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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Counselors and counselor educators have presented, investigated, argued for, and applied many differing theoretical orientations and techniques related to the counseling process. As a result, systematic investigations are beginning to reveal the importance of certain counseling variables based on theoretical formulations. Concomitantly, differing philosophical, theoretical orientations and strategies applicable to counselor training and supervision also exist, but with much less systematic investigation and application of results to the supervisory process (Anderson & Bown, 1955; Arbuckle, 1965; Cottle & Downie, 1970; Delaney & Moore, 1966; Hansen & Moore, 1966; Mazer & Engle, 1968; Patterson, 1964; Wicas & Mahan, 1966). Among the most representative theories of training and supervising novice counselors are those of Patterson (1964), Ohlsen (1974), Arbuckle (1965), Mueller and Kell (1972), and Mazer and Engle (1968).

The supervisory approach presented by Arbuckle (1965) refers to supervision in which the supervisor establishes a relationship with the counselor-trainee involving facilitative conditions, similar to those established with a client by a counselor. Although the relationship is primarily facilitative, the supervisor does relate to the student counselor from his own frame of reference and is evaluative. In this facilitative or "experiential" approach to supervision, Seligman and Baldwin (1972) suggest facilitation and evaluation may not be mutually exclusive conditions.
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An alternate approach presented by Anderson and Bown (1955) and Mazer and Engle (1968) emphasizes a "cognitive", evaluative approach to supervision, similar to the traditional student-teacher relationship, and de-emphasizes the significance of a counseling or facilitative relationship between the novice counselor and supervisor (Seligman & Baldwin, 1972).

A third theoretical approach, presented by Patterson (1964) and others (Cottle & Downie, 1970; Delaney & Moore, 1966; Hansen & Moore, 1966; Wicas & Mahan, 1966), assumes an intermediate position between the experiential and cognitive approaches to supervision. As summarized by Seligman and Baldwin (1972), this supervisory strategy considers supervision as counseling and teaching, involving instruction, consultation, and evaluation, in addition to a counseling or facilitative relationship between supervisor and trainee.

Despite theoretical and research advances in counselor training since 1955 (Cottle & Downie, 1970; Hansen & Warner, 1971), Seligman and Baldwin (1972) present the need for systematic investigations of available strategies of supervision and the intricacies, manipulations, and unspoken assumptions which develop in the supervisory relationship.

Formal, systematic theories of counselor education and supervision are at best implicit, at worst nonexistent. Strategies related to the training of counselors do exist, however, and span the spectrum from experiential to cognitive with an amalgamation of the two extremes occupying an intermediate position... Theories and strategies related to how we should teach, counsel, or supervise exist in reasonable abundance. Systematic investigations on how we actually do teach, counsel, or supervise are, however, quite limited (Seligman & Baldwin, 1972, p. 109).
Payne, Winter, and Bell (1972) further observe research has not ordinarily assessed information relating to various approaches of supervising counselors-in-training.

Related to the reported need for investigation of supervisory strategies, Tyler (1969) and Gilmore (1973) suggest the single basic skill common to all types of counseling in all settings is communication. Applying communication as a basic and common skill to counselor-trainee supervision, supervisors are both senders and receivers of verbal and nonverbal information.

Of special interest to the present study, Jakubowski-Spector, Dustin, and George (1971) indicate the importance of nonverbal information in the supervision of novice counselors:

What a counselor does may be more influential than what he says. . . . If a counselor educator is trying to teach genuine communication, the educator's interpersonal dealings with his students should reflect or model the kind of behavior he endorses. . . . Too often, a counselor educator verbalizes the importance of genuineness and self disclosure while his students do not find these behaviors in their interaction with him as an advisor, practicum instructor, or professor (pp. 248-249).

Jakubowski-Spector et al. are not suggesting supervisors mask or fake genuineness, self-disclosure, etc., but indicate the frequent discrepancy between supervisor verbalization and behavior. Haigh (1965) also discusses double messages communicated when there are discrepancies between what a supervisor didactically teaches and what he conveys to a trainee.

While realizing the importance of the total verbal and nonverbal interactive communication between supervisor and trainee, nonverbal information sent by the supervisor to the trainee is considered sufficiently important to justify an experimental investigation.
comparing counselor educators' supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior in the supervision of counselors-in-training.

Significance of the Present Study

"Counseling as a profession, if it is to continue its solid growth of the last twenty years, must demonstrate an ability to be successful in a variety of occupational settings" (Betz, 1973, p. 1). Betz (1973) further argues the importance of counselors being equipped with common core skills in order to successfully function in a variety of occupational settings. Numerous occupational situations and common core counseling skills require investigation; however, in this study, the occupational setting is counselor education and communication is the common core skill.

No consensus is apparent regarding which counseling skills are most successful and functional, but research does suggest the importance of certain core counseling skills (Berenson & Carkhuff, 1967; Gilmore, 1973; Holder, Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Patterson, 1974; Rogers, 1957, 1961, 1962; Tosi, 1970; Truax, 1963; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967; Tyler, 1969). Currently, counselor educators are beginning to use available research, basic philosophical notions, theoretical strategies, and professional standards in training and supervising novice counselors in acquiring these basic skills (Seligman & Baldwin, 1972).

Obviously, research and study are still required in the investigations of counselor skills and qualities. In addition, Shertzer and Stone (1971) suggest an equivalent need for the investigation and
development of techniques, strategies, and systems of training and supervision. According to Seligman and Baldwin (1972), formal systematic conceptualization of counselor education and supervision has occurred only within the past decade; and, "critical evaluation" of diverse formulations may occur during the 1970's (Shertzer, 1971).

The need for investigating diverse approaches to the supervisory process, exploring recently developed conceptualizations of counselor education and supervision, and the appropriateness, yet lack of systematic application, of communication research and literature to counselor education provide the rationale for investigating nonverbal communication in relation to counselor supervision.

Although a great deal of overlap occurs between verbal and nonverbal communication, some individuals believe 65 to 85 per cent of all communication is in the nonverbal dimension (Birdwhistle, 1970; Knapp, 1972). Research reflects nonverbal aspects of communication as primary in understanding expressed messages and adapting to one's environment (Davitz, 1964). Research findings presented by Davitz (1964) suggest: (a) nonverbal communication is a stable, measurable phenomena and (b) nonverbal expressive symbols are an inevitable part of the total communication matrix.

Several additional studies (Dittman, 1962; Scheflen, 1964; Schmidt & Strong, 1970) reveal a relationship between verbal and nonverbal behavior and different nonverbal cues as having different values in person perception. Research in counseling (Strong, Taylor, Bratton, & Loper, 1971) indicates nonverbal communication affects how a counselor is perceived and described by observers.
Hallberg (1971) posits there is a "silent curriculum" in counselor education which involves "the informal, covert set of attitudes and behaviors counselor educators impart to students. . . . it is that elusive communication to students: the spirit of an advising session" (p. 198). The present study is addressed to this "silent" and, in most instances, ignored curriculum and issue in counselor training and supervision. Assuming counselor educators' supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior are discriminable, the study assesses the relation among supervisors' nonverbal behavior, supervisory strategy, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals while supervising practicum, counseling students. The identification and recognition of such relations represents an important addition to the knowledge of supervisory strategy and theory, provides an additional basis to facilitate the effectiveness of supervisory strategies, and indicates the importance of communication concepts and research, specifically nonverbal, in the development and improvement of counselor training programs. A more inclusive study might involve the total verbal-nonverbal communication matrix; however, nonverbal behavior is used for the important role it plays in the total communication process, and for the informational cues it provides in relation to supervisory strategies.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study is: (a) to identify counselor educators' supervisory strategy; (b) to assess counselor educators' satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of
session goals; (c) to identify and assess counselor educators' nonverbal behavior; and (d) to assess the relation among counselor educators' supervisory strategy, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals. The independent variable is counselor educators' supervisory strategy. This variable is not manipulated; however, differences in counselor educators' supervisory strategy are expected to interact with the dependent variables consisting of: (a) counselor educators' satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals and (b) the frequency and type of supervisor nonverbal behavior.

Questions basic to the investigation include: (a) Can counselor educators accurately identify the supervisory strategy from which they supervise?; (b) Do counselor educators accurately assess satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals?; (c) Can the frequency and type of supervisor nonverbal behavior be identified and assessed?; and (d) What is the relation among supervisory strategy, satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, and the frequency and type of nonverbal behavior?

Hypotheses

The study consists of two exploratory hypotheses in addition to the hypotheses which test the relation among counselor educators' supervisory strategy, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Hypothesis 1. It is assumed counselor educators accurately identify the supervisory strategy from which they supervise. This
assumption is explored by comparing counselor educators' self-identified strategy with ratings of implemented supervisory strategy made by independent judges. The first exploratory hypothesis is:

Counselor educators' self-identified supervisory strategy is the same as independent judges' ratings of counselor educators' implemented supervisory strategy.

If significant differences exist, both counselor educators' self-identified supervisory strategy and judges' ratings are used to test the relation among supervisory strategy, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction. If significant differences do not exist, counselor educators' self-identified supervisory strategy is used for comparison with nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2. It is also assumed counselor educators accurately assess satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals. This assumption is investigated in the second exploratory hypothesis:

Counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals is the same as independent judges' ratings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

If significant differences exist, both counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction and judges' satisfaction ratings are compared with counselor educators' supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior. If significant differences do not exist, counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction is used for comparison with counselor educators' supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior.

Judges, independent of the Department of Counseling and Personnel, are selected by the investigator. Their ratings of supervisory behavior...
strategy, satisfaction, and assessment of supervisors' nonverbal behavior are obtained from observing videotaped supervisory sessions.

The relation among counselor educators' supervisory strategy, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction is investigated in the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3. There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy and the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior.

Hypothesis 4. There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies and the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior.

Hypothesis 5. There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

Hypothesis 6. There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

Hypothesis 7. There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Hypothesis 8. There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Hypothesis 9. There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

Hypothesis 10. There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.
Definition of Terms

The definitions are divided into: (a) communication terms and (b) terms pertaining to supervision.

Communication

Communication refers to "the process (or the product of the process) of acting on information" (Dance, 1972, pp. 7-8). This definition of communication implies reception, interpretation, and reaction to information, as well as the information itself. The focal information, to be "acted upon", is that expressed by counselor educators in supervisory sessions; and the process (or the product of the process) of acting on this information includes supervisors' and independent judges' identification and assessment of the information expressed by supervisors.

Nonverbal Behavior. This term refers to nonverbal cues or stimuli expressed or presented by counselor educators in supervisory sessions.

Nonverbal. Nonverbal is commonly used to describe all human communication events which are not spoken or written words (Knapp, 1972). In addition, "Stimuli are nonverbal when their effect is independent of any arbitrarily assigned meaning" (Dance, 1972, p. 14). Although an originally nonverbal cue may have an arbitrary meaning attached to it, and thus become both a nonverbal and a verbal stimulus (Dance, 1972), nonverbal refers to stimuli not dependent on arbitrarily assigned meaning. Counselor educators' nonverbal behavior is considered nonverbal stimuli when initially expressed, and not dependent.
on arbitrarily assigned meanings. Independent judges' responses to supervisors' nonverbal cues, however, attach meaning to the stimuli and permit the assessment and discussion of the nonverbal stimuli in verbal or symbolic terms. Supervisors' nonverbal cues investigated in this study include: kinesic, paralinguistic, touching, and proxemic behavior.

**Kinesic behavior.** Kinesic behavior refers to supervisor body movement during the supervisory session, and includes: (a) eye contact; (b) gestures or movement of the body, limbs, hands, head, feet and legs; (c) facial expression; and (d) posture (Knapp, 1972).

**Paralanguage.** Paralanguage refers to how something is said and not what is said. Defined as vocal cues accompanying spoken language, it consists of: (a) the vocal characteristics of laughing, yawning, sucking, sneezing, coughing, clearing of the throat, and sniffing; (b) the vocal qualifiers of voice loudness; and (c) the vocal segregates of "nonfluency filled" and "unfilled" pauses or hesitations (Knapp, 1972).

**Touching behavior.** Touching is viewed as distinct from body movement, and includes supervisor: (a) holding; (b) spot touching; (c) accidental brushing; and (d) touching during greetings and farewells (Hall, 1963).

**Proxemic behavior.** Proxemics, or spacial behavior, is defined as man's use and perception of personal and social space. Supervisor proxemic behavior involves: (a) the physical distance between supervisor and trainee and (b) the angle formed by the axis of the trainee's and supervisor's seating arrangement (Knapp, 1972).
Supervision

Supervision refers to the supervision of novice counselors enrolled in the Counseling and Personnel practicum course (C-P 628) at Western Michigan University. Similar to the definition of counseling, supervision is designed to develop counseling skills by assisting a novice counselor in changing, reducing confusion, and making choices or decisions. The novice counselors' goals, purposes, skills, and understandings are brought into focus in the supervisory relationship. Also similar to counseling, supervision may occur in groups or dyads; but, in this study, supervision refers to the dyad of counselor educator and trainee (Hansen & Moore, 1966).

Counseling. Counseling is defined as a special relationship and process designed to help an individual in changing, reducing confusion, and making choices or decisions (Tyler, 1969). While the counseling process may be conducted in groups or dyads, the reference to counseling in this study is to be counselor-client dyad.

Counselor educator. This term refers to the individual supervising the C-P 628 practicum trainee in his or her development of counseling skills. Graduate student supervisors are not considered counselor educators. Supervisor and mentor are synonymous with counselor educator.

Counselor-in-training. Counseling students enrolled in the C-P 628 practicum course are defined as counselors-in-training. Counselor-trainee, novice counselor, student counselor, and practicum counselor are synonymous with this term.

Supervisory strategy. Associated with the term supervision, supervisory strategy refers to the following counselor educator
approaches to training and supervising novice counselors: (a) experiential, (b) cognitive, and (c) intermediate.

**Experiential strategy.** This approach refers to supervision in which the supervisor establishes a relationship with the counselor trainee involving facilitative conditions, similar to those established with a client by a counselor. The approach may involve evaluation, but the relationship is primarily facilitative.

**Cognitive strategy.** The cognitive strategy to supervision emphasizes a cognitive, evaluative approach, similar to the traditional student-teacher relationship.

**Intermediate strategy.** This strategy refers to a counseling and teaching supervisory position, between the cognitive and experiential approaches, involving instruction, consultation, and evaluation, in addition to the facilitative relationship between supervisor and trainee.

