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The relationship between supervisors' facilitative characteristics and students' willingness to learn and receptivity in supervision was the focus of this study. Forty Master's level students, enrolled in a clinical practicum, rated their supervisors' Empathetic Understanding, Regard, Congruence, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known on the Revised Relational Inventory (RRI) (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Schacht, Howe, & Berman, 1988) and evaluated themselves on their willingness to learn in supervision and receptivity to supervisors' feedback using the Supervision Perception Form (SPF) (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984). Supervisors also participated by rating themselves with each student on these five relational characteristics and evaluating each student on the SPF.

From the supervisors' perspectives, Pearson moment correlations indicated positive association between the five facilitative supervisor characteristics and students' engagement in supervision. According to students, supervisors' relational qualities were positively related with willingness to learn, but only empathetic understanding, willingness to be known, and unconditionality were correlated with supervisory impact.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Supervision is an integral part of teaching and learning psychotherapy (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). Bradley and Olson (1980) demonstrated that the greater the number of supervision hours and supervisors, the higher supervisees rated their psychotherapeutic competence. Newman (1981) considered supervision as representing students' most important experience in developing professional proficiency as a psychotherapist. It is within supervision that students acquire a sense of competence by refining their counseling skills and defining their theoretical orientation. Supervisors encourage students' professional growth by serving as teachers, role models, and mentors. Potentially, supervisors can model professional counseling attitudes, high standards of competence, and acceptable behaviors. Supervisors with intrapersonal sensitivity facilitate supervisees' examining their feelings, beliefs, and attitudes towards psychotherapy (Newman, 1981). In successful supervision, students' self-examination results in integration of counseling skills with counseling theory, heightened self-other awareness, and finally identification as psychotherapists (Hess, 1980; Newman, 1981; Stoltenberg, 1980).
Although supervision is key in the training of counselors, scarcely any research has been done on the specific supervisor characteristics that encourage student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervision. This chapter will provide background for this problem by first defining supervision and describing its goals, second discussing the centrality of supervision in the professional development of psychologists, third examining the necessity of a positive supervisory relationship and the ethics of supervision that support a supervisor having relational skills, and fourth outlining the lack of research on the supervisory relationship. Finally the statement of the problem and purpose of this study are presented.

Definition and Goals of Supervision

Supervision has been defined as "a quintessential interpersonal interaction with the general goal that one person, the supervisor, meets with another, the supervisee, in an effort to make the latter more effective in helping people in psychotherapy" (Hess, 1980, p.25). Blocher (1983) describes the purpose of supervision as the education of a competent, ethical, and responsible psychologist. To this end, he views students' professional growth as the primary focus of supervision. A positive supervisory relationship consisting of open, honest communication is fundamental to the student development (Blocher, 1983). Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth (1982) concurred. They characterize supervision as an "intensive, interpersonally focused, one-to-one relationship in which one person is designated to facilitate the development of therapeutic competence in the other
person" (p. 2).

In this intensive interpersonal relationship, supervisors' main goal is to train students in the art of counseling. Specifically this entails supervisors teaching theoretical orientations, application of theories, and counseling skills (Hess, 1980; Thorne & Dryden, 1991). Other supervisory goals include enlarging students' understanding of clients' dynamics and the continuity of counseling (Bordin, 1983; Hess, 1980). Because supervisees impact clients relationally, supervisors also need to facilitate and to encourage supervisees' self-other awareness (Bordin, 1983; Thorne & Dryden, 1991). Meanwhile, supervisors monitor the quality of counseling provided by supervisees to insure acceptable levels of service (Bordin, 1983; Hess, 1980; Thorne & Dryden, 1991). Supervisees must integrate a large amount of information in order to understand the psychological functioning in a wide range of human beings including ethics, theories, social roles, and technical skills (Blocher, 1983). As supervisees consolidate these elements, their cognitive schemata and their clinical judgements mature in the direction of greater complexity (Blocher, 1983). Supervisees learn to develop therapeutic strategies and to competently implement interventions into their counseling (Barnat, 1980; Hess, 1980).

Centrality of Supervision in the Professional Development of Psychologists

Quality supervision during the development of therapists is recognized as
essential by the American Psychological Association (APA), Division of Psychotherapy. "No clinical psychologist can be considered to be adequately trained unless he [sic] has had sound training in psychotherapy" (Division of Psychotherapy, 1971, p.148). Understanding the processes of psychotherapy provides the knowledge base for designing research in therapy, teaching counseling skills, and supervising trainees and clinicians. Psychotherapy is mainly taught in supervision of counseling. Recognizing the importance of quality training in psychotherapy, the Division of Psychotherapy (1971) developed 23 principles for doctoral education in psychotherapy. These guidelines emphasize helping "students learn and experience the phenomena of process, growth, and development-in his [sic] clients and in his [sic] professional self, his [sic] personal self, and his [sic] field of psychology" (Division of Psychotherapy, 1971, p. 152). The first seven principles developed by APA focus on departmental structuring to attract and retain faculty competent in psychotherapy by rewarding their supervisory activities. Faculty should be recognized and promoted for their excellence in psychotherapy and supervision in order to provide students with mentors who are proficient at counseling. These psychologists, also, model for students a positive, professional attitude toward psychotherapeutic practice.

The next four principles address qualifications of faculty teaching counseling skills in practicums: (1) the faculty member should be a highly skilled psychotherapist, (2) the faculty member should be competent in teaching psychotherapy, (3) the faculty member should be continuously practicing the skills that they
teach, and (4) the faculty member should view their practice of psychotherapy as a worthwhile professional activity. The remaining principles set standards for practicum settings and curriculums.

Typically students first encounter supervision in their practicums, then internships, and finally on their jobs. Virtually all training programs for Master's level students require a clinical practicum (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). The APA's Criteria for Accreditation of Doctoral Programs require supervised practicums plus 2,000 hour internships (APA, 1980). Graduates are then compelled to work under the supervision of a licensed psychologist to qualify for licensure in most states. The length of supervision time varies depending on the state; the requirement in Michigan, for example, is two years of post-doctoral supervision before full licensure can be obtained (Michigan Public Health Code, 1978). Even after licensure is earned, mental health professionals are advised to seek supervision to remain abreast of new theoretical approaches and innovative psychotherapeutic techniques. One way psychologists fulfill the ethical competency standards set by the American Counseling Association (ACA), and the American Psychological Association (APA) is to obtain supervision. The ACA ethical standards recommend that members continue to improve professional practices to ensure competent service (1988). APA ethical standards require that psychologists "maintain high standards of competence in their work" and that they do not provide services outside their areas of expertise (1992, p. 1599).

Since the ethical standards of counselors and psychologists require
supervision, psychologists spend a fair amount of time supervising. In the middle to late 1970's, surveys of clinical psychologists and academicians revealed that 7 to 10 percent of their time was spent supervising students and other professionals (Garfield & Kurtz, 1976; Shemberg & Leventhal, 1978). A more recent questionnaire sent to counseling psychologists in American Psychological Association (APA) Division 17, Counseling Psychology, found three-fourths of them spend over 17 percent of their time in supervisory activities and one half spend over 9 percent of their time in supervision (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986). Of the total number of counseling psychologists surveyed, 70 percent of them supervised trainees or other professionals (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986).

Ethical Standards for Counseling Supervisors

Since supervision is recognized as a vital part of training and continuing education, ethical guidelines not only required supervision, but standards were developed to direct how supervision was practiced (AACD, 1988; APA, 1992). One example is professionals setting standards for supervisor characteristics and personal traits, and for the personal and professional nature of the supervisory relationship. According to the ACA (1989), supervisors are to demonstrate personal traits and characteristics that are congruent with their role; being encouraging, optimistic, and motivational while possessing a sense of humor. Supervisors' self-awareness of weaknesses and strengths, plus a cognizance of their interpersonal relational style, is perceived as critical for supervisors (AACD, 1989). They
should have sufficient self-awareness to avoid meeting their own personal needs at the expense of their supervisees (AACD, 1988). Kurpuis, Gibson, Lewis, and Corbet (1991) in a discussion about supervisory ethics suggested that supervisors' personal issues at times may interfere with supervision, resulting in strong reactions to supervisees' presentations of client material. For example, a supervisor from an alcoholic family may find it difficult to guide students who counsel people struggling with substance abuse (Kurpuis et al., 1991).

Another ethical standard for supervisors requires having a conceptual knowledge of the personal and professional nature of the supervisory relationship (AACD, 1989). Supervisors are responsible for establishing mutual trust, and for providing a balance between challenge and support (AACD, 1989). To foster a healthy working relationship, supervisors must be respectful of supervisees' autonomy, individual differences, personalities, and professional goals (AACD, 1989). Additionally supervisors can enhance the supervisory working alliance by demonstrating empathy, concreteness, respect, congruence, genuineness, and immediacy (AACD, 1989).

Supervisory Relationship

Potentially the complex interpersonal relationship between supervisor and supervisees complements the didactic experience, but supervisors functioning as evaluators can be intimidating and threatening to supervisees (Blocher, 1983; Hess, 1980; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Newman, 1981; Rioch, 1980). In the
theoretical and empirical literature, the supervisor-supervisee relationship is recognized as a crucial factor in successful supervision. A number of counseling theorists have posited that a warm, respectful, genuine, trusting supervisory relationship is necessary for effective supervision (Blocher, 1983; Bordin, 1983; Loganbill et al., 1982; Mearns, 1991; Rogers, 1956). Research has likewise shown, from the students' perspective, that satisfactory, positive, effective supervision was characterized by supportive interpersonal interactions (Allen, Szollos, Williams, 1986; Galante, 1985; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). A limitation of this research is that it does not specifically address which supervisor characteristics facilitated student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisor feedback.

A psychologically healthy supervisory relationship facilitates supervisees' self-disclosures, explorations of their beliefs and assumptions about psychotherapy, and increases self-other awarenesses. When supervisors create a supportive, accepting, empathic supervisory environment, supervisees are more likely to be trusting and disclosing so that they examine their thoughts and feelings regarding psychotherapy, and insights about their self-other awareness (Mearns, 1991; Shohet & Wilmot, 1991). Supervisees' self-disclosure is necessary if supervisors are to be helpful. Students who feel judged and criticized by their supervisors are unlikely to ask for assistance in dealing with difficult clinical problems. If this is the case, students tend to present in supervision those client cases that they feel relatively competent to handle, and seek informal supervision about problematic
clients elsewhere (Rosenblatt & Mayer, 1965; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983).

Feeling safe and comfortable in supervision also allows students to examine their assumptions, beliefs, values, and feelings in regard to the general process of psychotherapeutic change as they work with different clients. Rogers (1951) believed that students' clarification of their theoretical orientation is one of the first steps necessary for students to begin to learn about counseling (Rogers, 1951). Rogers (1951) opposed indoctrinating students in a specific theoretical approach, since he observed when this occurred students became very self-conscious about their performance. He noticed that imposing such an approach caused supervisees to focus on their counseling technique instead of attending to their interpersonal attitudes. Students' concentration on theoretical orientation distracted them from being genuine, congruent, and empathetic with clients. Rogers (1951, 1957) theorized that these relational attitudes were the most powerful component which facilitated client change.

A positive, communicative supervisory relationship is also invaluable when supervisees' unresolved personal issues arise (Thorne & Dryden, 1991). Mueller and Kell (1971) recognized that conflicts within clients will often trigger anxiety within therapists, thus hindering effective counseling. If supervisees remain unaware of personal concerns, they may likewise experience impasses or difficulties with their clients, but remain puzzled as to the cause. The more objective perspective of the supervisor assists supervisees in identifying intrapsychic conflicts needing attention. This enables supervisees to not only deepen their self-other
awareness, but also to begin to recognize the impact of their own personalities on the psychotherapy process (Bordin, 1983).

Research on Supervision in Counseling

Generally, supervision has been insufficiently researched. Ellis (1991) describes the proliferation of research in supervision as "largely haphazard, atheoretical, and rife with a host of methodological flaws" (p. 238). The lack of systematic inquiry into supervision is due to the tendency to ignore proposed supervisory models and previous findings. Instead of selecting research questions that build on earlier studies or on theoretical models, many researchers seem to select topics that randomly strike their interest (Loganbill et al., 1982). Unfortunately, the result is a hodgepodge of accumulated knowledge with inconsequential practical value (Ellis, 1991; Loganbill et al., 1982). Little empirical information about the effective conduct of supervision is known (Borders, 1989; Russell, Crimmings, & Lent, 1984). The result is that supervisors are left without much guidance, and therefore often perform supervision by "the seat of their pants" (Blocher, 1983, p. 27).

Although a few previous studies have begun describing satisfactory, effective, positive supervision (Allen, Szollos, Williams, 1986; Galante, 1985; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979), there has been a lack of research exploring the relational complexities that impact supervision (Loganbill et al., 1982). There is a paucity of empirical
research determining supervisor characteristics that contribute to an effective
growth-producing supervisory relationship (Carifio & Hess, 1987; Gandolfo &
Brown, 1987). Even less research has been conducted on those characteristics in
supervisees that lead to positive or negative experiences in supervision (Kennard
et al., 1987; Holloway & Wampold, 1983). "Last, the relationship between posi­
tive supervision and the acquisition of therapy skill has yet to be demonstrated"
(Kennard et al., 1987, p. 174). These assessments indicate that little is known
about the impact of the supervisor characteristics on supervisory relationship, and
subsequently on the process of learning. Hence this study, grounded in the
Rogerian theory of supervision, attempts to examine if specific supervisor charac­
teristics facilitate student willingness to learn from supervisors and engagement
in the supervisory process.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigates whether the supervisor's characteristics of empathe­
tic understanding, congruence, regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness
to be known influence the effectiveness of supervision for students. Briefly these
characteristics are defined: (a) empathetic understanding is the extent to which
a person experiences the words, feelings, and perceptions of another; (b)
congruence is the degree to which a person is fully integrated, so that there are
no inconsistencies between overt communications and feelings and behaviors; (c)
regard is "the affective aspect of one person's response to another" (Barrett-
Lennard, 1962, p. 4); (d) unconditionality of regard is "the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p.4); and (e) willingness to be known is the degree to which a person self-discloses his/her experiences, feelings, and perceptions of self, the other, and the relationship (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). If these supervisor qualities are present, is the supervisee more open to the supervisor's feedback and assistance? Is the supervisee willing to learn from the supervisor?

The variables will be both supervisor's and supervisee's perceptions of these supervisor characteristics. These perceptions will be based on the how supervisor views self and on the degree to which the supervisee experiences the supervisor's characteristics of empathetic understanding, congruence, regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness to be known. These variables are examined in terms of the supervisee's receptivity to the supervisor's impact and the supervisee's willingness to learn. Again, the supervisee's receptivity to supervisory feedback and willingness to learn are measured from the perceptions of both supervisor and supervisee.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study's purpose is to examine whether specific supervisor characteristics such as empathetic understanding, congruence, regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness to be known facilitate supervisee willingness to learn from the supervisor. Students' experience of these supervisor characteristics, as well
as supervisors’ self-rating of these qualities are examined. It is hoped that this study draws supervisors’ attention to the crucial impact they can have on the supervisee receptivity to learning in supervision. Hence the following research question will be addressed:

1. Is student willingness to learn and openness to supervisor influence in supervision a function of: (a) the students’ experience of the supervisor facilitative qualities in the supervisory relationship? (b) the supervisors’ self-rating of their facilitative qualities in the supervisory relationship?

