 2001; Schultz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson, & Bardos, 2002). The data gave us an account of the perception of both supervisor’s and supervisee’s about supervision, offering some indication of the needed modifications in counselor supervision training programs. The supervisor ratings on the SAGE, controlling for contract utilization, suggested that contract utilization is viewed as related to effective supervision. The conflicting reports on contract utilization are reflective of the need for training on concrete methods to improve communication in supervision. Research by Magnuson et al. (2000) offers support for this recommendation. They noted the absence of a contract as a component of “lousy” supervision. This also gives light to a benefit of employing a systems model in supervision.

Early in my review of the literature it became apparent to me that supervision without a model could be largely ineffective. Soon after, the importance of a model with a relational framework became apparent. In recent accounts on the importance of the supervision relationship, Gregory and Henderson (2008) suggested that working within a relational
framework in counseling supervision could improve the quality of the relationship, Vallance (2005) indicated that a high level of counselor confidence and congruence in the supervisory relationship leads to increased confidence and congruence in the counseling relationship, and Bernard and Goodyear (2009) noted the parallel process of the counseling and supervisory relationship as a central event of supervision. The findings of Rabinowitz et al. (1986), Sumerel and Borders (1996), and Hart and Nance (2003) suggest that the integrative approaches of Holloway’s systems approach model are a better fit for relationship building and communication than the working alliance or developmental model alone. Yet, Schwing, LaFollette, Steinfeldt, and Wong (2011) indicated that most current models of training and supervision do not directly incorporate a clarification of how the therapeutic relationship facilitates effectiveness of student supervision. The literature review and results of this study have implications for the utilization of a systems model in supervision. The correlations between the SWAI and SAGE measures for participants, suggest that both relationship and effectiveness need to be emphasized in supervision training. Adopting a systems approach model (Holloway, 1995) allows for attendance to the supervisory relationship, contract utilization, and developmental phases. This contextual approach allows for a more flexible supervisory strategy across phases with consistent consideration for the importance of the supervisory relationship. It is in line with what we have learned from Ecological Counseling theory as it allows for training and supervision that accounts for the diversity of counseling students and clients (Yager, 2004).

Another goal for this study was to collect data using methodologically sound measures that are reflective of the importance of examining relationships from a contextual approach, as indicated in systems and ecological counseling theory. The design of the SWAI (Efstation,
Patton, & Kardash, 1990) and SAGE (Milne & Reiser, 2008), allowed for a context sensitive examination given the inclusion of supervisor and supervisee perspectives. Further, the Cronbach’s Alpha offered support for the internal reliability of the measures. This speaks to a call for more methodologically sound research in counseling supervision.

**Limitations**

This study was unable to address some of the common limitations in applied counseling research. The small, nonrandom sample only included participants from one Midwestern university limiting the generalizability of results. Inclusion of Xavier students was expected to double the number of participants but resulted in no additional participants in the final sample. Statistical procedures were in place to minimize the impact of the small sample size but it should be considered when evaluating the results for hypothesis three. However, the small sample size does not account for the lack of significance for hypothesis one or two because the results did not approach significance.

In the initial development of this study, it was thought that six sessions would be ideal for establishing an understanding of the supervision process. However, due to data collection time constraints the inclusion criteria was decreased to four supervisory sessions. More time in supervision may have increased the first year students understanding of supervision and likely the chance for correlation with supervisors. The high scores of the supervisees may have restricted the range of the scores to the degree that limited the chance for a significant relationship in the dyad correlational analysis. Further, the small number of second year students and off site supervisors in this sample limits the generalizability of the results for this population.
The use of self-report measures is a common practice in descriptive research but these measures have the potential to inflate scores on measures. Results are interpreted based on the assumption that participants answered honestly without influence of bias. Response bias based on the subjects’ perception of the more socially desirable response could be present in this sample. Participant concern about the confidentiality of their responses may have also produced a response bias. In this study, three participants completed the questionnaire with the exception of the identifying information that would have allowed me to pair the dyad. These participants completed the questionnaire online and may have asked questions about confidentiality that would have resulted in sharing of the identifying information if they filled out the survey in person.

**Future Research**

In future research a greater sample size and increased heterogeneity would be advantageous. A sample comprised from more field practicum, and internship dyads may address the lack of experience that was present in the current study sample. Research in this area could also present findings on changes in these constructs over time. A broader geographical disbursement of included schools would also improve heterogeneity. When sampling from professionals and off campus locations data collection could be improved by making appointments for data collection in person at these locations. This personal appearance may also allow for questions about confidentiality to be answered, resulting in a greater participation rate.