**Review of the Literature**

The review includes a discussion of: (a) literature defining and concerning nonverbal behavior and kinesic, paralinguistic, touching, and proxemic variables used in the study; (b) literature describing experiential, cognitive, and intermediate supervisory strategies included in the study; and (c) literature relevant to the relation of nonverbal behavior to counseling and supervisory processes.
Literature defining and concerning nonverbal behavior and kinesic, paralinguistic, touching, and proxemic variables

Although counselor educators appear to recognize the importance of nonverbal behavior, there does not appear to be an awareness of nonverbal literature and research, generally, among counselor educators. Discussing nonverbal behavior, Gilmore (1973) states, "it is clearly a terribly important mode of sending and receiving signals about which there is not a great deal of practically useful advice to be given" (p. 231). Gilmore's statement reflects a 1950's awareness of nonverbal literature and research, characterized by: an awareness of nonverbal communication among a wide range of scholars and disciplines; anecdotal and insightful information, with little attempt to systematically record or replicate; primitive theory, extending the linguistic paradigm; few testable hypotheses to examine potential major issues; and limited methodology and technology to study the range of nonverbal phenomena (Harrison, 1973).

The present position of nonverbal literature and research reflects a somewhat different position.

Research on nonverbal communication appears to be moving into scientific maturity, with a shift from loose methods to well articulated theory, a move from anecdote to empirical research, and a swing from casual observation to sophisticated technologies and rigorous methodologies (Harrison & Knapp, 1972, p. 350).

Better theoretical formulations are anticipated, in addition to improved methodology, increased empirical research, and application of results (Harrison & Knapp, 1972).

The theoretical study of nonverbal behavior has ancient foundations, predating the time of Aristotle, but the scientific study of
nonverbal behavior has occurred within the last century, with significant research advances in the past decade. As in many fields, there is no consensus concerning theoretical and methodological issues; however, a basis for study exists as a result of theoretical formulations and research of numerous individuals (Argyle, 1969; Birdwhistle, 1970; Dance, 1972; Davis, 1973; Efron, 1972; Ekman & Friesen, 1968, 1969a, 1969b, 1972; Hall, 1959, 1966; Harrison, 1973; Knapp, 1972; Mehrabian, 1969; Montagu, 1971; Ruesch & Kees, 1971; Scheflen, 1964; Watson, 1972).

Nonverbal behavior. The application of the term nonverbal to a broad range of phenomena with a variety of attached meanings creates confusion in defining nonverbal. "The basic issue seems to be whether the events traditionally studied under the heading nonverbal are literally nonverbal" (Knapp, 1972, p. 3), and "where to draw the boundary between verbal and nonverbal" (Harrison & Knapp, 1972, p. 343).

Discussing this issue, Dance (1972) uses conceptual descriptions of stimulus, information, communication, symbol, verbal, and nonverbal to present his position that everything labeled nonverbal is not literally nonverbal. Dance (1972) suggests, when an individual is presented with stimuli, attending to selected stimuli from all available stimuli results in information; and responding to information constitutes communication. The original stimuli may be verbal (dependent on symbolic content for meaning) or nonverbal (independent of symbolic content for meaning). The choice to attend to nonverbal
stimuli results in nonverbal information. Responding to nonverbal information constitutes communication.

However, in responding to originally nonverbal stimuli and information, an individual may use arbitrarily assigned meaning, i.e., symbols or symbolic content. Thus, even though individuals engage in nonverbal behavior (independent of symbolic content or arbitrarily assigned meaning), when nonverbal behaviors are responded to in terms of symbols, they also become verbal stimuli (dependent on symbolic content for meaning). Therefore, nonverbal stimuli are not literally nonverbal, since without responding to nonverbal events in verbal or symbolic terms, there is only stimuli or information and not communication.

In the present study, counselor educators' nonverbal behavior is considered nonverbal stimuli when initially expressed in a supervisory session. While realizing the importance of supervisor's and trainee's responses to each other's nonverbal information in the supervisory session, independent judges select, attend to, and respond to only supervisors' nonverbal stimuli. Selecting, attending to, and responding to supervisors' nonverbal stimuli permits judges to identify and assess supervisors' nonverbal stimuli in verbal or symbolic terms.

Knapp (1972) suggests the identification of common assumptions and trends in literature and research as further means to establish boundaries between verbal and nonverbal and to clarify the definition of nonverbal.

One identified assumption presents nonverbal as human communication events which are not spoken or written words (Knapp, 1972).
Ekman and Friesen (1968, 1969a) express additional assumptions as:
(a) nonverbal behavior is concerned with the relationship aspect of communication, (b) nonverbal stimuli function as qualifiers to the understanding of verbal behavior, and (c) nonverbal stimuli are more revealing and less controllable than verbal behavior.

Further trends include theoretical and research categorization of nonverbal into defined areas: kinesic behavior, paralanguage, physical characteristics, proxemics, touching behavior, artifacts, and environmental factors (Knapp, 1972, pp. 5-8). Similar attempts to categorize nonverbal areas are presented by Argyle (1969), Barker and Collins (1970), Duncan (1969), Eisenberg and Smith (1971), Harrison and Knapp (1972), Knapp (1972), and Ruesch and Kees (1971).

Ekman and Friesen (1972) additionally classify nonverbal behavior as adaptors, illustrators, emblems, affect displays, and regulators.

Adaptors involve adaptive behaviors acquired during childhood to satisfy needs, perform actions, manage emotions, etc., and are generally believed to be related to negative feelings. Movements of the legs, hands, and feet are considered residues of adaptors. Illustrators are related to speech and serve to explain verbal expression. Emblems include nonverbal behavior having direct verbal translation or dictionary definition. Affect displays involve facial configurations displaying affective states. Regulators consist primarily of head nods and eye movements, and function to maintain and regulate the speaking and listening between two individuals.
Rosenfield (1966), Freedman and Hoffman (1967), Mahl (1968), and Efron (1972) present classification schemes similar to Ekman and Friesen (1972) and applicable to the areas of hand movement, facial behavior, and leg movement.

In the study of nonverbal behavior, Birdwhistle (1970) and Knapp (1972) further suggest the nonverbal dimension of communication is an inseparable part of the total communication process. As such, nonverbal behavior is important because of its role in the total communication matrix and, in this study, is investigated in the context of videotaped supervisory sessions.

Using the theoretical position of Dance (1972), the assumptions and trends identified by Knapp (1972) and Ekman and Friesen (1968, 1969a, 1972), and the suggestion of Birdwhistle (1970) and Knapp (1972), the study investigates the relation of kinesic, paralinguistic, touching, and proxemic behavior with supervisory variables.

**Kinesic variables.** Using Knapp's categorization (1972), kinesic behavior typically includes eye contact; gestures or movements of the body, limbs, hands, head, and feet and legs; facial expression; and posture. Research also relates kinesic behavior with variables concerning attitudes, status, affective states, approval seeking, deception, warmth, and interaction (Knapp, 1972).

Studies concerning eye behavior focus on pupil dilation and constriction (Hess, 1960, 1965) and eye contact (Kendon, 1967; Knapp, 1972). It appears visual eye contact conveys several kinds of information and serves several functions (Ellsworth & Ludwig, 1972). Studies of eye contact involve feedback, control of communication.
channels, distance, and relationships between individuals in various contexts (Knapp, 1972).

Kendon (1967) states individuals seek feedback and reactions from others through eye contact, and eye contact during listening and speaking may indicate various reactions.

Listeners anticipating long utterances often look away to express boredom. Looking away while listening may also indicate dissatisfaction with what is being said. Day (1964) and Kendon (1967) report listeners look away during hesitant or nonfluent messages and during difficult to understand material. Eye contact while listening may reflect agreement or attention.

Looking away more than usual while speaking may suggest uncertainty about, or a desire to modify, what is being said. Eye contact while speaking may also convey confidence in what is being said and interest in the other's reaction.

Ellsworth and Carlsmith (1968) contend positive verbal output presented with frequent eye contact results in positive evaluation, while negative verbal content occurring with frequent eye contact produces negative evaluation. However, Exline and Eldridge (1967) indicate unfavorable comments concerning performance are more favorably perceived by individuals when presented with more eye contact than with less eye contact.

Eye contact may further function to reveal openness of the communication channel. Eye contact establishes a desire to interact, while diminishing visual interaction decreases social contact. Goffman (1963) states individuals provide others "civil inattention", or
enough visual attention to acknowledge their presence, but not enough
to intrude. Goffman continues, however, that once eye contact is per-
mitted one is open to whatever follows.

Knapp (1972) presents information concerning the use of eye contact
to psychologically reduce physical distance between individuals. The
reverse, reducing eye contact, tends to psychologically increase
physical distance.

Mehrabian (1969) illustrates the relation between eye contact and
positive and negative attitudes toward others. There appears to be
more eye contact with liked than disliked individuals. Exline (1963)
also reports a relationship between frequency of eye contact and
positive attitudes between individuals. The occurrence of competition,
dislike, tension, or deception, however, may result in decreased eye
contact (Knapp, 1972).

Further, Hearn (1957) suggests maximum eye contact occurs with
moderately high status addressees and minimal eye contact with very
low status addressees.

Kleinke and Pohlen (1971) and Nichols and Champness (1971) further
believe emotional arousal is produced by eye contact, but the affec-
tive state is not inevitably in the form of liking (Ellsworth &
Ludwig, 1972). While eye avoidance may serve to insulate against
threats or discovery, eye contact longer than ten seconds is likely to
indicate aggressiveness or to elicit anxiety and discomfort in
others (Knapp, 1972).

Pellegrini, Hicks, and Gordon (1970) also report more frequent
and longer eye contact during approval seeking than approval avoidance.
Exline and Messick (1967) suggest dependent individuals use eye contact to elicit and communicate positive attitudes. Mobbs (1968) indicates extroverts tend to engage in more eye contact and for longer periods than do introverts.

Eye contact typically indicates need for affiliation, involvement, or inclusion. Affectionate individuals, high in need affiliation, return and engage in frequent eye contact (Davis, 1973). Exline (1963) states individuals oriented toward affiliation engage in more eye contact in affiliative than in competitive situations. Visual behavior, in relation to interpersonal attraction, establishes the concept of involvement as an important basic characteristic of eye contact (Ellsworth & Ludvig, 1972); and whether eye contact arouses liking, aversion, aggression, etc. it is always interpersonally involving (Knapp, 1972).

Regarding the kinesic variable of body movement, Mehrabian (1969) provides information concerning body movement and liking or disliking attitudes toward others. Mehrabian describes body orientation as the degree to which an individual's shoulders and legs are turned in the direction of another person; and, he indicates seated males and females reveal a less direct body orientation with intensely liked persons, although females also use indirect body orientation with intensely disliked persons and are most direct with neutral individuals. Mehrabian (1969) further notes the orientation of open arms and legs is more an indication of relaxation than liking or disliking attitudes, although legs and arms may be used as barriers when two individuals sit closer together than is comfortable.
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Dittman (1962) suggests the association of emotional arousal with frequency of bodily movement, and proposes the intensity of emotional arousal may be reflected in the amount of gestural activity or body cues. Ekman (1965) additionally reports the head and face provide information concerning which affect is experienced.

Rosenfield (1966) demonstrates head nodding, smiles, and high level gestural activity characterize approval seekers. Head nods, occurring with the verbal response "mm-hmm", by the listener, generally indicate the listener wants to talk or the speaker requires feedback (Dittman and Llewellyn, 1968).

Turning or tilting the head to one side is associated with making and completing points, and making transitions from one point to another (Birdwhistle, 1970). Further, downward head, eyelid, and hand movements occur at the end of statements, while upward movements occur at the end of questions. Mehrabian (1969) suggests individuals in inferior roles more often lower their heads, while higher status individuals keep their heads raised.

According to Davis (1973), seven hundred thousand different hand signals are possible, using combinations with other body movements. Ekman and Friesen (1969a), using informational cues provided by hands, face, and legs and feet during deception, report the face has the greatest capacity for sending nonverbal cues, followed by the hands, and the legs and feet respectively. The best source of nonverbal cues indicating deception, however, is the legs and feet, followed by the hands, and the face respectively.
Knapp (1972) states the face is a primary source of interpersonal attitudes and emotional states, however, complexity of the face and diverse investigation procedures make generalization of available research findings difficult.

Posture is the easiest of the nonverbal cues to discriminate. Scheflen (1964) observes about twenty-six traditional American gestures and fewer culturally standard postures. Gordon Hewes (1957) states roughly one thousand static postures are possible and comfortable, but only a few are culturally selected in individuals' behavioral repertoires.

Scheflen (1964) suggests others' body attitudes are reflected in "postural echo" or "posture matching". Matched or "mirror imaged" (reversed) postures are described as congruent and reflect a shared, common point of view between individuals. Scheflen (1964) suggests changes in body posture may coincide with changes in point of view, while noncongruent postures are used to establish psychological distance (Davis, 1973). The degree of postural congruence may also be related to similarity of status (Davis, 1973).

Mehrabian (1969) provides significant relations of positive and negative attitudes to the relaxation positions of reclining and sideways-leaning. Generally, reclining angles decrease as attitudes toward the individual become more positive. A person leaning backward and away is perceived as having a more neutral or negative attitude than one who is leaning forward. When an individual is relaxed and leans forward slightly, with the back slightly curved, a liking
attitude is conveyed (Davis, 1973). Leaning far backward or a straight, tense position may reflect dislike or threat (Davis, 1973).

In terms of sideways-lean, males display less sideways-lean and body relaxation with intensely disliked males, while females display most sideways-lean with intensely disliked males and females. Sideways-lean is also greater when communicating with lower status than higher status persons (Nehradian, 1969). Goffman (1961) further notes high status individuals assume relaxed positions while those of lower status assume more formal positions.

Reece and Whitman (1962) contend a position shift toward another person, smiling, direct eye contact, and still hands are indicative of a "warm" person. These cues, when associated with the verbal "mm-hmm", also increase verbal output from others. A "cold" individual typically gazes around the room, slumps, drums fingers, and does not smile.

Paralinguistic variables. Edward Sapir's investigation of and emphasis on the voice as a nonverbal communicator has led to increased experimentation in this area (Schuster, 1971). Paralanguage, defined as vocal cues accompanying spoken language, consists of voice qualities and vocalizations, with vocalizations including vocal characteristics, vocal qualifiers, and vocal segregates (Trager, 1958).

Vocal characteristics include laughing, yawning, sucking, sneezing, coughing, clearing of the throat, sniffing, etc. Vocal qualifiers consist of overloud to oversoft intensity, etc. Pauses, or hesitations, comprise vocal segregates. Mahl and Schulze (1964) further state the relevance of dialect or accent, nonfluencies,
speech rate, latency of response, and duration of utterance to para-
language. Mehrabian and Wiener (1967) contend vocal cues are
extremely important in the total impact of messages.

Vocal cues accompanying spoken language provide information con-
cerning personality, attitudes, and emotional state.

Findings concerning stereotyped judgments of vocal stimuli
indicate increased pitch variety leads to more positive personality
impressions (Addington, 1968). Knapp (1972) further suggests poor
voice qualities influence a listener's perception of another's
personality more than they decrease comprehension of the listener.

