4-1991

Activity between Supervisors and Supervisees Outside of Their Supervisory Sessions

Paul R. Ginter
Western Michigan University

ACTIVITY BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND SUPERVISEES OUTSIDE OF THEIR SUPERVISORY SESSIONS

by

Paul R. Ginter

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Counselor Education
and Counseling Psychology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1991

ACTIVITY BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND SUPERVISEES OUTSIDE OF THEIR SUPERVISORY SESSIONS

Paul R. Ginter, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1991

The present study explores non-sexual activities between supervisors and supervisees outside the context of psychotherapy supervision. The two general questions posed in this study are (1) what is the nature of non-sexual activity between supervisors and supervisees outside of supervision, and (2) what is the perceived impact (if any) on the supervision process?

Questionnaires were distributed to matched pairs of supervisory dyads at APA-approved predoctoral internship sites. The two types of internships included in the study were counseling centers at universities, and psychiatric hospitals. Sixty-six supervisory dyads were included in the analysis, selected from 152 returned questionnaires. The respondents represented a 76% return rate of distributed questionnaires.

Results showed minimal reported contact outside of supervision. The three most common activities reported by supervisors and supervisees were activities which were closely related to the internship experience (attending seminars, going to lunch together, and going to work related parties). No differences in reported activity were found between males and females, clinical versus counseling psychology participants, and same-sex versus opposite-sex supervisory dyads.

Activity outside of supervision also did not vary significantly due to time spent in supervision and whether the respondents "liked" their supervisor or supervisee personally or professionally. One significant finding was that supervisees desired more contact outside of supervision than did supervisors. A discussion of the results is presented as well as recommendations for further research.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9123602

Activity between supervisors and supervisees outside of their supervisory sessions

Ginter, Paul Robert, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1991

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation for the guidance offered by my committee chairperson, Dr. John Geisler; and to my committee members, Dr. Robert Betz and Dr. Malcolm Robertson for their time and assistance. I wish to thank them not only for the guidance with the dissertation, but for the support they offered throughout my doctoral program.

A special thanks goes to Dr. Steve Broday, whose discussions and encouragement during my internship year was invaluable. I also wish to thank Janice Tipton for her typing and proofreading efforts.

Finally, I wish to thank my parents for all of their love and support. Their belief in me has allowed me to also believe in myself.

Paul R. Ginter

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents--Continued

Table of Contents--Continued

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The working relationship between a supervisor and supervisee is one of the primary ingredients of the supervisory process (Hess, 1980). Recent research has explored a number of important variables regarding this relationship, including similarities in personality characteristics, theoretical orientation, and supervisory style (Lambert, 1980). One potentially relevant variable which has been ignored by researchers has been non-sexual activity between supervisors and supervisees outside of their supervision sessions. Such activity can be examined under the general category of dual relationships in supervision.

Because there is very little research involving dual relationships in supervision, it is necessary to review related literature to extract relevant information. Contact between supervisor and supervisee outside of the context of their professional relationship raises several potential areas of concern. Within professional literature in the field, implications for dual relationships in psychotherapy supervision seem to have been drawn primarily from theoretical perpectives in psychotherapy, reflecting an emphasis on the similarities between the psychotherapy process and the supervision process. This perspective, which originated in psychoanalytic theory, envisions supervision

as a parallel process to psychotherapy. Abroms (1977) described supervision as therapy of therapy, labeling it "metatherapy." From this perspective, as with psychotherapy, contact outside of supervision could be expected to blur the professional relationship between supervisor and supervisee. Contact with clients outside of therapy has been seen as problematic because it interferes with one of the core factors in the psychotherapeutic process, namely transference. This process involves the therapist becoming a "blank screen" in order for clients to project and work through their own personal issues. When therapists have relationships with clients outside of therapy, the neutrality of the therapist is lost, and the transference phenomena becomes distorted.

Freud (1963) first warned against the practice of therapists participating in loving relationships with clients. He maintained that clients falling in love with their therapists is induced by the analytic situation, and could not be considered legitimate love. Furthermore, he clearly expressed that therapeutic effectiveness would cease when such contact begins.

Although many schools of psychotherapy have incorporated concepts of transference in psychotherapy into their theoretical framework, it cannot be assumed that such concepts apply to the supervision process. Unfortunately, such theoretical constructs do not readily lend themselves to empirical inquiry. Therefore, the actual influence of transference phenomena, or of dual relationships affecting transference phenomena, has yet to be validated empirically, even in the psychotherapeutic process.

Although there are clearly similarities between psychotherapy and supervision, it is not clear how relevant assumptions concerning transference in psychotherapy are to supervision. A basic question is: Does contact outside of supervision hinder a naturally occurring process in which the supervisee works through transference issues with the supervisor?

In addition to psychotherapeutic concerns regarding dual relationships, it has also been speculated that other psychologist roles can be compromised. Pope, Schover, and Levenson (1980), suggested that trainees may also lose objectivity in roles of teacher and evaluator by having interpersonal contact. Kitchener (1988) discusses loss of objectivity among her guidelines differentiating between relationships that have a high probability of leading to harm and those that do not. She argues that the primary responsibility of professionals is to serve clients. By contrast, other relationships, such as friendships, imply relative reciprocity of participants' needs being met. Having relationships which supercede the professional relationship can make it more difficult to maintain the priority of keeping clients' best interests in mind.

The potential for difficulty is increased when there is incompatibility of behaviors between roles. The greater the incompatibility between roles, the greater the potential for harm. For instance, there may be greater incompatibility between the roles of supervisor and lover, than between the roles of supervisor and professor.

There is further potential for harm when there is greater

inequality in power and prestige associated with the role of the professional and the person receiving services. Kitchener (1988) suggests that a person seeking services who is participating in a dual relationship is not in a position to objectively evaluate either the professional services offered, or the potential for those in authority to use their power in a manipulative manner.

Once again, questions arise regarding the relevance of these issues to the supervision process. Does, for instance, going to lunch with a supervisee influence the supervisor's ability to maintain objectivity with the supervisee? Would lonely supervisors be more hesitant to discuss a supervisee's shortcomings if they relied on them for occasional social fulfillment? In short, how does the variety of different types of contact outside of supervision affect the supervision process and is the influence of such contact contingent on variables such as power differential between supervisor and supervisee and incompatibility of the roles of the participants?

Concerns regarding transference and loss of objectivity notwithstanding, keeping professional roles exclusive from other roles is not always possible to avoid. Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) suggested that in several job settings it would be nearly impossible to avoid dual roles. Among examples they provide of unavoidable blending of roles, they site positions on college campuses in which instructors must serve both as supervisor and as evaluator.

In addition to dual relationships which cannot be avoided, it appears that it is relatively common for professionals in the field to participate in dual relationships which can be avoided (Glaser &

Thorpe, 1986; Pope, Levenson, and Schover, 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985). Pope et al. (1979) found that 25% of women respondents with recent doctoral degrees reported that they had had sexual contact at least once with a psychology educator during their graduate training.

Considering theoretical cautions regarding dual relationships in psychotherapy and similar concerns regarding supervision, as well as the apparent prevalence of dual relationships in the field, it is somewhat surprising how little empirical research has been reported in this area. The research which has been reported has primarily focused on one type of contact, namely sexual contact. In studies exploring sexual contact between therapists and clients, research has found that clients perceived sexual contact with therapists as having significant adverse affects, often quite severe (Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984; Pope and Bouhoutsos, 1986; Vinson, 1984). In addition to women reporting severe depression and suicidal ideation, Vinson (1984) reported that 64% of subjects were diagnosed as suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Sexual contact between counselor educators and students has also often perceived as being harmful (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Robinson & Reid, 1985). Although much less severe psychological trauma was reported by students than clients, approximately one-half of respondents indicated that they felt that the contact had been coercive in nature.

The research that has been reported seems to validate concerns over dual relationships, including their prevalence and potential harm to client and trainee. Questions raised earlier have yet to be answered, however. As much of the existing research involves sexual

contact, and that research does not specifically include the impact of such contact between supervisor and supervisee, it is important to collect data which explore this important area of study. The purpose of the present exploratory study, then, is to provide empirical data on the nature and perceived impact of a variety of types of activity between supervisors and supervisees outside of supervision sessions.

Significance of the Study

Research dealing with dual relationships in supervision is crucial for a number of reasons. First, since there are no empirical data regarding the type and frequency of contact between supervisors and supervisees outside of supervision, it is difficult to have informed opinions concerning its effect on the supervision process.

Second, in light of the ambiguity regarding ethical standards for dual relationships in supervision, the present study could provide data that clarify and ultimately refine the standards. Third, not only could this research clarify ethical standards, but it may also provide valuable information for counselor educators. If it is discovered, for instance, that supervisees typically desire closer relationships outside of supervision than do their supervisors, training programs could lead beginning counselors to an awareness of such dynamics and provide means for dealing with its various implications.

Finally, in addition to this study elucidating ethical dilemmas and providing heuristic value, the current research will provide a framework for future research. This study will not only help fill the

gap in the existing literature, but may lead to the generation of further hypotheses regarding the nature of dual relationships in supervision, paving the way for more meaningful exploration into this important area of study.

Definitions

The term supervision will be defined as "a process in which one person is designated to facilitate the development of therapeutic competence in the other person" (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982, p. 4).

The term dual relationship will be used as a generic term referring to relationships which are in addition to and outside the normal parameters of the supervisory relationship. The term extra-supervisory relationship will be used interchangeably with the term dual relationship.

The term extra-supervisory activity will refer to activities which are in addition to and outside the normal parameters of supervisory activity. The term extra-supervisory contact will be used interchangeably with the term extra-supervisory activity.

Research Questions

The primary question to be addressed in this study is: What is the nature of non-sexual relationships between supervisees and supervisors outside of supervision sessions and what is the perceived impact, if any, on the supervision process? Specifically, the following questions include:

1. Will reports of type and frequency of extra-supervisory activity differ according to type of training program (clinical vs. counseling) and internship setting (psychiatric hospital vs. counseling center)?

2. Will reports of type and frequency of extra-supervisory activity differ according to whether the sex of the supervisor and supervisee match?

3. Will reports of type and frequency of extra-supervisory activity differ according to length of time in supervision?

4. Will reports of type and frequency of extra-supervisory activity differ between sexes?

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations exist in the present study. First, results cannot be assumed to be generalized to all psychotherapy supervision, as selecting subjects from predoctoral internship sites does not allow generalizations to be made to psychotherapy supervision in general. Also, respondents did not represent all current predoctoral interns. For the purpose of obtaining a manageable sample size, only selected categories of "type of agency" were chosen from Internship Programs in Professional Psychology (APIC, 1989). Furthermore, predoctoral interns and their supervisors cannot be assumed to represent supervision in general. For instance, it might be expected that beginning level counselors participate in a very different process of supervision than do predoctoral interns, who, in turn might differ from psychologists participating in peer supervision with colleagues.

Additionally, although interns at APA-approved sites can be assumed to have at least fairly similar training experiences, it is not reasonable to assume similar levels of professional development. Recent developmental models of supervision have suggested that supervision progresses through predictable stages, each characterized by different goals and styles of interaction between supervisor and supervisee (Stoltenberg, 1981). No measures were taken to differentiate between respondents on such levels.

Finally, it might be expected that different styles of supervision and diverse theoretical orientations of supervisors and supervisees might result in different attitudes and behaviors concerning contact outside of supervision. No attempts were made in this study to differentiate between differing supervision styles and theoretical orientations among respondents.

Overview of the Study

In Chapter II, a review of relevant literature is presented. The methodology used in collecting and analyzing the data is reported in Chapter III. Results of the study are contained in Chapter IV. Chapter V includes a discussion of the results, limitations of the study and implications for further research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

Because there are no published empirical data in the area of dual relationships between supervisors and supervisees, the literature review provided herein will be for purposes of analogy, in an effort to extract any relevant information. Prior to presenting the literature, ethical guidelines will be presented and discussed, reasoning that they reflect current thought regarding dual relationships in supervision. It will be helpful to briefly summarize the pertinent literature in the field.