Alternate data collection and analysis methods may also address limitations for a study examining the same constructs. Collecting data through a third party interview method could provide a more accurate distribution of ratings. This may improve participant understanding of
the questionnaire because it would allow for further clarification of the questions in the measures. It could also reduce concern about confidentiality, in that someone from outside the department would conduct the interviews and answer questions about confidentiality. Conversely, this could introduce greater incidence of socially desirable responses than the computerized assessment (Davis and Cowles, 1989). An alternative to addressing the lack of experience that would not introduce social desirable response bias would be applied during analysis of the data. Data analysis that included a weighted response application for supervise ratings to account for their lack experience may result in a more accurate representation of the supervisory process. However, there has been little academic research to validate this attitudinal weighting approach (Henning, 2010).

Other research that could add to our understanding of how specific models may improve working alliance and overall effectiveness in supervision would be advantageous to counseling education and supervision programming. Examining the working alliance and effectiveness of supervision for specific models could offer further knowledge towards evidenced based approaches in supervision. Such research could allow for evidence supported supervision curriculum guideline revision and improved supervision for students in training.

Conclusions

This research highlighted the association between working alliance and provision of effective supervision. Research that discusses the importance of working alliance and effective supervision, and the potential utility of systems supervision models to increase efficacy in supervision was overviewed. The inclusion of reports from supervisors and supervisees addressed a gap in the literature allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of the
supervision process with consideration for the use of methodologically sound measures. Much of the prior research on effectiveness in supervision explored supervisee satisfaction and skill building from the supervise perspective alone. The findings from this dual perspective study implicated the importance of contract utilization in effective supervision, and offer some indication of the needed modifications in counselor supervision training programs. The conflicting reports on contract utilization are reflective of the need for training on concrete methods to improve communication in supervision. The use of an integrative systems model that places emphasis on developmental learning needs, communication of goals/expectations, and working alliance seems to be a good fit for supervision of counselors in training.

The correlation between reports on the SWAI and SAGE also offered support for the use of an integrative systems model. The discrepancy between mean scores of the SAGE and lack of correlation between supervisors and supervisees may be attributed to the samples composition of young, first year counseling student supervisors and supervisees. Exploration of working alliance and effectiveness with a more experienced sample may produce different results.
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Appendix A
Research Announcement

UC Counseling List Serve Announcement

Greetings,

This spring brings me into the data collection phase of my dissertation. I am looking forward to my return to campus to introduce this research study to counseling education students and supervisors. The purpose of this research is to explore aspects of the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of the supervisory process. As principle investigator I will visit students under supervision in their respective counseling skill courses to invite them to learn more about the research study and participate. Supervisors will be invited to participate during their course on supervision or through contact by email or postal mail.

There will be no compensation for your participation but the information gathered may help counselor training programs tailor their supervisory training requirements to better meet the needs of counselors in training. If you chose to participate in the study the completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes. If you have questions about participation I can be contacted by phone at 859-866-3981 or by email at stewarpf@uc.email.edu. Have a great week!

Patricia F. Stewart-Hopkins, M.A, P.C

stewarpf@mail.uc.edu

University of Cincinnati

Counseling Education
Appendix B

Recruitment Script

Hello. Thanks for allowing me to have a few minutes of your class time today. I am Patricia Stewart-Hopkins. I’m here to introduce myself and my research study to you. I am a clinical counselor, doctoral student here at U.C., and adjunct professor at Cincinnati State University. As is required to complete my degree program here at U.C. I am conducting research for my dissertation. The purpose of this research is to explore aspects of the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of the supervisory process. Specifically, we hope to learn more about the similarities and differences among supervisor and supervisee perceptions about the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of supervision.

I am inviting graduate level counseling students and their respective supervisors who have participated in four or more sessions of supervision to take part in my research study. The data is being collected with the aid of Survey Monkey, an internet research marketing tool. After class today you will receive an email from me that includes a link that will allow you to learn more about my project and participate if you choose to do so. If you chose to participate in the study the completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes.