Cook (1965) believes nonfluencies, such as "er", "ah", "um",
"uh huh", and variants increase with the difficulty of the speaking
task to permit the speaker time to think. Dittman and Llewellyn
(1968) observe speech hesitations and nonfluencies when the idea
expressed is complex, there are fears about the subject matter, there
is a need to impress the listener, or there are pressures for immed-
iate responses. As nonfluencies increase, the perception of speaker
competence, creditability, and dynamism decrease, but trustworthiness
is not influenced (Miller & Hewgill, 1964; Sereno & Hawkins, 1967).
Further research indicates pauses or hesitations "filled" with non-
fluencies impair performance when compared to silent or "unfilled"
pauses (Goldman-Eisler, 1961; Livant, 1963).

Starkweather (1961) summarizes the relation between judgments of
emotion and voice pitch, rate, and volume; while Davitz (1964) further
indicates emotional meaning is communicated accurately by vocal expres-
sion.
Davitz (1964), using vocalizations of loudness, pitch, rate, and others, develops a relative association between certain vocal and emotional cues. Active emotions, i.e., joy, are reflected by high pitch and fast rate, while passive emotions, i.e., boredom, are reflected by low pitch and slow rate (Davitz and Davitz, 1961).

Affection is characterized by soft loudness, low pitch, and slow rate; anger is displayed by loud loudness, high pitch, and fast rate; boredom is expressed by moderate to low loudness, moderate to low pitch, and moderately slow rate; cheerfulness is characterized by moderately high loudness, moderately high pitch, and moderately fast rate; impatience is displayed by normal loudness, normal to moderately high pitch, and moderately fast rate; joy is expressed by loud loudness, high pitch, and fast rate; and, satisfaction is characterized by normal loudness, normal pitch, and normal rate (Davitz, 1964).

Knapp (1972) further suggests individuals lower their voice to indicate the end of declarative sentences, raise their voice at the end of questions, and sustain pitch to indicate continuance.

**Touching variables.** Literature concerning touching behavior is summarized by Frank (1971) and Montague (1971), and may be considered separate from kinesic study and subdivided into holding, spot touching, accidental brushing, and touching during greetings and farewells (Hall, 1963).

Knapp (1972) states touching behavior is probably one of the primary forms of communication and is assumed to be complex and significant due to the amount of skin surface and cerebral space involved in tactile stimulation (Davis, 1973). Clay (1966) and Montague (1971)
further cite the importance of touch and tactile satisfaction in healthy physical and emotional development. Yet, Jourard (1967) suggests modern man is out of touch with the experience of the body.

Touching suggests an intimate closeness and reflects an expectation in our culture that touching occurs in personal and intimate relationships. The frequency and type of adult touching, however, varies with relationships and individuals. Touch may convey encouragement, express tenderness, or display emotional support and identification (Knapp, 1972). Touching to express warmth and affection is used sparingly, yet touch influences others whether communicators know each other or not. Additionally, Jourard (1966) reports females more accessible to touch than males while status appears related to who touches whom (Davis, 1973).

Goffman (1971) notes the occurrence of more touching behavior in our culture than observed or admitted. Interpreting touch, Goffman (1971) emphasizes the importance of the part of the body touched and the context in which touching occurs.

An analysis of greetings and farewells involves five stages, and may include touching behavior (Davis, 1973). Greetings involve sighting and recognition, a distant greeting, an approach, a close salutation, and backing off. The order of occurrence may vary, but always ends in backing off. How the backing off occurs is significant. Turning aside while backing off is less "warm" than continued focus with the whole body (Davis, 1973).

Although the amount of research concerning farewells is less, farewells also include coming close, perhaps touching, and a parting ritual (Davis, 1973).
Proxemic variables. Proxemics, defined as the study of man's use and perception of personal and social space (Knapp, 1972), is developed from the work of E. T. Hall (1959, 1966). Hall (1966) views changing, personal space as informal space, classifying it as intimate distance, personal distance-close phase, personal distance-far phase, social distance-close phase, social distance-far phase, and public distance.

Physical contact to eighteen inches separation defines intimate distance, while one and a half to two and a half feet is personal space-close phase, and approximates an individual's personal space orientation, or "space bubble". Two and a half to four feet is personal distance-far phase, and is appropriate for discussing personal matters. Social distance-close phase is four to seven feet and is exemplified by distances normally assumed by individuals performing work tasks. Seven to twelve feet describes social distance-far phase and is associated with formal conversation.

Nonverbal research concerning spacial relationships focuses on structuring space toward others (Knapp, 1972). Watson (1972) states, "Proxemics is concerned with the relationships of humans and space" (p. 443), although he emphasizes the importance of the total context in proxemic research.

Discussions of pleasant topics appear to result in closer spacial distance than neutral or unpleasant topics (Little, 1968). Leopold (1963) also demonstrates a closer sitting distance when anticipating praise than when anticipating negative comments. Status discrepancy
also appears related to greater distance between interactants
(Mehrabian, 1969).

Little (1965) suggests a small intervening distance is related to positive attitudes of communication. Supporting Little's suggestion (1965), Mehrabian (1969) contends distance between addressee and communicator is related to the degree of negative attitude inferred by or communicated to the addressee. Kleck (1969) observes closer distance during interactions with warm, friendly individuals than with unfriendly individuals.

Patterson (1968) further presents distance as a basis for interpersonal judgments about others.

Associating seating arrangement with intimacy, Sommer (1969) presents side by side seating as most intimate, corner seating next, followed by opposite or face to face seating, and distant arrangements least intimate. Cook (1970) also suggests regulating intimacy through decreasing physical distance.

Hall (1963) uses the sociofugal-sociopetal axis or angle when referring to seating arrangements. Axis points from zero to eight represent eight positions with zero being face to face seating (maximum sociopetality), eight representing back to back seating (maximum sociofugality), two referring to interactants at right angles, and four being side by side seating. Other studies illustrate opposite sitting arrangements during competition, side by side seating while cooperating, and sitting at right angles during ordinary conversation (Davis, 1973).
Miller (1962) observes distance as a negative determinant of affect and closeness a positive indication of affect. In general, individuals stay away from those they dislike or fear, although distance may be related to poor self-image (Koch, 1971).

Rosenfield (1966) concludes distance decreases during approval seeking as compared to distance during approval avoidance; and high affiliation is also associated with closer distance than nonaffiliation (Cook, 1970).

**Literature describing experiential, cognitive, and intermediate supervisory strategies**

The investigation of supervisory sessions is concerned with non-verbal and supervisory variables in terms of process rather than outcome. The study does not assess the end result or outcome of the influence of these variables on trainee growth, but investigates these variables as ingredients of the supervisory process. Hallberg (1971), working from McLuhan's (1964) contention that the "medium is the message", suggests counselor preparation primarily involves transmitting a process. Walz and Roeber (1962) further suggest most supervision literature is concerned with outcomes of techniques and procedures rather than the supervisory process of assisting counselors in personal and professional development.

Seligman and Baldwin (1972), Cottle and Downie (1970), Kell and Burrow (1970), Arbuckle (1965) and Mueller and Kell (1972) provide a basis of literature relevant to the supervision of novice counselors. Seligman and Baldwin (1972) state individual supervision leads to specific and general counselor-trainee growth, but indicate the
dependence of counselor training on supervisor skills and characteristics.

Payne, Winter, and Bell (1972) suggest the need for investigating various types of supervision due to the amount of time devoted to individual supervision and the lack of research assessing different approaches to supervision and training. Hansen and Barker (1964) and Cash and Munger (1966) also indicate the lack of research in supervision supports the need to study and specify different types of supervisory behavior. Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions, edited by Lucio (1967), states:

Effective supervisors are educational change agents, and their effectiveness is contingent on their sensitivity to the operational climate as well as an awareness of strategies involving change (pp. 47-48).

Seligman and Baldwin (1972) believe measurable and applicable strategies of counselor supervision are developing and identifiable as experiential, cognitive, and intermediate. Seligman and Baldwin (1972) do not suggest the effectiveness of one strategy over another; but, similar to McGowan (1956), believe supervisors assume a position or approach congruent with their "response style" and philosophical beliefs. Generally, supervisors express their counseling bias to student counselors and supervise in terms of that position (Demos & Zuwaylif, 1962).

Experiential strategy. Ruble and Gray (1968) believe a legitimate practicum and supervisory goal is integrating the trainee's "self" with counseling techniques. Counselor-trainee integration of personal growth with counseling ability is seen as trainee preparation in understanding the dynamics occurring in a counseling session. Ruble
and Gray (1968) also contend there may be a low relationship among cognitive knowledge of counseling technique and theory and personality, values, and performance of beginning practicum counselors.

Lister (1966) relates the contribution of trainee awareness of subjective experiencing to mature, integrated counseling relationships, and presents ideas for supervisors to assist novice counselors in increasing their subjective experiencing. Associating external behavior with subjective experiencing assists the counselor-trainee in maintaining communication with clients and modifying counselor behavior. The supervisor assists the novice counselor, through inference of the trainee's internal experiencing, and sensitizes the novice counselor to subjective experiencing.

Lister (1964) suggests increased awareness of subjective experiencing leads to the discovery that counseling behavior is based on "personal theory" rather than formal theory. Primary emphasis on the cognitive, intellectual dimensions of supervision may prevent the supervisor from communicating and demonstrating to the trainee the integral nature of trainee experiencing in counseling interactions. Gendlin (1962) also suggests attending to inner experience leads to clearer and more explicit meaning.

Hurst and Jensen (1968) present a "personal growth" approach to counselor training and provide research evidence supporting the desirability, development, and implementation of personal growth training procedures.

Haigh (1965) contends desirable trainee change during supervision involves increased trainee awareness of the ability to use internal
responses. Haigh (1965) further suggests supervisors may be conflicted in their use of didactic or experiential strategies in supervision, but believes the experiential approach to be most appropriate for maximizing trainee growth.

Carkhuff (1969) and Pierce and Schauble (1970) demonstrate supervisor, facilitative conditions are determinants in the change and development of facilitative behaviors in counselor trainees.

Arbuckle (1958) believes the supervisor is more of a counselor than teacher, and assists trainees in coping with actual experiences. Arbuckle (1963) further contends the primary focus of supervision is process, with only a small part concerned with content.

The supervisory paradigm presented by Mueller and Kell (1972), dealing with sources of conflict and anxiety between counselor-trainee and supervisor, client and counselor-trainee, and client and others, also appears relevant to the experiential approach to supervision.

Their paradigm focuses on the need for the supervisee and supervisor to explore and examine: (a) supervisor and trainee feelings and assumptions about each other, (b) anxiety and conflict in the supervisee, (c) the trainee's interpersonal behavior and emotional life and needs, and (d) supervisee behavior and needs directed toward emotional insight. Mueller and Kell (1972) suggest supervision, at times, converges with therapy or counseling.

Payne, Winter, and Bell (1972) indicate "counseling-type" supervision may lower trainee inhibitions and increase congruence; but, because of beginning counselor expectations of supervision (Delaney...
& Moore, 1966; Gysbers & Johnston, 1965), Payne, et al. (1972) suggest supervisory strategy dealing with techniques as more appropriate.

Walz and Roeber (1962) indicate usual supervisor behavior to be cognitive, informative, and somewhat negative in evaluation. However, contradictory findings by Johnston and Gysbers (1966) may indicate a movement away from the instructional, cognitive approach.

Cognitive strategy. Anderson and Bown (1955) perceive supervision for maximum trainee growth as directive, didactic, and evaluative. Mazer and Engle (1968), similar to Anderson and Bown (1955), present evidence supporting the cognitive, instructional strategy over the more experiential supervisory approach. Mazer and Engle (1968) perceive the practicum supervisor as a teacher and, contrary to Patterson (1964) and Arbuckle (1963), present evidence in favor of instruction, informational advice, direction, and structure in supervising beginning practicum counselors (Delaney & Moore, 1966; Driekurs & Sonstegard, 1966; Gysbers & Johnston, 1965; Miller & Oetting, 1966). According to Mazer and Engle (1968) a great deal of counselor training involves only cognitive learning.

As indicated by Seligman and Baldwin (1972), Payne, Winter, and Bell (1972) present evidence suggesting greater trainee growth in empathic understanding when receiving cognitive advice and suggestions from supervisors than with the "counseling type" supervisory strategy. Payne and Gralinski (1968), when comparing didactic with experiential supervisory approaches, present similar findings for empathic improvement in counselor-trainees.
Reddy (1969) suggests didactic, positive, and immediate supervisory feedback as significant ingredients in developing verbal empathic statements in counselor-trainees. Blane (1968) also reports increases in trainee, empathic behavior toward clients when receiving positive verbal statements from supervisors as compared to negative or no supervisor feedback. In connection with these findings, Knapp (1971) suggests "the amount of sensitivity to nonverbal cues is related directly to the amount of interpersonal feedback a person receives and his receptivity and sensitivity to that feedback" (p. 247).

Demos and Zuwaylif (1962), in comparing client-centered, eclectic, and directive supervisory orientations, indicate the manner of trainee improvement of facilitative behavior is dependent on the theoretical orientation of supervisors.

Intermediate strategy. Truax (1970) presents an intermediate supervisory strategy integrating the experiential and cognitive, instructional approaches. Truax (1970) suggests two central elements of this approach are: (a) supervisors communicating facilitative behaviors to trainees and (b) supervisors providing specific didactic training.

Patterson (1964) also presents a position representative of the intermediate approach, and believes supervision may involve supervisor evaluation, but it is not a purely counseling or didactic, teaching approach.

In a presentation at the annual convention of the North Central Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Ohlsen (1974) additionally supports an intermediate approach to counselor supervision.
In addition to expressing facilitative conditions with the supervisee, Ohlsen (1974) perceives the supervisor as discriminating between counseling the supervisee and assisting the trainee in counseling a client. When the supervisor recognizes a trainee's unresolved problems as interfering with the trainee's counseling efficacy, the supervisor explores alternate sources of providing the supervisee assistance with unresolved problems.

As the trainee increasingly accepts personal responsibility for professional growth in supervision, the relationship between trainee and supervisor may change from supervision to consultation. Similar to counseling, a consulting relationship provides facilitative conditions with the trainee, but the supervisee seeks information, professional advice, and assistance from the supervisor in developing professional skill, rather than assistance with personal problems.

In a facilitative climate of support, caring, acceptance, and encouragement, the supervisor may confront the supervisee with evaluations of trainee deficiencies and provide suggestions for improvement.

**Literature relevant to the relation of nonverbal behavior to counseling and supervisory processes**

Relating counselor supervision to nonverbal communication, Ivey (1970) refers to "good" counselors as reflecting a physically relaxed posture, natural movements and gestures, and appropriate eye contact.

In addition to trainee development of facilitative verbal behavior, increased trainee awareness in determining and interpreting nonverbal behavior is also demonstrated by Delaney (1965) and Delaney
and Heimann (1966). Delaney (1969) presents a counselor education program to assist trainees in developing both verbal and nonverbal response leads and behavior competencies, in place of the present and primary emphasis on the analysis of trainee verbal behavior.

Previous studies (Cullan, 1966; Davitz, 1964; Delaney & Heimann, 1966; Island, 1966; Schmidt & Strong, 1970; Strong, Taylor, Bratton, & Loper, 1971) relate nonverbal behavior to counseling; however, little attention is devoted to the relation of nonverbal behavior to the supervision and training of novice counselors. Dunning (1971) states there is a remarkable neglect of nonverbal behavior as a specific research area in fields related to psychology and psychotherapy.

Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) indicate training programs do not establish their efficacy in terms of client benefits; however, during the past decade, considerable growth has occurred in the area of counselor training (Seligman & Baldwin, 1972). Studies have been conducted in the development of training standards, in practices used in the education and supervision of trainees, in systematic investigations of trainee change, in the development of innovative procedures, and in the use of paraprofessionals in counseling and counseling related activities (Seligman & Baldwin, 1972). Shertzer (1971) indicates the 1970's may reflect a phase of "critical evaluation" in counselor education and supervision.

The review of literature appears to justify the inclusion of a study comparing supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior as a legitimate portion of this "critical evaluation".
CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

Presented in this chapter are procedures for data collection, the description of the data and instrument development, and data analysis procedures.

Procedures for Data Collection

Data collection is divided into: (a) the definition of the population and selection of sample, (b) the use of videotape, and (c) the selection and training of independent judges.

Definition of the population and selection of sample

The population is defined as all counselor-trainees, and their practicum supervisors, participating in the Department of Counseling and Personnel practicum course (C-P 628) during fall and winter semesters, 1974-75, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Graduate student supervisors are not considered part of the population.

From seven available practicum supervisors during each semester, a total of eight are available for inclusion in the study due to some supervisors teaching practicums during both semesters. Four supervisors are selected from each of the fall and winter semester practicums.

All trainees enrolled in C-P 628 are paired with their respective supervisors. Since C-P 628 supervisors are not randomly selected, a sample of counselor-trainees is selected, from those identified with each of the respective supervisors, on a random basis according to
availability of trainee, supervisor, and videotaping facilities. One trainee is selected from each of the eight respective counselor educators' total practicum trainees.

The sample includes a total of 16 subjects, consisting of eight counselor educators and eight counselor-trainees.

It is not assumed the population from which the sample is drawn is normally distributed, nor is the population assumed to be equal in variance to other populations; however, it is assumed the observations are independent, the variables under study have underlying continuity, and the sampling distribution is representative of the defined population.

The small sample size and inability to assume normality of the population distribution presents limitations in terms of the normality of the sampling distribution and the generalization or application of conclusions to populations with normal distributions.

Considering the substantive aspects of the research questions, the investigator believes the application of research conclusions generally, rather than only to populations with normal distributions, is justified.

Use of videotape

Following the selection of study participants, supervisors are videotaped in a supervisory session with their respective trainees (videotape equipment description, filming specifications, and sample supervisor-trainee release and consent forms appear in Appendix A). The supervisor-trainee interaction is videotaped for the length of
the session and, for purposes of this investigation, is considered representative of supervisor behavior with the trainee. Sixty-minute videotapes are used for filming, since supervisory sessions are typically one-hour or less in duration.

The entire videotape of each supervisory interaction is viewed by independent judges to obtain assessments of supervisory strategy and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and goal attainment.

Thirty minute segments of each supervisory interaction are viewed by independent judges to assess supervisor nonverbal behavior. The 30 minute segments for independent judges' viewing and assessment consist of 10 minute segments selected from the beginning, middle, and end of each supervisory videotape.

Because the study involves the assessment of supervisors' nonverbal and supervisory behavior, videotape is used to provide maximum verbal and nonverbal stimuli needed to represent the original supervisory session (Kagan, Krathwhol, Goldberg, Campbell, Schauble, Greenberg, Danish, Resnikoff, Bowes, & Bondy, 1967; Shapiro, 1966).


Markey et al. (1970) indicate the increased use of audiovisual playback techniques in counselor education and supervision. Delaney (1969) discusses the use of videotape to increase counselor awareness in determining and interpreting nonverbal communication of emotion (Delaney, 1965; Delaney & Heimann, 1966). Videotape also permits the observance of counselor characteristics, including natural movements.
and gestures, eye contact, and "attitude" communication, as well as increasing the rapidity and effectiveness of the counselor education process (Ivey, 1970).

Yenawine and Arbuckle (1971) conclude videotape provides an objective basis for the evaluation of counselor interviews, is appropriate to critical analyses of relationships and interactions, and provides relevant material in regard to gesticulations and nonverbal expressions.

On the basis of this support, videotaped sessions of eight supervisor-trainee interactions provide the stimuli for independent judges' responses.

Selection and training of independent judges

The judges, independent of the Department of Counseling and Personnel, are selected by the investigator to observe the eight videotaped supervisory sessions, and receive training in the areas of counselor educator supervisory and nonverbal behavior. The training of judges includes: (a) reading selected supervision and nonverbal communication material; (b) didactic instruction, by the investigator, in the areas of supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior; and (c) observing a videotaped supervisory session, prepared by the investigator, for training in the identification and measurement of supervisory and nonverbal behavior. The training videotape is used to establish interjudge agreement regarding identification and measurement of supervisory and nonverbal behavior, prior to assessing the study's videotaped supervisor-trainee sessions.
Judges are selected from student volunteers enrolled in the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences' nonverbal communication course (CAS 570) during winter semester, 1975, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. To prevent judge bias, it is required judges have no previous contact or experience with the eight supervisors to be observed on videotape.

Selection of judges is based on personal interviews, made by the investigator, with student volunteers. Selected judges are paid $2 per hour for participation in the study.

Approximately 32 hours are anticipated for the training of judges and their viewing of and responding to supervisory videotapes. Of the anticipated 32 hours, approximately eight hours are devoted to judge training, approximately three hours of which include viewing and responding to the training videotape.

Counselor supervision and nonverbal communication reading material, assigned to judges, consists of the first two chapters of this thesis. Didactic instruction includes lectures and discussion concerning the material also presented in chapters one and two of the present study.

The judges' viewing of the training videotape, and each of the eight subsequent supervisory videotapes, is divided into five viewing phases: (a) one viewing of the entire videotape in regard to supervisory strategy, behavior, and goal attainment; (b) one viewing of the 30 minute segment of each videotape in terms of supervisor eye contact, head movement, and smiles; (c) one viewing of the 30 minute segment of each videotape for supervisor body movement of the limbs, hands, legs and feet, body orientation, body posture, body position,
and touching behavior; (d) one viewing of the 30 minute segment of each videotape in regard to supervisor vocal characteristics and pauses or hesitations; and (e) one viewing of the 30 minute segment of each videotape in terms of supervisor voice loudness.

Description of the Data and Instrument Development

Counselor educators' and judges' responses to supervisory instruments and judges' responses to observed, videotaped supervisory sessions are the primary source of data.

The description of the data and instrument development are organized in terms of: (a) a description of supervisory variables, (b) the instruments and procedures to measure supervisory variables, (c) a description of nonverbal variables, and (d) the instruments and procedures to measure nonverbal variables.

Description of supervisory variables

Supervisory variables of concern to the investigation include: (a) counselor educators' perception and use of supervisory strategy in supervision sessions with counselor-trainees; (b) information concerning counselor educators' conceptualization of counselor supervision, goals for the supervisory session, and supervisory behavior in the supervision session; (c) counselor educators' satisfaction with the attainment of stated goals for the supervisory session; and (d) counselor educators' satisfaction with stated supervisory behavior used to attain goals for the supervisory session.
**Instruments and procedures to measure supervisory variables**

The instruments designed to investigate supervisory variables include: (a) Pre Supervisory Session Scale, (b) Pre Supervisory Session Ranking, (c) Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire, (d) Post Supervisory Session Scale 1, and (e) Post Supervisory Session Scale 2 (samples of the instruments, developed by the investigator, appear in Appendix B).

Instrument development to assess supervisory variables is founded on the rationale presented in Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions, edited by Lucio (1967):

The supervisory function operates whenever decisions among alternative objectives are made, strategies to achieve defined purposes are planned, and results are explicitly evaluated (p. 11).

Since supervisory strategy, behavior, and goals vary, it appears appropriate to assess supervisor output in terms of supervisory strategy, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and goal attainment. Kelz and Trembley (1965) and Ohlsen (1974) further emphasize the importance of establishing goals and evaluating goal attainment in counselor supervision. Thus, one aspect of the present study is to assess counselor supervision in terms of supervisory goals, behavior, and strategy.

Counselor educators respond only to the pre and post-supervisory session instruments, without videotape stimuli.

Counselor educators' self-identified supervisory strategy, indicated on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking, is compared
with independent judges' ratings of counselor educators' implemented supervisory strategy.

Judges' ratings of implemented supervisory strategy are obtained by viewing the videotaped supervisory session and, on the basis of the viewing, completing the same Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking administered to supervisors.

Counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, indicated on Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2, is compared with independent judges' ratings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals. Judges complete the same Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2 administered to supervisors.

Supervisors respond to Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2 on the basis of their stated supervisory goals and behavior on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire.

Judges' ratings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals are based on the judges' videotaped observance or nonobservance of supervisors' stated goals and behaviors, as indicated by supervisors on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire.

Description of nonverbal variables

The identification of counselor educator nonverbal behavior, in the areas of kinesic, paralinguistic, touching, and proxemic behavior, is based on relevant literature and divided into: (a) assessments of
the frequency of kinesic, paralinguistic and touching behavior; and
(b) measurements of proxemic behavior.

Due to the limitation of measurement devices available to the
investigator, only the following nonverbal variables described are
amenable to investigation in the present study.

The frequency of supervisor kinesic behavior involves: (a)
the number of times eye contact is made by the supervisor; (b) the
number of supervisor movements or gestures of the limbs, hands, head,
and feet and legs; (c) the number of supervisor smiles; (d) the number
of supervisor changes in body orientation; (e) the number of supervisor
matching or mirroring postures; and (f) the number of supervisor for­
ward, reclining, and sideways leaning positions.

Although Kendon (1969) and Birdwhistle (1970) present comprehen­
sive notational systems which attempt to specify and descriminate
detailed kinesic behavior, only the frequency of gross kinesic behavior
is assessed in the present investigation.

The frequency of supervisor eye contact is measured in terms of
units of duration. Supervisor eye contact of 10 seconds or less in
duration is recorded as one unit of eye contact.

The number of supervisor movements of limbs, hands, and feet and
legs are counted according to movement to completion. The beginning
of a movement to stoppage constitutes one movement of a limb, hand, or
feet and legs respectively. Each combined upward and downward or side
to side movement of the head is counted as one head movement.

One smile is recorded each time the supervisor expresses an
observable smile.
A supervisor change in body orientation consists of a change in the degree to which the supervisor's shoulders and legs are turned in the direction of the trainee. A change in the direction of the supervisor's shoulders or legs toward the trainee is counted as one change in supervisor body orientation.

One supervisor matched or mirrored posture is counted each time the supervisor matches or mirrors a posture assumed by the trainee for a duration of 30 seconds or less.

The frequency of supervisor forward, reclining, and sideways leaning position is also assessed in terms of units. One supervisor forward, reclining, or sideways leaning position is counted each time the supervisor assumes one of these positions for 30 seconds or less.

The frequency of supervisor touching behavior includes the amount of: (a) holding, (b) spot touching, (c) accidental brushing, and (d) touching during greetings and farewells.

Hall (1963) also provides a notational system and scale for the analysis of touching behavior. However, only the frequency of supervisor touching is identified in this study.

The frequency of touching behavior is measured according to the number of times the supervisor touches the trainee. Touching for a duration of 30 seconds constitutes one holding response and differentiates holding from spot touching, accidental brushing, and touching during greetings and farewells.

Supervisor paralanguage consists of: (a) the frequency of vocal characteristics, i.e., laughing, yawning, sucking, sneezing, coughing, clearing the throat, and sniffing; (b) the number of changes in vocal
qualifiers, i.e., voice loudness; and (c) the number of vocal segregates, i.e., "nonfluency filled" and "unfilled" pauses or hesitations.

The frequency of vocal characteristics is assessed in terms of the number of supervisor laughing, yawning, sucking, sneezing, coughing, clearing of the throat, and sniffing responses.

One change in voice loudness is counted each time the recorded audio level fluctuates five decibles from the supervisor's normal voice loudness. Normal supervisor voice loudness is established by the investigator prior to the judges' assessment of this variable.

The frequency of supervisor pauses or hesitations is measured according to duration. A supervisor pause or hesitation of five seconds or less in duration, while speaking, is counted as one pause or hesitation. A pause or hesitation of five seconds or less in duration, while speaking, is counted as one "unfilled" pause unless nonfluencies such as "er", "ah", "uh", "um", "uh huh", or variants occur during the pause, in which case the pause is counted as one "nonfluency filled" pause or hesitation.

Supervisory proxemic behavior involves: (a) the physical distance between supervisor and trainee and subsequent classification of supervisor-trainee distance as intimate distance, personal distance-close phase, personal distance-far phase, social distance-close phase, social distance-far phase, and public distance; and (b) the sociofugal-sociopetal axis, i.e., the angle formed by the axis of supervisor-trainee seating arrangement.

Measurements of supervisor proxemic behavior include the physical distance between supervisor and trainee and the angle formed by the
axis of supervisor-trainee seating arrangements. These measurements are obtained by measuring supervisor and trainee chair positions prior to and following each supervisory session.

**Instruments and procedures to measure nonverbal variables**

Recording the frequency of observed, videotaped supervisory kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior is completed by judges viewing the eight supervisory sessions according to the previously specified viewing phases; judges' responding verbally to their observance of occurring supervisor nonverbal behaviors which correspond to the viewing phase under consideration; and the investigator's concurrent tabulation of the frequency of judges' responses to occurring supervisor nonverbal behavior.

Depending on the viewing phase under consideration, judges respond by: (a) verbally identifying the area of supervisor nonverbal behavior, i.e., eye contact, head movement, smiles, body movement of limbs, hands, legs and feet, body orientation, body posture, body position, touching behavior, vocal characteristics of laughing, yawning, sucking, sneezing, coughing, clearing of the throat, and sniffing, pauses or hesitations, and voice loudness; (b) verbally counting supervisor nonverbal behaviors as they occur and are observed; and (c) verbally indicating the beginning and ending of supervisor nonverbal behaviors as they occur and are observed.

As judges respond according to the above procedure, the investigator concurrently tabulates judges' responses concerning the frequency of supervisor nonverbal behaviors on Score Sheets and records the
duration of specified nonverbal behaviors using a stop watch (sample Score Sheets appear in Appendix C).

The frequency of supervisor kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior is tallied from Score Sheet tabulations and appropriate analysis procedures applied to the results.

Supervisor proxemic behavior is obtained by pre and post-supervisory session measurements of supervisor-trainee chair distances and angles, recording these measurements on paper for classification and analysis, and displaying measurements of distances and angles in figure form.

Data Analysis Procedures

Upon collection of data, appropriate statistical procedures are applied in the testing of hypotheses.

An appraisal of the study's exploratory hypotheses is made with the use of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. Siegel (1956) states the efficiency of the Spearman rank correlation is about 91%, when compared with the most powerful parametric correlation, the Pearson r. A .05 level of probability is established for statistical significance.