**Hypotheses**

Thus far, person-centered research has focused on whether supervisees learned counseling skills when supervisors established an empathetic relationship with them and modeled therapeutic qualities in supervision. No studies have examined if supervisors exhibiting these facilitative conditions encouraged supervisee willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisor feedback. Therefore, in this study the following hypotheses will be examined:

**Hypothesis 1.** Supervisors’ perceptions of student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervision as measured by the Supervision Perception Form for Supervisors (SPF-S) is directly related to:

a. Supervisor self-rating of their level of empathetic understanding as measured by the Revised Relational Inventory (RRI).

b. Supervisor self-rating of their level of congruence as measured by the **Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.**
RRI.

c. Supervisor self-rating of their level of regard as measured by the RRI.
d. Supervisor self-rating of their level of unconditionality of regard as measured by the RRI.
e. Supervisor self-rating of their level of willingness to be known as measured by the RRI.

Hypothesis 2. Students’ self-rating of their willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory impact as measured by the Supervision Perception Form for Trainees (SPF-T) is directly related to:

a. Student perceptions of their supervisors’ level of empathetic understanding as measured by the Revised Relational Inventory (RRI).
b. Student perceptions of their supervisors’ level of congruence as measured by the RRI.
c. Student perceptions of their supervisors’ level of regard as measured by the RRI.
d. Student perceptions of their supervisors’ level of unconditionality of regard as measured by the RRI.
e. Student perceptions of their supervisors’ level of willingness to be known as measured by the RRI.

Overview of Remaining Chapters

Chapter II reviews models of supervision addressing the supervisory rela-
tionship with an emphasis on Rogers' person-centered therapy of supervision. Empirical evidence that reports conditions in the supervisory relationship that enhance or hinder supervision and consequentially supervision outcomes (i.e., satisfaction) are discussed. Chapter III delineates the research methodology: population sample, research design, research instruments, the ethical considerations, data analysis, and limitations of the study. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study and uses tables to depict the data analysis. Chapter V provides a discussion of the results including the study's contribution to the field of supervision. Suggestions for further research are considered.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Although the majority of the supervisory literature concentrates on the developmental stages of students’ professional maturation, in this chapter the focus is on the supervisory relationship itself (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Hill, Charles, & Reed, 1981; Krause & Allen, 1988; McNeil, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985, Wiley & Ray, 1986). There are two reasons for this. First, without a solid, working relationship supervisees may not fully engage in supervision (Bordin, 1983; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983). Second, regardless of whether the supervisory relationship is satisfactory or not, it provides the primary environmental arena for students’ professional development (Holloway, 1987). Blocher (1983) states that students’ progress in supervision will be hampered if a supervisory relationship lacks mutual respect and concern between supervisor and student. Friedlander and Ward (1984) underscored the importance of the supervisory relationship: "The supervisory relationship may be as potent in effecting supervisory outcomes as the therapeutic relationship is effecting client outcomes" (p. 544).

First, the relational supervisory models of Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth (1982), Blocher (1983), Bordin (1983), and Mueller and Kell (1972) explain how
mutual trust, respect, and caring between supervisor and supervisee provide the foundation for a positive, satisfying supervisory relationship and how this relationship facilitates the learning of counseling skills. Second, since empirical research on effective supervisor characteristics is scarce, descriptive studies examining the qualities of a positive and a negative supervisory relationship are reported. Included are those studies examining supervisor characteristics and styles. Third, because supervisees also influence the supervisory interaction, studies exploring supervisee qualities which affect supervision are also reviewed. Fourth, Rogers' person-centered model of supervision is described since it forms the major theoretical basis for the present study. Rogers (1951, 1957) specified the supervisor characteristics necessary for experiential learning within supervision. In brief, he postulated that when the facilitative qualities of congruence, empathetic understanding, unconditional regard are experienced in supervision, supervisees will be receptive to personal growth and professional learning. Fifth, research offering evidence of the validity of Rogers' approach to supervision is presented which supports the use of his theory as basis for this study. A review of the supervisory literature indicates that few studies have explored the specific conditions that encourage learning in supervision. Therefore, this study examines whether supervisees are more receptive to learning in supervision when they experience Rogersian facilitative qualities within the supervisory relationship.
Models of Supervision Emphasizing Relationship

There are two reasons for the inclusion of this section. First, it gives theoretical support to the importance of the supervisory relationship and to the characteristics of both supervisor and student that some psychologists believe to be necessary to create a positive functional supervisory relationship. Second, it describes supervisory interactions that current theoretical models of supervision emphasize as pivotal for students learning the process of counseling in supervision.

A supportive, trusting, respectful, communicative supervisory relationship has been viewed by many as central to the success of supervision (Altucher, 1967; Blocher, 1983; Bordin, 1983; Loganbill et al., 1982; Mueller & Kell, 1972). Although many theorists agree on the importance of a positive supervisory relationship, they disagree on who holds primary responsibility for maintaining the relationship. Loganbill et al. (1982) theorized that supervisors provide supportive, accepting environments by demonstrating warmth, liking, respect, and empathy towards their supervisees. In this milieu, Loganbill et al. (1982) theorized that supervisees felt secure enough to express their thoughts and feelings without fear of adverse judgement and rejection. Hence supervisees’ anxieties were calmed, which enabled them to reflect and integrate their reactions while conducting counseling. Additionally, for Loganbill et al. (1982), the supervisory relationship is the "the vehicle through which essential knowledge is given" (p.29). A trusting,
open supervisory relationship facilitates supervisees' acceptance of new information and opportunities for growth. Yet the experience of the relationship itself fosters significant learning. For example, supervisors who discuss interpersonal conflicts in the supervisory relationship model for supervisees how disagreements could be managed with their clients.

In contrast to the position that supervisors are primarily responsible for the supervisory relationship, Mueller and Kell (1977), Bordin (1983), and Blocher (1983) theorized that trust, care, and respect are the mutual responsibilities of both supervisees and supervisors. Despite Mueller and Kell's (1977), Bordin's (1983), and Blocher's (1983) mutual belief that a cooperative supervisory relationship is central to supervision, unique differences still exist between their supervisory models.

Mueller and Kell (1972) highlighted the parallel process that often occurs in the supervision of counseling. Parallel process occurs when problems within the client or the counseling relationship are replicated in the supervision. In other words, when supervisees empathize with their clients' anxieties, the supervisees' own intrapsychic conflicts are triggered. Then these conflicts surface in supervision. With such intimately personal material arising it becomes crucial that supervisors provide a trusting and caring relationship, to enable supervisees to explore areas of vulnerability. When supervisees examine their reactions to clients, areas of personal difficulties may emerge for the supervisees which potentially could prompt them to pursue psychotherapy. When supervisees are able to
deal with their anxieties openly, they are more likely to be comfortable with client issues, thus allowing for significant therapeutic encounters to transpire which results in greater progress for the client.

But the process of trust is reciprocal. If supervisees responded to the supervisors' offers of help by hiding their difficulties working with clients through the use of rationalizations, justifications, and intellectualizations, supervisees undermine the supervisors' faith that the supervisee will self-disclose crucial client information. Once the supervisor's trust erodes, there is no foundation on which to construct a productive supervisory relationship (Mueller & Kell, 1972).

Bordin's (1983) model of supervision also emphasizes the mutuality of the trust and care in the supervisory relationship. Bordin uses the term "working alliance" to emphasize the importance of the supervisory relationship. In his view the power which induces change in supervision is the alliance between the supervisor and supervisee. The strength of that alliance depends on setting common goals, on working together to meet these goals, and on the bond between the two parties. Bordin also (1983) observed that bonding can happen only when there is mutual liking, trust, respect, and caring between the supervisor and the student.

The formation of this "working alliance" is necessary for the tasks of supervision. Like Mueller & Kell (1977) and Loganbill et al. (1982), Bordin (1983) regards one of the supervisees' tasks to be confronting their inner world and recognizing its impact on clients. Given the ever present component of evaluation in supervision, appropriate trust is often not easily attained. However, students
who feel a bond with their supervisors are more willing to trust their supervisors with their internal conflicts despite the evaluative quality that is also a part of the relationship.

Like Bordin (1983), Blocher (1983) presents a teacher-student model of supervision which assumes that an effective relationship is characterized by mutual respect, trust, and concern. These qualities enable honest communication for teaching counseling skills and for discussing the counselor's interpersonal functioning in counseling. Blocher (1983) concluded, "Where either supervisor or student is unable to function in a relationship in this way, little success would be expected" (p. 33).

Blocher (1983) regarded the purpose of supervision as educating supervisees, whom he called learners, primarily through their interactions with clients. "Supervision... uses the psychological content in a systematic way to change the psychological functioning of a learner" (Bordin, 1983, p. 28). As supervisees process psychological information from counseling clients in increasingly more complex ways, their perceptions of others change. This influences their effectiveness in counseling.

Blocher (1983) outlines the dynamics essential for learning counseling skills. First, the student needs to be challenged to learn. Second, he or she must invest in performing. Third, when the student's anxieties are triggered by high levels of challenge and involvement, these anxieties need to be calmed by a supportive, warm, caring relationship. Fourth, structure must be provided to insure
clear learning strategies for the student to approach the tasks. Fifth, supervisees need accurate, interpretable feedback regarding their performance to clarify areas for growth. Sixth, the supervisor should encourage the student to experiment with innovative counseling practices. And seventh, the supervisor must provide the student time for reflection on and integration of new ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. Although the supervisor and the supervisee are mutually responsible for a positive supervisory relationship, the supervisor designs and manages supervision around these dynamics. The goal of supervision should be to create humane, flexible, and supportive learning environments that encourage students' professional development (Blocher, 1983).

Despite some differences, the supervisory models of Blocher (1983), Bordin (1983), Loganbill et al. (1982) and Mueller and Kell (1977) provide support for attending to the components of a successful supervisory relationship since it can influence the effectiveness of the supervisory experience. Now the question is how to engage students in the supervisory process so they will engage in learning counseling. Bordin's (1983) first condition for learning counseling skills is that students are challenged to learn. What can supervisors do to challenge students to learn while assisting them to invest in performing? Blocher (1983), Bordin (1983), Loganbill et al. (1982), and Mueller and Kell (1977) all make a case for supervisors initiating a caring, trusting, and communicative relationship with students or providing a safe environment for students to discuss their reactions to clients. Therefore, it is not only the supervisors' knowledge of counseling but their
interpersonal style of interacting with students that is crucial. In addition as Mueller and Kell (1977) emphasize, students need to be responsive for supervision to be successful.

Supervision of Counseling: Positive and Negative Experiences

Although the above supervisory models have not yet been empirically validated, research has been published on the overall positive and negative aspects of supervision interaction. Therefore in this next section characteristics and styles of preferred and disliked supervisors from the perspectives of students is described and qualities of positive and negative supervisory relationships from the perspectives of both supervisors and students. This broad review of the literature on the supervisory relationship illustrates the general, descriptive nature of the research in this area and demonstrates the necessity for further examination of specific supervisor characteristics that facilitate student engagement in learning from the supervisory experience, which is the focus of this study.

Characteristics and Styles of Preferred Supervisors

Student Perspectives

Many studies of supervision surveyed supervisees to elicit their perceptions of supervisors' positive relational qualities (Allen, Szollos, & Williams, 1986; Gandolfo & Brown, 1987; Kennard et al., 1987; Nelson, 1978). Supervisees
preferred the supervisors who were non-threatening, tactful, non-authoritarian, flexible, self-disclosing, permissive, perceptive, supportive, sensitive, reassuring, understanding, and accepting (Hutt et al., 1983; Kennard, Steward, & Gluck, 1987; Galante 1987; Miller & Oetting, 1966; Nelson, 1978). Students also valued supervisors who possessed a sense of humor, built supervisees' confidence, put supervisees at ease, called the supervisee by name, established good rapport, and demonstrated interest in supervision (Miller & Oetting, 1966; Nelson, 1978; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979).

Carifio and Hess (1987) presented research findings addressing the ideal supervisor characteristics. The following personality characteristics were listed as important: high levels of empathy, respect, genuineness, flexibility, concern, investment, and openness. Ideal supervisors characterized by interns were warm, self-disclosing, flexible, and supportive (Gandolfo & Brown, 1986). Students also reported satisfactory supervision occurred when they rated supervisors high on expertise, trustworthiness, and interpersonal attractiveness (Allen et al., 1986; Heppner & Handley, 1981; Heppner & Handley, 1982). But in Allen's et al. (1986) questionnaire, students reported that their best supervision was associated with the supervisors' expertise and trustworthiness (Allen et al., 1986). Before concluding interpersonal attractiveness is less crucial in supervision, another study needs to be considered. Dodenhoff (1981) found that students who perceived their supervisors as friendly were rated by their supervisors as more effective in counseling. Apparently supervisors' interpersonal attractiveness as well as
expertise and trustworthiness are associated with students' satisfaction with supervision and the perceived supervisory outcomes.

In addition to specific supervisor characteristics that facilitate a positive, satisfactory relationship, supervisees described a positive supervisory relationship as embodying warmth, acceptance, trust, respect, and understanding (Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983). These qualities produced the interpersonal climate which facilitated professional growth (Hutt et al., 1983). Learning occurred when supervisees could safely discuss their difficulties with clients without fear of negative evaluations. Supervisors made it clear that mistakes did not compromise the supervisees' worth. More exploration and discussion of their behaviors, thoughts, attitudes, and feelings regarding the counseling process followed (Hutt et al., 1983).

Rabinowitz, Heppner, & Roehlke's (1986) research supported this finding. Beginning practicum students, advanced practicum students, and interns all endorsed "getting support from supervisor" as the most essential component dealt with in supervision. This same sample selected "supporting, reassuring, and nurturing" as the most vital weekly supervisory interventions (Rabinowitz, Heppner, & Roehlke, 1986).

**Mutual Perspective of Both Student and Supervisor**

Although it has been vital to begin to understand students' perspectives of positive supervisory, the supervisors' viewpoints are just as important to the comprehension of the supervisory process (Hutt et al., 1983). In a study by Galante,
1987, supervisors, as well as students, agreed that effective supervision was characterized by mutual respect, good rapport and supportive supervisors. Additionally, in effective supervision supervisors and students perceived that personal and interpersonal problems were not troublesome. The focus in effective supervision was on the trainee’s personal and professional development (Galante, 1987). In essence, positive rapport enabled open communication for discussion of interactions with clients without distracting problems in the supervisory relationship.

As Blocher (1983) pointed out, communication is vital to supervision. In a study by Lanning and Lemons (1977), as the level of effective communication increased, satisfaction with the supervisory relationship improved. Supervisees evaluated supervision more positively and were more comfortable in the relationship when there was an open, honest respectful exchange of ideas (Gandolfo & Brown, 1987; Holloway & Wampold, 1983).

Positive Supervisory Styles

Cherniss and Egnatios (1977) surveyed clinicians’ community mental health programs and found that clinicians appreciated supervisors who offered advise, interpretations, and suggestions regarding client dynamics and counseling techniques. These clinicians also reported benefiting when supervisors asked questions to stimulate thinking and to encourage clinicians to solve problems for themselves. Additionally the results showed that clinicians found it helpful to be
allowed to work through their own emotional responses to their relationship with the client.