There will be no compensation for your participation but the information gathered may help counselor training programs tailor their supervisory training requirements to better meet the needs of counselors in training. If you have questions about participation I can be contacted by phone at 859-866-3981 or by email at stewarpf@uc.email.edu. (I will write my contact information on the classroom dry erase board.) My contact information will also be included in the email invite you receive from me today. Thanks for your time and attention.
Appendix C

Email to Potential Participants

Note: If you would like to participate in the research study described below, please click on the highlighted link. You can contact Patricia Stewart-Hopkins at stewarpf@uc.email.edu, or by phone at 859-866-3981 with any questions or concerns about this opportunity.

Dear colleagues,

I am inviting graduate level counseling students and their respective supervisors who have participated in four or more sessions of supervision to take part in a research study that I am doing as part of my doctoral degree program. Dr. Geoff Yager is my faculty advisor, and is guiding me on this research project. The purpose of this research is to explore aspects of the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of the supervisory process. Specifically, we hope to learn more about the similarities and differences among supervisor and supervisee perceptions about the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of supervision. You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study. However, your participation may help counselor training programs tailor their supervisory training program requirements to better meet the needs of counselors in training.

Participation in this study is purely voluntary, and there are multiple measures to protect your confidentiality. If you chose to participate in the study the completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes. The information sheet that is utilized as an informed consent will appear as the first page of the survey once the participants click on the link in the email below. Thanks in advance for your time and feedback. Please click the link below to learn more about the study and participate if interested.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Y3PWG93

Patricia F. Stewart-Hopkins, M.A, P.C.

stewarpf@uc.email.edu

Cell Phone: 859-866-3981

University of Cincinnati

Counseling Education
Appendix D

Information Sheet

University of Cincinnati

Department: Counseling Education

Principal Investigator: Patricia F. Stewart-Hopkins

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Yager

Title of Study: Correlations Between Supervisory Relationships & Effectiveness: Self

Perceptions of Supervisor and supervisee

Introduction:

I am inviting graduate level counseling students and their respective supervisors who have participated in six or more sessions of supervision to take part in a research study that I am doing as part of my doctoral degree program. Please read the following explanation carefully and ask questions about anything you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?

The person in charge of this research study is Patricia F. Stewart-Hopkins of the University of Cincinnati (UC) Department of Counseling Education. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Geoff Yager.

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this research is to explore aspects of the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of the supervisory process. Specifically, we hope to learn more about the similarities and differences among supervisor and supervisee perceptions about the supervisory relationship and the effectiveness of supervision.

Who will be in this research study?

You are eligible to participate in this study if you are a counseling student or supervisor that has participated in four supervision sessions.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?

You will be asked to complete a questionnaire if you chose to participate. It will take
about 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The research questionnaire will ask for basic demographic information and information related to your experience in supervision. You can complete the survey at your convenience on any internet accessible device.

**Are there any risks to being in this research study?**

I do not expect you to be exposed to any risk or discomfort from participating in this study. None of the interview questions ask for sensitive personal information and you may choose not to answer any questions.

**Are there any benefits from being in this research study?**

You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study. However, your participation may help counselor training programs tailor their supervisory training program requirements to better meet the needs of counselors in training.

**What will you get because of being in this research study?**

You will not receive any payments or given anything to take part in this study.

**Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?**

If you do not want to take part in this research study you can decline to participate. There are no other activities planned if you do not want to complete the questionnaire.

**How will your research information be kept confidential?**

The research questions regarding the relationship between supervisor and supervisee perceptions preclude complete anonymity. In order to provide a measure of confidentiality a subject identification letter number sequence will be assigned after receipt of each student and supervisor paired questionnaire set. I will then delete names from the questionnaires. The principle investigator will be the only person who has access to the name and letter number sequence pairings. Information about you will be kept private by limiting access to research data to my faculty advisor, Dr. Yager, and I. The research data will be stored in a locked file cabinet for three years after the end of this study and then will be destroyed by shredding. The results from the study may be published; however, you will not be identified by name. Due to technology limitations the researcher cannot promise that information sent by the internet or email will be private. Once it is received the information will be kept on a password-protected computer. Agents of the University of Cincinnati may inspect study records for audit or quality assurance purposes.

**What are your legal rights in this research study?**

Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.
What if you have questions about this research study?

If you have any questions about study-related activities, you may call me at 859-866-3981 or Dr. Yager, my faculty advisor, at 513-556-3347.