The remaining hypotheses dealing with the relation among counselor educators' supervisory strategy, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction are assessed by using the Kendall coefficient of concordance. "Such a measure may be particularly useful in studies of interjudge or interest reliability, and also has applications in studies of clusters of variables" (Siegel, 1956, p. 229). "It is useful in determining
the agreement among several judges or the association among three or more variables" (Siegel, 1965, p. 239). The Kendall coefficient of concordance appears applicable to the present study, which is concerned with both interjudge agreement and the association among several variables. A .05 level of probability is again established for statistical significance.

In conjunction with the .05 level of probability established for statistical significance, the magnitude of the anticipated high and low correlations of previously stated hypotheses is differentiated. In reference to Siegel (1956) and for the purposes of this investigation, statistically significant Spearman rank correlation and Kendall coefficient of concordance values are considered high correlations and are differentiated from statistically nonsignificant or low correlation coefficients.

The magnitude of relations is additionally discussed in terms of common factor variance, or the variance shared by and common to two or more variables.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Presented in this chapter are a discussion of analyzed and non-analyzed data and the findings of applied data analysis procedures in testing two exploratory and eight study hypotheses.

The results of training procedures to establish interjudge agreement prior to assessing the study's hypotheses regarding identification and measurement of supervisory and nonverbal behavior are included in Appendix F.

Analyzed and Nonanalyzed Data

The discussion is in terms of data analyzed and anticipated data which are not tested due to nonoccurrence in supervisory sessions.

All anticipated kinesic variables occur in supervisory sessions and are thus amenable to testing.

Anticipated counselor educators' touching behavior, however, does not occur in supervisory sessions and is therefore not involved in data analysis.

Supervisor paralinguistic data are reduced from originally anticipated data. Supervisors' vocal characteristics include all anticipated data except sneezing behavior, which does not occur in supervisory sessions. Also, due to additional limitations in measurement devices, supervisors' vocal qualifiers of voice loudness are not considered in data analysis. Supervisors' vocal segregates, consisting of
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"nonfluency filled" and "unfilled" pauses, do occur and are included in hypothesis testing.

Anticipated supervisor, proxemic behaviors also occur in supervisory sessions, and are considered in the analysis of data.

Findings

Based on the application of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient and the Kendall coefficient of concordance, results of hypotheses testing are reported and hypotheses accepted, not accepted, or rejected at the .05 level of probability.

Results of testing the two exploratory and eight study hypotheses produce findings which require discussion in relation to conclusions. Therefore, results appear in this section, with conclusions, justified by the findings, presented in the discussion portion of the thesis.

Results of Testing Exploratory Hypotheses 1 and 2

Prior to testing the first exploratory hypothesis, counselor educators' and judges' classifications of supervisory strategies are determined, by the investigator, on the basis of data received from supervisors' and judges' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale, Ranking, and Questionnaire.

Where differences between counselor educators' classifications of self-rated supervisory strategies occur on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking, supervisors' responses to items one, two, and three on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire serve the pivotal function in determining intermediate, cognitive, or experiential classifications.
Where differences between judges' ratings of counselor educators' supervisory strategies occur on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking, judges' responses on the pre-session ranking are used in classifying supervisors' strategies as intermediate, cognitive, or experiential.

Using this classification criteria, counselor educators' and judges' classifications of supervisory strategy are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**
Classifications of Counselor Educators' Supervisory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Counselor Educators(^a)</th>
<th>Judges(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Classifications are based on counselor educators' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale, Ranking, and Questionnaire.

\(^b\)Classifications are based on judges' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Ranking.

On the basis of supervisors' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale, Ranking, and Questionnaire, supervisors' self-rated strategies produce the following classifications: (a) supervisors A, B, and E are classified intermediate in supervisory approach; (b) supervisors C and D are classified cognitive; and (c) supervisors F, G, and H are classified experiential in strategy (see Table 1).
Differences between supervisors' self-rated supervisory strategies on the pre-session scale and ranking occur for supervisors A, E, and G (see Table 2). Both supervisors A and G rate themselves experiential on the pre-session scale and intermediate on the pre-session ranking. Supervisor A's responses to items one through three on the pre-session questionnaire indicate an intermediate classification appropriate (see Appendix D for supervisors' responses to items one through three on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire). Supervisor G's responses to the same items on the pre-session questionnaire support an experiential, strategy classification.

### TABLE 2

Classifications of Supervisory Strategies Based on Counselor Educators' Responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Experiential/Intermediate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisor E's self-rating on the pre-session scale is evenly split between an experiential and intermediate approach; while the pre-session ranking indicates an intermediate, supervisory classification. Responses on the pre-session questionnaire support an intermediate classification appropriate for supervisor E.
Supervisors B, C, D, F, and H produce the same self-ratings of supervisory strategy on the pre-session scale and ranking, with supporting responses to these classifications on questionnaire items one through three.

Using judges' observations of videotaped supervisory sessions, and their subsequent ratings on the Pre Supervisory Session Ranking, the following supervisory classifications are produced: (a) supervisors E and F are classified intermediate in supervisory strategy; (b) supervisors B, C, D, and H are classified cognitive; and (c) supervisors A and G are classified experiential in approach (see Table 1).

Differences between judges' ratings of counselor educators' strategies on the pre-session scale occur for supervisors E and F (see Table 3). Judge A's classification of supervisor E is evenly split between an experiential and intermediate strategy, while judge B classifies supervisor E intermediate in approach on the pre-session scale. Both judges, however, classify supervisor E intermediate in strategy on the pre-session ranking. Supervisor E is thus classified intermediate in supervisory approach (see Table 1). Supervisor F is similarly classified experiential and intermediate on the pre-session scale by judge B, while judge A classifies supervisor F intermediate in supervisory strategy. Again, both judges classify supervisor F intermediate on the pre-session ranking, and supervisor F is likewise classified intermediate in approach (see Table 1).

The investigator's determination of counselor educators' and judges' classifications of supervisory strategy is not arbitrary, but is based on tests of association using judge and supervisor data expressed on classification instruments.
TABLE 3

Classifications of Supervisory Strategies
Based on Judges' Responses on the
Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge A</td>
<td>Judge B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Experiential/Intermediate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Experiential/Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying the Spearman rank correlation coefficient to establish judge agreement in classifying supervisory strategies, there is a statistically significant correlation between judges' ratings of supervisory strategies on the combined Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking, $r_s(16) = .66, p < .02$ (see Table 4).

On the basis of Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking scores, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient also indicates a statistically significant agreement between counselor educators' self-rated and judge-rated, supervisory strategies, $r_s(16) = .70, p < .02$ (see Table 5).

However, when testing the association between supervisors' and judges' classifications of supervisory strategies, using supervisors' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale, Ranking, and
Questionnaire and judges' responses on the Pre Supervisory Session Ranking, no statistically significant association is produced, \( r_s (8) = -0.30, p > 0.10 \) (see Table 6).

**TABLE 4**

Agreement Between Rankings of Judge-Rated, Supervisory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank(^a) Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di(^2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge A</td>
<td>Judge B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \sum di^2 = 227.5 \)

\( r_s = 0.66^* \)

\(^a\)Rankings of supervisory strategies are based on judges' combined Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking scores.

\(^*p < 0.02.\)
### TABLE 5

Agreement Between Rankings of Judge-Rated and Supervisor-Rated, Supervisory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank(^a) Counselor Educators</th>
<th>Rank(^a) Judges</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di(^2))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{\text{a}}\text{Rankings of judge-rated and supervisor-rated, supervisory strategies are based on combined Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking scores of counselor educators and judges.}\]

Even though there is statistically significant agreement between supervisor and judge-rated, supervisory strategies when using only Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking scores (\(r_s\) \[16\] = .70, \(p < .02\)), there is no statistically significant correlation between

\[\sum d_i^2 = 205\]
\[r_s = .70^*\]
judges' ratings on the pre-session ranking and supervisors' ratings on the pre-session scale, ranking, and questionnaire, \( r_s = -0.30, \ p > .10 \).

**TABLE 6**

Association Between Rankings of Judge-Rated and Supervisor-Rated, Supervisory Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank Counselor Educators</th>
<th>Rank Judges</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ E_{di^2} = 108 \]

\[ r_s = -0.30^* \]

\(^a\)Rankings of supervisory strategies are based on counselor educators' Pre Supervisory Session Scale, Ranking, and Questionnaire responses.

\(^b\)Rankings of supervisory strategies are based on judges' Pre Supervisory Session Ranking scores.

\(*\ p > .10.\)

Since the investigation uses supervisor-rated strategies on the pre-session scale, ranking, and questionnaire and judges' ratings of supervisory strategy on the pre-session ranking in classifying supervisory strategies, the first exploratory hypothesis of no difference between supervisors' self-identified strategies and judges' ratings of...
implemented supervisory strategies is not accepted, $r_s(8) = -.30$, $p > .10$.

Both counselor educators' self-identified strategies and judges' classifications of supervisory approaches are thus used to test the relation among supervisory strategies, nonverbal behavior, and satisfaction scores as stated in the study hypotheses.

Establishing judge agreement in relation to the second exploratory hypothesis, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient reveals a statistically significant association between the rankings of judges' scores on Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2, $r_s(16) = .83$, $p < .02$ (see Table 7). Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2 assess satisfaction with supervisors' attainment of session goals and supervisory behavior as stated on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire (see Appendix E for Supervisors' stated session goals and behavior).

Testing the second exploratory hypothesis, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient indicates a statistically significant correlation between rankings of judges' and supervisors' satisfaction scores on Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2, $r_s(16) = .76$, $p < .02$ (see Table 8).

Based on these results, the second exploratory hypothesis, which states supervisors' self-rated satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals is the same as judges' ratings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, is accepted at a probability level of $<.02$.

Using the construct of common factor variance (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 88), squaring the coefficient of .76 produces a .58 value and
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indicates 58% of counselor educator and judge variance is shared in common.

**TABLE 7**

Agreement Between Rankings of Judge-Rated Satisfaction with Supervisors' Attainment of Stated Session Goals and Supervisory Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Judge A</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Scale 1 scores - goals |
| | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | H |
| | 11.5 | 13.0 | -1.5 | 2.25 |
| | 13.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| | 16.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| | 6.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| | 9.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 20.25 |
| | 6.0 | 11.0 | -5.0 | 25.00 |

| | Scale 2 scores - behavior |
| | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | H |
| | 3.5 | 8.5 | -5.0 | 25.00 |
| | 11.5 | 10.0 | 1.5 | 2.25 |
| | 14.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| | 3.5 | 8.5 | -5.0 | 25.00 |
| | 9.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 20.25 |
| | 6.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 |
| | 8.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 9.00 |
| | 15.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (d_{i}^2) = 132 \]

\[ r = 0.83^* \]

<sup>a</sup>Rankings of satisfaction with counselor educators' attainment of stated session goals and behavior are based on judges' combined Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2 scores.

*<sup>p</sup> < .02.
Counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals is thus used for comparison with supervisory strategies and nonverbal behavior.

### TABLE 8

Agreement Between Rankings of Judge-Rated and Supervisor-Rated Satisfaction with Supervisors' Attainment of Stated Session Goals and Supervisory Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Counselor Educators</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale 1 scores - goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale 2 scores - behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma d_i^2 = 164 \]
\[ r_s = .76^* \]

<sup>a</sup>Rankings of satisfaction with counselor educators' attainment of stated session goals and behavior are based on combined Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2 scores of counselor educators and judges.

*<sup>p</sup> < .02.
Results of Testing Study Hypotheses 3 and 4

The Kendall coefficient of concordance reveals a statistically significant correlation among the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors ($\omega [20] = .81, p < .001$), when ranking judge-observed, nonverbal frequency data of the eight counselor educators without discriminating supervisor and judge-rated, strategy classifications (see Table 9).

Both counselor educators' and judges' classifications of supervisory approaches are also used when applying the Kendall coefficient of concordance to test the association among rankings of the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors.

Using supervisor-rated classifications of strategies, and ranking the frequency data of intermediately classified counselor educators, a statistically significant correlation is indicated among rankings of supervisors' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors, $\omega (20) = .87$, $p < .001$ (see Table 10).

Supervisor-rated, strategy classifications of cognitive and experiential also reveal statistically significant correlations ($\omega [20] = .90, p < .01$ and $\omega [20] = .85, p < .001$, respectively) among the ranked frequency data of supervisors' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors (see Tables 11 and 12).

The Kendall coefficient of concordance additionally produces statistically significant correlations ($\omega [20] = .86, p < .025$; $\omega [20] = .82, p < .001$; and $\omega [20] = .94, p < .01$) among rankings of counselor educators' nonverbal kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors, when
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TABLE 9
Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior (Without Discriminating Supervisory Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

*p < .001.
### TABLE 10
Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior (Supervisor-Rated, Intermediate Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sums of Ranks (Rj)**

| A | 12 | 14 | 43 | 11 | 6 | 18 | 41 | 48.5 | 29 | 35 | 41 | 50.5 | 60.0 | 33 | 47 | 58.0 | 55 | 33 | 25 |

\[ W = .87^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.  
*\[ p < .001. \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M = .90^*$

Note. In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

$p < .01.$
### TABLE 12

Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior (Supervisor-Rated, Experiential Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sums of Ranks (Rj) | 15          | 3                 | 13                  | 38    | 11           | 7               | 28             | 35.5           | 28.5                    | 39                   | 47.5                | 33                  | 31       | 47     | 58.0   | 47.5            | 44     | 58.0   | 56.0        | 17             | 26             |

Note. In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

*p < .001.
applied to judge-rated classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential supervisory approaches, respectively (see Tables 13, 14, and 15).

Looking at the correlations of supervisor and judge-rated classifications, the correlations of intermediately classified supervisors' are .87 and .86, respectively, and are the second highest correlations using both supervisors' and judges' classifications. Cognitively classified supervisors produce correlations of .90 and .82, .90 being the highest correlation for supervisor-rated classifications and .82 being the lowest association using judge-rated classifications. Experientially classified supervisors reveal associations of .85 and .94, .85 assuming the lowest correlation using supervisor-rated classifications and .94 being the highest correlation for judge-rated classifications.

Since hypotheses three and four are directional, the following statements are made on the basis of the results. Hypothesis three, which states there is a high correlation among the experiential rankings of the frequency of supervisors' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors, is accepted at a probability level of <.01. Hypothesis four, however, is rejected at a <.025 probability level, since there are high correlations among the cognitive and intermediate rankings of the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors.

Results of Testing Study Hypotheses 5 and 6

Both counselor educators' and judges' classifications of supervisory strategies are used when applying the Spearman rank correlation
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### TABLE 13

Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior (Judge-Rated, Intermediate Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

*P < .025
### TABLE 14
Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior (Judge-Rated, Cognitive Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Movement - Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Movement - Side</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limb Movement (Arm)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Movement - Down</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg/Feet Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Movement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Movement - mirrored</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Changes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched Posture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrored Posture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Sideways</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Forward</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Reclining</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Sideways</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Reclining</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Orientation Forward</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yawning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sniffing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coughing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled Pauses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled Pauses</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled Pauses</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled Pauses</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

*p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sums of Ranks (Rj)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. In ascending order, the lowest rank is assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior.