As previously mentioned, there is no empirical or theoretical literature dealing with non-sexual extra-supervisory contact between supervisors and supervisees. However, there is limited theoretical literature exploring more general aspects involving the supervisory relationship. Also, there is considerable research concerning contact between counselor educators and students outside the context of training which might provide relevant information. A great deal of literature exists exploring dual relationships between therapist and client.

In light of the above mentioned literature, the contents of this chapter include: (a) ethical standards concerning dual relationships in supervision, (b) dual relationships between therapists and clients,

(c) theoretical concerns regarding dual relationships and the supervisory relationship, and (d) dual relationships between counselor educators and students. A summary of the relevant topics related to dual relationships in supervision will then be presented.

Ethical Standards

In order to assess the profession's current position concerning contact between supervisors and supervisees outside the context of supervision, it will be necessary to examine the profession's ethical standards. Relationships between therapists and clients which are outside the realm of the therapeutic relationship are strongly discouraged by professional ethics in the field. Principle 6a. of the Ethical Standards of Psychologists states:

> Psychologists make every effort to avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgment or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of such dual relationships include, but are not limited to, research with and treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends or relatives. Sexual intimacies with clients are unethical. (APA, 1981, p. 636)

Ethics regarding supervisory relationships, issued by the American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD), are very similar with the notable omission of the prohibition of sexual intimacy between supervisor and supervisee: "Supervisors make every effort to avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgment or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of such dual relationships include, research with and treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends or relatives" (AACD, 1988, p. 3).

Although the above mentioned standards suggest avoiding certain relationships which may conflict with primary roles, they by no means

provide definitive guidelines. The phrase, "make every effort to avoid" does not prohibit dual relationships, but simply implies that there may be problems with such relationships.

An additional guideline issued by the American Psychological Association (7d.) restricts exploitative professional relationships (including supervisory relationships) but is quite liberal, even in reference to sexual intimacies which are strictly forbidden in therapeutic relationships. This standard states that psychologists do not condone or engage in sexual harassment, defining sexual harassment as those behaviors which are "unwanted by the recipient" (p. 637). This does not clearly prohibit those sexual relationships within the context of supervision which involve mutual consent and certainly does little to discourage other types of dual relationships.

The lack of specific ethics regarding dual relationships in supervision is reflected both in the types of ethical violations reported, and in the difficulty in substantiating dual relationship claims. Of all of the ethical violations reported to the AACD Ethics Committee between 1985 and March, 1988, none pertained to the supervisory relationship. This dearth of adjudicated supervision violations may not accurately reflect the prevalence of dual relationships in supervision. Schaefer (1990) reported that there has been a large increase in reported violations over the past several years, many of them involving counselor educators and students. However, a large percentage of these were reported anonymously and could not be acted upon.

Dual Relationships in Psychotherapy

It is important to understand why ethical guidelines have discouraged (although not clearly) dual relationships in supervision. Generally, ethical guidelines are assumed to be based on some type of theoretical reasoning or empirical data which supports its rationale. In the field of psychotherapy, in light of the paucity of literature pertaining specifically to dual relationships in supervision, it appears that ethical guidelines are based on theoretical and empirical arguments prohibiting dual relationships between therapist and client.

Although empirical research concerning dual relationships in psychotherapy has only recently become available, theorists and clinicians have traditionally regarded such relationships to be harmful (Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986). A number of justifications for this position have been suggested. Pope and Bouhoutsos (1986) explore three major issues which should serve as deterrents to dual relationships with clients: (1) the extreme vulnerability of clients in therapeutic relationships, (2) the responsibilities of therapists as professionals, and (3) the potential harm to clients that sexual intimacies between client and therapist may cause.

Pope and Bouhoutsos (1986) explored many variables which heighten the tendency toward sexual involvement in therapeutic relationships. Not only do clients often share their most vulnerable private selves, they most often do so during times in which they are in the most pain and suffering. They may feel confused and desperate with the sense

that their only means of moving toward improved psychological health is with the help of the therapist.

Another aspect of vulnerability of the client involves transference. Freud first warned against the practice of attributing client's loving feelings to therapist's charms rather than as a clinical phenomenon (Freud, 1963). Loving feelings for the therapist clearly involved transference, whereas such feelings felt by therapists for clients clearly reflected countertransference phenomena. For Freud, to not treat such feelings as clinical phenomena meant the destruction of the therapy. Furthermore, Freud suggested that, "The love relationship actually destroys the influence of the analytic treatment on the patient: the combination of the two would be an inconceivable thing" (Freud, 1963, p. 174).

Pope and Bouhoutsos (1986) point out that the power differential between therapist and client magnifies the potential dangers of acting on normal transferences in therapy in sexual ways. They cite a statement by Marmor (1977) to highlight the role of client vulnerability in such situations:

> Such behavior is particularly reprehensible because of the other relationships between a client and a professional, the client may be able to maintain a certain amount of person (sic) reserve and still benefit from the relationship to a greater or less degree. In the psychotherapeutic relationship, however, a special emphasis is placed on the therapeutic necessity for the patient to set aside his or her defenses and to open himself or herself completely to the presumably benign and constructive influence of the therapist's professional skill. The implicit and explicit basis on which such total openness and trust is solicited is a solemn commitment that it will not be betrayed. Under such circumstances a positive transference that leaves the patient uniquely vulnerable to the influence of the therapist usually develops. To exploit this iatrogenically induced vulnerability seems to me particularly reprehensible and unethical. (pp. 158 - 159).

An assumption which has been made by those condemning dual relationships is that it necessitates forfeiting unbiased objectivity and clarity (Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986). The therapist's needs for sexual intimacy may conflict with the client's basic treatment needs.

In efforts to determine the effects of sexual involvement between therapist and client, Taylor and Wagner (1976) reviewed reports of all such cases which had appeared in the literature to that point in time. They concluded that negative effects for either the client or the therapist occurred 45% of the time, positive effects occurred 21% of the time, and mixed results 32% of the time.

Chesler (1972) found in interviews with women who had been involved sexually with health care practitioners that they felt "mistreated" and "abandoned" by the therapist with whom they had the contact. Several of these women were reported being either severely depressed and/or suicidal.

There have been a limited number of empirical studies which have explored the effect of sexual intimacy between therapist and client. Feldman-Summers and Jones (1984) investigated the effect of 21 women who had had sex with their therapist, comparing them to 10 who had not. Nineteen of the 21 women reported that they suffered negative impacts as a result of the sexual contact. As compared to women who had not had sex with their therapist, these women revealed greater mistrust of and anger toward men and a greater number of psychological and psychosomatic symptoms following termination of therapy. They also found that the severity of the psychological impact was significantly related to the magnitude of psychological and psychosomatic

symptoms prior to treatment, prior victimization, and the marital status of the therapist or health care professional.

Bouhoutsos, Holroyd, Lerman, Forer, & Greenberg (1983) surveyed 704 psychologists who provided information on 559 cases of clients who had reported sexual contact with their previous therapist. The respondents determined that the client's personality was adversely affected in 34% of the cases. They also reported that the client had negative feelings about the experience in 29% of the cases and that the patient's sexual, marital, or intimate relationship deteriorated in 26% of the cases. Sixteen percent of the cases reported positive effects of sexual involvement. Furthermore, 77% of the cases reported adverse effects on the therapeutic process, with 37% terminating therapy and 40% indicating that it interfered with therapy. Fifteen percent report no effect on therapy and 6% reported a positive effect.

In a study involving 28 subjects (22 females and 6 males) Vinson (1984) found that males were much less likely than the females to feel that their present lives were disrupted as a result of having sex with their therapist. During the two year period following termination of therapy, two-thirds of the female subjects reported that they were experiencing significant withdrawal from friends, fluctuations in weight, a decrease in recreational and social activities and sexual difficulties. They reported that any gains in therapy occurred before the sexual involvement began and that their presenting problems were basically ignored subsequent to the sexual contact. Vinson (1984) diagnosed 64% of these subjects as suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Certainly, the literature regarding dual relationships in psychotherapy which involve sexual contact leaves little question as to its many risks. Although less attention has been focused on other types of dual relationships between therapist and client (such as platonic friendships), it is assumed that they also run certain risks and should likewise be avoided. The question remains, however: How is client-therapist contact relevant to supervisor-supervisee contact? Does Freud's assertion that "When sexual intimacy begins, therapy ends," also hold true for supervisory relationships? Furthermore, is sexual contact distinctly different than other types of contact, or are all types of contact detrimental to supervisory or therapeutic relationships? To assess the first of these two questions it is necessary to discuss commonalities and differences between psychotherapy and supervision.

Theoretical Concerns Regarding Dual Relationships in Supervision

One way in which Bruch (1974) likens therapy to supervision is that they both involve interpersonal relationships in which one seeks guidance of another. Schmidt (1979) stressed the educational aspect of both, whereas Truax and Carkhuff (1967) noted the common theme of self-exploration in therapy and supervision. Further impetus for likening supervision to therapy is provided by those approaches which view the supervisor as assuming the role of therapist for the supervisee.

Supervisor as Therapist to Supervisee

Hess (1980) maintains that of the numerous roles that supervisors can assume (e.g., teacher, colleague-peer, monitor), the role of therapist to the supervisee is perhaps the most common. He cites three main reasons for this tendency. First, supervisors typically receive considerably more training in psychotherapy than they do in supervision and feel more comfortable with their psychotherapeutic skills.

Second, many schools of psychotherapy focus on the personality or interpersonal style of the supervisee as an integral aspect of the therapy process. From this perspective, one primary goal of supervision is to help the supervisee to become aware of blind spots in his/her personality which may interfere with therapy.

Third, an effective means of learning is by modeling and by being experientially involved in the learning process. From this viewpoint, supervision in which the supervisor acts as therapist for the supervisee could be a valuable means of the supervisee improving his/her skills. According to Rioch (1980) (who writes from an analytic viewpoint):

> the supervisor attempts to work with the student's anxieties and defenses against them. The reason why I am in favor of the third kind of supervision is simple: it stands a chance of stirring up anxiety. I think that there is no greater teacher in the whole wide world. (p. 75)

Rioch goes on to caution:

> But the student must give permission for this kind of work to occur. Even if he gives lip service to wanting to understand and penetrate his own defenses, he may be incapable of

> seeing what he is doing, not because of intellectual incompetence, but because his defenses are too well entrenched. (p. 75)

Other theorists more strongly discourage the supervisor from taking the role of therapist. Hess (1980) maintains that there are issues which are personal but are appropriate to discuss in supervision. He maintains, however, that the supervisor can pursue countertransference issues but should not delve into personal therapy with the supervisee. Hess, like Rioch and others, suggest that exploring the supervisee's personal issues in supervision should come only at the invitation of the supervisee and with most of the focus on the supervision of the supervisee's work with clients (Cohen & DeBetz, 1977; Hess, 1980). In short, these authors suggest that such issues concern trainee skill development rather than changing the personality of the supervisee.

Cohen and DeBetz (1977) further caution against the practice of "diagnosing" the trainee in supervisory sessions and in written evaluations. They suggest that it is unfair to treat the therapist as a patient without granting him/her patient privileges.

In research assessing a number of variables related to dissatisfaction with supervisors, Rosenblatt and Mayer (1975) found that supervisors who turned supervision into psychotherapy were rated most objectionable to supervisees. Several reasons were cited for such strong objections. Supervisees felt that when supervisors inaccurately assessed their psychological issues interfering with psychotherapeutic work with clients, there was often little means for adequately defending themselves against such claims. Basing such

supervisory interpretations on a supervisee's unconscious dynamics cannot effectively be disputed by the supervisee. Denial of such defenses could be seen as further proof that the supervisee's issue does, in fact, exist. Furthermore, there was also the realization that when psychological issues were raised by supervisors, such issues were most often not easily rectified.

The current trend toward discouraging supervisors from functioning as therapists to the supervisee has prompted several theorists to propose means of clearly separating the two functions (Whitson & Emerson, 1989), and procedures to take to re-establish, clarify, and maintain the appropriate boundaries of the relationship (Schaefer, 1981).