The UC Institutional Review Board reviews all research projects that involve human participants to be sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant or complaints about the study, you may contact the UC IRB at (513) 558-5259. Or, you may call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547, or write to the IRB, 300 University Hall, ML 0567, 51 Goodman Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0567, or email the IRB office at irb@ucmail.uc.edu.

Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?

No one has to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have. You may choose not to participate or you may quit participating AT ANY TIME. To withdrawal from being in the study exit the questionnaire browser window and contact Patricia Stewart at 859-866-3981.

BY TURNING IN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE YOU INDICATE YOUR CONSENT FOR YOUR ANSWERS TO BE USED IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMATION SHEET FOR YOUR REFERENCE.
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Questionnaire

Supervision Working Alliance

Supervisor Form

Instructions: Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of your work with your supervisee. After each item, check (X) the space over the number corresponding to the appropriate point of the following seven-point scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Almost
Never
Almost
Always

1. I help my trainee work within a specific treatment plan with his/her client.

2. I help my trainee stay on track during our meetings.

3. My style is to carefully and systematically consider the material that my trainee brings to supervision.

4. My trainee works with me on specific goals in the supervisory session.

5. In supervision, I expect my trainee to think about or reflect on my comments to him or her.

6. I teach my trainee through direct suggestion.
7. In supervision, I place a high priority on our understanding the client's perspective.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I encourage my trainee to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. When correcting my trainee's errors with a client, I offer alternative ways of intervening.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I encourage my trainee to formulate his/her own interventions with his/her clients.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I encourage my trainee to talk about the work in ways that are comfortable for him/her.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I welcome my trainee's explanations about his/her client's behavior.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. During supervision, my trainee talks more than I do.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I make an effort to understand my trainee.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I am tactful when commenting about my trainee's performance.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I facilitate my trainee's talking in our sessions.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. In supervision, my trainee is more curious than anxious when discussing his/her  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
difficulties with me.

18. My trainee appears to be comfortable working with me.

19. My trainee understands client behavior and treatment techniques similar to the way I do.

20. During supervision, my trainee seems able to stand back and reflect on what I am saying to him/her.

21. I stay in tune with my trainee during supervision.

22. My trainee identifies with me in the way he/she thinks and talks about his/her clients.

23. My trainee consistently implements suggestions made in supervision.
Supervision Working Alliance

Supervisee Form

Instructions: Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of your work with your supervisee. After each item, check (X) the space over the number corresponding to the appropriate point of the following seven-point scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost Always
Almost Never

1. I feel comfortable working with my supervisor. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. My supervisor welcomes my explanations about the client's behavior. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. My supervisor makes the effort to understand me. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. My supervisor encourages me to talk about my work with clients in ways that are comfortable for me. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. My supervisor is tactful when commenting about my performance. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. My supervisor encourages me to formulate my own interventions with the client. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. My supervisor helps me talk freely in our sessions. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. My supervisor stays in tune with me during supervision.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I understand client behavior and treatment technique similar to the way my supervisor does.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I feel free to mention to my supervisor any troublesome feelings I might have about him/her.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. My supervisor treats me like a colleague in our supervisory sessions.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. In supervision, I am more curious than anxious when discussing my difficulties with clients.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. In supervision, my supervisor places a high priority on our understanding the client’s perspective.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. My supervisor encourages me to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. My supervisor’s style is to carefully and systematically consider the material I bring to supervision.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. When correcting my errors with a client, my supervisor offers alternative ways of intervening with that client.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. My supervisor helps me work within a specific treatment plan with my clients.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. My supervisor helps me stay on track during our
meetings.

19. I work with my supervisor on specific goals in the ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ supervisory session.
### Supervision Adherence and Guidance Evaluation

**Supervisor / Supervisee Instructions**

Each item is rated on a Likert scale, ranging from 0-6 where 5-6 indicates an expert level of competence, 3-4 a competent level, and 0-1 a level below competence. Competence by definition is a minimum score of 4 on each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence level</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incompetent</strong></td>
<td>0 Absence of feature, or highly inappropriate performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice</strong></td>
<td>1 Inappropriate performance, with major problems evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced beginner</strong></td>
<td>2 Evidence of competence, but numerous problems and lack of consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competent</strong></td>
<td>3 Competent, but some problems and/or inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
<td>4 Good features, but minor problems and/or inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert</strong></td>
<td>5 Very good features, minimal problems and/or inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Excellent performance, or very good even in the face of difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the top ratings of 5 & 6 (i.e. near the ‘expert’ end of the continuum) are reserved for those supervisors demonstrating highly effective skills, particularly in the face of difficulties (i.e. high levels of emotional discharge from the supervisees; and various problematic situational factors, like a noisy room or faulty equipment).
Instructions: Rate the supervision experience between 0-6 for each of the 23 categories to indicate the degree to which you think the supervisor has satisfied the scoring criteria explained below.