*p < .01.
coefficient to test the association between rankings of supervisors' physical distance and seating angle data.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient is used to test hypotheses five and six, since the association being tested is between two rankings of supervisors' nonverbal behavior, i.e., physical distance and seating angle, rather than the relation among several rankings of supervisors' nonverbal behavior, in which case the Kendall coefficient of concordance is applicable.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient does not indicate a statistically significant correlation ($r_s = .64, p > .05$) between rankings of supervisors' physical distance and seating angle data when not discriminating supervisor and judge-rated, strategy classifications (see Table 16).

Supervisor-rated, strategy classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential produce the following respective and statistically nonsignificant correlations between rankings of supervisors' physical distance and seating angle data: $r_s (3) = .50, p = .33$; $r_s (2) = 1.0, p = .50$; and $r_s (3) = -1.0, p = .17$ (see Tables 17, 18, and 19).

Statistically nonsignificant correlations are also indicated between rankings of counselor educators' seating angle and physical distance when the Spearman rank correlation coefficient is applied to the respective judge-rated, strategy classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential, $r_s (2) = 1.0, p = .50$; $r_s (4) = .75, p = .12$; and $r_s (2) = 1.0, p = .50$ (see Tables 20, 21, and 22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum di^2 = 30.50 \]
\[ r_s = .64^* \]

Note. In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

*\( p > .05 \).

Although none of the correlations are statistically significant at the established .05 level of probability, two perfect, positive correlations for judge-rated classifications of intermediate and experiential, and one perfect, positive and one perfect, negative correlation for the respective, supervisor-rated classifications of cognitive and experiential are indicated. These correlations are further presented in the discussion portion of the thesis.

However, due to statistically nonsignificant probability levels (\( p > .05 \)) both hypotheses five and six are not accepted.
### TABLE 17
Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance (Supervisor-Rated, Intermediate Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank Seating Angle</th>
<th>Rank Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 2 \]
\[ r_s = .50^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

\*\( p = .33 \).

### TABLE 18
Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance (Supervisor-Rated, Cognitive Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank Seating Angle</th>
<th>Rank Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 0 \]
\[ r_s = 1.00^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

\*\( p = .50 \).
### TABLE 19

**Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance**  
(Supervisor-Rated, Experiential Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 8 \]
\[ r_s = -1.0^* \]

*Note.* In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

*p = .17.*

### TABLE 20

**Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance**  
(Judge-Rated, Intermediate Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 0 \]
\[ r_s = 1.0^* \]

*Note.* In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

*p = .50.*
### TABLE 21

**Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance (Judge-Rated, Cognitive Strategy)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 2.5 \]
\[ r_s = 0.75^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

*p = .12.*

### TABLE 22

**Association Between Rankings of Supervisors' Seating Angle and Physical Distance (Judge-Rated, Experiential Strategy)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Rank Differences (di)</th>
<th>Rank Differences Squared (di²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Sigma di^2 = 0 \]
\[ r_s = 1.0^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' largest seating angle and closest physical distance.

*p = .50.*
Results of Testing Study Hypotheses 7 and 8

Ranking the data of the eight counselor educators, without discriminating supervisor and judge-rated, supervisory strategies, the Kendall coefficient of concordance reveals a statistically significant correlation among rankings of the frequency of supervisors' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors and supervisors' scores of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, \( W(22) = .80, p < .001 \) (see Table 23).

Using supervisor-rated classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential approaches, statistically significant correlations are also produced (\( W[22] = .88, p < .001 \); \( W[22] = .89, p < .01 \); and \( W[22] = .81, p < .001 \), respectively) among rankings of the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors and scores of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals (see Tables 24, 25, and 26).

On the basis of judges' classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential supervisory strategies, the Kendall coefficient of concordance likewise produces statistically significant correlations (\( W[22] = .85, p < .025 \); \( W[22] = .82, p < .001 \); and \( W[22] = .95, p < .005 \), respectively) among rankings of the frequency of kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors and supervisors' goal and behavior satisfaction scores (see Tables 27, 28, and 29).

Both counselor educators' and judges' classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential supervisory strategies thus produce statistically significant associations among the rankings of kinesic, paralinguistic, and satisfaction data.
TABLE 23
Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior and Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores (Without Discriminating Supervisory Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Eye</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Hand Movement</th>
<th>Head Movement</th>
<th>Leg/Post Movement</th>
<th>Nodded Posture</th>
<th>Body Orientation Change</th>
<th>Body Position Forward</th>
<th>Body Crossing</th>
<th>Spitting</th>
<th>Laughing</th>
<th>Yawning</th>
<th>Sniffing</th>
<th>Sneezing</th>
<th>Coughing</th>
<th>Filled Pause</th>
<th>Unfilled Pause</th>
<th>Goal Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum of Ranks (Rj)**: 41  8  33  113.5  30  19  54  106.5  122.5  93  127.5  81  99  133.5  168.0  102.5  132.5  166.5  155.5  71  63  146.0  141.5

\[ \mu = .80 \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

*p < .001.*
### TABLE 24

**Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators’ Nonverbal Behavior and Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores (Supervisor-Rated, Intermediate Strategy)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior</th>
<th>Rank of Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior</th>
<th>Rank of Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior</th>
<th>Rank of Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators’ nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

*p < .001.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior and Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7 1 2 14 5 4 3 19 12 13 21 8 10 15 16 9 23 18 22 11 6 17 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7 1 4 16 3 2 5 9 18 12 20 8 15 17 22.5 11 14 21 13 10 6 22.5 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sums of Ranks (Rj)**

| Rank | 14 2 6 30 8 6 8 28 30 25 41 16 25 32 38.5 20 37 39 35 21 12 39.5 39 |

\( U = .89^a \)

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

\( ^a p < .01. \)
### TABLE 26

Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior and Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores (Supervisor-Rated, Experiential Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Observed, Nonverbal Behavior and Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

*p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Judge-Oberved, Novell Behavioral and Supervisor-Rated, Satisfaction Scores</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks (T)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>( M = .98 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Counselor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Irate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Correct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Error</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' novel behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

* \( p < .025 \)
TABLE 28

Association Among Rankings of the Frequency of Counselor Educators' Nonverbal Behavior and Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores (Judge-Rated, Cognitive Strategy)

| B | 6 | 1 | 4 | 16.5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 22.5 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 20.5 | 22.5 | 11 | 15 | 20.5 | 19 | 12 | 8 | 16.5 | 18 |
| C | 1 | 1 | 2 | 14 | . | 5 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 21 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 20 |
| D | 7 | 1 | 4 | 16 | . | 3 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 18 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 22.5 | 11 | 14 | 21 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 22.5 | 19 |
| H | 6 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 12 | 10 | 17 | 8 | 13 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 15 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 14 |

Sums of Ranks (Rj)

| | 20 | 4 | 15 | 55.5 | 14 | 10 | 24 | 62.5 | 73.0 | 44 | 60 | 46 | 43 | 65.5 | 61.5 | 51.5 | 67 | 80.0 | 74.5 | 37 | 27 | 72.0 | 71 |

Note. In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

*p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Behavior</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>\begin{tabular}{l} \text{Eye} \ \text{Head Movement - Up} \ \text{Head Movement - Down} \ \text{Shoulder} \ \text{Limb (Arm)} \ \text{Head Movement - Right} \ \text{Head Movement - Left} \ \text{Nodded} \ \text{Hunched Posture} \ \text{Mirrored Posture} \ \text{Body Congenital Changes} \ \text{Body Position - Recumbent} \ \text{Body Position - Reclining} \ \text{Lambling} \ \text{Yawning} \ \text{Sucking} \ \text{Cringing} \ \text{Coughing} \ \text{Sniffing} \ \text{Filled Pause} \ \text{Unfilled Pause} \ \text{Goal Satisfaction} \ \text{Behavior Satisfaction} \end{tabular}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 15 9 11 8 12 13 19 10 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 10 11 20.5 12 8 15 22.5 17 16 22.5 20.5 5 9 19 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sums of Ranks \( (R_j) \) | 10 | 2 | 9 | 27 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 25 | 25 | 38.5 | 20 | 25 | 45.0 | 29 | 29 | 45.0 | 39.5 | 11 | 19 | 39 | 39 |

\( \mu = .95 \)

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to the highest frequency of counselor educators' nonverbal behavior and highest satisfaction scores.

\( p < .005 \)
Supervisor-rated classifications of strategies indicate the association among rankings of the cognitive approach to be the highest (.89) with rankings of the intermediate and experiential, strategy classifications next and in order, .88 and .81.

The judge-rated, intermediate approach, similar to the supervisor-rated classification, produces the second highest correlation among rankings of nonverbal and satisfaction data (.85); however, reversing the order of supervisor-rated classifications, the correlation among rankings of the judge-rated, experiential strategy is the highest (.95), while the association among rankings of the judge-rated, cognitive approach is the lowest, .82.

Based on these results, hypothesis seven, which states there is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, the frequency of counselor educator kinesic and paralinguistic behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, is accepted at the <.001 and <.005 levels of probability, respectively, for supervisor and judge-rated classifications.

Additionally, statistically significant correlations of .89 and .82, respectively, among rankings of the supervisor and judge-rated, cognitive strategies and .88 and .85, respectively, among rankings of the supervisor and judge-rated, intermediate strategies indicate sufficiently high associations to reject hypothesis eight.

Results of Testing Study Hypotheses 9 and 10

Using the rankings of all counselor educators, without discriminating supervisor and judge-rated, strategy classifications, the
Kendall coefficient of concordance reveals a statistically significant association among rankings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle, \( W(8) = .51, \ p < .025 \) (see Table 30).

TABLE 30

Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Without Discriminating Supervisory Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
<th>Goal Satisfaction</th>
<th>Behavior Satisfaction</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( W = .51^* \)

Note. In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

*\( p < .025 \).

Supervisor and judge-rated classifications, however, do not indicate statistically significant correlations among rankings of supervisors' goal and behavior satisfaction scores, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.
The only exception to this statement is a statistically significant association among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings of the supervisor-rated, intermediate classification, \( W (2) = .75, p < .025 \) (see Table 31).

### TABLE 31

Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Supervisor-Rated, Intermediate Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank of Ranks (Rj)</th>
<th>Goal Satisfaction</th>
<th>Behavior Satisfaction</th>
<th>Physical Distance</th>
<th>Seating Angle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( W = .75^* \)

*Note.* In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

\( ^*p < .025. \)

The cognitive and experiential approaches, resulting from supervisor-rated classifications, do not reveal statistically significant associations, \( W (1) = .25, p > .25 \) and \( W (2) = .25, p > .25 \), respectively (see Tables 32 and 33).

Testing the association among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings, using judge-rated classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential strategies, statistically nonsignificant associations are revealed, \( W (1) = .25, p > .25; \)
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\( W (3) = .13, \ p > .35; \) and \( W (1) = .25, \ p > .25, \) respectively (see Tables 34, 35, and 36).

### TABLE 32

Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Supervisor-Rated, Cognitive Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Rank Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Satisfaction</td>
<td>Behavior Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Distance</td>
<td>Seating Angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( W = .25^* \)

Note. In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

\( *p > .25. \)

Results thus indicate nonacceptance of hypothesis nine due to low correlations (.25) and statistically nonsignificant levels of probability (\( p > .25 \)) for the association among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings of supervisor and judge-rated, experiential strategies.

In relation to hypothesis ten, neither supervisor or judge-rated, cognitive classifications produce statistically significant correlations (\( p > .25 \) and \( > .35 \), respectively) among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings. Therefore, the hypothesis of a low correlation among rankings of cognitively classified supervisors is not accepted at the established .05 probability level.
### TABLE 33

Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Supervisor-Rated, Experiential Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Goal Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Behavior Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Physical Distance Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W = .25^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

\[^*P > .25.\]

### TABLE 34

Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Judge-Rated, Intermediate Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor Educator</th>
<th>Goal Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Behavior Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Physical Distance Rank</th>
<th>Seating Angle Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W = .25^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

\[^*P > .25.\]
### TABLE 35
Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Judge-Rated, Cognitive Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Rank Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W = .13^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

*\( p > .35. \)

### TABLE 36
Association Among Rankings of Supervisors' Goal and Behavior Satisfaction Scores, Physical Distance, and Seating Angle (Judge-Rated, Experiential Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Rank Sum of Ranks (Rj)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W = .25^* \]

**Note.** In ascending order, the lowest ranks are assigned to counselor educators' highest goal and behavior satisfaction scores, largest seating angle, and closest physical distance.

*\( p > .25. \)
Also in relation to hypothesis ten, the judge-rated, intermediate classification does not indicate a statistically significant association \((p > .25)\) among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings. However, the supervisor-rated, intermediate classification does produce a high and statistically significant correlation \((W^2 = .75, p < .025)\) among these variables. The hypothesis of a low correlation among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle rankings for the supervisor-rated, intermediate classification is, therefore, rejected.

Summary of Findings

Summarizing, the following statements are made in reference to the acceptance, nonacceptance, or rejection of hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1**

Counselor educators' self-identified supervisory strategy is the same as independent judges' ratings of counselor educators' implemented supervisory strategy.

A probability level of \(>.10\) indicates the nonacceptance of exploratory hypothesis one.

**Hypothesis 2**

Counselor educators' self-rated satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals is the same as independent judges' ratings of satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Exploratory hypothesis two is accepted at a probability level of \(<.02\).
Hypothesis 3

There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy and the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior.

Removing the variable of touching behavior due to nonoccurrence in supervisory sessions, study hypothesis three is accepted at the <.001 probability level for supervisor-rated, strategy classifications and at a probability level of <.01 for judge-rated classifications.

Hypothesis 4

There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies and the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior.

Again removing the touching behavior variable, hypothesis four is rejected at the <.001 and <.01 levels for respective, supervisor-rated, intermediate and cognitive strategies and at the <.025 and <.001 levels for respective, judge-rated classifications of intermediate and cognitive.

Hypothesis 5

There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

Hypothesis five is not accepted for supervisor-rated classifications ($p = .17$) or judge-rated classifications ($p = .50$).

Hypothesis 6

There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.
Hypothesis six is also not accepted at probability levels of $p = .33$ and $p = .50$ for supervisors' respective classifications of intermediate and cognitive and at levels of $p = .50$ and $p = .12$ for respective, judge-rated classifications of intermediate and cognitive.

Hypothesis 7

There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Eliminating touching behavior due to nonoccurrence, hypothesis seven is accepted at a probability level of $<.001$ for supervisors' strategy classifications and at a $<.005$ level for judge-rated classifications.