In addition to the perspective of the supervisor behaving as a therapist with the supervisee, approaches which characterize supervision as a parallel process to psychotherapy also highlight similarities between supervision and psychotherapy.

Supervision as Parallel Process With Psychotherapy

According to a number of psychoanalytic theorists, the interactions between supervisor and supervisee tend to parallel those between supervisee and client (Doehrman, 1976; Eckstein & Wallerstein, 1972). Doehrman (1976) observed that supervisees develop highly emotional and intense reactions to their supervisor, mirroring ways in which clients often have strong transference reactions to therapists.

Beckett (1969) also describes the supervisory relationship in

a way which strongly parallels the psychotherapeutic relationship. He maintains that the raw material of supervision is the emotional reaction of the trainee to the client. In the course of forming a working relationship with the supervisor, the supervisee develops "transference reactions" to the supervisor. This transference, as well as other conflicts and fears of the supervisee, are expected to be acted out and worked through in supervision.

Research on Counselor Educators and Students

Although not specifically geared toward supervision, studies have been conducted on counselor educators' attitudes toward dual relationships. In a survey conducted by Roberts, Murrel, Thomas & Claxton (1982), 73% of counselor educators believed it ethical to have a nonsexual relationship with students, but not to have a sexual relationship. Twenty-one percent felt that close relationships with students who were in their classes are unethical under any circumstances. Only 7% believed that sexual relationships (if non-coerced) with students who are in the program was ethical. Whereas some respondents believe it desirable to maintain a certain professional distance from students, others indicated that close relationships with students are desirable and necessary for an effective counselor education program.

A number of studies have shown sexual relationships involving counselor educators and students to be quite common (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985). Pope, Levenson, and Schover (1979) found in an anonymous survey of psychologists that 25% of women respondents with a recent Ph.D. degree reported that they had

sexual contact at least one time with a psychology educator during their graduate training.

In addition to exploring attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision and their prevalence, the perceived impact of sexual contact between counselor educators and students has been explored (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Pope et al., 1979; Roberts et al., 1982). In a study involving a sample of female members of APA division 12 (clinical psychology), Glaser and Thorpe (1986) evaluated the effects of sexual intimacies between counselor educators and students. Incidences of sexual contact with educators were nearly three times higher for divorced or separated women than for those who were not divorced or separated. Respondents rendered more critical judgments as to the coercive nature of the contact during their present evaluation of the situation as compared to an "at-the-time" rating. For instance, 72% of respondents had felt that they had not been at all coerced at the time of contact, whereas only 49% now felt that they had not been coerced. Additionally, only 2.5% reported that they felt very coerced at the time of contact, compared to 13.9% feeling that they were, in fact, coerced. Similarly, 19% reported that the sexual contact hindered the working relationship at the time, whereas 33% later perceived it that way. Those reporting professional and ethical problems as a result of the sexual contact also increased from 36% at the time of contact, to 56% at the time when the survey was completed.

Glaser and Thorpe (1986) also asked respondents to indicate how thorough their training was regarding the ethics of sexual involvement

between therapists and clients, as 22% reported thorough coverage, 45% reported that it was "somewhat" covered and 33% reported that it was "not at all" covered.

Although various researchers have suggested guidelines for decision making which would restrict exploitative dual relationships (Gottlieb, 1986; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985), it appears that little progress has been made thus far.

Summary

In light of unclear ethical standards concerning dual relationships in supervision, as well as the paucity of empirical data, it is clear that further research is warranted. For purposes of analogy, the preceding review of the literature explored related areas, including dual relationships between counselor educators and students, and dual relationships in psychotherapy, in hopes of enhancing understanding of relevant issues. Upon reviewing the current literature, it is apparent that although there is ample evidence that certain dual relationship practices are best avoided, a number of "gray" areas exist.

The purpose of the present study is to empirically explore a number of relevant issues concerning dual relationships in supervision. Such an exploration is exploratory in nature, designed to generate hypotheses for further research.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter outlines the methods for gathering and analyzing the data. The first section contains a description of the participants in the study. The next section describes the procedures, providing descriptions of how the sample was obtained. Next, the rationale for the survey instrument and its content are provided. Finally, the procedures for analyzing the data are discussed.

Population and Sample

One hundred and fifty-four supervisees and supervisors from 66 APA-approved predoctoral internship sites completed and returned the questionnaires, representing a 76% return rate of those receiving the questionnaire. The 66 internship sites sampled were selected from a pool of 80 sites which met the criteria outlined in the Procedures section of this chapter. One hundred and two of these represented respondents from psychiatric hospitals, 52 represented respondents from counseling centers. Out of the 154 respondents, 74 were predoctoral interns and 80 were supervisors.

Although directions accompanying the questionnaires stipulated that participants be from clinical training programs if they were in a psychiatric hospital internship site, and from a counseling psychology or counselor education program if they were in a counseling

center internship site, 20 returned questionnaires did not fit the criteria. Several respondents indicated that they were from various other training programs, including school psychology, experimental psychology and psychiatric nursing. These questionnaires were not included in the analysis. Also not included in the analysis were respondents from clinical training programs interning or supervising at counseling centers and respondents from counseling psychology or counselor education programs interning or supervising at psychiatric hospitals. Finally, respondents whose supervisor or supervisee did not return their questionnaire were excluded, limiting the analysis to matched pairs.

Excluding responses from respondents who did not fit the established criteria, 132 of the returned questionnaires were analyzed, representing 66 matched pairs. The 66 dyads used in the analysis represented 65% of the 101 dyads to which questionnaires were distributed. Of these, 45 were from clinical sites, and 21 from counseling centers. Seventy-three (55%) of these were females, and 59 (45%) were males. The mean age for clinical supervisors was 39, and the mean age for clinical supervisees was 34. The mean age for counseling center supervisors was 41, and the mean age for counseling center supervisees was 36. The mean age for females in the sample was 36, and the mean age for males in the sample was 38.

Non-respondents were analyzed to determine if they had differing characteristics from those returning the questionnaire. Both counseling center and psychiatric hospital non-respondents represented 24% of the distributed questionnaires. The interns had a slightly

higher non-response rate (27%) than did supervisors (21%).

Procedures

Subjects were drawn from counseling centers at universities, and from psychiatric hospital sites. APA-approved sites were selected because they are presumed to provide a relatively homogeneous group of supervisees, in terms of training and experience level. Clinical and counseling psychology predoctoral internship sites were selected in an effort to identify similarities and differences in attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision between counseling and clinical psychologists.

Counseling center sites were selected from Internship Programs in Professional Psychology (APIC, 1989), based on the following criteria: (a) sites were listed under "University Counseling Center," (b) they were listed as having "full" or "provisional" approval by the APA, and (c) the starting date listed for the internship was in August or September (this criterion was intended to allow participants sufficient time to return questionnaires prior to the conclusion of their internship year). Training directors from counseling center sites were asked to supply the questionnaires to only those supervisory dyads in which both supervisor and supervisee were trained in counseling psychology or counselor education programs.

To survey clinically oriented programs, the following criteria were used: (a) the internships were listed under "Private Psychiatric Hospitals" or "State/City/County" Hospitals, (b) sites were listed as having either "full" or "provisional" approval by the APA, and (c) the

starting date listed for the internship was in August or September. Training directors from these sites were asked to supply the questionnaires only to those supervisory dyads in which both supervisor and supervisee were trained in clinical psychology programs.

Pre-Survey Letter

Letters were sent along with several copies of the questionnaire to training directors of selected internship sites. An initial letter was sent to the training directors requesting their participation in the study, including a description of the means by which supervisors and supervisees were selected. A copy of the letter to the training directors in counseling centers is presented in Appendix B. A cover page to the questionnaires requesting participation along with a brief description of participant's role in the study were made available to supervisors and supervisees. These pages are presented in Appendices C and D.

Training directors were also asked to provide information on an included postcard and return it. This postcard had blanks for indicating the number of questionnaires distributed to appropriate supervisory dyads as well as the number which were not distributed because they did not fit the criteria. A copy of this postcard is presented in Appendix E.

Follow-up phone contact was attempted in instances in which no response had been received. An additional postcard was sent in instances in which the questionnaires had been distributed, but few supervisors or supervisees had responded. For instance, if a training

director had sent back a postcard indicating that five pairs of questionnaires had been distributed and only two pairs had been returned, this additional reminder was sent. A copy of this reminder is presented in Appendix F.

Instrumentation

The method chosen for surveying this population was by questionnaire. This method was chosen for several reasons. Most importantly, the use of questionnaires provided an effective method for gathering large amounts of data. Since this was an exploratory study, it was necessary to sample a sufficient number of supervisors and supervisees to ensure that the information gathered would be representative of supervision dyads in general.

Another important capability of a questionnaire is that it ensures anonymity, allowing for free expression of feelings and attitudes regarding issues in this area. The questionnaire for supervisees is presented in Appendix G. The questionnaire for supervisors is presented in Appendix H.

Formulating the Questionnaire

A group of five supervisors and five supervisees was interviewed as part of a pilot study in order to determine which questions would most effectively render pertinent information. In addition to demographic information, the questionnaire was designed to explore two primary areas involved with dual relationships: (1) the nature and extent of contact between supervisor and supervisee outside of

supervision, and (2) the attitudes and feelings associated with the contact.

Demographic information included the subject's sex, age, type of graduate training, and internship setting. In addition to demographic information, a question (question 5) requesting the length of time in supervision was included. Information obtained from this question was used to explore differences in extra-supervisory activities and attitudes based on length of supervision, as well as allowing for potential developmental trends regarding dual relationships in supervision.

The next series of questions was designed to elucidate the nature of extra-supervisory contact between supervisors and supervisees. The first of these questions (question 7) was intended to gather descriptive data regarding the type and amount of contact between supervisors and supervisees outside the context of supervision. The list of activities resulted from the pilot interviews with supervisors and supervisees and was intended to cover a wide range of possible activities in which supervisors and supervisees might engage. The next questions (questions 8 and 9) were designed to elicit whether supervisor and supervisee enjoy each other, both from a professional and personal standpoint, reasoning that the nature of extra-supervisory contact may be partially a function of feelings toward the supervisor or supervisee.

Questions 10 and 11 explored whether or not supervisors and supervisees would wish to have closer contact outside the context of supervision. The purpose of this question was to determine attitudes

and feelings toward extra-supervisory contact with their current supervisor or supervisee. Question 11, which inquired about the desire to have a closer relationship after supervision has ended, was designed to explore individuals beliefs regarding dual relationships in supervision. For instance, a supervisor may wish to have no more contact with his or her supervisee currently, but desire closer contact after supervision has ended. This position may stem from his or her beliefs about potential negative effects of dual relationships.

The next question (question 12) was designed to assess how the nature of the extra-supervisory contact has changed over the course of supervision. This question was considered particularly important in light of recent interest in the developmental aspects of supervision.

Finally, a question exploring perceptions of how extra-supervisory contact has affected supervision was asked (question 13). Although no causal relationships can be drawn from this inquiry, it was hoped that this particular question would render certain patterns and themes, thereby generating further hypotheses regarding the impact of extra-supervisory contact on the supervision process.

Analyzing the Data

Means, standard deviations, and percentages were computed for the forced choice questions. The specific statistical procedures used for each hypothesis are presented after the following list of all of the null hypotheses:

1. There will be no differences between male and female respondents on reported activity outside of supervision.

2. There will be no differences between same-sex and opposite-sex dyads on reported activity outside of supervision.

3. There will be no differences between clinical psychology respondents training in psychiatric hospitals and counseling psychology or counselor educator respondents from counseling centers on reported activity outside of supervision.

4. There will be no differences between respondents currently in supervision four or less months from those currently in supervision eight or more months on reported activity outside of supervision.

5. There will be no differences between respondents reporting liking their supervisor/supervisee professionally (question 8) with those who don't like their supervisor/supervisee on reported activity outside of supervision.

6. There will be no differences between respondents reporting liking their supervisor/supervisee as a person (question 9) with those who don't like their supervisor/supervisee as a person on reported activity outside of supervision.

7. There will be no differences between supervisors and supervisees on their response to whether they would like to have a closer relationship with each other during supervision (question 10).