More recently Friedlander and Ward (1984) directed a series of studies to develop and validate an inventory to assess supervisory style. The Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) revealed three supervisory styles: a collegial style, where supervisors were warm, supportive, friendly, open, and flexible, a relational style in which supervisors were invested, committed, therapeutic, and perceptive in supervision; and a structured style where supervisors emphasized the content and goals of supervision. The research revealed the style made no difference on supervisees' engagement in supervision and their reported satisfaction with supervision. An explanation for this is that although supervisors might use one predominant supervisory style, their styles are often multidimensional. For instance, qualities associated with the collegial style might be present across all three supervisory styles (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

Characteristics of Disliked Supervisors and Negative Supervisory Styles

Characteristics of Disliked Supervisors

In this section characteristics of disliked supervisors are reported, but these results are not directly connected to whether students engaged in learning from their supervisors. Students who were disappointed with counseling supervision described their supervisors as biased, rigid, domineering, defensive, closed, critical,
and unsupportive (Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Hutt et al, 1983; Miller & Oetting, 1966). Students disliked supervisors who reacted defensively, sometimes attacking or threatening students when they asked questions. Supervisees were also frustrated when their supervisor did not model effective counseling skills in the supervisory relationship (Miller & Oetting, 1966).

Allen et al. (1986) offer support that supervisees of different genders identify different characteristics of unsatisfactory supervision. For male supervisees the worst supervisory experiences occurred when they had to compete with other students for their supervisor's attention, when they were not taught technical skills, and when they were not encouraged to explore new therapeutic strategies (Allen et al., 1986). Female students encountered their worst supervision when supervisors were authoritarian and sexist. For these women the worst experiences occurred when supervisors used sexist language, emphasized traditional stereotypes, devalued them on the basis of gender, and violated their personal privacy (Allen et al., 1986). "Larger percentages of women than men also viewed the absence of sexist attitudes and practices as influential in defining best supervisory experiences" (Allen et al., 1986, p. 97).

**Negative Supervisory Styles**

Rosenblatt and Mayer (1965) reported objectionable, dissatisfactory supervisory styles depicted by social work students. When supervisors overly monitored students, or gave them no autonomy to make decisions, students reacted by
resisting supervisory input. At the other extreme, they were frustrated when supervisors offered no guidance and became self-protective or if supervisors were critical, cold, aloof, and hostile. Cherniss and Egnatios (1977) found similar results in that clinicians' least preferred supervisory style was authoritarian, allowing the supervisee little autonomy. At the other extreme clinicians were also frustrated with a laissez faire supervisory style which meant leaving the supervisee alone and rarely being available for consultation. Rosenblatt and Mayer's (1965) study revealed that supervisees were most distressed when supervisors classified students as immature or dependent. Students were strongly influence by these labels and severely doubted their ability to rectify these personality deficits and become effective therapists.

Students reported that the impact of these objectionable supervisory styles impeded their ability to learn. Instead of presenting difficulties that they were having counseling clients, they conveyed a superficial attitude of compliance and cooperation in supervision. To avoid close scrutiny, domination, or criticism students monitored clinical material, presenting cases to supervisors in which clients were responding well to psychotherapy (Rosenblatt & Mayer, 1965).

Supervisees in Hutt et al.'s (1983) study characterized a negative supervisory relationship as evoking "intense negative feelings in the supervisee while it failed to satisfy important professional needs" (Hutt et al., 1983, p. 121). Supervisees involved in negative relationships experienced anxiety, frustration, and anger with the supervisor. The relationship was reported to be burdened with
mistrust, disrespect, and a lack of honest self-disclosure. Instead of experiencing support, supervisees expected criticism from these supervisors. In reaction supervisees protected themselves by not revealing problems, conflicts, or negative feelings to the supervisor. The task of supervision shifted from a focus on counselor-client interactions to avoiding presenting problematic material. Supervisees felt powerless as the relationship continued. They attempted to minimize threats to self, to control their negative feelings, and to learn when it was possible (Hutt et al., 1983). If the supervisor did not assume responsibility for resolving the conflicts in the supervisory relationship, an impasse developed. Supervisees became resistant to the supervisor's authority because they believed that the supervisor was insensitive and inept. Supervisees who wanted to improve the quality of the relationship attempted to express some of their reactions to the supervisors. In those cases where the supervisor's defensiveness discouraged further dialogue, conflicts remained unresolved (Hutt et al., 1983).

Similar results were found when Moskowitz and Rupert (1983) surveyed 158 clinical psychology graduated students who described three areas of conflict in supervision: theoretical orientation, supervisory style, and personality clashes. The easiest conflicts to resolve were differences in theoretical orientation or style and the hardest were trainee's and supervisor's personality issues. An example of personal issues interfering with supervision would be a supervisor using supervision to focus on their own needs and frustrations. About one third of the students surveyed reported an interpersonal conflict that "made it difficult to learn
from supervision" (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983, p. 635).

Although students were uncomfortable addressing relational difficulties, they desired conflict resolution and 76% initiated a discussion of the problem (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983). Unfortunately, "a workable or excellent relationship following discussion resulted in less than 40% of the cases" (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983). Students felt that discussions were not helpful for the following reasons: (a) supervisors did not change their behavior or views the way students wished, (b) supervisors felt it was the trainee’s personal problem, or (c) the supervisor acted as though the student was wrong. When conflicts were unresolved, students sought support from others, censored the sensitive material in their progress notes, concealed difficulties during supervision, and appeared to comply with their supervisors’ suggestions (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983).

In Galante’s survey of 625 trainee respondents’ perceptions of effective and ineffective supervision, 295 (47.2%) indicated that they had been in supervision where "their ability to learn was impaired" (Galante, 1987, p. 30). Trainees viewed ineffective supervision as characterized by more focus on trainees’ counseling skill deficiencies, more directive style of supervision and less learning of specific counseling interventions, case conceptualizations, and general therapy techniques; and less work on developing trainees’ own therapy style (Galante, 1987).

Role conflict and role ambiguity are other sources of conflict that affect students’ satisfaction with supervision (Friedlander, Keller, Peca-Baker, & Olk,
Role conflict occurs when supervisees struggle to balance the roles of student, counselor, and colleague. In the student role, supervisees are expected to follow the directive of their supervisors and as counselors they are to demonstrate capacity for autonomous decision-making. When students pursue a direction in counseling which contradicts their supervisor's suggestions, they may experience role conflict. Olk & Friedlander (1992) discovered that postdoctoral students faced more role conflict than practicum students, resulting in higher levels of dissatisfaction with supervision. Inexperienced practicum students encountered little role conflict because they tended to mistrust their own judgments and therefore more easily accepted to their supervisors' opinions (Friedlander et al., 1986).

Role ambiguity is generated by uncertainty regarding supervisors' expectations, by lack of knowledge about how to meet these expectations, and by the criteria used in the evaluation process. Practicum students reported more role ambiguity than more experienced students. Again, high levels of role ambiguity were associated with dissatisfaction with supervision. This finding supported Bordin's (1983) model of supervision which suggests that when supervisory goals are mutually clarified and agreed upon, a solid the working alliance is formed, which should in turn lead to greater satisfaction with supervision.

Summary

The research elicited supervisees' preferences or dislikes for supervisor

Therefore, it is not surprising to find that supervisees disliked supervisors whom they perceived as biased, rigid, domineering, and defensive, closed, critical, and unsupportive (Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Hutt et al., 1983, Miller & Oetting, 1966). Research in supervision has only begun to inform supervisors about characteristics desirable and nondesirable to supervisees. Areas yet to be studied are the specific supervisor characteristics that facilitate supervisee willingness to learn and receptivity to learning from the supervisor. Generally this research as focused on supervisor characteristics as experienced by supervisees; only a few studies have elicited the perspective of supervisors (Allen et al., 1986; Galante, 1987; Golden, 1987; Kennard et al, 1987).

The research reflects some agreement as to the relational styles of supervisors that facilitate a positive, satisfying, and effective supervision and the supervisory styles that interfere with supervision. Researchers have yet to study the specific behaviors, and aspects of styles demonstrated by supervisors in supervision.
that facilitate the supervisee willingness to learn and receptivity to the supervisors’ feedback. Supervisory relational styles that supervisees preferred in supervision which enhanced the supervisory relationships and thus learning were described (Chemiss & Eqnatios, 1977; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Rabinowitz, Heppner, & Roelke’s 1986; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Rapport, personal attention, warmth, acceptance, trust, respect, support, and openness characterized positive and satisfying supervision for supervisees (Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Hutt et al., 1983; Rabinowitz et al., 1986; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). In contrast, supervisees described negative supervisory relationships as mistrusting, disrespectful, and lacking honest self-disclosure (Hutt et al, 1983). The result is that student learning about the counseling process from their supervisors is impeded and they disengage from the supervisory relationship (Hutt et al., 1983; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Rosenblatt & Mayer, 1965).

Although supervisees wanted a positive, supportive relationship, they also desired supervisors to provide some structure with supervisory goals and content, advise, interpret, and make suggestions regarding client dynamics and counseling techniques (Chemiss & Eqnatios, 1977, Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Galante, 1987). But there needs to be a balance. Students wanted guidance, but they resented being overly monitored or given no autonomy to make their decisions regarding case management of their clients (Rosenblatt & Mayer, 1965).

Thus far, the research provides only a broad understanding of the
components that supervisees view as important or detrimental to supervision. Knowledge about the specific characteristics which encourage the supervisees’ receptivity to supervisors’ input and enhance the supervisee willingness to learn is still lacking.

Supervisee Impact on Supervision

Despite supervisors’ impact on the emotional environment of supervision, supervisees’ defenses, interest in supervision, and personal qualities also affect supervision (Galante, 1987; Hutt et al., 1983; Kennard et al., 1987). Supervisees were found to impede their own learning process when they resisted supervisors’ feedback or took a defensive posture (Gutheil, 1977; Mueller & Kell, 1972). Trainees’ resistance to supervision was a difficulty cited by inexperienced supervisors (McColley & Baker, 1982). Surveying supervisors with two years or less experience, McColley & Baker (1982) found that about one-fifth of the beginning supervisors reported trainees’ resistance to learning as problematic (McColley & Baker, 1982).

Gutheil’s (1977) experience as a supervisor led him to observe that psychiatric students’ resistance often stemmed from professional insecurity which in turn interfered with their learning. To cope with their feelings of inadequacy regarding their counseling skills, interns clung to a theoretical orientation bypassing the process of further exploration and experimentation in the counseling relationship.

Distancing themselves from patients was another common defense used by
psychiatric interns (Gutheil, 1977). Students avoided experiencing the patient as a person with emotional turmoil. Instead they adopted a strictly behavioral or medical perspective. Supervisors who challenged this comfortable posture risked supervisees perhaps becoming more defended and rigid (Gutheil, 1977).

A student's level of interest in the supervisor's feedback was also found to determine the quality of supervision. When supervisors perceived trainees' interest in supervisors' suggestions and feedback, trainees reported a positive supervisory experience (Kennard et al., 1987). This indicates that a relationship where supervisees are open to learning from the supervisor may lead to a more positive outcome. Due to the retrospective methodology it is unclear whether students were receptive to learning before supervision, or whether they became receptive to supervisors because of the support they received, or both (Kennard et al., 1987).

In any case, supervisees' responsiveness to supervision is said to be essential to learning (Mueller & Kell, 1972). In the qualitative study by Hutt et al. (1983), supervisees recognized the mutuality of the supervisory relationship. When warmth, acceptance, respect, understanding, and trust were demonstrated by supervisors, often these qualities were reciprocated by the supervisees. "The quality of the supervisory relationship encouraged supervisees to disclose actions, feelings, attitudes, and conflicts which occurred in their professional work" (Hutt et al., 1983, p. 120). It seems that the exchange of personal feelings and experiences by both supervisors and supervisees contributed to the supervisory
relationship becoming more collaborative. In each relationship the exploration of clients' dynamics was a mutual process, although at times the supervisees' needs and concerns were the primary focus (Hutt et al., 1983).

There exists little research which specifically addresses supervisees' characteristics which contribute to positive, productive supervision. In the 1960s and 1970s, psychologists attempted to determine those personality characteristics that differentiated between effectiveness and ineffectiveness in counseling trainees. Whitely (1969) and Rowe, Murphy, and Decspikes (1975) described this research as generally contradictory and unproductive.

One exception is the work of Tinsley and Tinsley (1977). Using the Omnibus Personality Inventory, they found that certain personality variables contributed to the supervisors' perceptions of differences in students' current level of functioning and effectiveness as counselors. Supervisors perceived effective trainees as more introspective, philosophical, questioning, imaginative, and appreciative of esthetics. They were viewed as more independent, tolerant of others' viewpoints, and less judgmental. Moreover, these trainees valued feelings and expressed them. While this study did not indicate whether these characteristics directly contributed to positive outcomes in supervision, these counselor qualities impressed the supervisors (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1977).

Instead of examining qualities of effective counselors, Stillman (1980) explored supervisees' qualities that directly correlated with their responsiveness to supervision. He measured students' empathy, respect, and genuineness towards
clients before practicum and discovered that empathy and respect towards clients is associated with receptiveness to supervision, flexibility in counseling, and overall competence (Stillman, 1980).

Summary

Although supervisees’ level of resistance, defensiveness, empathy, and respect impact their receptivity to supervision, the focus of this study remains on the supervisor characteristics that facilitate supervisee learning. Thus the question persists: what supervisor qualities facilitate supervisee willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisor input? Rogers’ theory of supervision provides one possible explanation.

Person-Centered Supervision

Rogers’ Approach to Training Psychotherapists

Rogers (1957) theorized about the necessary and sufficient conditions for personality change, growth, and learning. Briefly, these conditions emphasized being congruent, exhibiting acceptance, and demonstrating empathetic understanding while relating to others (Rogers, 1957). If these conditions exist then personal growth will occur in any relationship (Rogers, 1957, 1961). He applied these principles to counseling, education, and the training of psychotherapists (Rogers, 1951, 1956, 1961). In this section, these Rogerian assumptions and
Roger presumed that all individuals have the capacity to be self-determining, self-directing, and self-actualizing (Rogers, 1961). He theorized that if students could be in charge of their education they would reach their potential. In his view, the amount learned depends on whether students experience an accepting, congruent relationship with their teachers, are given access to a number of educational resources, and are exposed to real life problems (Rogers, 1961).

Rogers applied this self-directing educational philosophy to the training of psychotherapists (Rogers, 1951, 1956). He (1961) labelled the process "student-centered teaching." His teaching style was to present his students with a number of learning opportunities and let them decide which ones they wanted to experience. Examples of experiential learning included listening to tape-recorded client sessions, role-playing counseling, viewing live therapy sessions, listening to audiotapes of counseling sessions, and counseling clients (Rogers, 1951, 1956). Rogers hoped to create a learning environment for student-counselors which would stimulate their thinking, and thus motivate them to become effective therapists (Rogers, 1961).

But Rogers (1957, 1961) recognized that merely encouraging clients and students to be self-directing was not sufficient. He believed that experiential learning needed to be facilitated, not communicated, for students to learn effective counseling skills. Consequently, he delineated six conditions that are basic for personality change in counseling and then applied them to teaching students
about counseling in the supervision relationship. They are as follows:

1. Two persons are in relationship. Significant positive personality change does not occur except in relationship to another. Supervisor-supervisee must experience psychological contact with each other (Rogers, 1957).

2. Often students are in a state of incongruence, feeling anxious or vulnerable. Rogers defines incongruence as an awareness that there is discrepancy between the actual experience of self and self-concept (Rogers, 1957). Frequently, supervisees feel vulnerable when encountering new information or a situation in which they feel incompetent. To cope, they may resist supervisory feedback because it is contrary to previous experiences and to their self-perceptions (Rogers, 1961).

3. The supervisor should be congruent or integrated while in the relationship with the student. This means that the supervisor is genuine with the student (Rogers, 1957). If supervisors openly express their feelings, attitudes, conclusions, and opinions, without imposing these viewpoints on students, then they give students permission to self-disclose. As students discuss their reactions, they become more receptive to new material and begin to discern counseling interventions that are effective (Rogers, 1956, 1961).