Hypothesis 8

There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, the frequency of counselor educator kinesic, paralinguistic, and touching behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

Again eliminating touching behavior as a variable, supervisors' classifications of strategies indicate rejection of hypothesis eight at the $<.001$ probability level for the intermediate classification and at a probability level of $<.01$ for the cognitive approach. Judges' classifications also indicate rejection of hypothesis eight for the intermediate and cognitive classifications at probability levels of $<.025$ and $<.001$, respectively.
Hypothesis 9

There is a high correlation among the experiential supervisory strategy, satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

Hypothesis nine is not accepted at the >.25 probability level for supervisors' and judges' classifications.

Hypothesis 10

There is a low correlation among the cognitive and intermediate supervisory strategies, satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, distance appropriate for discussing personal matters, and intimate or cooperative seating angle.

The portion of hypothesis ten concerning the cognitive strategy is not accepted at the >.25 probability level for supervisors' classifications and the >.35 level of probability for judge-rated classifications. Similarly, judge-rated classifications of the intermediate approach are not statistically significant (p >.25). However, the portion of hypothesis ten concerning the supervisor-rated, intermediate classifications is rejected (p <.025).

These findings provide the framework for statements, discussion, and conclusions presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

Discussion concerning practical and theoretical implications of findings and conclusions and recommendations are presented in this chapter.

Statements regarding the results of hypotheses analyzed by the Kendall coefficient of concordance, and estimating the "true" ranking of nonverbal and satisfaction variables, are based on the order of sums of ranks, $R_j$ (Siegel, 1956). Siegel (1956) additionally suggests the best estimate of true ranking is provided by the order of sums of ranks only when the Kendall coefficient of concordance is significant.

Practical and theoretical implications, in reference to hypotheses and findings and clarified by the work of others, suggest possible consequences for counselor education and supervision.

Conclusions and recommendations concern study findings, theoretical and practical contributions, resolution of defined purposes, and limitations and suggested improvements of the investigation.

Practical and Theoretical Implications

Discussion and implications of hypothesis 1

In relation to hypothesis one, and using judges' and supervisors' responses on scale and ranking instruments, a statistically significant correlation is apparent, $r_s (16) = .70, p < .02$. Thus, there is indication of agreement between supervisors' and judges' ratings of
supervisory strategy. However, using strategy classifications based on judges' ratings on the ranking instrument and supervisors' responses on scale, ranking, and questionnaire instruments, hypothesis one is not accepted, $r_s(8) = -0.30$, $p > .10$.

Therefore, the question still remains concerning similarities or differences between supervisors' self-identified, supervisory strategies and judges' ratings of implemented, supervisory strategies.

Perhaps intermediate, cognitive, and experiential, supervisory strategies are not amenable to categorization; rather, strategies may fall on a continuum, with experiential and cognitive approaches located at the extremes of the continuum and the intermediate approach occupying a central position. Supervisors may thus assume differing degrees or characteristics of a particular strategy, which in some cases overlap with characteristics of an adjoining approach on the continuum. An overlap between strategies occupying the extremes of the continuum, however, is not anticipated.

Going beyond the data and results and using a continuum to discuss supervisory strategies, perhaps little or no difference between judges' and supervisors' ratings of approaches, which may overlap on a continuum, is an acceptable and anticipated result.

Looking at strategy classifications from this frame of reference, an overlap between judges' and supervisors' classifications of experiential and intermediate and cognitive and intermediate is anticipated, and is perhaps applicable to supervisors A, B, and F (see Table 1). However, supervisor H, self-rated as experiential and judge-rated as cognitive in approach (see Table 1), represents a
difference between judge and supervisor classifications at the extremities of the continuum. An overlap involving the extremes of a continuum is not anticipated, and for this supervisor is a possible indication of "real" difference between self-identified and implemented, supervisory strategy.

Seligman and Baldwin (1972) contend there is a lack of explicit, formal, and systematic theories of supervision. Additionally, the inability of this research to identify differences or similarities between supervisors' and judges' ratings of supervisory strategies suggests the appropriateness of concentrating on existing, or creating new, theories of supervision concerned with the development and implementation of supervisory approaches.

An existing theoretical framework which is fluid, flexible, and applicable to the development and implementation of supervisory strategies is that of McGowan (1956). The theory suggests development of a strategy congruent with individuals' "response styles" and philosophical beliefs. Similar to the formulation of a "counseling style", McGowan (1956) implies the importance of a "personal theory", as well as formal theory, in strategy development and use.

Related to the consideration of personal style and formal theory, Lucio (1967) suggests effective supervision is dependent on situational variables and an awareness of strategies involving change. In addition, supervisor personality may be considered an important variable in relation to the development and implementation of effective supervision strategies.
Despite the use of supervised practicums in counselor education programs, available literature describing supervision process and outcome, and the amount of time spent in individual supervision; little attention is devoted to such variables as formal theory, personal style, operational climate, supervisor personality, and change strategies in the training and education of prospective supervisors.

These statements are merely intended to provide conjecture, possible explanations, stimulation, and suggestions in further exploring the unanswered question of the study's first hypothesis: Can counselor educators accurately identify the supervisory strategy from which they supervise?

Discussion and implications of hypothesis 2

In reference to the second hypothesis, supervisors' ratings of satisfaction with their attainment of stated session goals and supervisory behavior are in close agreement with judges' ratings of these variables, \( r_s (16) = .76, p < .02 \). It thus appears counselor educators do accurately assess satisfaction with their supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals.

This finding implies the inappropriateness of attempting to demonstrate one approach more effective or satisfactory than another and the benefit of specifying evaluative criteria to increase the efficacy of counselor supervision and training, regardless of supervisory strategy.
The evaluation of defined supervisory goals, objectives, purposes, and behaviors seems most productive in an attempt to understand and effectively apply these conditions to the supervisory process and the acquisition of supervisory skills in the training of counselor educators. Supporting this position, Lucio (1967) describes the supervisory function in terms of providing alternative goals or objectives, defining and planning purposes, and evaluating results. Trembley (1965) and Ohlsen (1974) further emphasize the importance of goal specification, establishment, and evaluation in counselor-training.

The present study "forces" supervisors to identify their goals and behaviors prior to the supervisory session, thus providing criteria to evaluate satisfaction. A remaining concern to the investigator, however, is whether counselor educators typically specify, define, and evaluate their session goals and supervisory behavior in the supervision of novice counselors. Counselor education programs and practicums evaluate counselor-trainees in terms of performance and attainment of specified criteria; yet, how often do counselor educators not define and evaluate, implicitly or explicitly, their own session goals, supervisory behavior, or other objectives and criteria in supervising counselor-trainees?

Discussion and implications of hypotheses 3 and 4

Hypothesis three's predicted high correlation among the frequency of counselor educators' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors is
accepted at the <.001 and <.01 levels of probability, respectively, for supervisor and judge-rated experiential strategies.

The low correlation among these variables and the cognitive and intermediate strategies, predicted in hypothesis four, is rejected at the <.01 and <.001 probability levels, respectively, for supervisor and judge-rated, cognitive strategies and at the <.001 and <.025 levels for the respective supervisor and judge-rated, intermediate strategies.

Since the Kendall coefficient of concordance is statistically significant for both hypotheses three and four, the five lowest, five-second lowest, and five highest sums of ranks are arbitrarily selected to discuss nonverbal behaviors of both supervisors' and judges' classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential strategies.

Also based on relevant literature and research presented in chapter one, the following statements are not presented as declarative, but are provided as inferential meanings to the nonverbal behaviors of supervisors representing all three strategies.

Head movement (up), hand movement, limb (arm) movement, and head movement (side) are among the five lowest sums of ranks, and the most frequently occurring nonverbal behaviors, for all three supervisory approaches.

Supervisors' frequent or high level gestural activity of the head, arms, and hands is indicative of communicating emotional arousal, approval seeking, a desire to talk, feedback, points and point transitions, and deception.

The intermediate and experiential approaches also include eye contact within the five lowest sums of ranks, with eye contact.
serving several functions and conveying several kinds of information (Ellsworth and Ludwig, 1972). Nonverbal literature and research commonly associate frequent eye contact with serving functions and conveying information such as: agreement or attention; confidence and interest; openness of communication channel and a desire to interact; positive attitudes; approval seeking; a need for affiliation, involvement, or inclusion; emotional arousal; and psychologically reducing physical distance.

The cognitive approach also communicates the information and serves the functions associated with eye contact, but less frequently than the intermediate and experiential approaches. Dissimilar from the intermediate and experiential strategies, the frequency of eye contact for the cognitive approach is among the five-second lowest sums of ranks, with leg and feet movement among the five lowest. According to Knapp (1972) the occurrence of competition, dislike, tension, or deception are more likely with less frequent eye contact; while Ekman and Friesen (1969a) additionally suggest leg and feet movement is the best source of nonverbal stimuli indicating deception.

Also, in relation to the frequency of supervisors' leg and feet movement, it is among the five-second lowest rank sums for intermediate and experiential strategies and is perhaps indicative of deception, but to a lesser degree than the cognitive approach.

It thus appears intermediate and experiential strategies convey nonverbal information and messages, such as those mentioned, through frequent gestural activity and eye contact. Cognitive supervisors similarly communicate this information through gestural activity of
the head, arms, and hands; but they may also convey more deception, tension, dislike, or competition through less frequent eye contact and more frequent leg and feet movement.

In reference to the five-second lowest sums of ranks, all strategies include "nonfluency filled" and "unfilled" pauses. Cook (1965) and Dittman and Llewellyn (1968) report nonfluencies increase under the following conditions: the speaker requires time to think, the idea expressed is complex, there are fears about the subject matter, there is a need to impress the listener, or there are pressures for immediate responses. Research indicates pauses "filled" with nonfluencies impair performance when compared with "unfilled" pauses (Goldman-Eisler, 1961; Livant, 1963); and as nonfluencies increase, the perception of speaker competence, credibility, and dynamism decrease (Miller and Hewgill, 1964; Sereno and Hawkins, 1967).

The frequent occurrence of "nonfluency filled" pauses may thus indicate perception of decreased supervisor competence, performance, credibility, and dynamism among the three supervisory strategies.

Additionally, supervisors' and judges' classifications of intermediate approaches reveal sucking behavior among the five-second lowest rank sums. This frequency is attributed to more smoking and coffee drinking behavior among intermediately classified supervisors.

The intermediate and cognitive approaches also share reclining body position in common among the five-second lowest rank sums. Generally, reclining angles decrease as attitudes toward individuals become more positive, while individuals leaning backward and away are perceived as neutral or negative in attitude (Mehrabian, 1969).
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However, the reclining position may indicate a more neutral than negative attitude for the intermediate strategy, due to more frequent eye contact and subsequent psychological reduction of physical distance.

The experiential approach indicates mirrored (reversed) posture within the five-second lowest sums of ranks. Matched or mirrored postures reflect shared, common points of view or attitudes between interactants (Scheflen, 1964). The frequency of experiential supervisors' mirrored posture thus appears to convey a degree of attitude congruence between experiential supervisors and counselors-in-training.

Forward body position, indicative of a liking attitude toward others, is among the five-highest sums of ranks for the experiential strategy, but is perhaps more a reflection of the incompatibility of supervisors simultaneously mirroring posture and leaning forward than dislike.

Also among the five-highest sums of ranks, and the least frequently occurring nonverbal behaviors for the three approaches, are sniffing, coughing, and yawning. The low frequency of these vocal characteristics among the three approaches may reveal the low influential nature of these variables in the supervisory process.

Summarizing, and in relation to kinesic variables, frequent eye contact and gestural activity of the head, arms, hands, and legs and feet suggest the importance, needed consideration, and practical applications of these variables to the supervisory process. Supervisors' awareness of their expression of these nonverbal behaviors, and possible meanings conveyed, provide a basis for improved supervisor and counselor training effectiveness.
To a lesser degree, but still of concern to the supervisory process, are kinesic variables of body position and posture, and attitudes communicated by these behaviors.

Paralinguistic variables of practical importance to counselor education and supervision are "filled" and "unfilled" pauses. Nonfluency filled pauses are of particular concern to counselor supervision and training due to adverse consequences often associated with filled hesitations.

Applicable to supervisors and the supervisory process, the ability to increase awareness in determining and interpreting nonverbal behavior is demonstrated among counselor-trainees by Delaney (1965) and Delaney and Heiman (1966). Delaney (1969) also emphasizes and discusses the importance of developing both verbal and nonverbal behavior competencies, in place of the present, primary emphasis on the analysis of verbal behaviors in counselor training and supervision.

The present investigation displays the high and low frequency of specific nonverbal behaviors, implies the importance and applicability of these behaviors to counselor supervision and training, and suggests counselor education not continue to neglect the influence of these variables in training and supervision processes.

Discussion and implications of hypotheses 5 and 6

As indicated in chapter three, none of the correlations pertaining to supervisory strategies and the proxemic variables of hypotheses five and six are statistically significant at the .05 level of probability, and both hypotheses are not accepted.
Despite nonsignificance of results and nonacceptance of hypotheses, movements are indicated for supervisor and judge-rated, supervisory strategies (supervisors' physical distances and seating angles are presented in Appendix G, Figures 1 through 8).

Supervisor-rated classifications produce one perfect, positive and one perfect, negative correlation for the cognitive and experiential strategies, respectively.

Judge-rated, supervisory strategies produce perfect, positive correlations for both the experiential and intermediate approaches.

Cognitive strategies. Supervisors C and D, self-identified as cognitive in supervisory approach, increase physical distance between themselves and the trainee resulting in a social distance-close phase classification of distance. The social distance-close phase classification represents a distance normally assumed by individuals performing work tasks. The distance between supervisor C and trainee increases from 41 to 48 inches (1.04 to 1.22 m), while the physical distance between trainee and supervisor D increases from 41 to 50 inches (1.04 to 1.27 m).

In relation to the proxemic variable of seating angle between supervisor and trainee, the angle between trainee and supervisor C increases from 73 to 80 degrees, yet remains within an axis point classification of two; while the angle between supervisor D and trainee decreases from 73 to 45 degrees, and changes from a classification position of two to one.

The axis point classification of two is an angle appropriate for ordinary conversation and second most in intimacy when compared with
the most intimate angle of side by side seating. An axis point classification of one is a competitive angle and the least intimate when compared to right angle or side by side seating arrangement.

**Experiential strategies.** For both supervisor and judge-rated experiential approaches, supervisors remain within the personal distance-far phase classification and axis point classification of two.

In relation to supervisor-rated experiential strategies, the distance between supervisor F and trainee is 41 inches (1.04 m) prior to and following the supervisory session. The distance between trainee and supervisor H increases from 41 to 41 1/2 inches (1.04 to 1.05 m), and from 41 to 42 inches (1.04 to 1.07 m) between supervisor G and trainee.

The seating angle between trainee and supervisor F remains at 73 degrees; while there is an increase from a 73 to 74 degree angle between supervisor H and trainee. The greatest increase in angle between a supervisor and trainee, from a 73 to 95.5 degree angle, occurs between trainee and supervisor G.

For judge-rated experiential strategies, the increase in physical distance between supervisor A and trainee is from 41 to 43 inches (1.04 to 1.09 m), and from 41 to 42 inches (1.04 to 1.07 m) between trainee and supervisor G.