8. There will be no differences between supervisors and supervisees on their response to whether they would like to have a closer relationship with each other after supervision has ended (question 11).

The first three hypotheses, comparing males versus females,

same-sex dyads, and clinical versus counseling center respondents on reported activity outside of supervision were analysed using the Mann-Whitney test. The Mann-Whitney was chosen over an independent t-test because the data violate a number of assumptions for using parametric statistics. Although the data reflecting extra-supervisory activity are in ordinal form, the categories for coding time spent in these activities are not equally distributed. The Mann-Whitney is designed to determine significant differences between two independent samples, using mean ranks rather than means.

A Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was used to test the fourth hypothesis. This method of analysis was chosen because it allowed three levels of this variable to be compared on aggregate extra-supervisory activity. This procedure was selected over the Analysis of Variance procedure because the data violate the same basic assumptions required for parametric statistics that were previously noted. The fourth hypothesis compares reported aggregate activity across the following three variables: (1) respondents currently in supervision four or less months, (2) respondents currently in supervision five to eight months, and (3) respondents currently in supervision nine or more months.

Hypothesis five, comparing respondents liking or not liking their supervisor/supervisee professionally, was also analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis procedure. This hypothesis compares reported aggregate extra-supervisory activity across three variables. These include whether respondents like their supervisor or supervisee professionally (1) to a large extent, (2) somewhat, or (3) feel neutral or dislike

him/her. The questionnaire offered respondents five choices for this question, ranging from liking their supervisor "to a large extent" to "disliking him/her professionally." Due to a lack of variability of responses, with an overwhelming majority of respondents indicating liking their supervisor or supervisee professionally, categories were combined into the three categories listed above in order to compute the Kruskal-Wallis. The sixth hypothesis was tested in a virtually identical manner to the fifth hypothesis. Hypothesis six, however, involved whether the supervisor or supervisee liked his/her supervisee or supervisor personally rather than professionally.

The seventh and eighth hypotheses, comparing supervisors and supervisees on their responses to whether they would like to have a closer relationship during and after supervision, were analysed using a Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. This procedure was used for several reasons. First, it was determined important to compute an analysis which determined differences between supervisors and supervisees within each of the supervisory dyads rather than as groups of supervisors or supervisees. A nonparametric procedure was used because the data did not have sufficient variability to warrant the use of parametric procedures and the data were nominal data. All hypotheses were tested at the $p<.05$ level of significance.

Themes were extracted from open-ended questions with guidelines suggested by Patton (1980). Three trained raters did content analysis on each item. Initially, categories for coding were established by drawing themes from responses of the pilot study. These categories were explained to the raters who were then asked to code a series of

sample responses. When there was a consensus as to how to code these sample responses, raters proceeded to code all of the open-ended responses. Interrater reliability was assessed by calculating a chi-square analysis of the coding rendered by the three raters. This analysis revealed no significant differences between the raters [$x(2)=.594, p=.743$].

Once themes were extracted for each item, analyses were made, exploring the various research questions. The following analyses were made on responses to the open-ended questions.

1. Patterns of responses regarding feelings and attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact provided by male respondents were compared to those provided by female respondents.

2. Patterns of responses regarding feelings and attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact provided by counseling center interns and supervisors were compared to those provided by psychiatric hospital interns and supervisors.

3. Patterns of responses regarding feelings and attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact provided by same-sex supervisory dyads were compared to those provided by opposite sex supervisory dyads.

4. Patterns of responses regarding feelings and attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact provided by those currently in supervision for less than three months were compared to those who have been in supervision for more than six months.

5. Patterns of responses regarding feelings and attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact provided by supervisors were compared to supervisees.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

This chapter contains the analysis of the data gathered from the questionnaires. The first section contains descriptive statistics regarding the type and amount of extra-supervisory contact between supervisors and supervisees. This section includes analyses of the hypotheses involving type and frequency of contact, including comparisons between supervisors and supervisees, clinical sites versus counseling sites, and males versus females. Comparisons of amount of time spent in supervision, and whether the supervisory dyad consisted of same-sex or opposite-sex pairs, were made. Results of the open-ended responses will be provided in the final section of the chapter.

Descriptive Data

In general, respondents reported very little extra-supervisory contact with their supervisor/supervisee. Rank ordered mean responses for each of the activities, standard deviations, and percentage of respondents reporting participating in the activity at least once are presented in Table 1. The three following types of activities were endorsed much more frequently than others on the list: (1) attending workshops, seminars, or lectures; (2) going to a work related party; or (3) going to lunch. These activities were primarily professional

Table 1

Rank Ordered Means of Activity Between Supervisors and Supervisees

Activity	Rank	Mean	SD	% participating in activity at least once
Attend workshops/seminars/ lectured	1	1.93	.959	65
Go to a work related party	2	1.85	.502	79
Go to lunch	3	1.78	.981	52
Go to dinner	4	1.13	.336	13
Spend time together in either of your homes	5	1.11	.309	11
Other, please specify _____	5	1.11	.814	34
Go to a nightclub or bar	6	1.06	.270	5
Participate in recreational activities (tennis, hiking, etc.)	6	1.06	.270	5
Go to a party unrelated to work	7	1.04	.192	4
Participate in civic clubs or volunteer activities	7	1.04	.358	2
Go to a sporting event	8	1.03	.172	3
Go to a play	9	1.01	.087	1
Go to a movie	10	1.00	.000	0
Attend religious activities	10	1.00	.000	0
Participate in dating activities	10	1.00	.000	0

Note: Possible Range of 1 to 5. 1="never", 5="at least once per week."

in nature and were closely associated with the internship experience. Many of the respondents who reported going to lunch regularly with their supervisor or supervisee also indicated that they primarily used that time to discuss professional matters. Of the categories which appear to be strictly outside of normal work related activities, "Go to dinner" had the highest mean ranking, followed by "Spend time together in either of your homes."

Out of the 132 questionnaires analyzed, no one reported participating in the following activities: (a) going to a movie, (b) attending religious activities, or (c) participating in dating activities. Additionally, only one respondent reported going to a play.

Table 2

Mann-Whitney U Test for Males vs. Females on Reported Extra-Supervisory Activity

	n	Mean Rank	U	p
Males	59	68.69	2024.5	.549
Females	73	64.73		

In comparing male respondents to females, differences in total amount of reported activity did not reach statistical significance (U=2024.5, p=.5488). Results of the Mann-Whitney U test for males versus females on aggregate extra-supervisory activity are presented in Table 2.

A Mann-Whitney procedure was computed to determine if supervisors

and supervisees were any more likely to participate in extra-supervisory activities if their supervisee or supervisor was the same gender. Analysis of the data in Table 3 indicates that same-sex dyads were no more likely to participate in extra-supervisory activity than were opposite-sex dyads (U=405.0, p=.0849).

Table 3

Mann-Whitney U Test for Same-Sex vs. Opposite-Sex Dyads on Reported Extra-Supervisory Activity

	n	Mean Rank	U	p
Same-Sex Dyads	37	37.05	405.0	.0849
Opposite-Sex Dyads	29	28.97		

Table 4

Mann-Whitney U Test for Counseling Center Respondents vs. Psychiatric Hospital Respondents on Reported Extra-Supervisory Activity

	n	Mean Rank	U	p
Psychiatric Hospitals	90	67.62	1789.5	.6181
Counseling Centers	42	64.11		

The respondents from psychiatric hospitals compared to respondents from counseling centers also showed no statistical differences in extra-supervisory activity (U=1789.5, p=.6181). The results of the Mann-Whitney procedure for psychiatric hospitals respondents versus counseling centers respondents on reported extra-supervisory

activity are presented in Table 4.

Table 5

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA by Ranks of Respondents Reporting Extra-Supervisory Activity by Months in Supervision (N=132)

	Cases	Mean Rank	H	p
0-4 Months	44	56.97	6.57	.034
5-8 Months	14	86.00		
9-12 Months	74	68.48		

A Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks procedure was used to compare differences in the amount of extra-supervisory contact between those who had been in supervision for the following periods of time: (a) from zero to four months, (b) from five to eight months, and (c) from nine to 12 months. Results from the Kruskal-Wallis procedure are presented in Table 5. Although the Kruskal-Wallis procedure did not reach significance at the .05 level, the overall level of extra-supervisory activity was so low among all groups that this statistical significance is considered to have little practical significance.

A Kruskal-Wallis procedure was also computed to compare different levels of respondents reporting liking their supervisor or supervisee, both professionally and personally. Supervisors and supervisees who reported liking their supervisee or supervisor to a "large extent" professionally did not differ significantly on reported

extra-supervisory activity from those who were neutral or did not like him or her. A Kruskal-Wallis procedure for "liking supervisor or supervisee professionally" by amount of activity is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA by Ranks of Respondents Reporting Extra-Supervisory Activity by Three Levels by Which They Reported Liking Their Supervisor/Supervisee Professionally (N=132)

	Cases	Mean Rank	H	p
Like to Large Extent	61	73.07	4.55	.097
Like Somewhat	49	64.20		
Neutral to Dislike	22	53.41		

Table 7

Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA by Ranks of Respondents Reporting Extra-Supervisory Activity by Three Levels by Which They Reported Liking Their Supervisor/Supervisee Personally (N=132)

	Cases	Mean Rank	H	p
Like to Large Extent	59	72.02	2.92	.222
Like Somewhat	52	64.42		
Neutral to Dislike	21	56.14		

Supervisors and supervisees who reported liking their supervisee or supervisor to a "large extent" personally also did not report spending more time participating in extra-supervisory activity than those who were neutral or did not like him/her. A Kruskal-Wallis

procedure for "liking supervisor or supervisee personally" by amount of activity is presented in Table 7.

In general, both supervisors and supervisees indicated that they liked their supervisee/supervisor professionally, 83% indicating either liking their supervisor/supervisee, or liking their supervisor/supervisee "to a large extent." Sixteen respondents reported feeling neutral about their supervisee/supervisor while six indicated dislike. Ratings for liking their supervisor or supervisee personally were slightly less extreme, with two less respondents endorsing "largely liking" their supervisor or supervisee and four less respondents indicating dislike.

Table 8

Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test for Supervisors Compared to Their Supervisees on Desire for Closeness During Supervision

	n	Mean Rank	p
Supervisors	66	9.88	.0033*
Supervisees	66	11.00	

*Significant at the .05 level.

With respect to whether participants wanted to be closer to their supervisor or supervisee during supervision, only 16% indicated they would. Only two respondents (both supervisees) indicated they would like to be less close, while most (83%) expressed a desire to stay the same. A Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used to test differences between supervisors and supervisees

on responses to this question. This statistical procedure allows comparisons to be made between supervisees and supervisors within each supervisory dyad. This analysis produced significant results, with supervisees more frequently desiring closer contact outside of supervision while in supervision with their current supervisor (p=.0033). Results of the Wilcoxon comparing supervisors to their supervisees on their desire for closeness during supervision are presented in Table 8.

Table 9

Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test for Supervisors Compared to Their Supervisees on Desire for Closeness After Supervision

	n	Mean Rank	p
Supervisors	66	12.26	.0946
Supervisees	66	13.07	

Almost twice as many respondents expressed a desire to get closer to their supervisor or supervisee after supervision ended (30% compared to 16%). The majority of respondents continued to be in favor of having the relationship remain the same at the conclusion of supervision (64%). Analysis of the data in Table 9 indicates that there was no statistically significant difference between supervisees and supervisors on this variable (p=.095). Supervisors appear to have established much firmer boundaries regarding contact during supervision versus contact once supervision has ended. Supervisees

did not report a statistically significant increase in desire for more closeness after the conclusion of supervision (p=.1396). Supervisors, on the other hand, clearly favored more closeness after the conclusion of supervision (p=.0016).

Open-Ended Responses

The responses to the open-ended questions were examined in order to gather subjective perceptions and attitudes regarding contact outside the context of supervision. The open-ended responses will first be addressed from the context of the stated hypotheses, examining whether various groups differed in their reported attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact. This will be followed by an overall analysis of general themes and patterns, thus providing a more detailed account of the content of responses.