4. Supervisors need to offer unconditional positive regard to the students. There is an experience of a warm acceptance of the student's experience, and of caring for the student as a separate person with many feelings (Rogers, 1957). Supervisors' acceptance of students' individuality encourages them to be self-
directing and open to learning. In supervision, supervisors' unconditional positive regard forms a supportive base for supervisees dealing with the challenges of learning psychotherapy (Rogers, 1956, 1961).

5. The supervisor needs to experience an empathetic understanding of the student's circumstances and must communicate this to the student (Rogers, 1957).

6. The student must experience the supervisor's empathetic understanding and unconditional regard at least to some degree. Unless the student is aware of them such attitudes do not exist within the relationship (Rogers, 1957). If students do not experience their supervisors' empathetic understanding and unconditional regard, then conditions that will enhance learning are absent (Rogers, 1956, 1961).

The Rogerian approach to supervision centered around supervisors who were congruent, accepting, and empathetic. These qualities provided a supportive relationship that enabled supervisees to clarify their theoretical orientation and to develop their counseling skills (Rogers 1951, 1956). Rogers considered the clarification of students' attitudes and philosophies regarding therapeutic change as the first step in learning psychotherapy (1956, 1961). He believed that once supervisees understood their underlying assumptions, they could begin to examine their attitudes and behaviors in their counseling sessions. Consequently, trainees could develop their orientation to psychotherapy out of the experiences they gained through counseling others. In supervision, supervisees start to learn to differentiate between effective and ineffective responses and attitudes. Learning
how to conduct therapy results from a continuous formulating and revising of ones' counseling approaches (Rogers, 1956).

Supervisors who create a safe, secure, accepting environment for the supervisees, not only encourage exploration of the counselor role, but also model the attitudes necessary for client change (Rogers, 1961). Beginning counselors can learn about the importance of facilitative qualities (congruence, acceptance, empathetic understanding, respect) through experiencing them in their supervisory relationship.

Rogers placed a major portion of responsibility for the trainees' development on supervisors who must provide the necessary facilitative conditions for the supervisees' learning. But he also stated that it is supervisees' responsibility to engage in the process of developing their own capacity for genuineness, empathy, congruence, and understanding of clients' dynamics (Rogers, 1951). Therefore, Rogers viewed developing competency in psychotherapy as a mutual commitment and investment from both supervisors and supervisees.

**Person-Centered Supervision: Current Practices**

Although Rogers' wrote about student-centered supervision primarily in the 1950s and 1960s, his ideas are still being applied to supervision today. Now the Rogerian approach to supervision is called person-centered supervision. In person-centered supervision the psychological health of the supervisory relationship still determines whether or not supervision produces learning in the trainee
Supervisors "create an environment that will facilitate the supervisee's openness to continued growth and learning, willingness for deeper self-knowledge, and assessment of the ethics and effectiveness of his or her work" (Bowen, 1986, p. 297). When the supervisory relationship provides a safe, nonjudgmental place to explore the dynamics of counseling, supervisees increase their awareness of their impact on clients. Supervisees become more effective as they reevaluate and rethink their therapeutic interventions (Bowen, 1986; Mearns, 1991).

David Mearns (1991), whose views are similar to Rogers, identified the supervisor characteristics that enhanced the supervisory relationship: commitment to the relationship, valuing of the supervisee, congruence, and empathy. To create and maintain a positive, healthy relationship with their supervisees, supervisors must be committed to dealing with the difficulties that arise in the relationship. Research shows that one consequence of ignoring friction was that trainees did not disclose their thoughts and feelings regarding client cases (Mearns, 1991; Moskowitz and Ruppert, 1983). Mearns's (1991) supervisory theory is corroborated by Shohet's and Wilmot's (1991) conclusions which states that a problematic supervisory relationship interferes with addressing difficult client material. Instead the work of supervision becomes sidetracked. Various issues become areas of contention such as race, sex, ideology, boundaries, power, and control. If both supervisees and supervisors are committed to exploring the processes of their working together, then judgmental attitudes can be dropped and
misunderstandings corrected. Once problems are addressed the supervisory relationship is more likely to become collaborative and opportunities for learning occur (Shohet & Wilmot, 1991).

For optimum learning to transpire, supervisors must display a willingness to be open and honest with trainees. Supervisors who are congruent or self-integrated with their supervisees do not communicate contradictory messages to their trainees. Instead supervisors reveal insights, reactions, perceptions, and attitudes that are all consistent. This invites supervisees to participate in a honest, trusting relationship. Genuine supervisors permit students to courageously engage in self-awareness and work towards self-acceptance (Bowens, 1986; Mearns, 1991; Rogers, 1961).

Mearns also found that valuing was an additional prerequisite to effective supervision. He describes valuing as the absence of judging supervisees. This valuing is viewed as necessary to provide an environment for safe self-disclosure. Supervisees are encouraged to reveal those areas that they suspect they are operating ineffectively or even possibly in ways that are harmful to clients. Valuing implies total acceptance of trainees regardless of their feelings, beliefs, or behaviors. Rogers (1961) uses the term unconditional positive regard in much the same way that Mearns uses the word valuing.

Supervisor empathy is also viewed as necessary to an effective supervisory relationship. As with counselors in therapy, supervisors need to communicate that they grasp the supervisees' frame of reference (Mearns, 1991). This requires a
continuous desire to understand the students' feelings and to explore their personal meanings. Supervisors must attempt to gain a view of the trainees’ own private worlds, to share understanding. This level of empathy allows supervisees to feel accepted so that they openly examine and learn about aspects of their therapeutic style (Rogers, 1961).

Commitment, congruence, valuing, and empathy are viewed as the fundamental characteristics that allow a supervisory relationship to form in ways that foster the supervisees' understanding of the process of therapy (Mearns, 1991). Experiencing such a relationship increases the likelihood that conflicts which arise will be resolved without impeding learning. To maintain a psychologically healthy relationship, Mearns (1991) recommends taking time periodically to focus on the process of the supervisory relationship, so that learning in supervision will be maximized.

Research Supporting Learning in Person-Centered Supervision

Research findings that corroborate the Person-Centered Model of Supervision focus on two main areas: satisfying and effective supervision and supervisors' modeling. Golden (1987) used the Barrett-Lennard Relational Inventory (BLRI) developed by Barrett-Lennard to measure the modified Rogerian facilitative qualities of empathy, congruence, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness to be known. The results from her study indicated that when both supervisors and supervisees experienced regard, empathy, and congruence in their
relationship they reported satisfaction with supervision (Golden, 1987). Clinical and counseling psychologists rated their most effective supervisors high on these same qualities plus two others: unconditionality and willingness to be known (Schacht, Howe, & Berman, 1989).

Another area of research addresses the effectiveness of supervisors' modeling. Rogers (1951, 1957) theorized that supervisees experiencing empathy, congruence, and unconditional regard positive in supervision would exhibit more of these qualities with their clients. However, because some of the earlier research was of questionable quality, results were contradictory (Payne & Gralinski, 1968; Payne, Winter, & Bell, 1972; Ronnestad, 1977).

Several studies compared two forms of supervision, didactic and experiential, to assess their effectiveness in teaching empathy (Goldfarb, 1978; Karr & Geist, 1977; Payne & Gralinski, 1968, 1969; Payne et al., 1972; Karr & Geist, 1977; Ronnestad, 1977). The Didactic or technique-style of supervision was characterized by supervisors providing direct feedback or specific examples of appropriate responses. In experiential or counseling-style supervision, the supervisor attempted to establish an empathetic relationship with students by focusing on their feelings or reactions to clients. The results showed that the didactic supervision was more effective in raising the students' level of empathy towards clients (Payne & Gralinski, 1968, 1969; Payne, Weiss, & Kapp, 1972; Payne et al., 1972; Ronnestad, 1977). However, before generalizing these findings to supervision, the methodological designs must be scrutinized.
The studies cited above contain some serious methodological flaws. First of all, supervision was simulated following enacted counseling interviews (Payne & Gralinski, 1968, 1969; Payne, Weiss, & Kapp, 1972; Payne et al., 1972; Ronnestad, 1977). Payne and his co-authors recruited male undergraduates to act as counselors although they had never received any training to provide counseling. Ronnestad (1977) did improve his research design over Payne's by using graduate students enrolled in a Master's counseling program. But in both studies, supervisors were inexperienced graduate students from clinical and counseling psychology programs. Whether the results of this analogue study can be generalized to actual supervision relationships is debatable. Ronnestad (1977) warned that "caution should be exercised in generalizing from these results to actual supervision programs" (p. 199). In addition, Payne et al. (1972) concluded, "it should be noted that the training period was brief and that brevity may be a greater disadvantage for the experiential method" (p. 428).

Norman Goldfarb (1978) also produced an analogue study, but his results differed from Payne's (1968, 1969, 1972) and Ronnestad's (1977). He found clients rated supervisees more effective and empathetic when supervisors communicated empathy, genuineness, and understanding to trainees and encouraged them to explore their feelings as well as the feelings of their clients. Increased competency was also found when supervisors gave counselors examples of effective empathetic responses. These results indicate that supervisees' improvement in therapeutic skills and effectiveness may depend on supervisors' ability to establish
a positive relationship with the trainee and then to teach specific skills (Goldfarb, 1978). Once more, doubt exists as to generalizibility of these findings since the more typical supervisory conditions were not replicated in this study.

In a review of earlier research, Carkhuff (1969) confirmed Goldfarb's results (1978). He concluded that training programs emphasizing modeling and systematic teaching of interpersonal skills (empathy, respect, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, and immediacy) produce the greatest increases in the trainees' helping role and skill development (Carkhuff, 1969).

The most critical factor in training was not found to be the training programs themselves, but the supervisors' level of facilitative functioning (Carkhuff, 1969; Pierce & Schauble, 1970). In Carkhuff's (1969) review of 16 studies, trainees' improvement in their counseling skills depended on the supervisors' mastery of therapeutic skills. Similar results are reported by Pierce and Schauble (1970). Trainees supervised by individuals who demonstrated empathy, respect, genuineness, concreteness, self-disclosure, confrontation, and immediacy, were able to exhibit higher levels of these qualities with their clients. Unfortunately, supervisees with supervisors who themselves performed these skills at only minimal levels either displayed little change or deteriorated in their skills (Carkhuff, 1969; Pierce & Schauble, 1970).

The quality of a counseling trainee's early skill development appears to have lasting effects. Pierce and Schauble (1971) in a follow-up study nine months later, discovered that highly functioning trainees were able to maintain their...
counseling skills. Less skilled supervisees showed little skill improvement; however, they did increase in their ability to be concrete.

The results found by Wedeking and Scott (1976) and Karr and Geist (1977) challenge the idea that supervisors' level of empathy influenced supervisees. The findings of both studies revealed that there was no relationship between supervisors' empathy level in supervision and trainees' empathy level in therapy. Instead the work of Karr and Geist (1977) showed a relationship between the level of the supervisors' genuineness, respect, and concreteness and the degree to which supervisees exhibited these same qualities in therapy. Another interesting result was that at the end of the study trainees improved overall in their empathy, genuineness, concreteness, and respect (Karr & Geist, 1977). This indicates that the "acquisition of empathy may also be related to experiences outside of university supervision, such as agency supervisors" (Karr & Geist, 1977, p. 266).

Lambert's (1974) study may partially explained the reason for the lack of relationship between student and supervisor empathy level in the two studies above. He compared the levels of facilitative qualities supervisors used in supervision and those used in counseling. Results indicated that supervisors exhibited the same levels of genuineness and regard during supervision as they did in counseling, but they demonstrated lower levels of empathy and concreteness in supervision. Consequently, supervisees may be less affected by supervisors' empathy because supervisors' empathy was only minimally present in supervision.
Summary

This review of research reveals that there is support for Rogers' approach to supervision. Supervisors who build rapport with their supervisees and model facilitative qualities tend to be successful in teaching these skills to supervisees (Carkhuff, 1969; Goldfarb, 1978; Karr & Geist, 1977; Pierce & Schauble, 1970, 1971). Using a Rogerian approach resulted in supervisees being more satisfied with supervision and considering it to be more effective (Golden, 1987; Schacht et al., 1989). Therefore, given the positive, empirical support for Rogers' approach to supervision, his supervisory method forms the theoretical base for this study.

The gaps in the existing research have focused this study. First, although supervisors' modeling of facilitative qualities has been examined, it is still unclear whether supervisors' demonstration of these qualities in the supervisory relationship enhances the supervisee willingness to learn and receptivity to the supervisor's feedback. As yet, student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisor impact in supervision have not been studied. Another deficiency in the supervision research is that generally research has focused on supervisor characteristics as experienced by supervisees, and only a few studies have elicited the perspective of supervisors. Hence, this study measures the supervisor characteristics of empathy, congruence, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness to be known from the perspective of the supervisor, as well as of the student.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the research design of the current study, recruitment, and data collection techniques which examine the impact of supervisor characteristics on student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory impact. Also included is a discussion of the validity and reliability of the Revised Relational Inventory (RRI) (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Schacht, Howe, & Berman, 1988) and the Supervision Perception Form (SPF) (Heppner & Roehike, 1984) used in the study. Then a brief description of methods chosen for statistical analysis is presented with the limitations of the study.

Research Design

This descriptive study, approved of by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University (see Appendix A), explored whether there is an association between the relational qualities of supervisors and student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisor input. Supervisors’ relational characteristics measured by the RRI were empathetic understanding, congruence, regard, unconditionality of regard, and willingness to be known. In determining the presence of these qualities, perspectives of both supervisors and
students were considered. Therefore, supervisors were rated on their relational qualities by students and by themselves. Supervisor and student perspectives were also important when measuring student participation in supervision. Hence supervisors and trainees completed the SPF which measured student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory input.

Description of Research Procedures

Selection of Participants

Since the perceptions of both supervisors and students were to be examined, Master's students from the Counseling Education and Counseling Psychology (CECP) department at Western Michigan University who were enrolled in counseling practicum (CECP 612) and their supervisors were asked to voluntarily participate in this study. Available for this study were six practicums with a maximum of seven students in each class totaling 42 potential student participants. The six practicum instructors provided individual and group supervision.

During these 15 week practicums, students were introduced to their first counseling sessions with clients. Class time consisted of providing counseling services, presenting and discussing clinical cases, supervising, and observing other students counseling through one-way mirrors. Supervision consisted of students and practicum instructors meeting on a one to one basis depending on student need.
The total number of supervision sessions varied from 3-15 sessions.

**Data Collection**

To recruit subjects for the study, the investigator elicited the help of the practicum instructors at an introductory meeting. At the beginning of the Spring semester, these instructors informed their students of the study and indicated that the researcher would be coming into class to ask for their participation. At the beginning of the Spring semester, the researcher attended classes to ask for students' participation and asked them to sign up for the study and sign a consent form. To ensure that the supervisory pairs would correctly matched, students placed their name and the name of their supervisor on a master list. Each student was assigned a number and each supervisor a letter of the alphabet. Students were then informed that their responses would be confidential and unavailable for evaluative purposes, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

Between the eleventh and the thirteenth week of the Spring/Summer semester 1994, instrument packets were distributed to each practicum during class time. In some cases supervisors were present while students filled out the instruments, but in most cases supervisors were absent. The starting of data collection coincided with students having had a minimum of five supervisory sessions and at most thirteen supervisory sessions with the median of ten supervisory sessions. Students were informed by their instructors when the instrument packets would
be distributed. Packets were coded with the names of both student and supervisor. An "E" in the code signified that a supervisee was completing the packet and an "O" that a supervisor was completing the packet. Included in these packets were consent forms, demographic sheets, copies of the Supervisory Perception Form-Trainee (SPF-T) and the Revised Relationship Inventory (RRI). Demographic information requested included gender, age, ethnicity, Master's degree program in which students are enrolled, previous counseling experience, number of weeks involved in current practicum training, number of one to one supervisory sessions, and number of client sessions in present practicum training. The above demographic information was selected based on a similar study as well as input from supervisors in this study (Golden, 1987). In addition to the demographic form students were asked to fill out the RRI with their supervisors as the focus, and to rate themselves on the SPF-T.