1. Relating Rating:
   The supervisor ensures that the ‘core conditions’ (i.e. warmth, genuineness, empathy and understanding) are present. The supervisor ensures that any emotions arising in either supervision or the supervisee’s therapy/work are recognized and managed appropriately. Two aspects are relevant, (a) fostering desirable emotions- concerning self-awareness, perplexity, confidence and motivation (etc.); and (b) dealing with undesirable emotions – anger, lethargy or hostility, etc. Effective supervisors are expected to be attentive to therapists’ personal issues (countertransference) when these interfere with the effective delivery of therapy.

2. Collaborating Rating:
The supervisor encourages the supervisee to be an active partner in the supervisory experience (i.e. having shared goals). There is clear evidence of productive teamwork with the supervisor encouraging the supervisee to participate fully. This ensures that the supervisee takes the appropriate level of responsibility and control, with respect to his/her learning experience.

3. Managing Rating:
The supervisor engages in structuring and pacing activity which establishes order to the supervision session (e.g. introducing a topic or creating a task, structural, “signpost” statements); setting up learning situations (e.g. creating or arranging teaching materials); assuming responsibility (‘in charge’). The supervisor makes sure that session pacing is appropriate and that the sessions flow smoothly.

4. Facilitating:
The supervisor fosters desirable emotions and a level of perplexity that facilitates learning. A gentle, quizzical style of open-ended questioning, combined with appropriate non-verbal forms of communication is used to help the supervisee re-conceptualize and change his/her approach.

5. Agenda-setting Rating:
The supervisor sets explicit learning goals for the session in a collaborative fashion and manages the session agenda while also preparing for the session by reviewing the supervisee’s needs (based on previous sessions). The supervisor ensures that topics are agreed to in an appropriate way, are defined (i.e. ‘SMARTER’ specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-phased, energizing, and recorded/observable objectives for the session), and are addressed adequately.

6. Demonstrating Rating:
The supervisor actively attempts to develop competence by demonstrating/modeling the correct performance of a skill (e.g. behavioral, visual, acting, watching videos or modeling). These activities can also help the supervisee identify potential obstacles and think through the change mechanisms underpinning tasks he/she is using with patients.
7. **Discussing Rating:**
The supervisor discusses issues to skillfully and constructively de-stabilize or shift supervisee’s understanding/grasp/constructs. Typically occurs as a reaction to the supervisee’s opinion or grasp of facts. Discussing often entails the use of Socratic questioning designed to be open-ended and to raise the supervisee’s awareness of key issues or concerns without imposing an authoritative closed-ended framework.

8. **Evaluating:**
The supervisor explicitly monitors, checks or evaluates the supervisee’s work/competence (e.g. eliciting his/her knowledge base or proficiency i.e. behavioral skill); encouraging work-related data collection or analysis (e.g. applying clinical outcome measures); and, uses capsule summaries to review what has been learned.

9. **Experiencing Rating:**
The supervisor develops a fuller understanding or awareness of supervises thoughts and feelings in the therapy session and particularly in relation to immediate experiences in the supervision session. Supervisor promotes awareness of current thoughts and feelings and helps supervisee recognize, identify and deepen his/her own feelings. Goal is to achieve an optimal level of arousal and processing that contributes to the engagement and richness of the supervision session.

10. **Feeding back (giving) Rating:**
The supervisor provides a general summary of the positives and negatives in the supervisee’s performance; supporting the supervisee – using praise/reinforce; contingent and constructive. The feedback style should be both supportive and constructive, and not given in a critical manner.

11. **Feeding back (receiving) Rating:**
The supervisor asks the supervisee to summarize aspects of the supervision session, the manner in which the information is elicited should be open, thus encouraging the supervisee to be honest and forthcoming about his/her opinions and impressions- of both supervision and the learning process in general. The supervisor actively elicits feedback not only about helpful aspects of the supervision session, but about any difficulties or conflicts that may have been experienced. The supervisor demonstrates openness to receiving and processing feedback in an authentic, self-reflective and genuine manner.