An analysis of open-ended questions rendered relatively little difference between males and females. Out of 59 males, 32 (54%) stated that contact outside of supervision had not affected supervision. Forty-nine (67%) out of the 73 female respondents likewise indicated no impact. The percentages of other categories of responses were also quite similar between male and female respondents. One supervisor did specifically refer to gender issues in dual relationships, suggesting that he was more hesitant to have such contact with his female supervisee in light of recent negative focus in the press regarding harmful sexual relationships within the profession. This respondent also commented that such limitations in the relationship were unfortunate. Overall, however, attitudes toward

extra-supervisory contact did not appear to differ between males and females.

Similarly, few differences existed in responses by counseling center interns and supervisors compared to responses by psychiatric hospital interns and supervisors. Out of 42 counseling center respondents, 25 (60%) stated that contact outside of supervision had not affected supervision. Fifty-six out of the 90 (62%) psychiatric hospital respondents likewise indicated no perceived impact of contact outside the context of supervision. Percentages of other categories or responses were also very similar between counseling center respondents and psychiatric hospital respondents.

Attitudes regarding the impact of extra-supervisory contact also did not significantly differ according to time spent in supervision. Out of the 44 respondents in supervision for four or less months, 28 (64%) stated that contact outside of supervision had not affected supervision. Out of the 74 respondents who were in supervision for more than eight months, 48 (65%) also indicated no impact. The percentages of other responses were also very similar between those in supervision for four or less months, and those in supervision for eight or more months.

The analysis of themes comparing attitudes toward extra-supervisory contact did differ somewhat between supervisors and supervisees. Forty-three out of the 66 supervisors (65%) indicated that they did not think that the extra-supervisory activity had any impact on the supervision process. Supervisees had a comparable percentage, with 38 out of 66 reporting that contact outside of supervision had

no effect (58%). One response did differ between supervisors and supervisees, however. Seven supervisees (11% of supervisees) mentioned how contact outside of supervision led to more trust, whereas only one supervisor offered a similar response.

In addition to the forced-choice component of the question asking desired closeness during and after supervision, respondents were asked to explain their choices. A number of reasons were expressed by those supervisors or supervisees wishing less closeness or wishing closeness to remain the same during supervision. Several respondents mentioned the importance of keeping professional lives separate from personal lives. One respondent wrote:

> Our current relationship provides me with support and guidance, yet I believe my supervisor maintains a deliberate distance in order to facilitate this relationship. More personal contact (through outside activities) might blur the boundaries and move us toward a more recip.ocal relationship and diminish what I gain from being a supervisee.

Another mentioned the importance of keeping boundaries because of inherent power differentials. He wrote, "I regard the supervisor/supervisee relationship as akin to a therapist/client relationship in which the power differential can easily be abused--even in well intentioned ways." Additional comments by respondents desiring closeness to remain the same during supervision are presented in Table 10.

For the 16% of supervisors or supervisees wishing more closeness outside of supervision during their current supervisory relationship, a number of reasons were expressed. One supervisor indicated that his relationship with his supervisee remained quite stiff and uncomfortable. Likewise, several respondents indicated that being closer

outside of supervision would lead to more comfort and openness in supervision.

Table 10

Responses by Participants Desiring Closeness to Supervisor or Supervisee to Remain the Same During Supervision (Question 10)

I would like a personal relationship if he were not my supervisor.
I believe that our current relationship is very appropriate for the supervisor/supervisee roles we are currently in.
As long as I am his supervisee, I do not want to confound our relationship by adding a more social component.
I believe that a supervisory relationship is very different from a friendship or a therapeutic relationship and should remain so.
I think that this (social contact) should be limited so as not to detract from the objectivity of the supervisory relationship.
The role of mentor is always the primary one, and if one tries to be just a colleague, he abdicates to some extent the role of teacher and facilitator.
Because of the supervisory role, I see it as unethical to maintain a dual relationship.
Our working relationship seems well suited to our mutual task: Working together, and to expand it beyond this purpose would, in my view, muddy the waters that are tricky enough already.
It's important, for me, to maintain sufficient distance to act impartial as a supervisor.
I do not believe in dual relationships. As long as I need to function as a supervisor, I do not wish to become my supervisee's friend or partner in any activity.

A number of other respondents indicated that their desire for more closeness was based on the hope that their relationship with their supervisor or supervisee would become more collegial.

Comments of participants desiring more closeness outside of supervisory sessions during their current supervisory relationship are listed in Table 11.

Table 11

Responses by Participants Desiring Increased Closeness to Supervisor or Supervisee During Supervision (Question 10)

Wish she shared more of who she is and would get to know me as a "person" (versus as an intern) better.
I would like to understand my supervisor on a deeper level so that I could better understand countertransference issues (his) in his work with clients and to learn more about what he keys into with my work with patients.
I would enjoy a warmer relationship beyond the strictly professional one that is currently maintained.
I feel that closer (but not too close) relationships can help both parties learn from each other.
I'd like to be somewhat closer. At times there is awkwardness about a common topic for conversation besides what's happening in the hospital. This is somewhat abated in the last three to four weeks as the internship is drawing to a close. I'm about done with my degree, and I'm less intern and somewhat more peer. I think it is more actually based in both our fairly analytic orientation (a'la R. Langs) of keeping good boundaries.
He is my age and we have similar backgrounds with mutual friends.

A number of respondents also preferred less contact after supervision or simply desired for it to stay the same. One of the reasons for less or equal contact was based on logistics. Several respondents indicated that the supervisee would be moving to a different state at the conclusion of the internship year.

Several supervisors and supervisees hope to keep current boundaries, particularly in light of future professional contact. Although

there was no mention of a specific ethical code, these respondents often implied that dual relationships were ill-advised. The following statements reflected this stance: "I believe that a supervisory relationship is very different from friendship or a therapeutic relationship and should remain so." "Professional relationships and non-dual relationships during internship is important as is non-dual relationships at any time."

One supervisor indicated that the supervisory relationship provided a structure in which there was often more closeness than there was for him in typical friendships. He anticipated less closeness as a result of the supervisory relationship ending and had the expectation of infrequent social contact. Comments expressed by respondents desiring closeness to supervisor or supervisee to remain the same after supervision has ended are presented in Table 12.

Both supervisors and supervisees were more likely to want closer contact outside of supervision once supervision had ended (30% of respondents). Responses indicating a desire for increased closeness after supervision has ended are listed in Table 13.

A number of reasons were offered to justify more contact after the conclusion of supervision. Several supervisees expressed an interest in spending time together afterwards, often citing a desire for the supervisor to continue being a mentor or role model. Both supervisors and supervisees expessed that they had common interests with their supervisor or supervisee and wished to pursue them. Others simply indicated that they sincerely enjoyed the other's company and therefore hoped to cultivate a close collegial relationship (most did

mention a professional component with few simply wishing to increase social contact).

Table 12

Responses by Participants Desiring Closeness to Supervisor or Supervisee to Remain the Same After Supervision (Question 11)

Maybe if I were younger I would like a friendship, but age difference is too great.
The relationship may develop further, but this is never planned.
I don't think he's going to change. He's pretty aloof, and that is something I don't want to work through just so we can be closer.
I am comfortable with how our relationship currently stands. There are some aspects of him as a person that I believe I might have difficulty handling if our relationship would become any closer once our supervisory relationship ends.
We have a very good working relationship. I can turn to him for support and guidance with comfort. However, I don't feel comfortable knowing more about him on a personal level. Our private lives are our own, and I believe it's important to maintain certain boundaries with supervisors.
Although I like and respect her as a person, I feel that the power differential in supervision could not be changed afterwards.
I don't feel like I can be myself with him and it often feels like his needs (e.g., to talk about his own experiences) are attended to more than mine--just in that he is much more verbose than I am and he uses up most of "my" supervision time.
I wouldn't want the relationship to change. I see her as a mentor, I like the boundaries.
The boundaries of our relationship have been established in a way where we are both comfortable. I don't foresee that changing. After this supervisory relationship has ended, he will still have a supervisory role in my overall training program.

Table 13

Responses by Participants Desiring Increased Closeness to Supervisor or Supervisee After Supervision (Question 11)

Perhaps it would be best to say I would like to keep in touch with this supervisee, more as a peer than as a supervisor.
I would like the supervisee to become a colleague and peer. Should friendship develop, that would be fine with me.
Would enjoy getting to know her better on a personal level when my role changes.
This particular supervisee is a genuinely nice person whom I would enjoy getting to know better once the supervisory relationship has ended.
After internship has ended--as I move into a professional role--I hope that my supervisor will become more of a colleague and a friend.
Following the conclusion of supervision, I would enjoy pursuing a friendship with my current supervisor.
Closer! I have respect for his professional confidence, his high standards, and his integrity. He is a man of few words, but they are words upon which one can depend.
I would like to become friends because I feel a special bond with my supervisor.
When it's over I would like to be friends with her. She is a wonderful person.

Supervisees were more likely to express stronger emotional responses regarding future closeness. Whereas no supervisor expressed dislike for his/her supervisee, either professionally or personally, several supervisees indicated that they did not like their supervisor or felt uncomfortable with him or her. Four supervisees indicated that they did not like or respect their supervisor and therefore

preferred to cut off any contact. The following represents two examples of supervisees who indicated they desired less contact: (a) "I have nothing in common with her and I do not enjoy being around her"; (b) "I don't think he's gonna change. He's pretty aloof, and that is something that I don't want to work through just so we can be closer." Supervisees' references of respect for their supervisor were also voiced more strongly with statements such as, "I have respect for his professional competence, his high standards, and his integrity. He is a man of few words, but they are words upon which you can depend."

Responses to how extra-supervisory contact had changed during the course of supervision were typified by three main themes. They included: (1) no change in contact, (2) increased levels of comfort, and (3) a higher degree of collegiality.

The majority of respondents (70%) indicated that there was no change in extra-supervisory activity over the course of supervision. They cited a number of reasons, ranging from philosophical concerns, to more practical matters. Among respondents indicating that extra-supervisory contact had not changed over the course of supervision, several implied that they would have preferred that it had changed. Three supervisees described their supervisor as being somewhat emotionally distant, using words such as "stiff" and "aloof."

Others mentioned boundary issues as being an important factor in extra-supervisory contact remaining the same throughout supervision. One respondent said, "The boundaries began very clear and remain very clear." Another supervisor mentioned power differentials between

supervisor and supervisee as a reason not to be involved socially. Yet another compared the supervisory relationship to the client-therapist relationship, justifying no outside contact. Two others indicated no theoretical issues involved, but simply felt no desire to have social contact because they had few interests in common with that particular supervisor or supervisee.

The second most common theme regarding changing extra-supervisory contact throughout the course of supervision was that the contact had become more comfortable, relaxed, or open. Twenty-three percent of respondents indicated this trend. Comments regarding the extra-supervisory contact leading to more comfort or closeness over the course of supervision are listed in Table 14.

Although this question concerned changes in extra-supervisory contact, several respondents indicated that the more open and comfortable relating was a result of the strictly professional contact. Apparently the ongoing contact within supervision resulted in more comfort and openness outside of supervision. Most of the respondents who reported feeling more relaxed in supervision did not report an increase in the nature or frequency of extra-supervisory contact in other sections of the questionnaire. The following statement echoed this sense of comfort, "As we got to experience each other's worlds, our relationship grew fonder, more intimate, and open."

Six respondents indicated that one of the ways that extra-supervisory contact had changed was that it had become more collegial in nature. They voiced the notion that this increased contact was part of the process of establishing a more equal peer relationship.

Table 14

Responses Indicating Increased Comfort or Closeness Over the Course of Supervision

It has become more social, less restricted.
Supervision has become more relaxed as we have gotten more comfortable with each other.
I think our contact has become more open, easy-going as we have gotten to know each other's styles.
Are able to talk about interests/activities outside of work with greater ease. Have gotten to know each other better as individuals.
More comfortable in supervision meetings re: sharing more difficult or problematic aspects of therapy cases.
I am more comfortable chatting with him at staff parties now than I was earlier in the year before we had begun to talk in supervision about our personal lives and not just about test batteries.
As we've come to know each other better, we've come to be more relaxed with each other perhaps a bit more open about our personal lives.
Become more relaxed, perhaps a bit less formal as we have become more familiar with each other.
After three months of supervision and getting to know her, I felt comfortable inviting her to my home for dinner and to meet my family.