Packets were either mailed to supervisors or given to them at the time that data were collected from their students. Supervisors were asked to rate themselves on the RRI, to rate their students on the Supervision Perception Form-Supervisor (SPF-S), and to complete a demographic form. The demographic information asked supervisors to provide their gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, disciplinary affiliation, whether they have had formal supervisory training, number of years supervising, number of students they have supervised, number of sessions they have worked with this student, and number of other students they are currently supervising. Supervisors supervising more than one student were
asked to complete the research instruments for each student they supervised. To avoid confusion when a supervisor had more than one supervisee, the researcher recorded a student's name on the packet that contained instruments for that specific individual.

Again, the author informed the participants that the data gathered was used in aggregate form and would not be used for evaluative purposes. Additionally, both supervisors and students were not cognizant of who agreed to participate in the study.

Protection for Participants/Confidentiality of Data

Potential discomforts were minimized by asking students and their supervisors to voluntarily participate in this study. Students' refusals to be involved in this study were not to affect supervisors' evaluation of clinical performance during the practicum. Likewise, there was to be no penalty for supervisors if they chose to not participate. To increase the comfort level of both students and supervisors in responding honestly to questions, participants were asked not to put their names on the questionnaire packets which were coded. In addition, confidentiality was emphasized and the researcher informed respondents of the procedure for protecting privacy. No names appeared on any item on which information was recorded. Questionnaires were coded, and a master list kept by the researcher which contained names of participants with corresponding code numbers. Once the data was collected and analyzed, the master list was
destroyed. All other materials will be kept locked up for five years and then destroyed.

Operational Definitions

The supervisors' relational qualities that were measured were empathetic understanding, regard, unconditionality, congruence, and willingness to be known. All these qualities but "willingness to be known" were facilitative characteristics that Rogers (1957) listed as the necessary conditions for a learning environment. Schacht, Howe, and Berman (1988) modified the Barrett-Lennard Relational Inventory (BLRI) to measure these qualities in the supervisory relationship and renamed the BLRI, Revised Relational Inventory (RRI). The RRI maintained BLRI definitions of the relational characteristics which were similar to Rogers' definitions. Barrett-Lennard's definitions of empathetic understanding corresponds to Rogers' definition of empathy; and his definition of congruence is similar to Rogers (1957). However, instead of defining and measuring unconditional positive regard, Barrett-Lennard conceptualized the separate components of regard and unconditionality. In addition, Barrett-Lennard introduced the fifth variable "willingness to be known." Below the five relational qualities from the BLRI which are used in the RRI are defined.

1. Empathetic understanding is "conceived as the extent to which one person is conscious of the immediate awareness of another" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 3). It is the active process of one person desiring to know fully the process and
content of another's awareness and communication. It is attempting to understand the deeper meaning and implications behind what is communicated outwardly (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

2. Regard is the affective reaction of one person towards another. Level of regard lies on a continuum from positive (high) and to negative (low) feelings. Feelings of high regard include the positive feelings of respect, liking, appreciation, and affection, while feelings of low regard consist of negative feelings such as dislike, impatience, and contempt (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

3. Whereas regard is the range of feelings that one person has towards another, unconditionality is the degree of constancy of these feelings. Unconditionality of regard results when individuals maintain their feelings towards another despite changes in the others' moods, attitudes, or experiences (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

4. Congruence is the degree to which one person is fully integrated while relating to another. Congruent individuals are consistent in their awareness, experience, and overt communication. They communicate honestly and directly without sending inconsistent messages or conveying hidden agendas (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

5. Willingness to be known is defined as one person's willingness to reveal oneself to another. The degree of one's self disclosure is guided by the other's receptivity to experience and to know one as a person. To be known as a person involves an exchange and a sharing of experiences, perceptions, and feelings.
regarding self, other, and the relational interaction.

Instruments

This section begins with a discussion of the Barrett-Lennard Relational Inventory since Schacht, Howe, and Berman (1989) only modified the BLRI slightly to develop the RRI used in this study. Changes to the BLRI are detailed and the RRI is described including its use as a self-rating instrument and its reliability and validity. Lastly, the SPF's development and reliability and validity are addressed.

The Barrett-Lennard Relational Inventory

The BLRI consists of five subscales measuring regard, unconditionality of regard, empathetic understanding, congruence, and willingness to be known. Initially Barrett-Lennard developed this inventory to measure the presence of Rogerian facilitative qualities in the counseling relationship. He designed it to be completed by both clients and therapists. Based on Rogerian theory, Barrett-Lennard (1962) believed that clients' experience of these facilitative qualities influenced their ability to change therapeutically. Clients' perception of these counselor characteristics resulted not only from therapists' demonstration of these attributes in counseling, but from the interaction of clients' personalities with therapists' styles. Thus, two parallel forms of the BLRI measured therapists' relational qualities from clients' and therapists' perspectives. For example, Item 1 in the
BLRI which reads, "He respects me" is answered by the client about the therapist. In the therapist's version, the first and third pronouns are reversed so item 1 becomes "I respected him."

Barrett-Lennard development of the BLRI included establishing split-half and test-retest reliabilities, and content and construct validities (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). Using a sample of 42 counseling center clients seeing 21 different therapists, Barrett-Lennard found satisfactory split-half reliabilities for all the sub-scales: level of regard, .93; empathetic understanding, .86; congruence, .89; unconventionality, .82; and willingness to be known, .82. Test-retest reliabilities using 36 college students taking a general introductory psychology class over a 4-week period were also obtained: level of regard, .84; empathetic understanding, .89; congruence, .86; unconventionality, .90; willingness to be known, .78 and total score, .95 (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

When developing the inventory, Barrett-Lennard (1962) worked to establish content validity by asking five judges, client-centered counselors with varying levels of experience, to classify each item as either "a positive or a negative indicator of the variable in question, and give a neutral rating to any item they regarded as relevant or ambiguous" (p. 6). Judges also rated each positive item on a scale from 1 to 5 and each negative item on a scale from -1 to -5 in terms of their importance as positive or negative indicators of the variable. Based on the judges’ evaluations seven items were then eliminated.

Construct validity of the BLRI was sought by Barrett-Lennard (1962)
through intercorrelations of the five subscales and correlations with other indices of therapeutic change. To discover whether the five subscales were measuring distinctive constructs, the BLRI was given to the sample of 42 clients and their therapists who both rated the therapy relationship after five counseling sessions. Product-moment correlations of the five subscales were performed on the client data and then the therapist data. Intercorrelations of the client scores showed that the five variables correlated with varying degrees to the total score. Congruence correlated the highest with the total score, .92 and unconditionality correlated the lowest with the total score at .53. The intercorrelations between the five scales varied considerably ranging from .04 correlation between willingness to learn and unconditionality to .85 correlation between empathetic understanding and congruence (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). The client scores showed unconditionality to be the most independent of the measures. Although theoretically empathetic understanding and congruence are operationally separate and distinct, here empirically they are indistinguishable. Barrett-Lennard explains this strong relationship by stating that for a person to empathically receive and understand an other's communication, it is necessary for that person to be congruent or integrated. Barrett-Lennard (1962) remarked, "Clearly the scales are measuring different things-with the possible exception of empathetic understanding and congruence-and are not, for example, merely reflecting the client's general satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the relationship" (p.13). Barrett-Lennard (1962) maintained that the five variables were related, but distinct.
Barrett-Lennard's (1962) further attempts to establish construct validity resulted in his administering the inventory to the 42 clients along with some other indices that measured therapeutic change. He wanted to correlate these measures with his relational inventory to establish construct validity. Barrett-Lennard (1962) hypothesized that since the five variables of the BLRI were theorized to measure therapeutic change, correlation with other measures of therapeutic change or adjustment would indicate the construct validity of this inventory. Barrett-Lennard's results showed that clients who reported the most therapeutic change also rated the relationship with their therapist high in levels of regard, empathetic understanding, congruence, unconditionality and willingness to be known (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). This finding offered some substantiation for the BLRI's construct validity.

Others have found validity for the BLRI. In a review of counselor rating scales, Ponterotto and Furlong (1985) cited two studies which support the predictive validity of the BLRI. Kurtz and Grummon (1972) found client-perceived empathy (only the empathy scale was used) to be correlated with various measures of psychotherapy outcome. Gross and DeRidder (1966) also discovered that clients experiencing therapists' empathy, regard, unconditionality, congruence, and willingness to be known made greater gains in counseling (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985, p. 607). Although more validity data on the BLRI is needed, a major strength of the BLRI is its widespread use for research in clinical settings. Between 1974 and 1984 BLRI was cited in 45 published studies (Ponterotto &
Besides examining the facilitative characteristics of therapists, the BLRI also has been used to assess supervisors' relational qualities in the supervisory relationship (Golden, 1987; Handley, 1982; Lemons & Lanning, 1979; Schacht et al., 1989). Instead of using the BLRI, Schacht, Howe, and Berman (1988) modified the BLRI to use with supervisory pairs. One modification was a small change in the wording of the items, using an "M" to signify the supervisor who had contributed the most to professionals therapeutic effectiveness and a "L" to signify the supervisor who had contributed the least. For example item #1 on the RRI read, "M. respected me" or "L. respected me." In this study the original wording of the BLRI items was used since the researcher was not investigating supervisors who contributed most and least to the therapeutic effectiveness of supervisees. The only alteration made was inserting feminine pronouns since two of the supervisors were female. For example item (1) "He respected me" was changed to "He/She respected me." Another revision that Schacht et al. (1989) made to the BLRI was reducing the items from 92 to 40 while maintaining the integrity of the five subscales: (1) Regard, (2) Unconditionality, (3) Empathetic Understanding, (4) Congruence, and (5) Willingness to be Known. This is substantiated by the reliability and validity of the RRI.

The reliability of the RRI is .92 which is comparable to other modified ver-
sions of the BLRI (Schacht et al., 1989). Reliabilities of two other revised BLRIs are .95 (Dalton, 1983) and .93 (Wiebe & Pierce, 1973). The subscales continued to be moderately correlated, ranging from .17-58, which indicates the ability of the instrument to measure different constructs. These findings are consistent with Barrett-Lennard’s theory regarding the relationship of the variables.

Schacht et al. (1988) addressed the construct validity of the shortened BLRI by performing a factor analysis on the five subscales. Congruence showed the strongest loading as the principle factor, correlating .85-.87. This is consistent with Barrett-Lennard’s theory that Congruence is the precondition and limiting variable for the other facilitative conditions. The second highest loading was on the Empathetic Understanding scale, followed by Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. "These findings are consistent with other research finding one principle factor on which regard, empathy, and congruence load most heavily" (Schacht et al., 1989, p. 704).

Since the RRI is a shortened version of the BLRI, scoring is the same. Depending on the wording of each item, scoring occurs in either a positive or negative direction. Responses are in six gradations: (1) I strongly feel it is not true; (2) I feel it is not true; (3) I feel it is probably untrue; more untrue than true; (4) I feel it is probably true; more true than untrue; (5) I feel it is true; and (6) I strongly feel it is true. Items within each subscale were worded in both positive or negative directions and recoded so that high scores correspond to high levels of facilitative conditions (Schacht et al., 1988). The highest possible score
for Empathetic Understanding, Regard, and Congruence is 60 since there are ten items for each subscale; and the highest possible score for Willingness to be Known and Unconditionality is 30 since there are five items for each of these subscales.

In this study, the Schacht et al. (1988) shortened version of the BLRI was used to assess the facilitative qualities of the supervisor from two perspectives: (1) supervisors rating themselves on the five facilitative qualities, as well as (2) students rating supervisors on these relational qualities. In past research, the BLRI has been used to assess the supervisory relationship from supervisors and supervisees reporting their experience of the others' facilitative qualities (Golden, 1987; Handley, 1982; Lemons & Lanning, 1979; Schacht et al., 1989). The BLRI has seldom been used as a self-rating instrument for the supervisor solely. Hence, a case was made for using the RRI or modified BLRI in this manner.

Barrett-Lennard originally designed the BLRI to be a self-rating inventory for therapists to rate themselves on the subscales of Empathetic Understanding, Regard, Congruence, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. Whereas clients' experience of therapists' facilitative characteristics in the counseling relationship was crucial for therapeutic change, Barrett-Lennard viewed the counseling relationship as interactive. His intention was to compare the clients' perspectives of their counseling relationships with therapists' perceptions of their demonstration of facilitative conditions with clients. Handley (1982) also considered the supervisory relationship to be interactive. Accordingly, he administered a
modified version of the BLRI to supervisory pairs to measure supervisors' responses to their supervisees. Supervisees evaluated supervisors and supervisors rated themselves on their ability to be empathetic, congruent, and treat students with regard (Handley, 1982). Handley (1983) used the revised BLRI to measure perceptions of the supervisory relationship and found a possible interaction between similarity of supervisor-student cognitive styles to mutual perceptions of the supervisory interpersonal relationship.

In the current investigation, the supervisory relationship is also assumed to be interactive. Therefore the Schacht et al. (1988) modified version of the BLRI is used to measure supervisors' facilitative characteristics from the students' perspective as well as supervisors' perception of themselves.

Supervision Perception Form

The other instrument used in this study is Heppner and Roehlke's (1984) Supervision Perception Form (SPF) initially developed to examine the interpersonal influence process in supervision. The SPF consists of two subscales measuring students' Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact. Heppner and Roehlke (1984) developed two forms of the SPF: a trainee form (SPF-T) examining the trainee's self-perceptions and a supervisor form (SPF-S) measuring the supervisors' perceptions of the trainees. For example, item 3 on the SPF-T reads "I was open and willing to change" and on the SPF-S "My supervisee was open and willing to change." Trainees or supervisors rate each item by selecting: (1)
Strongly Disagree, (2) Moderately Disagree, (3) Slightly Disagree, (4) Slightly Agree, (5) Moderately Agree, or (6) Strongly Agree.

The Willingness to Learn subscale on the SPF-T consists of 10 questions which measure the trainees' perceptions of how willing they were to learn from their supervisors (e.g. willingness to change in supervisory sessions, receptivity to positive critiques and suggestions from the supervisor). The other subscale on the SPF-T, Supervisory Impact, includes 14 questions that assess the trainees' perceptions of the supervisors' impact on a range of counseling skills (e.g. diagnostic and assessment abilities, trying new counseling techniques, case management abilities, case conceptualizations).

The SPF-S consists of 24 questions that parallel the 24 of the SPF-T. The SPF-S was designed to assess the supervisors' perceptions of the trainees' willingness to learn and of their impact on trainee's counseling skills. In both forms of the SPF, the high scores indicate positive perceptions of supervisory impact and willingness to learn. The highest possible scores are 84 for supervisory impact and 60 for willingness to learn.