12. **Formulating Rating:**
The supervisor works actively to help the supervisee develop an individualized case formulation. Supervisors can help supervisees develop case formulation through a number of approaches including specifically questioning the supervisee. An ‘interpreting’ mode should be established, in which connections between seemingly isolated statements or events are formulated. The supervisee should be able to define problems and make sense of them and explore/ offer an understanding.
13. **Listening Rating:**
The supervisor actively listens and pays close attention to the supervisee’s speech and behaviour. The supervisor listens in a confident and genuine/authentic manner before reacting. The supervisor is focused and not distracted by trying to ‘multi-task’ or accomplish other tasks during supervision.

14. **Observing Rating:**
Supervisor observes supervisee activity and behaviour in therapy sessions, either live or through video/audio tapes.

15. **Prompting Rating:**
The supervisor reminds the supervisee about relevant material by prompting them (e.g. ‘sounds like your earlier point’). This can include repeating or rephrasing that contains a reference to stated or implied feelings.

16. **Questioning Rating:**
The supervisor helps the supervisee develop hypotheses regarding therapeutic/work problems and to generate potential solutions. The supervisee is assisted in developing a range of perspectives regarding the therapeutic process and the usefulness of different therapeutic techniques.

17. **Teaching Rating:**
The supervisor provides information about theories, facts, figures, ideas, methods, articles (‘information transmission’) and video/audio tapes to the supervisee in a didactic, directive fashion (e.g. traditional teaching). Symbolic (i.e. verbal) learning is emphasized.

18. **Training/experimenting Rating:**
The supervisor helps the supervisee learn by engaging him/her in an appropriate experiential activity. The method needs to be appropriate to the learning needs of the supervisee and his/her stage of development and also should build on strengths. The supervisor engages in relevant ‘action’ methods including: modeling, demonstrating, watching videos, simulation, behavioral rehearsal, & role play.

19. **Experiencing Rating:**
The supervisee is able to develop a fuller understanding or awareness of his/her thoughts and feelings in the session and in relation to the material provided in supervision (e.g. recounting incidents in therapy). Supervisee indicates being aware of current sensations; recognizes/identifies/labels own feelings.

20. **Reflecting Rating:**
The supervisee draws on personal understanding and history to make sense of recent experience, as well as other learning modes (i.e. items 18, 20-22) to recount own perceptions. Supervisee shows signs of integrating material; assimilating things into a reasoned understanding; grounding ‘experiencing’ in their own understanding.

21. **Conceptualizing Rating:**
The supervisee develops a richer understanding of relevant material, as opposed to merely experiencing it; using language and public knowledge to comprehend; seeking insight. Supervisee indicates signs of assimilating information; reasoning something through; integrating material to make sense.

22. Planning Rating: _____

Supervisee shows ability to draw on own understanding to plan relevant action, including problem-solving and decision-making possibly jointly with supervisor.

23. Experimenting Rating: _____

Supervisee engages in action to verify/falsify/test out an understanding; it involves problem-solving efforts to develop knowledge through ‘trial and error’ activities. Supervisee engages in observable actions designed to try things out; to act on external world so as to address a puzzle/concern/worry/goal/etc.; to rehearse a new skill (e.g. in order to see what happens, gain competence, or to get feedback).
1. Indicate your current supervisory role.

Supervisee          Supervisor

2. Indicate your age ____________

3. Indicate your gender.

MALE              FEMALE

4. Indicate your current level of education.

Masters           Pre-Practicum  Advanced  Field  Internship  Advanced
                  Skills          Practicum  Internship

Doctorate  1 yr  2 yr  3 yr or more  Part Time  Full Time

Graduate  Masters  Doctoral  Other
           Completion  Completion

5. Indicate your current licensure status.

Counselor in Training  Professional Counselor

Professional Clinical Counselor  Dual Licensure
6. Write in the number of years of post licensure professional experience you have currently.

_________________

7. Write in the current number of years of your participation in the supervisory process.

Supervisee _____  Supervisor _____

8. Please indicate whether a supervision contract was utilized during the supervisory process you are evaluating? Yes  No

9. Have you participated in 4 or more supervision sessions for the supervisory process you are evaluating? Yes  No

10. If you are a supervisor indicate your supervisee’s last name. If you are a supervisee indicate your supervisor’s last name.

__________________