One respondent wrote: "My supervisor also communicates that he thinks of me as a colleague not just a student, and that has changed the nature of supervision." In a similar vein, one supervisee said that increased contact outside of supervision with his supervisor allowed him to feel less concerned by the unequal nature of the supervisory relationship. He wrote:

> As our friendship improves so does the enjoyability of relating; that is, the authority seems less influential in how we get along. This is primarily a change on my part in that I am less aware or bothered by the unequal nature of a supervisory relationship.

In response to how extra-supervisory contact with the supervisor or supervisee had affected supervision, four major themes were evident: (1) no affect on supervision, (2) increased comfort or openness, (3) an increase in the collegial nature of relationship, and (4) increased sense of trust.

A majority indicated that the extra-supervisory contact had not had an affect on supervision (61%). Several of these indicated that the fact that extra-supervisory contact was minimal or had no effect on supervision was a result of a very conscious decision. Supervisors expressed these ideas more adamantly than supervisees. The following statements are examples of concerns about dual relationships which were raised by supervisors: "It is important to keep social contact to a minimum. Such relationships are tricky enough as they are, and there is no need to muddy the waters. It is important to maintain somewhat of a neutral, uninvolved stance as to keep objectivity."

Several respondents who indicated that supervision had not affected supervision expressed disappointment in the supervisory relationship. They stated that more contact outside of supervision would have been beneficial. One supervisee wrote, "A bit more contact would have afforded a better integration of my personality dynamics as it impacted my therapy work." Another felt very strongly about this, stating:

> Basically my supervisor is very distant and does not share any personal information regarding herself what-so-ever. She is

> analytically trained and keeps a strict frame. I find this uncomfortable, unuseful and ridiculous at this stage in my training. I am older that she is, and find the whole thing artificial and not helpful. What I would have liked was some mentoring in the way of sharing. I don't care if we don't socialize outside. I do care that I know her as a person/ woman/psychologist.

Another supervisee responded much differently to such firm boundaries set by her supervisor:

> This supervisor talked about dual relationships at the beginning of the year for the purpose of clarifying our relationship. It has been clear to me that he wants to avoid dual relationships, and the relaxed confusion. Though the limit setting was abrupt at first, I have known throughout the year where I stood and that any connectedness we felt would not evolve into a differend kind of relationship.

Additional comments regarding no change in supervision as a result of extra-supervisory contact are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Responses Indicating No Change Resulting From Extra-Supervisory Contact

Our contact outside of supervision has not affected supervision that much. It has enriched our understanding of each other as people, but has not affected our ability to do business in supervision.
Feel the need to maintain appropriate boundaries.
Gotten to know supervisee better, but not gone outside professional boundaries.
Boundaries that have been established on-site are respected even at lectures off-site.
I like the firm boundaries.

Twenty-five (19%) respondents indicated that the extra-supervisory contact had resulted in increased comfort or openness. One respondent indicated, "Contact outside supervision sessions has made

the relationship warmer, more relaxed." Another wrote, "Perhaps I feel a little bit more comfortable talking because he is not closed or distant." Additional comments regarding an increased sense of closeness resulting from extra-supervisory contact are listed in Table 16.

Table 16

Responses Indicating Greater Comfort or Closeness Resulting From Extra-Supervisory Contact

I think comfort with me through some outside contact like lunch together can and has made [her] more relaxed in supervision and has been positive.
Somewhat less formality, easygoing.
Made supervision more accessible.
The one time we had dinner after a conference helped me to see him as more of an individual. I felt closer to him after that.
I think he generally feels more comfortable with me as he has gotten to know me better. My sense of humor appears to have helped that along.

An additional seven respondents (five percent) included the word "trust" in their discussions about the benefits of their extra-supervisory contact, explaining that contact outside of supervision had led them to feel as if they could trust their supervisor or supervisee. Comments indicating increased trust resulting from extra-supervisory contact are presented in Table 17.

In some cases, the increased trust seemed to be related to the idea that the contact outside of supervision gave the supervisee an increased appreciation of the supervisor as a person. Seeing supervisors as human, and not simply in a professional role was important

for some supervisees in the process of opening up and trusting within supervision sessions. Responses regarding the value of perceiving colleagues from a more personal perspective are presented in Table 18.

Table 17

Responses Indicating Increased Trust Resulting From Extra-Supervisory Contact

Feel more at ease in discussing cases and some of my concerns; more trusting relationship now.
Enhanced trust issues.
It has added to my trust and respect.
Improved it because I feel more free to share my struggles, perceived weaknesses, and countertransference issues, etc. I think it has improved or allowed for more trust, and thus has enhanced the process.

Five respondents' (four percent) response to the impact of extra-supervisory contact was that it led supervisors and supervisees to feel as if they were in a more collegial, peer-like relationship. One supervisor indicated, "Facilitated the supervisee's development of a collegial relationship." Another wrote, "It's allowed for a mutual give-and-take in our supervision and helped establish a sense of being colleagues."

There were several comments which did not fit into any of the categories. For instance, several respondents mentioned the importance of humor in their supervisory relationships. They said that it was useful in feeling more comfort around their supervisor or supervisee. Two respondents indicated that there had been an increase in activity outside the context of supervision, but did not describe in

what ways the contact had changed. There were also comments not fitting into any of the major themes which involved idiosyncratic descriptions of respondents' relationships with their supervisor or supervisee.

Table 18

Responses Indicating Increased Sense of Colleague as a Person Resulting From Extra-Supervisory Contact

in fostering a greater sense of comfort and respect for each other . . . we recognize each other's humanness.
It has allowed me to experience him as a human being rather than as a role inhabitant.
I think my seeing this supervisor as a caring and competent single mother (along with her acknowledgment of various human frailties) has helped me to trust her judgment and become more confident in her ability to critique my work in a thoughtful manner.
Being able to see my supervisor in a few different settings has increased my trust in and liking for him as a person, which has enabled me to "lower my defenses" and feel more comfortable and open in supervision.
It has made it easier for me to disclose aspects of my personal life to seek and receive support and supervision or as they relate to my practice.
I got to know the supervisee better and realize what a lovely person with a lot of integrity she is.
I have seen him in a wider context and in different roles, namely as a husband and a father.

Summary of the Results

In this chapter the results from the questionnaire data were presented. In general, very little extra-supervisory activity was reported. The highest mean ranking of reported activity was under the ranking indicating "on one or two occasions."

Out of the eight hypotheses generated from the forced choice question, only the question concerning desire for closer contact during supervision was statistically significant. Supervisees indicated a greater desire to have closer contact during supervision than did supervisors. It was also found that supervisors desired closer contact significantly more after supervision was completed compared to desired contact during supervision.

Although little extra-supervisory contact was reported, most open-ended responses indicated that contact outside of supervision led to more productive supervision. An increased sense of openness and trust was common, as well as an increased sense of collegiality.

The following chapter will address a number of these findings, raising possible explanations and implications. The limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research will also be offered.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Overview

Each of the major hypotheses listed in Chapter III will be discussed in this chapter. The results will be interpreted and the implications of these findings will be explored. The limitations of the study will then be presented. Finally, recommendations for future research will be offered.

Reported Contact Outside of Supervision

The most significant finding in the present study is the minimal extra-supervisory contact reported by supervisors and supervisees. Of the three activities in which respondents clearly reported the most activity (attending professional seminars, going to work related parties, and going to lunch), all were closely related to the professional aspects of the internship experience. Although lunch could certainly be considered social in nature, it appears that respondents primarily perceived it as work related. Several supervisors and supervisees indicated that the times that they did go out for lunch, they did so under the auspices of discussing internship related topics such as administrative concerns. The next highest reported activity, going to dinner, could also be seen as a natural extension of the work day, and not perceived as outside the normal parameters of the

internship experience.

Even the three activities reported most frequently failed to reach a mean score at the level (2.00) indicating "on one or two occasions." No respondent reported participating in dating activities with his/her supervisor or supervisee. This finding is somewhat surprising considering the recent data concerning the frequency of sexual contact between clients and therapists (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983), and between counselor educators and students (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson, & Reid, 1985). The finding by Pope et al. (1979) that 25% of women with a recent Ph.D. degree reported that they had sexual contact on at least one occasion with a psychology educator might lead one to suspect that such an occurrence would be probable given the size of the sample in the present study. It also seems reasonable to expect more frequency of non-sexual extra-supervisory activities which are considered to be more casual in nature.

An obvious question which arises when considering these results is whether they were reported accurately by those returning the questionnaire. Since it was made clear to prospective participants that responses to the questionnaires were to be kept strictly confidential, it is improbable that those who returned the questionnaire significantly underestimated the amount of time participating in extra-supervisory activity. If participants did wish to report less activity than they were actually involved in, greater discrepancies in reported activity within supervisory dyads would be expected. Other than a few minor differences within a few supervisory dyads,

supervisor and supervisee responses to listed activities were extremely similar.

Also, were supervisors and supervisees who do participate in more frequent extra-supervisory contact less likely to return the questionnaire? Studies have shown that counselor educators claiming sexual contact with students were significantly later in responding than those who claimed no contact (Holrody & Brodsky, 1977; Pope, Levenson, & Schover, 1979). Such results suggest a nonresponse bias toward underestimating sexual contact.

It appears that a bias toward underestimating contact would be less likely in this study, however. Even those who advocate more contact outside of supervision did not report actually participating in significant contact outside of supervisory sessions. Also, whereas the above mentioned studies involved behavior which respondents might not want to admit to because of stronger ethical concerns, the majority of activities listed in this study were more benign. Respondents would presumably be less concerned about admitting to going to lunch with their colleagues, for instance, than having sexual relationships with them. A number of explanations for the minimal extra-supervisory contact will be offered when presenting findings from open-ended responses.

Of the six hypotheses involving reported activity outside of supervision, none reached statistical significance. Type or amount of activity did not vary significantly as a function of gender or type of training. A Kruskal-Wallis procedure revealed differences between groups in reported extra-supervisory activity as a function

of time spent in supervision. Although this analysis was significant, the overall activity was so low that it is doubtful that such a difference has any practical significance.

There was no significant difference in extra-supervisory contact based on whether supervisory dyads were same-sex or opposite-sex, or the degree to which the supervisee or supervisor liked his/her supervisor or supervisee professionally or personally. Therefore, these variables may not be the most relevant issues regarding dual relationships in supervision.

The null hypothesis which was rejected involved whether supervisors and supervisees differed in their desire to have closer extra-supervisory contact during supervision. Supervisees in this study were significantly more likely to report desiring more closeness during supervision than were their supervisors. A number of possible explanations could account for this finding.

One possible explanation for supervisees desiring closer contact with supervisors involves inherent power differentials in supervision. This may also represent a reflection of power differentials between supervisors and supervisees. Several supervision studies have included discussions concerning the vulnerable position that the supervisee holds in the supervision process (Hutt, Scott, and King, 1983; Kadushin, 1968; Rosenblatt & Mayer, 1975). Fears concerning evaluation, criticism of work and judgments concerning the supervisee's personality characteristics are among the factors cited as eliciting concern.

Assuming that supervisees do, in fact, experience higher levels

of anxiety than supervisors in the supervision process is also consistent with the finding that supervisees' responses were often more extreme than supervisors, with supervisees either more strongly liking or more strongly disliking supervisors. It is not unreasonable to expect that the anxiety generated might result in supervisees experiencing the supervisory relationship more intensely than supervisors. It naturally follows, then, that responses offered by supervisees would be expressed more intensely than responses offered by supervisors.

One means of reducing feelings of vulnerability in the supervisee would be to equalize the supervisory relationship by relating to the supervisor more as a peer than as a person in a position of authority. The practice of undermining the inherent power of the supervisor has been explored by Kadushin (1968) in his article regarding the "games people play" in supervision.