Heppner and Roehlke (1984) report no reliability or validity data for the SPF. However, reliability data has been reported more recently. Swanson and O'Saben's (1993) study which examined differences in the supervisory needs of students reported, "Internal consistency reliability coefficients in this sample were Supervisory Impact, .84; Willingness to learn, .73" (p. 458).
Data Analysis

Pearson moment correlations were performed to examine the associations between supervisor characteristics of Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Conditionality, Level of Regard, and Willingness to be Known, and students' receptivity to feedback from their supervisors and student Willingness to Learn.

Multiple regression analysis was then conducted to discover if supervisor characteristics would be predictive of student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisors' input. In addition, reliabilities were found for the subscales of all instrumentation used; and means, ranges, percentiles, frequencies; and standard deviations were used to analyze the sample's demographic information.

Pearson Moment Correlations

Pearson moment correlations was chosen for statistical analysis to examine the relationships between the variables. This statistical analysis was selected because it is a summary measure of the direction and degree of the linear relationship between two variables. Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Level of Regard, and Willingness to be Known were individually correlated with students' receptivity to Supervisory Impact and subsequently correlated with students' Willingness to Learn. Since there was no manipulation of variables, direction and degree of the linear relationship were explored, not causality. In order to use the Pearson moment correlations the data met the assumption that
the data consist of independent observations with bivariate normal distributions. The analysis was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After data collection, scores from the BLRI and the SPF were entered into a computer for analysis by the SPSS statistical package. Once the subscales on both instruments were computed, then correlations were performed.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

Once Pearson moment correlations were calculated, multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to discover whether the independent variables of supervisors' Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known were predictive of the dependent variables of students' Willingness to learn and receptivity to feedback. Once again, no causal interpretations could be concluded, but regression analysis did give some indications as to which five supervisory characteristics could predict student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory feedback. In other words, regression analysis gives the percentage of variability explained in the dependent variables (students' Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact) by the independent variables (the five supervisory characteristics). When it was determined which supervisory characteristics were predictive of student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory impact, then another regression analysis was performed using only supervisor characteristics with significant predictability to discover if this predictability was maintained. These multiple regressions were
reanalyzed using the colinearity checks of Tolerance and Variance Independent Factors (VIF) which would indicate whether the predictive variability was due to the supervisor qualities.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Finally, summary information describing the sample was also obtained using the SPSS program. Means, ranges, and percentages in the sample were tabulated regarding age, gender, ethnicity, disciplinary affiliation, and educational level. The percentage of students with previous training and experience was calculated along with the means of one to one supervisory sessions, of client sessions and of practicum weeks. For supervisors, means were calculated to summarize the supervisor’s previous experience in terms of number of years providing supervision, number of trainees supervised, and number of supervision sessions completed during the semester in which the investigation took place.

**Limitations**

A limitation in this study involved the small size of the sample of supervisors (seven) and the generalizability of the sample. The student sample used in this study was representative of Master’s level students completing their Master’s in counseling at Western Michigan University during the Spring/Summer semester in 1994. Therefore, any generalizations or conclusions from this study need to be made with caution. A second limitation was that this study described
student and supervisor perspectives. Hence causality can not be interpreted. Lastly this study examines only student engagement in supervision, not actual learning. To measure student learning, Borders (1989) proposes that actual client outcomes be evaluated, which was not done in this study.

Although the SPF is a relatively new instrument compared to the BLRI which was developed in 1969, it is quite promising and has been used in two significant studies (Heppner and Roehlke, 1984: Swanson and O'Saben, 1993). Therefore, although there is indication of reliability, little work as been attempted on its validity.

Summary

This descriptive study examined whether facilitative supervisor qualities were associated with student willingness to learn and supervisory impact. Since the researcher viewed the supervisory relationship as an interactive process, student and supervisor perspectives of these supervisor characteristics were investigated. The total number of participants was 40 Master's-level students enrolled in the CECP 604 practicum at Western Michigan University and their seven supervisors. Using the RRI, students rated their supervisors on Empathetic Understanding, Regard, Congruence, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. They also evaluated their Willingness to Learn and the Supervisory Impact on the SPF-T. Then supervisors rate their facilitative qualities on the RRI and their supervisees on the SPF-T.
Pearson moment correlations were conducted to discover if supervisor qualities were significantly associated with student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory impact. Next multiple regression analysis were performed to discover if any of these supervisor qualities were predictive of student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervision.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Sample

Data was collected from 40 Master's level students enrolled in the Counseling Education and Counseling Psychology (CECP) practicum course 612 at Western Michigan University and their seven supervisors. Each of the six classes had a limit of seven students, so there was a possibility of 42 students participating in the study. One student elected to not fill out the forms and one other only partially completed the questionnaires, so these forms were eliminated from the sample. Still the return rate was exceptionally high at 95%. In the practicum, each student participated in individual supervision with the course instructor or a doctoral graduate assistant. Instructors supervised seven students, with the exception of one who supervised three students because a doctoral student supervised the remaining four. Supervisors suggested that the research be conducted during the twelfth or thirteenth week of the semester to provide them enough time to develop a relationship with students, to give them ample opportunities to observe students counseling, and to give students time to have had several client sessions. Therefore, the data was collected during the twelfth and thirteenth week, allowing students to have had median of ten sessions individual supervisory
sessions and a median of eleven client sessions.

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there was an association between levels of supervisors' relational qualities of empathy, regard, congruence, unconditionality, and willingness to be known as measured by the RRI and levels of trainees' receptivity to supervision and willingness to learn as measured by the SPF. Thus supervisors' characteristics were correlated with supervisory impact and willingness to learn.

Demographic information collected from students and supervisors included gender, age, ethnicity, disciplinary affiliation, educational level, and number of weeks in supervision (see Table 1). The majority of students were females numbering 28 or 70% of the sample in comparison to 12 males or 30%. Five out of the 7 supervisors (71%) were male. Students' and supervisors' average ages were fairly close numerically with the former average age at 35 years, with a range of 22 to 55 years, and the latter at 39 years, with a range of 27-55 years. The ethnicity of both the supervisee and supervisor groups was also similar with 38 students and six supervisors describing themselves as caucasian. There was one Hispanic student, one Malaysian student, and one British Black supervisor.

The disciplinary affiliation for 85% of the students was counseling psychology and for 71.5% of supervisors was primarily counseling and clinical psychology. Students were enrolled in CECP 612 to meet a course requirement for a Master's program: 34 students were working towards completing Master's degrees of counseling psychology, and the rest of the students were completing Master's degrees
## Table 1
Demographic Information for Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisees N=40</th>
<th>Supervisors N=7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>22-55</td>
<td>27-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>28 (70%)</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>12 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>38 (95%)</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>34 (85%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Education</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agency</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Current Supervisory Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Client Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>40 (enrolled) (100%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Supervisees N=40</th>
<th>Supervisors N=7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Counseling for 10 Experienced Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Supervisory Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the following areas: counselor education, education, community agency, and school counseling. All of the supervisors identified themselves as psychologists, but only four have doctoral degrees. These supervisors were more experienced supervising with an average of 6.4 years supervising. The remaining three supervisors have master's degrees and were currently working towards completion of their doctoral degrees in either counseling psychology or counselor education. These master-level supervisors were more inexperienced with 2.3 years supervising. Since about half of the supervisors were doctoral students and were less experienced this might have affected supervisor perceptions of what specific characteristics influence student's willingness to learn and engagement in supervision.

The majority (75%) of students had no prior experience counseling clients professionally and only 40% of them had any previous training. Training included
employment and volunteer experiences, bachelor degrees in counseling or psychology, and workshops. The length of the training for these 16 students averaged 2.8 years and ranged from several weeks of training to ten years working in the mental health field (see Table 2). But one-fourth of the students had counseled previously for a median of four years which may have influenced the student perspective. More experienced students maybe more autonomous and more difficult to engage in the supervisory process.

The number of supervisory and client sessions may have also affected the supervisory relationship. Students and supervisors who met frequently would have an opportunity to establish more rapport and establish a working alliance. They

Table 2
Supervisees' Previous Training in Psychological Counseling and Previous Experience Counseling Professionally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych.Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also would have had more opportunities to develop conflicts or become aware of differences which could impede or enhance the supervisory relationship. The focus of supervision and potential the relationship is also influenced by the number of counseling sessions a student has conducted. Those students with only a couple of sessions are still in the initial stages of establishing a therapeutic alliance and assessing the intrapsychic and interpersonal dynamics of the clients. They may need reassurance and empathetic understanding to calm their anxieties so they can listen to the client. Those students having had five and six client sessions are entering the middle stage of therapy and may need assistance in developing specific interventions targeted at making psychological change. Supervisors might be more directive, giving student feedback and suggestions. Therefore students may need their supervisors to be more self-disclosing about their counseling experiences.

Reliabilities of RRI and SPF

The internal consistency reliability coefficients of the RRI calculated on this sample of students and supervisors varied somewhat from the previously reported coefficients of the RRI's internal consistency. Schacht et al. (1988) obtained RRI's Cronbach's alphas of internal consistencies which were compared to the internal consistencies on this sample. Reliabilities of this sample were as following: (a) regard was .73 compared to .85 (Schacht et al., 1988), (b) Empathy was .81 compared to .77 (Schacht et al., 1988), (c) Congruence was .78 compared
to .77 (Schacht et al., 1988), (d) Unconditionality was .74 compared to .82 (Schacht et al., 1988), and (e) Willingness to be Known was .60 compared to .72 (Schacht et al., 1988). Overall the reliabilities tended to be lower in this sample of students, but most were over .70 with the exception being the reliability of the Willingness to Learn (WTL) scale (see Table 3).

The reliabilities of SPF-T, found in previous studies, were similar to the reliabilities of SPF-T in this study. Swanson and O'Saben (1993) reported reliabilities of the Supervisory Impact (SI) scale as .84 and the WTL scale as .73 which corresponded to .87 reliability on SI and .74 on WTL in this trainee sample (see Table 4). Reliabilities of the SPF-S were higher with .94 for SI and .93 for WTL. Since reliabilities of RRI and SPF were fairly high, the reliability of this study's results can be reported with confidence.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Trainees Alpha</th>
<th>Supervisors Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4

Reliability of the Supervision Perception Form (SPF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Trainees (SPF-T)</th>
<th>Supervisors (SPF-S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis One

In hypothesis one, it was predicated that supervisor perceptions of student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervision would be directly related to supervisors' self-rating of their Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. Overall these supervisor characteristics were positively correlated with supervisors' rating of student Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact, ranging from .54-.85 (see Table 5) at .01 significance.

According to supervisors, their Regard correlated strongly with student Willingness to Learn from supervision with a correlation of .85. Congruence, Empathetic Understanding, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known correlated with Willingness to Learn at .80, .63, .62, and .54 respectively as seen in Table 5. These supervisor characteristics were significantly correlated with Willingness to Learn since all were above .40 which was the critical value of R for
Table 5
Summary of Pearson-Product Moment Correlations Between Trainees’ Supervisory Impact/Willingness to Learn and Five Supervisors’ Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Trainees’ Perspective</th>
<th>Supervisors’ Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R_1</td>
<td>R2_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known Supervisory Impact</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known Willingness to Learn</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = product-moment correlational coefficient
Critical Value of R = .40
P < .01
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rejecting the null hypothesis (Hopkins, Glass, & Hopkins, 1987). These coefficients were interpreted by squaring the correlation coefficient, R, which "shows the proportion of variance in one variable that can be attributed to its linear relationship with the other variable" (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavih, 1979, p. 309). For example, .85 squared or .72 of the variation of Willingness to Learn can be attributed to the tendency of Willingness to Learn to vary linearly with Regard. Table 5 shows the remaining correlation coefficients squared which range from .29-.64. The correlation coefficients squared of Congruence, Empathetic Understanding, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known were .64, .40, .38, and .29 respectively. Therefore based on the Pearson moment correlations, part of hypothesis one was accepted by the researcher. Data were further analyzed to determine if any of these supervisor characteristics could predict Willingness to Learn (see Table 6). Multiple regression analysis substantiated that Regard was positively

Table 6

Multiple Regression of Supervisors' Perception of Trainees' Willingness to Learn and Supervisors' Self-Rating of Regard and Congruence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R square=.75
related to Willingness to Learn. The residual plot, determined to be normally distributed with constant variance, indicates the fit of $R^2$ or .75. Hence 75% of the variance of supervisor perspectives of student Willingness to Learn was accounted by supervisors' view of their Regard.

SPF-S measuring Supervisory Impact (SI), supervisor perceptions of their impact on student counseling skills (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984), was the most highly associated with supervisor Regard and Congruence. As shown in Table 5 the Pearson product moment coefficient, $R$, for Regard and Supervisory Impact was .74 and .78 for Congruence and Supervisory Impact. Empathetic Understanding correlated with SI at .66 which was the third highest level and Unconditionality and Willingness to be Known were associated with SI at coefficients .59 and .57. Again the critical $R$ value was .40, so all the supervisors' characteristics were significantly, positively correlated with SI. A multiple regression analysis added support to the relationship between Supervisory Impact and the two independent variables of Congruence and Empathetic Understanding since these variables were significantly weighted to predicate Supervisory Impact as shown in Table 7. A residual plot revealed a normal distribution with a mean of zero and a constant variance. The fit of the regressive model was determined by $R^2$ or .65 which means that 65% of the variance in SI was explained by the independent variables of Congruence and Empathetic Understanding. Empathetic Understanding and Congruence were directly related to trainees' receptivity to supervision and predicated 65% of the variability of Supervisory Impact. Based on the
Table 7
Multiple Regression of Supervisors' Perception of Trainees' Receptivity to Supervisory Impact and Supervisors' Self-Rating of Empathy and Congruence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R square=.65

above data, the investigator decided to accept hypothesis one.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two predicted that students' self-rating of their Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact would be directly related to their perceptions of their supervisors' Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. Although all Pearson product moment coefficients were not as strongly positive as the correlations found from supervisors' perspectives, these coefficients still were in the positive direction, ranging from .36 to .66.

Willingness to Learn had larger positive correlations with supervisor characteristics ranging from .43-.66 than Supervisory Impact. Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known were the highest correlations with coefficients
of .66 and .58 as shown in Table 5. Interpreted this means that 43% of the variance of Empathetic Understanding and 33% of the variance of Willingness to be Known have a tendency to change linearly with Willingness to Learn. As seen in Table 8, multiple regression analysis supported the relationship of Willingness to Learn and supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known. The fit of the regression model was .58 meaning that 58% of the variability of student Willingness to Learn from supervision was explained by supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known. Although the remaining supervisory characteristics of Regard, Congruence, and Unconditionality had a lower positive association with Willingness to Learn ranging from .43-.57 (see Table 5), they were significantly related since the critical value of R was .40 (Hopkins et al., 1987).

Trainees also viewed supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known as having a significant impact on their own Willingness to Learn from supervision. Multiple regression analysis revealed that 58% of the variability of student Willingness to Learn was explained by supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known. The table below shows the results of the regression analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R squared = .58

This indicates a strong positive relationship between supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known and trainees' Willingness to Learn from supervision.
to be Known to be the most correlated with Supervisory Impact with .55 and .42 correlation coefficients. Unconditionality was a close third at .41 with Regard and Congruence correlating with SI at .37 and .36 (see Table 5). Hence from the trainees' perspective only Empathetic Understanding, Willingness to be Known, and Unconditionality were significantly correlated with SI. Regard and Congruence were rejected as significantly correlated since they were below .40, the critical R value. Again a multiple regression analysis was conducted to verify the relationship between Supervisory Impact and the five facilitative supervisor characteristics. Willingness to be Known was the only significantly weighted supervisory characteristic on SI and the fit of the regression model as determined by R square was 33% meaning that 33% of the variance of SI was accounted for by supervisors' Willingness to be Known (see Table 9). At first glance this might be interpreted as low, but with all the variables that potentially could influence

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Supervisory Impact t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared=.33
supervisory impact, one-third accounted by supervisors' Willingness to be Known was quite high. Therefore, given the Pearson moment correlations a positive relationship was found for Willingness to Learn and the five supervisor characteristics; and Supervisory Impact was positively associated with Empathetic Understanding, Willingness to be Known, and Unconditionality.