The phenomenon of supervisees desiring closer extra-supervisory contact during supervision is also consistent with Krause and Allen's (1988) finding that supervisees preferred supervision which was characterized by a collegial relationship with focus on personal development. One might expect that if supervisees have a strong need for collegial relationships that they would be more open to contact outside of supervision than would their supervisors.

Open-Ended Responses

Although the forced-choice questions revealed only one statistically significant finding for the proposed hypotheses, the open-ended questions revealed a number of relevant themes. The first of

these themes to be discussed involves responses to questions regarding closer contact during and after supervision. Based on the conservative attitudes regarding minimizing extra-supervisory contact, it is not surprising that both supervisors and supervisees were more likely to want closer contact once supervision has ended, as opposed to during ongoing supervision. Comparing desire for closeness during and after supervision is perhaps the best way to distinguish which respondents discouraged extra-supervisory relationships based on some principle or logic. Unfortunately, a majority of respondents did not choose to explain why their desire for contact outside of supervision increased with the anticipation of supervision ending. Although a number of respondents expressed potential concerns regarding dual relationships in supervision, it is important to note that fewer than 30% of the respondents indicated that they didn't participate in extra-supervisory activity because they perceived that it was unethical or that it detracted from supervision. Although theoretical or ethical considerations were provided, other reasons for minimizing extra-supervisory activity were also expressed. Two such reasons included (1) respondents having no interests in common with their supervisor or supervisee, and (2) supervisor or supervisee already having established sufficient social contacts.

Statements indicating that supervisors and supervisees did not seek contact outside of supervision because of lack of shared interests made no reference to ethical or theoretical concerns about

such contact. These statements implied that they might well have been more involved outside of supervision had they had shared interests.

The fact that supervisees are often new to an area or to an internship site, whereas supervisors have often established social networks, provides an additional explanation for minimal contact. Several supervisors did, in fact, mention that they had no need for social contact outside of supervision because they already had enough friends. Supervisees, on the other hand, may perceive their contacts at the internship as their main source of support.

Another possible explanation for minimal contact outside of supervision involves the short-term nature of the predoctoral internship. Simply having one year in the internship might discourage social contact, especially contact initiated by supervisors. It may be that supervisors, after having years of interns coming and leaving, might not want to develop too close relationships with supervisees. It may be painful for supervisors to establish close relationships with supervisees, only to have them leave.

Interestingly, respondents did not refer to ethical standards as their primary consideration in determining the amount of contact outside of supervision. Comments such as, "You shouldn't muddy the waters," or, "You lose objectivity," presumably reflect underlying reasons for current ethical guidelines discouraging dual relationships. No references were made to specific guidelines, however. One respondent erroneously stated that dual relationships are unethical. It is possible that few respondents referred to the ethical

standards in justifying responses because it is understood that current standards do not actually prohibit, but simply discourage dual relationships in supervision. An alternative explanation for this finding is that the current ethical standards regarding dual relationship are simply too vague or are not well understood by professionals in the field.

Perhaps a more likely explanation, supervisors and supervisees may think more in terms of what are the best means for providing effective supervision, rather than placing emphasis on ethical standards. Responses discouraging dual relationships in supervision emphasized how being involved with supervisors or supervisees outside of supervision could potentially interfere with elements of supervision considered to be essential in the process. Such elements typically included the ability to be objective, and not confuse contact outside of supervision with the professional relationship. Issues of "right" or "wrong" practices seemed to be of little importance compared to more pragmatic concerns.

Such statements regarding the importance of maintaining boundaries might best be understood by considering the role of theoretical approaches in supervision. It might be expected that different models of psychotherapy supervision would influence the way in which respondents view extra-supervisory contact. It is likely, for example, that psychoanalytically based supervision would view contact outside of supervision as violating the boundaries necessary for effective supervision and would be concerned about issues of transference and/or countertransference which might arise. Most objections to contact

outside of supervision did appear to be grounded in psychodynamic priniciples of psychotherapy. Only one respondent, however, explicitly stated the importance of a particular theoretical perspective in determining her beliefs regarding dual relationships in supervision, "I think it (the minimal extra-supervisory contact) is more actually based in both our fairly analytic (a la R. Langs) orientation of keeping clear boundaries."

It is doubtful whether respondents advocating extra-supervisory contact operated from strict psychodynamic theoretical perspectives. Supervisors and supervisees who have been somewhat involved in extra-supervisory activity generally reported positive repercussions. No supervisor or supervisee reported feeling coerced into having such contact. Obviously with the power differentials and evaluative factors involved, the potential for abuse must be seriously considered. None of the respondents from this study reported any feelings of being violated as a result of such contact, however. As a matter of fact, several supervisees expressed regret that their supervisory relationship was kept on such a professional level. It appeared from comments offered by a number of these respondents that the key element of concern involved the potential to experience their supervisor as human. These supervisees indicated that seeing their supervisor's humanness allowed them to establish greater levels of openness, comfort and trust. Such contact also was associated with increased feelings of collegiality.

Perhaps the attitudes expressed concerning extra-supervisory contact by respondents in this study reflect the ambiguity of current

ethical guidelines. While a number of respondents strongly expressed concern over the inappropriateness of dual relationships between supervisors and supervisees, others indicated that they viewed at least a certain degree of contact outside of supervision as acceptable and even considered it necessary. Furthermore, supervisors and supervisees reporting participating in extra-supervisory activities claimed that it did, in fact, enhance the supervisory relationship. With such varied perspectives concerning contact outside of supervision, it is important to consider areas of future research which will help clarify the potential impact of dual relationships on the supervision process. The limitations of the study will first be addressed.

Limitations

It is important to reiterate the purpose of this study when considering its limitations. This study was designed to be exploratory in nature. As there were no empirical data available regarding extra-supervisory contact between supervisor and supervisee, it was considered important to assess the type and amount of extra-supervisory contact between supervisors and supervisees currently in supervision, as well as exploring attitudes and feelings toward such contact. Therefore, the data generated preclude a wide range of potential data concerning this important area of study. Examples of such data of importance will be explored in the following section concerning future research.

Generally speaking, the present study has little to offer in

terms of any causal implications. Although assessing the nature of supervisory activity and perceptions toward such activity is important, it is difficult to assess the real impact of such activity on the supervisory process.

Another limitation of the study involves its generalizability. Because the sample included only APA-approved internship sites, it would be inappropriate to assume that the results can be generalized to supervision in general. Strict guidelines regarding internship programs at APA-approved sites may result in less frequency of extra-supervisory activity than might generally be expected. Furthermore, attitudes concerning dual relationships between supervisors and supervisees may also differ if other samples were polled. It is reasonable to assume that perceptions of extra-supervisory contact may vary across skill levels based on a number or studies previously mentioned (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Miars et al., 1983; Stoltenberg et al., 1987).

Recommendations for Further Research

A number of potential recommendations are suggested for further research. One important area of research stemming from this study involves more thorough exploration of the effects of dual relationships on the supervision process. For instance, because none of the respondents participating in activities outside of supervision reported negative effects of such contact, it is still unclear as to how contact outside of supervision might negatively impact the supervisory relationship. Research focusing strictly on those participating in

relationships outside of supervision could provide useful data regarding its impact. Such information would be valuable in establishing clearer ethical principles regarding dual relationships.

Also, the fact that supervisees wished for closer contact outside of supervision with their supervisors could be explored in greater depth. Without further data, it can only be speculated as to the source of this variance between supervisees and supervisors. Why do supervisees desire more contact, and what impact might such contact have on the supervisory process?

Questions also remain regarding similarities and differences between supervision and psychotherapy. Pope and Bouhoutsos (1986) outlined a number of variables which heighten the tendency toward sexual involvement in therapeutic relationships. One such variable is the vulnerability of clients in psychotherapy. How does the vulnerability of the supervisee compare to that of the client? Is it reasonable to be concerned about such vulnerability? Certainly supervisees wanting more contact during supervision may be a reflection of such vulnerability.

Furthermore, transference between supervisors and supervisees could also be considered. Although only a few respondents indicated concern over transference or countertransference issues, there were suggestions to not "muddy the waters" and also concern regarding loss of objectivity with increased extra-supervisory contact. Finally, several researchers have suggested that power differentials between therapist and client, or between those involved in other professional relationships, magnify the potential dangers of outside contact

(Kitchener, 1988; Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986). Results from this questionnaire likewise highlight power differentials. The question remains, however, whether such power differentials loom as large as they do in therapy. As Rabinowitz, Heppner, & Roehlke, (1986) suggest, such questions regarding supervision must be investigated by focusing on what actually occurs in supervision, rather than assuming supervision to be analogous to psychotherapy.

Another question to be explored is whether non-sexual activity differs considerably from sexual activity in terms of potential harm to those in a subordinate position. Most studies have focused on sexual contact. Further studies regarding non-sexual contact are recommended.

Such questions provide valuable direction for future research in supervision. When considering the importance of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee in the supervisory process, it is clear that the effects of contact outside of supervisory sessions merit further exploration.

Appendix A

Letter to Counseling Center Training Director

Appendix A

Letter to Counseling Center Training Director

Dear Training Director,

I am currently involved in research exploring attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision. Research findings will be presented in my doctoral dissertation, in order to complete my degree from Western Michigan Univerisity in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department. The research is under the supervision of my chair, Dr. John Geisler. You have been selected as a potential participant in this study based on your status as training director of an APA approved predoctoral internship program.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in distributing questionnaires to supervisory dyads in your predoctoral internship program (the questionnaire takes approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete). Please adhere to the following guidelines:

(1) Distribute matched-pairs of questionnaires only to supervisory dyads in which both supervisor and supervisee were trained in counseling psychology or counselor education programs (including yourself, if appropriate); note that one envelope is "for supervisor" and the other is "for intern."

(2) Complete and return the enclosed postcard, indicating the number of questionnaires distributed by you.

(3) Return any unused questionnaires.

(4) If a supervisor has more than one appropriately matched supervisee, s/he can complete a questionnaire for each supervisee.

(5) The participants can send the completed questionnaires directly to me in the self-addressed envelopes provided.

This research has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Board. Responses will be analysed in aggregate form insuring confidentiality. I will be available to answer any questions you may have and to share results with you. I can be reached at (404) 542-3183. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Paul Ginter, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix B

Letter to Psychiatric Hospital Training Director

Appendix B

Letter to Psychiatric Hospital Training Director

Dear Training Director,

I am currently involved in research exploring attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision. Research findings will be presented in my doctoral dissertation, in order to complete my degree from Western Michigan University in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department. The research is under the supervision of my chair, Dr. John Geisler. You have been selected as a potential participant in this study based on your status as training director of an APA approved predoctoral internship program.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in distributing questionnaires to supervisory dyads in your predoctoral internship program (the questionnaire takes approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete). Please adhere to the following guidelines:

(1) Distribute matched-pairs of questionnaires only to supervisory dyads in which both supervisor and supervisee were trained in clinical psychology programs (including yourself, if appropriate); note that one envelope is "for supervisor" and the other is "for intern".

(2) Complete and return the enclosed postcard, indicating the number of questionnaires distributed by you.

(3) Return any unused questionnaires.

(4) If a supervisor has more than one appropriately matched supervisee, s/he can complete a questionnaire for each supervisee.

(5) The participants can send the completed questionnaires directly to me in the self-addressed envelopes provided.

This research has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Board. Responses will be analysed in aggregate form insuring confidentiality. I will be available to answer any questions you may have and to share results with you. I can be reached at (404) 542-3183. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Paul Ginter, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix C

Letter to Supervisor

Appendix C

Letter to Supervisor

Dear Supervisor,

I am currently involved in research exploring attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision. Your perceptions and attitudes concerning this issue are very much needed. You have been selected as a potential participant in this study based on your status as a supervisor in an APA approved predoctoral internship program.

Research findings will be presented in my doctoral dissertation, in order to complete my degree from Western Michigan University in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department. This research has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Board and is under the supervision of my chair, Dr. John Geisler.

Your part in this study involves filling out a brief questionnaire which takes approximatelyl 10 to 20 minutes to complete. Responses will be analysed in aggregate form insuring confidentiality. Quotes from your responses to the open-ended questions may be included in the Results and Discussion section of the dissertation, but care will be taken to present such information in a manner which guarantees anonymity. I would appreciate your returning the completed questionnaire in the attached envelope by June 30, 1990.

You may withdraw from the study at any time. Also, please send back the questionnaire even if you don't complete it. I will be available to answer any questions you may have and to share results with you. I can be reached at (404) 542-3183. Your participation in the study will be appreciated a great deal.

Sincerely,

Paul Ginter, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix D

Letter to Intern

Appendix D

Letter to Intern

Dear Fellow Intern,

I am currently involved in research exploring attitudes toward dual relationships in supervision. Your perceptions and attitudes concerning this issue are very much needed. You have been selected as a potential participant in this study based on your status as an intern in an APA approved predoctoral internship program.

Research findings will be presented in my doctoral disseration, in order to complete my degree from Western Micigan University in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department. This research has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Board and is under the supervision of my chair, Dr. John Geisler.

Your part in this study involves filling out a brief questionnaire which takes approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete. Responses will be analysed in aggregate form insuring confidentiality. Quotes from your responses to the open-ended questions may be included in the Results and Discussion section of the dissertation, but care will be taken to present such information in a manner which guarantees anonymity. I would appreciate your returning the completed questionnaire in the attached envelope by June 30, 1990.

You may withdraw from the study at any time. Also, please send back the questionnaire even if you don't complete it. I will be available to answer any questions you may have and to share results with you. I can be reached at (404) 542-3183. Your participation in the study will be appreciated a great deal.

Sincerely,

Paul Ginter, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix E

Postcards Indicating Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned

Appendix E

Postcards Indicating Number of Questionnaires Distributed and Returned

I have distributed ____ pairs of questionnaires to appropriate supervisory dyads.

I am returning ____ pairs of questionnaires because the remaining supervisory dyads did not fit the criteria.

Appendix F

Reminder to Training Directors to Return Questionnaires

Appendix F

Reminder to Training Directors to Return Questionnaires

Recently, I sent questionnaires to you as part of my dissertation on dual relationships in supervision. I greatly appreciate your help so far.

At this point, there are ____ questionnaires which have not been returned. If you could remind those participating to return the questionnaires, I would be extremely grateful.

Thanks for your time and effort.

Paul Ginter

Appendix G

Questionnaire for Supervisee

Appendix G

Questionnaire for Supervisee

1. ____ Male ____ Female

2. ____ Age

3. Degree:
____ Clinical Psychology ____ Counseling Psychology or Counselor Education

4. Which best describes your internship site?
____ University Counseling Center
____ Psychiatric Hospital

(When responding to the following items, please do so in reference to your current supervisor)

5. ____ Gender of supervisor: ____ Male ____Female

6. ____ For how many months have you been supervised by your current supervisor? ____

7. How much time (if any) have you spent with your supervisor doing the listed activities? Please use the following scale:

1 = never
2 = on one or two occasions
3 = approximately once per month
4 = more than once per month
5 = at least once per week

____ Go to lunch

____ Go to dinner

____ Go to a work related party

____ Go to a party unrelated to work

____ Go to a movie

____ Go to a play

____ Go to a sporting event

____ Go to a nightclub or bar

____ Participate in recreational activities (tennis, hiking, etc.)

____ Spend time together in either of your homes

____ Attend workshops, seminars, or lectures

____ Participate in civic clubs or volunteer activities

____ Attend religious activities

____ Participate in dating activities

____ Other, please describe _____

8. To what extent do you like your supervisor as a supervisor? (Please circle)

To a large extent		Neutral		Dislike him/her as a person
1	2	3	4	5

9. To what extent do you like your supervisor as a person? (Please circle)

To a large extent		Neutral		Dislike him/her as a person
1	2	3	4	5

10. Would you like your relationship with your supervisor (Outside of your supervisory meetings) to a) be closer b) be less close or c) remain the same? (Please explain)

11. After supervision has ended, would you like your relationship with your supervisor to a) be closer b) be less close or c) remain the same? (Please explain)

12. In what ways (if any) has your contact with your supervisor (outside of supervisory meetings) changed over the course of supervision? (Please explain)

13. In what ways (if any) do you think that your contact with your supervisor (outside of supervisory meetings) has affected supervision? (Please explain)

Appendix H

Questionnaire for Supervisor

Appendix H

Questionnaire for Supervisor

1. ____ Male ____ Female

2. ____ Age

3. Degree:
____ Clinical Psychology ____ Counseling Psychology or Counselor Education

4. Which best describes your internship site?
____ University Counseling Center
____ Psychiatric Hospital

(When responding to the following items, please do so in reference to current supervisee)

5. ____ Gender of supervisee: ____ Male ____ Female

6. ____ For how many months have you been supervising your current supervisee? ____

7. How much time (if any) have you spent with you supervisee doing the listed activities? Please use the following scale:

1 = never
2 = on one or two occasions
3 = approximately once per month
4 = more than once per month
5 = at least once per week

____ Go to lunch

____ Go to dinner

____ Go to a work related party

____ Go to a party unrelated to work

____ Go to a movie

____ Go to a play

____ Go to a sporting event

____ Go to a nightclub or bar

____ Participate in recreational activities (tennis, hiking, etc.)

____ Spend time together in either of your homes

____ Attend workshops, seminars, or lectures

____ Participate in civic clubs or volunteer activities

____ Attend religious activities

____ Participate in dating activities

____ Other, please describe _____

8. To what extent do you like your supervisee as a supervisee? (Please circle)

To a large extent		Neutral		Dislike him/her as a supervisee
1	2	3	4	5

9. To what extent do you like your supervisee as a person? (Please circle)

To a large extent		Neutral		Dislike him/her as a person
1	2	3	4	5

10. Would you like your relationship with your supervisee (Outside of your supervisory meetings) to a) be closer b) be less close or c) remain the same? (Please explain)

11. After supervision has ended, would you like your relationship with your supervisee to a) be closer b) be less close or c) remain the same? (Please explain)

12. In what ways (if any) has your contact with your supervisee (outside of supervisory meetings) changed over the course of supervision? (Please explain)

13. In what ways (if any) do you think that your contact with your supervisee (outside of supervisory meetings) has affected supervision? (Please explain)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abroms, G. M. (1977). Supervision as metatherapy. In F. W. Kaslow & Associates (Eds.), Supervision consultation, and staff training in the helping professions (pp. 81-99). San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

American Association for Counseling and Development. (1988). Ethical standards. Alexandria, VA: Author. (Originally published by the American Personnel and Guidance Association).

American Psychological Association. (1981). Ethical standards of psychologists. Washington, DC: Author.

Association of Psychology Internship Centers. (1989). Internship programs in professional psychology. Washington, DC: Author.

Beckett, T. A. (1969). A candidate's reflections on the supervisory process. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 5, 169-179.

Bouhoutsos, J. C., Holroyd, J., Lerman, H., Forer, R. R., & Greenberg, M. (1983). Sexual intimacy between psychotherapists and patients. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14, 185-196.

Bruch, H. (1974). Learning psychotherapy: Rationale and ground rules. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chesler, P. (1972). Women and madness. New York: Avon.

Cohen, R. J., & DeBetz, B. (1977). Responsive supervision of the psychiatric resident and clinical psychology intern. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 37, 51-64.

Doehrman, M. G. (1976). Parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 40, 234-241.

Eckstein, R., & Wallerstein, R. S. (1972). The teaching and learning of psychotherapy (2nd Ed.). New York: International Universities Press.

Feldman-Summers, S., & Jones, G. (1984). Psychological impacts of sexual contact between therapists or other health care practitioners and their clients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 1054-1061.

Freud, S. (1963). Further recommendations in the technique of psychoanalysis: Observation on transference love. In J. Rieff (Ed.), Freud: Therapy and technique (pp. 167-180) New York: Collier.

Glaser, R. D., & Thorpe, J. S. (1986). Unethical intimacy: A survey of sexual contact and advances between psychology educators and female graduate students. American Psychologist, 41, 43-51.

Gottlieb, M. C. (1986, August). Is it ever all right? In R. M. Dawes (Chair), Dual relationships: Therapist and ex-patient. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1984). Differences among supervisees at different levels of training: Implications for a developmental model of supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 76-90.

Hess, A. K. (1980). Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research and practice. New York: Wiley.

Holroyd, J. C., & Brodsky, A. M. (1977). Psychologists' attitudes and practices regarding erotic and nonerotic contact with patients. American Psychologist, 32, 843-849.

Hutt, C. H., Scott, J., & King, M. (1983). A phenomenological study of supervisees' positive and negative experiences in supervision. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 20, 118-123.

Kadushin, A. (1968). Games people play in supervision. Social Work, 13, 23-32.

Keith-Spiegel, P., & Koocher, G. (1985). Ethics in psychology. New York: Random House.

Kitchener, K. S. (1988). Dual relationships: What makes them so problematic? Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 217-221.

Krause, A. A., & Allen, G. J. (1988). Perceptions of counselor supervision: An examination of Stoltenberg's model from the perspectives of the supervisor and supervisee. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35, 77-80.

Lambert, M. J. (1980). Research and the supervisory process. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research and practice (pp. 423-452). New York: Wiley.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). A conceptual model for supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 10, 3-43.

Marmor, J. (1977). Designated discussion of 'The ethics of sex therapy.' In W. H. Masters, V. E. Johnson, and R. D. Kolodney (Eds.), Ethical issues in sex therapy and research (pp. 157-161). Boston: Little, Brown.

Miars, R. D., Tracey, T. J., Ray, P. B., Cornfeld, J. L., O'Farrell, M., & Gelso, C. J. (1983). Variations in supervision process across trainee experience levels. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 403-412.

Orlich, D. C. (1978). Designing sensible surveys. New York: Redgrave.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pope, K. S., & Bouhoutsos, J. (1986). Sexual intimacy between therapists and patients. New York: Praeger.

Pope, K. S., Levenson, H., & Schover, L. (1979). Sexual intimacy in psychology training: Results and implications of a national survey. American Psychologist, 34, 682-689.

Pope, K. S., Schover, L. S., & Levenson, H. (1980). Sexual behavior between clinical supervisors and trainees: Implications for standards of professional practice. Professional Psychology, 11, 157-162.

Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 292-300.

Rioch, M. (1980). The dilemmas of supervision in dynamic psychotherapy. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research and practice. (pp. 156-172). New York: Wiley.

Roberts, G. T., Murrel, P. H., Thomas, R. E., & Claxton, C. S. (1982). Ethical concerns for counselor educators. Counselor Education and Supervision, 20, 8-14.

Robinson, W., & Reid, P. T. (1985). Sexual intimacies in psychology revisited. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16, 512-520.

Rosenblatt, A., & Mayer, J. E. (1975). Objectionable supervising styles: Students' views. Social Work, 20, 184-189.

Schaefer, A. B. (1981). Clinical supervision. In C. E. Walker (Ed.), Clinical practice of psychotherapy (pp. 50-61). New York: Pergamon Press.

Schaefer, C. (1990). Ethics: Dual relationships come under scrutiny. Guidepost, 32, 1,3,16.

Schmidt, J. (1979). Psychotherapy supervision: A cognitive behavioral model. Professional Psychology, 10, 278-284.

Stoltenberg, C. D. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 59-65.

Stoltenberg, C. D., Pierce, R. A., & McNeil, B. W. (1987). Effects of experience on counselor trainees' needs. The Clinical Supervisor, 5, 23-32.

Taylor, B. J., & Wagner, N. W. (1976). Sex between therapists and clients: A review and analysis. Professional Psychology, 7, 593-601.

Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. (1967). Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine.

Vinson, J. S. (1984). Sexual contact with psychotherapists: A study of client reactions and complaint procedures. In K. S. Pope, & J. C. Bouhoutsos (Eds.), Sexual intimacy between therapists and patients (pp. 57-68). New York: Praeger.

Whitson, S. C., & Emerson, S. (1989). Ethical implications for supervisors in counseling of trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 28, 318-325.