Differences Between Students and Supervisors

Examining the perspectives of both students and supervisors indicated differences and similarities of views regarding supervisor characteristics in relation to Supervisory Impact and Willingness to Learn. Students indicated that supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known influenced their Willingness to Learn from supervision and supervisor impact on their learning a range of counseling skills. Similarly supervisors indicated that their empathy influenced student counseling skills, but their Willingness to be Known correlated at only .59 with Supervisory Impact. When a multiple regression was conducted, Willingness to be Known was not weighted significantly on Supervisory Impact. Instead, supervisors perceived Congruence to influence Supervisory Impact more. Supervisors also perceived that their Regard for the student influenced trainee Willingness to Learn from supervision. Students disagreed, placing the emphasis instead on supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known.

If students considered supervisor Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known important to Willingness to Learning in supervision, do
students experience these supervisory qualities and do supervisors demonstrate these characteristics? As shown in Table 10, t-tests comparing these two qualities indicated some significant differences between trainees' and supervisors' ratings. Students rated supervisor's Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be

Table 10
Comparison of Trainees' Rating of Supervisors' Facilitative Qualities and Supervisors' Self-Rating of Their Facilitative Qualities Using t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Qualities</th>
<th>Trainees' Rating</th>
<th>Supervisors' Self-Rating</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>2.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>-.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P< .01
**P< .04
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Known differently from supervisors at an .04 and an .01 significant level. This was important to note since students rated Willingness to be Known as predictors of Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact, and Empathetic Understanding as a predictor of Willingness to Learn. Students and supervisors also rated supervisors' Unconditionality differently at a .01 significant level (see Table 10). No significant differences were found in students' and supervisors' perceptions of supervisory Regard and Congruence which supervisors' viewed as important to students' Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact.

Since students and supervisors differed on their experience of supervisor qualities, the question was then asked if there were differences in trainee and supervisor perceptions of student receptivity to Supervisory Impact and Willingness to Learn. From the results of the two t-tests performed, the answer was yes. Significant differences were found between trainees' and supervisors' ratings of students' Willingness to Learn and being influenced by Supervisory Impact (see Table 11).
Table 11
Comparison of Trainees' Self Rating of Their Receptivity to Supervisory Impact and Willingness to Learn and Supervisor Rating of Trainees' Receptivity to Supervisory Impact and Trainees' Willingness to Learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trainees' Self-Rating</th>
<th>Supervisors' Rating</th>
<th>t-tests</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .000
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter briefly summarizes the study and its findings. Conclusions and implications of the study are discussed, and recommendations for further research and application are made.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the five supervisor characteristics of Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known; and student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. A total of 40 Master's students at Western Michigan University enrolled in CECP 612 and their seven supervisors participated in the study during the 1994 Spring and Summer sessions. Supervisors suggested that the study be conducted during the twelfth or thirteenth week, so that students would be likely to have had several counseling and individual supervisory sessions, thus giving both supervisors and students an opportunity to relate and interact with each other. Near the end of the counseling practicum, the researcher distributed to both supervisors and students a demographic form, the Revised Relational Inventory (RRI) and the trainee and supervisor versions of Supervision Perception Form (SPF). Data were collected and scored on the five
subscales of the RRI (Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known) and the two subscales of the SPF (Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact). Supervisors rated themselves on the facilitative characteristics of Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known and then rated their students on Willingness to Learn (WTL) and receptivity to Supervisory Impact (SI). Students also evaluated supervisors on these five facilitative supervisor characteristics, themselves on their Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. Each facilitative supervisor characteristic was correlated to Supervisory Impact and then Willingness to Learn using Pearson moment correlations.

Summary of the Findings

Hypothesis one stated that according to supervisors there would be a direct relationship between their facilitative qualities of Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Regard, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known and student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. The five supervisor characteristics correlated in a positive direction with supervisor perceptions of their students' Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. Therefore, hypothesis one was accepted since all the correlation were above the crucial R value of .4.

Hypothesis two examined student perceptions of these five facilitative supervisor qualities in relation to their self-rating of Willingness to Learn and
receptivity to supervision. All correlations of supervisor qualities and Willingness to Learn were in a positive direction and all above .4, the crucial value of R, so hypothesis one was accepted. Supervisory Impact was also positively associated (above .4) with the Empathetic Understanding, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known. Trainees' ratings of Regard and Congruence in relation to Supervisory Impact were .37 and .36 respectively, so only parts A, D, and E of hypothesis two were accepted.

Then multiple regressions were conducted to discover if any of the facilitative supervisor qualities could predict Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact. These analyses did yield a predictive relationship between four of the supervisor characteristics and student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. However, the perspectives of supervisors and students differed somewhat on the importance of specific supervisor characteristics. According to students, supervisor Willingness to be Known was a predictor of student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. Empathetic Understanding was also a predictor of Willingness to Learn. Instead of Empathetic Understanding and Willingness to be Known, supervisors thought that their Regard for students influenced student Willingness to Learn. Supervisors rated Empathetic Understanding and Congruence as predicting Supervisory Impact whereas students believed that supervisor Willingness to be Known enhanced their receptivity to Supervisory Impact.
Conclusions and Implications

Supervisor Characteristics

Given the supervision literature, it was not surprising that supervisor personality characteristics of Regard, Congruence, Empathy, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be Known were related to student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. Theorists believed that supervisor acceptance of, respect for, trust in, and care for supervisees were vital in creating a supportive, learning environment for them (Blocher, 1983; Bordin, 1983; Loganbill et al., 1982). They viewed the supervisory relationship as pivotal for students to engage in the learning process. This study also provides further support for Rogers' (1951, 1961) theory that supervisor empathy, congruence, unconditional positive regard created a relationship in which students were free to explore, clarify, and integrate their personal approaches to counseling. Students such as the majority of ones in this study, beginning counseling for the first time, are vulnerable and tentative. At this point they have invested their time and money in completing counseling courses, but have yet to prove that they have the qualities to be an effective counselor. Meanwhile they were awkwardly applying new counseling skills, and were experiencing anxiety regarding their supervisors' opinion of their work. If the supervisor does not focus on building a supportive, trusting relationship with students, supervision was likely to be ineffectual. According to Rogers (1951, 1961), supervisors, like therapists, needed to establish relationships in
which students experienced supervisors as genuine and having unconditional regard and empathy for them. This type of relationship allowed students to honestly disclose their struggles, feelings, and thoughts regarding the therapeutic process which assisted them in clarifying and developing a genuine counseling approach. The results of this study underscored the value of these Rogerian qualities as both supervisors and students associated a majority of the supervisor qualities with the student engagement and receptivity to the supervisory process. Thus, the value of the supervisory relationship and its impact on learning acknowledged by Rogers (1951) and then later by Mearns (1991) was supported by the results of this research.

Previous investigations examined supervisor qualities that students preferred or believed contributed to effective supervision such as understanding, accepting, trusting, supporting, and respecting them (Hutt, Scott, King, 1983; Kennard, Steward, and Gluck, 1987; Miller & Oetting, 1966; Nelson, 1978). Other preferred supervisor characteristics that students listed were flexibility, perceptivity, warmth and being self-disclosing, non-threatening, non-authoritarian, reassuring, and possessing a sense of humor (Galante, 1985; Hutt et al., 1983; Miller & Oetting, 1966; Nelson, 1978). Examination of these supervisor characteristics reveal similarity to characteristics investigated in this study. For example, understanding is similar to empathetic understanding since there is an attempt to know the thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of others. Self-revealing corresponds to willingness to be known, since both indicate self-disclosing to another person.
Given the overlap and similarities in meaning with other descriptors of preferred supervisor qualities, the facilitative supervisor characteristics investigated in this study added support to previous studies.

Although this study centered on the importance of specific supervisor characteristics in the supervisory process, generalizations to other populations need to be made with caution. Further studies might include random sampling of Master's students in the area or nationwide. However, no study prior to this had directly related these specific facilitative supervisor characteristics to student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory impact. Therefore this study was a beginning to a deeper understanding of supervisor characteristics necessary for effective supervision.

The researcher accepted only parts of hypothesis two. Regard and congruence did not strongly correlate with Supervisory Impact for the trainees. Several reasons might provide an explanation. The correlations of Regard and Supervisory Impact, and Congruence and Supervisory Impact showed a slight difference from the other correlations (.05 and .06). This small variation could be due to misreading or answering the questions incorrectly. One supervisor commented, "Some questions were difficult to know which side to respond to such as RRI # 2." Statement #2 reads, "He/She understood my words but not the way I felt." He continues, "What if you understood the words and the way the supervisee felt. Does a not true answer mean I did not understand words?" When the researcher reread the statement it seemed to be clear to her, but it may have caused others...
confusion as well. The lack of correlation of Regard and Congruence to Supervisory Impact may also be linked to student preferences. Student receptivity to feedback might depend on supervisor openness to sharing thoughts and feelings instead of students feeling liked by supervisors or being highly regarded. One-quarter of the sample consisted of experienced students who may not need supervisors' regard and congruence as much as novice counselors. In addition, when supervisors are willing to be known, students may already feel respected or highly regarded. The same would be true for experiencing the supervisor as genuine or congruent. Supervisors discussing their opinions and feelings probably communicate genuineness and meets students' deeper need for modelling appropriate disclosure about clinical experiences. The result might be that students feel less intimidated and judged by their supervisors, so they were more receptive to feedback about diagnosis, counseling techniques, and case management.

Supervisors perceived that all five characteristics were associated positively with Supervisory Impact. Apparently supervisors in this study valued Regard, Empathetic Understanding, Congruence, Unconditionality, and Willingness to be known and viewed these qualities as important to student receptivity to supervisory input. The two highest correlations with Supervisory Impact were Regard and Congruence which were the lowest for students. The implication is that supervisors are working towards caring about their students and being genuine while students are wanting their supervisors to be more empathetic and self-disclosing. Supervisors did rated Empathetic Understanding as a predictor of
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Supervisory Impact. Supervisor Empathetic Understanding, the supervisors' active process of desiring to fully understand the process and content of student perceptions and communications, was viewed as influencing Supervisory Impact. Supervisors believed that students would be more receptive to supervision if supervisors attempted to understand students' thoughts and feelings. This result was supported by other studies which found supervisors' empathy influenced satisfaction from supervision, effectiveness of supervision, and trainee skill development (Carkhuff, 1969; Golden, 1987; Pierce & Schauble, 1970, 1971; Schacht, Howe, & Berman, 1989).

Supervisee Willingness to Learn and Supervisory Impact

Since student engagement in the learning process is the first step towards effective supervision, differences in supervisor and trainee perspectives of characteristics predicating Supervisory Impact and student Willingness to Learn need to be noted. Students, unlike their supervisors, rate supervisor Willingness to be Known as predictive of student Willingness to Learn and receptivity to Supervisory Impact. Supervisors might find that they engage and influence the student more if they are willing to be known. Willing to be known means self-disclosing experiences, feelings and perceptions of themselves, the student and their relationship. For some supervisors this may seem inappropriate or risky, but if the self-disclosing is done respectfully and sensitively there might be more open communication with supervisees. Supervisors revealing their thoughts and feelings about
their successes and struggles with clients may assist supervisees in understanding the complex nature of counseling. Additionally, supervisors are willing to be known may encourage supervisees to discuss honestly their difficulties with clients, to explore personal issues that interfere with counseling, and to address directly conflicts that surface in the supervisory relationship. The effects of interacting more honestly in supervision finds support in Lemons and Lanning’s study (1979) which concludes that effective communication increases satisfaction in the supervisory relationship for both supervisors and supervisees.

Dissimilar perceptions of supervisor and student experiences of supervision implies that both may evaluate supervision differently. If supervisors, like those in this study, believe that their empathetic understanding for students and congruence is crucial for student receptivity to supervision then that will be their focus. According to student reports, supervisor willingness to be known influenced student receptivity to feedback. In other words, from the students’ perspective, supervisors have missed the mark. Supervisors may also misperceive how to engage student willingness to learn. According to this study’s data, supervisors believe that communicating high regard for students enhances their willingness to learn. Instead, students prefer empathetic understanding and willingness to be known from their supervisors.

Not only did students desire supervisor willingness to be known, but they experienced this quality differently from supervisors. Students rated supervisors lower on willingness to be known than supervisors did. On the one supervisory
quality that students believed facilitated their receptivity to supervisory impact and willingness to learn, supervisors and students differed. Supervisors viewed themselves as more self-revealing than students experienced. An impasse in the supervisory relationship could surface based on this one misperception alone.

Supervisors and students also perceived student willingness to learn and receptivity to supervisory feedback differently. Students rated themselves higher on Supervisory Impact and supervisors rated students higher on Willingness to Learn. Students viewed themselves as more receptive to supervisory feedback regarding therapeutic impasses, assessment, counseling techniques, case management, and intervention strategies than their supervisor thought. And supervisors experienced students as open to change, using supervision well, and having personality characteristics of an effective counselor more than students did.

These differences in student and supervisor perspectives suggest that supervisors need to discuss their perceptions with students. Discussing candidly the supervisory relationship assists supervisors in determining what specifically students need to engage in the learning process. A honest discussion might reveal to supervisors that students desire to know supervisors' struggles and successes with counseling. Students may also want more discussion about supervisors' experience of them, the supervisory relationships, and their experience of supervisors. Additionally, students could voice their need for more direct feedback from supervisors. It is also important for students to give supervisors feedback about their experience of supervision, telling supervisors what they want from
supervision. Supervisors and students being honest with each other about their relationship requires risk and both may feel vulnerable, but the benefits are a richer learning experience. As supervisors model a willingness to be known, students experience a deeper level of relating and are more likely to initiate disclosing with their clients.

Further Research and Application

Much of the literature on supervision emphasizes the development of counselors' identities, mentioning the supervisory relationship only briefly if at all (Hogan, 1964; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Reising & Daniel, 1986; Skovolt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Wiley & Ray, 1986; Worthington, 1984). Holloway's (1987) critique of the supervisory literature suggests student behavior in supervision may be the result of being in an intensive, evaluative, ongoing, demanding relationship. Results of this study lend support Holloway's conclusion since supervisor characteristics seem to influence student engagement in learning in supervision. Students report being more willing to learn in the process of supervision if they experience facilitative supervisor qualities. Therefore, supervisors would do well to attend to their feelings about students, possible countertransferences, and monitor whether or not they are being empathetic, open, valuing, genuine, and unconditional with students. If supervisors sense difficulty in the supervisory relationship, they might first examine themselves, and student perceptions of them, before assuming the problems and
deficits are the students'. This suggestion is not to imply that students are not problematic at times, only that supervisors might first probe their thoughts, feelings, and reactions, evaluating the supervisory relationship.

Future research in this area might replicate this study with doctoral students and larger randomized samples, so the results would be more generalizable. Other possibilities for further research include:

1. Investigating additional supervisor characteristics such as warmth, trustworthiness, and respectfulness in relationship to student willingness to learn and the influence of the supervisory impact.

2. Qualitative, in-depth student and supervisor interviews at crucial times during training to explore the essential factors for effective supervision.

3. Examination of student qualities that facilitate the supervisory relationship and enhance their learning of counseling skills.

4. Use objective data not self-rating such as client outcomes, as Borders (1989) suggests, to rate students’ actual performance and to assess student learning in supervision.

Regardless of the studies pursued, researchers are continually challenged to reexamine the direction of their research in light of supervisory theories and current findings, attending to the counselor learning in the context of the supervisory relationship.
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Appendix B

Consent Forms
I have been invited to participate in a research project about the counselor and supervisor relationship. I further understand that this project is Ms. Elizabeth Olson's dissertation project.

My consent to participate in this project indicates that I will be asked to complete two questionnaires regarding my perceptions of supervision. I will also be asked to provide general information about myself such as my age, gender, and level of education.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to me except as otherwise specified in this consent form. I understand that one potential risk in this project is that I may become aware of areas in my supervisory relationship that I may want to discuss. If this occurs, I understand that my option will be to talk to my supervisor or the class instructor.

One way in which I may benefit from this activity is becoming more aware of the purposes, tasks, and expectations of supervision, so that I can grow professionally. I also understand that I am making a contribution to the others, supervising or being supervised, who may better comprehend the process of supervision from the knowledge gained in this research.

I understand that all the information collected from me is confidential. That means that my name will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. The forms will all be coded, and Ms. Olson will keep a master list with the names of participants and the corresponding code numbers. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the master list will be destroyed. All other forms will be retained for five years in a locked file and then destroyed. In addition only the aggregate data will be analyzed and reported. In no way will the information gathered be used to evaluate my performance during the practicum.

I understand that I may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I may contact with Dr. Prosser at 387-5120 or Ms. Olson at 1-857-4569. I may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board or the Vice President for Research at 387-8290 with any concerns that I have. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to participate.
I have been invited to participate in a research project about the counselor and supervisor relationship. I further understand that this project is Ms. Elizabeth Olson's dissertation project.

My consent to participate in this project indicates that I will be asked to complete two questionnaires regarding my perceptions of supervision. I will also be asked to provide general information about myself such as my age, gender, and level of education.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to me except as otherwise specified in this consent form. I understand that one potential risk in this project is that I may become aware of areas in my supervision that I may want to address. If this occurs, I understand that my option will initiate changes or talk to my supervisee.

One way in which I may benefit from this activity is becoming more aware of the purposes, tasks, and expectations of supervision, so that I supervise more effectively. I also understand that I am making a contribution to the others, supervising or being supervised, who may better comprehend the process of supervision from the knowledge gained in this research.

I understand that all the information collected from me is confidential. That means that my name will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. The forms will all be coded, and Ms. Olson will keep a master list with the names of participants and the corresponding code numbers. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the master list will be destroyed. All other forms will be retained for five years in a locked file and then destroyed. In addition only the aggregate data will be analyzed and reported. In no way will the information gathered be used to evaluate my performance during the practicum.

I understand that I may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I may contact with Dr. Prosser at 387-5120 or Ms. Olson at 1-857-4569. I may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board or the Vice President for Research at 387-8290 with any concerns that I have. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to participate.

Signature

Date
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Appendix C

Demographic Forms for Supervisees and Supervisors
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR SUPERVISEES

Please complete the following information to provide us with some general information about you.

1. Gender:  
   M ___________. 
   F ___________. 

2. Age: 

3. Ethnicity: 
   _____ African-American  _____ Asian-American 
   _____ Caucasian      _____ Hispanic      
   _____ Native American _____ Other ___________. 

4. At present studying for: 
   Masters of Arts in ___________. 
   Other ___________. 

5. Specify any previous training in psychological counseling. 
   _____________________________________________. 

6. Any previous experience practicing psychological counseling professionally. 
   Yes ___________. 
   No ___________. 

7. If yes, please specify the total number of years ___________. 

8. Total number of weeks you have been involved in your present practicum training ___________. 

9. Total of one to one supervisory sessions ___________. 

10. Total number of client sessions you have had ___________. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FOR SUPERVISORS

Please complete the following information to provide us with some general information about you. Place a check mark or provide the appropriate information.

1. Gender: M_________.
   F_________

2. Age: ________

3. Ethnicity:
   ___African-American ___Asian-American
   ___Caucasian       ___Hispanic
   ___Native American  ___Other ________.

4. Educational Level:
   Masters__________.
   Ph.D__________.
   Ed.D__________.
   Other__________.

5. Disciplinary Affiliation:
   Counseling Psychology______.
   Clinical Psychology______.
   Other______________________.

6. Do you have formal training in counseling supervision?
   Yes__________________.
   No__________________.

7. Total number of years experience supervising counseling__________.

8. Total number of trainees whose counseling you have supervised__________.

9. How many other students are you currently supervising?__________.

10. Total number of sessions that you have worked with these students______.
Appendix D

Revised Relational Inventory for Students and
Revised Relational Inventory for Supervisors
Revised Relationship Inventory - Form A

Please rate on the following scales your supervisor, according to your experience of him/her in supervision. Fill in the numbered circle on the scan sheet which corresponds to how strongly you feel each statement is true or not true according to the key below. Make certain that you use the scan sheet coded RRI. Please answer every item.

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 (1) He/she respected me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (2) He/she understood my words, but not the way I felt.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (3) He/she pretended that s/he liked me or understood me more than he/she really did.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (4) He/she preferred to talk only about me and not all about him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (5) He/she liked seeing me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (6) He/she was interested in knowing what my experiences meant to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (7) He/she was disturbed whenever I talked about or asked about certain things.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (8) If I felt negatively toward him/her, he/she responded negatively to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (9) He/she appreciated me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (10) Sometimes he/she thought that I felt a certain way, because he/she felt that way.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (11) He/she behaved just the way she/he was, in our relationship.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (12) He/she would freely tell me his/her own thoughts and feelings when I wanted to know them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (13) He/she cared for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (14) His/her own attitudes toward some of the things I said, or did, stopped him/her from really understanding me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (15) I do not think that he/she hid anything from him/herself that s/he felt with me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (16) Sometime he/she was warmly responsive to me, at other times cold or disapproving.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (17) He/she was interested in me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (18) He/she appreciated what my experiences felt like to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (19) I felt that I could trust him/her to be honest with me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (20) He/she adopted a professional role that made it hard for me to know what he/she was like as a person.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (21) He/she did not really care what happened to me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I strongly feel it is not true</th>
<th>I feel it is not true</th>
<th>I feel it is probably untrue; more untrue than true</th>
<th>I feel it is probably true; more true than untrue</th>
<th>I feel it is true</th>
<th>I strongly feel it is true.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 (22) He/she did not realize how strongly I felt about some of the things we discussed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (23) There were times when I felt that his/her outward response was quite different from his/her inner reaction to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (24) Depending on his/her mood, he/she sometimes responded to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than he/she did at other times.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (25) He/she seemed to really value me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (26) He/she responded to me mechanically.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (27) I don't think that he/she was being honest with him/herself about the way that s/he felt about me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (28) He/she wanted to say as little as possible about his/her own thoughts and feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (29) He/she felt a deep affection for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (30) He/she usually understood all of what I said to her/him.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (31) Sometimes he/she was not at all comfortable but we went on, outwardly ignoring it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (32) His/her general feeling toward me varied considerably.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (33) He/she regarded me as a disagreeable person.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (34) When I did not say what I meant at all clearly, he/she still understood me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (35) I felt that he/she was being genuine with me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (36) His/her own feelings and thoughts were always available to me, but never imposed on me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (37) At times he/she felt contempt for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (38) Sometimes he/she responded quite positively to me, at other times s/he seemed indifferent.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (39) He/she did not try to mislead me about his/her own thoughts or feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (40) He/she could be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them him/herself.
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Revised Relationship Inventory - Form B

Please rate on the following scales yourself as a supervisor according to your experience supervising the supervisee named above. Circle the numbered circle on the scan sheet which corresponds to how strongly you feel each statement is true or not true according to the key below. Caution make certain that you use the scan sheet coded RRI with the correct supervisee's name written on it. Please mark every item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I strongly feel it is not true</th>
<th>I feel it is not true</th>
<th>I feel it is probably untrue than true</th>
<th>I feel it is probably true more true than untrue</th>
<th>I feel it is true more true</th>
<th>I feel it is true more true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(1) I respected him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(2) I understood his/her words, but not the way he/she felt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(3) I pretended that I liked or understood him/her more than I really did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(4) I preferred to talk only about him/her and not all about myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(5) I liked seeing him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(6) I was interested in knowing what his/her experiences meant to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(7) I was disturbed whenever he/she talked about or asked about certain things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(8) If he/she felt negatively toward me, I responded negatively to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(9) I appreciated him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(10) Sometimes I thought that he/she felt a certain way, because I felt that way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(11) I behaved just the way I am, in our relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(12) I would freely tell him/her my thoughts and feelings when s/he wanted to know them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(13) I cared for him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(14) My attitudes toward some of the things he/she said, or did, stopped me from really understanding him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(15) I do not think that I hid anything from myself that I felt with him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(16) Sometimes I was warmly responsive to him/her, at other times cold or disapproving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(17) I was interested in him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(18) I appreciated what his/her experiences felt like to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>(19) I felt that I could trust myself to be honest with him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisee:

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 (20) I adopted a professional role that made it hard for him/her to know what I was like as a person.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (21) I did not really care what happened to him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (22) I did not realize how strongly he/she felt about some of the things we discussed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (23) There were times when I felt that my outward response was quite different from my inner reaction to him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (24) Depending on my mood, I sometimes responded to him/her with quite a lot more warmth and interest than I did at other times.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (25) I seemed to really value him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (26) I responded to him/her in a mechanical way.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (27) I don't think that I was being honest with myself about the way that I felt about him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (28) I wanted to say as little as possible about my thoughts and feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (29) I felt a deep affection for him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (30) I usually understood all of what he/she said to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (31) Sometimes I was not at all comfortable but we went on, outwardly ignoring it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (32) My general feeling toward him/her varied considerably.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (33) I regarded him/her as a disagreeable person.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (34) When he/she did not say what he/she meant at all clearly, I still understood him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (35) I felt that I was being genuine with him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (36) My own feelings and thoughts were always available to him/her but never imposed on him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (37) At times I felt contempt for him/her.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (38) Sometimes I responded quite positively to him/her, at other times I seemed indifferent.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (39) I did not try to mislead him/her about my thoughts or feelings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 (40) I could be deeply and fully aware of his/her most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them.
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Appendix E

Supervision Perception Form-Trainee (SPF-T) and Supervision Perception Form-Supervisor (SPF-S)
Identification Code:

SUPERVISION PERCEPTION FORM—TRAINEE

Please rate the following aspects of supervision, considering each item carefully on its own merit.

NOTE: This questionnaire will not be shared with your supervisor, and your identification will be kept completely confidential.

Ratings

Below are 24 statements. Read each statement, and then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, using the following alternatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place your responses (1-6) in the column to the left of the statement.

1. My supervisor was able to assist me through therapeutic impasses with clients (e.g., hostility, resistance, silence, transference).
2. I was open and willing to change.
3. My supervisor was able to have an impact on my diagnostic and assessment abilities.
4. My supervisor was able to influence me to try new counseling techniques.
5. My supervisor was able to have an impact on my judgment about client needs and counseling approaches.
6. I did not have debilitating personal characteristics or problems which interfered with my counseling effectiveness.
7. My supervisor facilitated the development of my own theory and style of counseling.
8. I was receptive to positive critiques and suggestions.
9. My supervisor was able to influence my case management abilities.
10. I was prepared and made good use of supervision time.
11. My supervisor was able to help me develop more effective intervention strategies.
12. I learned from my supervisor and behaved differently with clients as a result of my supervisor's suggestions.
13. I was motivated to use supervision and to learn new techniques.
14. My supervisor would like to supervise me again.
15. I was receptive to negative critiques and suggestions.
16. Overall, my supervisor was satisfied with my performance this semester.
17. I have the personality characteristics of an effective counselor.
18. My supervisor was able to have an impact on my attitudes and behaviors as a counselor.
19. I respected my supervisor.
20. The supervisor helped me identify my strengths and increase my confidence as a counselor.
21. I was able to use/integrate supervision into my own style.
22. My supervisor was able to help me accept my limitations as a counselor.
23. My professional potential was above average.
24. My supervisor helped me deal with personal characteristics or problems that were interfering with my counseling.

Identification Code:

SUPERVISION PERCEPTION FORM—SUPERVISOR

Please rate the following aspects of supervision, considering each item carefully on its own merit.

NOTE: This questionnaire will not be shared with your supervisee, and your identification will be kept completely confidential.

Ratings

Below are 24 statements. Read each statement, and then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement, using the following alternatives:

6 = Strongly Agree  3 = Slightly Disagree
5 = Moderately Agree  2 = Moderately Disagree
4 = Slightly Agree   1 = Strongly Disagree

Place your responses (1-6) in the column to the left of the statement.

1. I was able to assist the supervisee through therapeutic impasses with clients (e.g., hostility, resistance, silence, transference).

2. The supervisee was open and willing to change.

3. I was able to have an impact on my supervisee's diagnostic and assessment abilities.

4. I was able to influence my supervisee to try new counseling techniques.

5. I was able to have an impact on my supervisee's judgment about client needs and counseling approaches.

6. The supervisee did not have debilitating personal characteristics or problems which interfered with his/her counseling effectiveness.

7. I facilitated the development of the supervisee's own theory and style of counseling.

8. The supervisee was receptive to positive critiques and suggestions.

9. I was able to influence the supervisee's case management abilities.

10. The supervisee was prepared and made good use of supervision time.

11. I was able to help the supervisee develop more effective intervention strategies.

12. The supervisee learned from me and behaved differently with clients as a result of my suggestions.

13. The supervisee was motivated to use supervision and to learn new techniques.
14. I would like to supervise this supervisee again.
15. The supervisee was receptive to negative critiques and suggestions.
16. Overall, I was satisfied with the performance of my supervisee this semester.
17. The supervisee has the personality characteristics of an effective counselor.
18. I was able to have an impact on my supervisee’s attitudes and behaviors as a counselor.
19. The supervisee respected me.
20. I helped the supervisee identify his/her strengths and increase his/her confidence as a counselor.
21. The supervisee was able to use/integrate supervision into his/her own style.
22. I was able to help the supervisee accept his/her limitations as a counselor.
23. The supervisee’s professional potential was above average.
24. I helped the supervisee deal with personal characteristics or problems that were interfering with the supervisee’s counseling.

Source:
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Appendix F

Permission to Use the Revised Relational Inventory for Students and the Revised Relational Inventory for Supervisors, and the Supervision Perception Form-Trainee (SPF-T) and the Supervision Perception Form-Supervisor (SPF-S)
Elizabeth Olson  
Samaritan Counseling Center  
218 W. Grand River Avenue  
East Lansing, MI 48823  

Dear Bach,  

I am writing, as you requested, to give my permission for UM to supply copies of your dissertation containing the Revised Relationship Inventory (RRI) on demand, provided, of course, that appropriate acknowledgement is given to me and Barrett-Lennard. I enjoyed getting your results - Thanks! Best wishes, and let me know if you need anything further.

Sincerely,  

Anita J. Schacht, Ph.D.  
Clinical Psychologist
Nov. 10, 1995

Dear Beth,

You have my permission to use the Supervision Perception Form (both trainer and supervisor form) in your dissertation. The UMC may supply copies on demand.

[Signature]

[Note: This document is a letter granting permission to use a form in a dissertation. It is addressed to Beth, and the signature appears to be handwritten.]
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