The angle between supervisor A and trainee decreases from a 73 to 70 degree angle; while the angle between supervisor G and trainee increases from a 73 to 95.5 degree angle.

**Intermediate strategies.** Judge-rated, intermediate strategies display a change from a personal distance-far phase to social
distance-close phase classification between supervisor E and trainee; while supervisor F and trainee remain within the personal distance-far phase classifications.

The greatest increase in physical distance, from 41 to 53 inches (1.04 to 1.35 m), occurs between trainee and supervisor E. The distance between supervisor F is 41 inches (1.04 m) prior to and following the supervisory session.

The seating angle between trainee and supervisor F does not change from 73 degrees and remains at an axis position of one. The angle between supervisor E and trainee decreases from a 73 to 53 degree angle and changes from an axis position of two to one.

Summary. In terms of proxemic variables, supervisors do not assume seating angles or physical distances identified as most intimate: right angle seating and intimate distance.

Additionally, the absence of touching behavior in supervisory sessions is a possible consequence of the less intimate physical distances and seating angles assumed by counselor educators.

Despite the expressed importance of touch and tactile stimulation in healthy physical and emotional development (Clay, 1966; Montague, 1971), Jourard (1967) suggests modern man does not experience touch. Counselor educators' assumption of distances and angles, typically not intimate or appropriate enough to easily touch another, may reflect the sparse use of touch to convey personal and intimate relationships or closeness in counselor supervision.

The lack of touching behavior in supervisory sessions is perhaps an important concern to a profession training individuals to assist
others in healthy emotional development, and perhaps signifies an area of counselor training and supervision requiring additional attention, consideration, and exploration.

Even though findings are not statistically significant ($p > .05$) in relation to proxemic variables, these statements and observations concerning findings emphasize the importance of an awareness and application of appropriate proxemic behavior in the supervision and training of counselor-trainees.

**Discussion and implications of hypotheses 7 and 8**

The predictions of hypotheses seven and eight are associated with hypotheses three and four and introduce the correlation of goal and behavior satisfaction with supervisors' kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors.

Hypothesis seven, predicting a high correlation among the experiential strategy, frequency of counselor educator kinesic and paralinguistic behavior, and satisfaction with supervisory behavior and attainment of session goals, is accepted at the $< .001$ probability level for supervisor-rated, experiential strategies and at the $< .005$ level for judge-rated, experiential approaches.

Hypothesis eight's anticipated low correlation among these variables and intermediate and cognitive strategies is rejected at the $< .01$ and $< .001$ levels, respectively, for supervisor and judge-rated, cognitive strategies and at the $< .001$ and $< .025$ levels, respectively, for supervisor and judge-rated, intermediate strategies.
In general, there is little change in sums of ranks for kinesic and paralinguistic behaviors when introducing goal and behavior satisfaction variables.

Referring to the five lowest sums of ranks, all supervisor and judge-rated, strategy classifications share frequency of head movement (up), hand movement, limb (arm) movement, head movement (side), and eye contact in common. The exception is the supervisor-rated, cognitive approaches, which replace eye contact with leg and feet movement.

The five-second lowest sums of ranks again indicate the three approaches share "filled" and "unfilled" pauses in common. Additionally, the intermediate and experiential strategies share leg and feet movement and reclining body position among the five-second lowest rank sums. Sums of ranks in reference to hypotheses three and four, however, reveal leg and feet movement common between intermediate and experiential approaches; and reclining body position is common between cognitive and intermediate approaches, rather than between experiential and intermediate classifications.

The five highest sums of ranks indicate yawning and coughing low in frequency and common to all strategies, with sniffing behavior additionally shared between intermediate and experiential strategies.

With the exception of behavior satisfaction for the supervisor-rated, experiential strategies, supervisor' ratings reveal satisfaction with goal and behavior attainment also among the five highest sums of ranks.
Again, with the exception of the supervisor-rated, experiential strategies, supervisors and judges are equally or more satisfied with goal attainment than supervisory behavior.

Among counselor educators included in the study, these findings may reflect more emphasis on goals and goal attainment than supervisory behavior. Not discounting the importance of goal attainment and assessment, supervisory behaviors, including nonverbal behaviors, to attain and assess goals require increased emphasis and attention in counselor preparation and supervision.

Seligman and Baldwin (1972) suggest the need for investigations concerning the "how" of supervision. Jakubowski-Spector et al. also indicate the important and influential nature of "what" a counselor does. This study identifies nonverbal behavior as part of the "how" and "what" of supervision, with significant study findings indicating the importance of attending to and applying kinesic and paralinguistic variables and assessment criteria to the supervision process.

Discussion and implications of hypotheses 9 and 10

Related to hypotheses five and six, hypotheses nine and ten introduce the association of goal and behavior satisfaction with counselor educators' proxemic behaviors.

Hypothesis nine is not accepted due to low correlations and statistically nonsignificant probability levels among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle variables for supervisor and judge-rated experiential strategies, $W(8) = .25, p > .25$ and $W(8) = .25, p > .25$, respectively.
Hypothesis ten's predicted, low correlation among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle variables is also not accepted for supervisor and judge-rated cognitive strategies, $\bar{W}(8) = .25, p > .25$ and $\bar{W}(8) = .13, p > .35$, respectively.

The judge-rated, intermediate approaches additionally indicate nonacceptance of the low correlation among satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle variables, $\bar{W}(8) = .25, p > .25$. The supervisor-rated, intermediate strategies, however, do provide a high and statistically significant association among these variables, $\bar{W}(8) = .75, p < .025$.

Similar to the significant correlation of the supervisor-rated, intermediate approaches, a significant association is produced among goal and behavior satisfaction, physical distance, and seating angle variables when supervisory strategies are not discriminated as intermediate, cognitive, or experiential, $\bar{W}(8) = .51, p < .025$. However, a correlation of .51 indicates only 26% of the variance is shared in common among the eight supervisors and associated strategies.

With the exception of supervisor-rated, intermediate strategies, and unlike kinesic and paralinguistic variables, supervisors' proxemic behaviors are not correlated with goal and behavior satisfaction for intermediate, cognitive, and experiential, supervisory approaches.

These results may indicate counselor educators do not require personal distances and intimate or cooperative seating angles to attain satisfaction with goals and supervisory behavior. However, the findings may also be indicative of supervisors' unawareness of
appropriate seating angles and physical distances for certain types of interactions or relationships.

Ekman and Friesen (1968, 1969a) suggest nonverbal behaviors (including proxemics) typically involve the relationship aspect of communication. Considering the influence of nonverbal behaviors in communicating relationship dimensions, perhaps less intimate distances and angles permit attainment of supervision goals and behaviors from more objective and cognitive relationship levels. More intimate distances and angles are perhaps appropriate for the attainment of goals and behaviors from more personal, intermediate or experiential relationship levels.

Of importance to counselor educators, regardless of supervisory strategy, are attitudes, intimacy, cooperation, affect, approval, affiliation, and interpersonal judgments communicated to counselor-trainees by supervisors' proxemic behaviors. The apparent lack of association among proxemic variables and goal and behavior satisfaction may imply the need for increased awareness and application of these behaviors in counselor supervision.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions, contributions, study limitations, and recommendations are presented in response to the purpose and questions outlined in chapter one.

Supervisory approaches are identifiable by characteristics specific to the various strategies, although whether counselor educators accurately identify supervisory strategies from which they
supervise remains unresolved. The study does not provide a contribu-
tive answer to this question, but findings do suggest supervisory
strategies may not function in accordance with categorization
criteria when implemented. Strategies are perhaps fluid and flexible,
with overlapping, strategy characteristics creating difficulty in
categorizing implemented approaches.

Counselor educators accurately assess satisfaction with supervi-
sory behavior and attainment of identified session goals. Contributing
to existing opinion and knowledge, there do not appear to be differences
between judges' and supervisors' evaluations of satisfaction with the
attainment of identified session goals and supervisory behavior.
Criteria for assessment and evaluation, whether satisfaction, perform-
ance, effectiveness, competency, etc., however, require continued
identification and specification to provide systematic feedback
concerning the supervisory function.

The frequency of counselor educators' kinesic, paralinguistic,
and proxemic behavior is identifiable and assessable, with significant
relations demonstrated among nonverbal and satisfaction data of
supervisory strategies. These results contribute additional informa-
tion in relation to supervisory process, and indicate the importance of
considering the frequency and conveyed meanings of nonverbal behaviors
in supervising counselor-trainees and training counselor educators in
the development and implementation of supervisory processes.

In relation to supervisory strategies, a limitation of the present
study includes the use of an inappropriate instrument to assess
implemented supervisory strategies. Instruments to assess supervisory,
strategy characteristics by means other than mutually exclusive classifications of intermediate, cognitive, and experiential approaches are required. Similarly, the study's inability to assess voice loudness displays a study limitation and the requirement of an appropriate assessment instrument.

The sample size of eight supervisors and eight trainees, and inability to assume normality of the population distribution, presents an additional study limitation, although the application of results and conclusions generally is explicit and justified.

Considering the limitations, recommendations concerning study improvements and application of findings are provided.

Recommendations in relation to the study include replication of the investigation with possible additions involving: (a) content analysis of the total verbal-nonverbal communication matrix, and (b) analysis of data concerning counselor educators' education and training in preparation for their individual supervision of counselor-trainees. Additionally, an increased sample size is encouraged to provide generalization of results to larger and normally distributed populations of counselor educators and trainees.

Although not totally justified on the basis of this study, need exists for the incorporation of education procedures: (a) to increase trainee and supervisor awareness of the occurrence and nonocurrence of nonverbal behaviors in counseling and supervision relationships; (b) to provide information and didactic instruction concerning nonverbal behaviors and their associated meanings; and (c) to develop
the performance abilities of trainees and supervisors in determining and interpreting nonverbal behaviors.

Supervisory process and outcome studies, concerning strategy development and implementation, require greater attention in the education and training of counselor educators.

Supervisory behaviors, including nonverbal behaviors frequently expressed as well as absent in the supervisory process, also require increased exploration and attention in counselor education programs.

Finally, the appropriateness and need for the further specification and assessment of supervision goals and criteria are again emphasized and recommended.

Continued and increased delineation and evaluation of supervisory strategy, nonverbal stimuli, behaviors, and goals in relation to supervisory process are supported in the present study. The investigation also justifies the importance and inclusion of these variables as a legitimate part of the continuing "critical evaluation" of counselor education and supervision.
REFERENCES

Books


**Periodicals**


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception. Psychiatry, 1969, 32, 88-106. (a)


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Miscellaneous


Exline, R., & Eldridge, C. Effects of two patterns of a speaker's visual behavior upon the perception of the authenticity of his verbal message. Paper presented to the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, 1967.


APPENDIX A

USE OF COUNSELING AND PERSONNEL FACULTY AND STUDENTS IN RESEARCH

From time to time faculty and students in the Department of Counseling and Personnel are asked to participate as subjects in research.

An approved doctoral research study, to be investigated by Michael Wilbur, a doctoral student in the Department of Counseling and Personnel at Western Michigan University, requires the participation of the Department's faculty and students in C-P Course 628 during Fall and Winter Semesters 1974-75.

The study will involve the supervision of counselors-in-training; however, a detailed description of the exact variables to be studied cannot be provided since such a description could adversely influence the variables to be investigated.

Faculty and student participation in the study will include the professors and their students enrolled in the Counseling and Personnel Course 628. Specific requirements will involve the videotaping of 628 professors with one of their supervisees (randomly selected from 628 students whom they supervise) in a supervisory session. Fall and Winter semester 628 courses will be used to provide counselor educators, and their students, who are willing to participate in the study.

The videotaping of the supervisory sessions will be viewed by observers (independent of the Department of Counseling and Personnel) trained in the identification and measurement of the independent variables. Faculty and students participating in the study will remain anonymous and the videotape sessions erased upon completion of the investigation. The only modification to this procedure (with the approval of the study participants) would be a composite videotape of supervisory sessions to provide only the investigator with this aspect or component of his study. In all instances, the videotape material will remain confidential and not used or shown for educational, instructional, or other purposes—other than use in the proposed research investigation. Study participants will be provided an abstract of the research results upon completion of the study.

As a faculty member or student in the Department of Counseling and Personnel, willing to participate in the research study to be investigated by Michael Wilbur, I hereby authorize the videotape supervisory sessions be used for the research purposes presented in this document. I understand that these supervisory sessions will be
considered "Confidential" communications and any information concerning these sessions will receive the same professional treatment as would be expected with any confidential information.

Signature ___________________________ Date ______________
COMPOSITE VIDEOTAPE OF SUPERVISORY SESSIONS

The research investigator, Michael Wilbur, has my approval to use the videotape supervisory session completed on ________ in compiling a composite videotape of supervisory sessions to provide the investigator only with this aspect or component of his study.

Signature __________________________ Date ________________

Address __________________________ Phone ________________
VIDEOTAPE EQUIPMENT DESCRIPTION
AND FILMING SPECIFICATIONS

Videotape Equipment Description

The following videotape equipment is used for filming and playback of eight, supervisor-trainee sessions: (a) eight black and white, Scotch Brand Videotapes, 1/2 inch x 2400 feet (.0127 x 182.9 m); (b) Sony Videocorder, model AV-3600 (VTR); (c) Magnavox ETV Monitor, 21 inch (.53 m) screen; (d) Sony Electret Condenser Microphone; (e) Sony Video Camera, model AVC - 3200; and (f) Sony TV Zoom Lens.

Lens settings are: focus - infinity (00); focal length - 12.5 mm; and lens opening - 2.8 cm.

Filming Specifications

The room used for filming is 15 feet (4.59 m) in length and seven feet, eight and one half inches (2.35 m) in width. The room length is east-west and the room width is north-south. A diagram of the room and its contents appears on the last page of Appendix A.

A fixed camera, facing west, is obscured behind a black curtain with the camera lens located 21 3/4 inches (.55 m) from the east wall, 52 inches (1.32 m) from the south wall, and nine feet six and one-quarter inches (2.9 m) from the subjects.

Two, movable chairs, facing east, are located 14 inches (.36 m) from the west wall, with one chair located eight inches (.20 m) from the north wall and a second chair located ten inches (.25 m) from the south wall. The chair arrangement, between trainee and supervisor, is established at a physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees prior to each supervisory session.

A small table, 22 inches by 18 inches (.56 x .46 m), is also located behind and between the interactants to provide a stand for the microphone and audio taperecorders used in supervision.
APPENDIX B

PRE SUPERVISORY SESSION SCALE

The statements which follow attempt to assess your perception and use of supervisory strategy in supervision sessions with counselors-in-training. The "correct" answer to each item is merely your honest response. Please respond to every statement.

Following is a list of items which might be answered as: agree, mildly agree, uncertain, mildly disagree, or disagree. If you agree with the statement concerning your perception and use of supervisory strategy place a check (✓) on the number 1; check (✓) number 2 if you mildly agree with the statement; place a check (✓) on the number 3 if you are uncertain; if you mildly disagree with the statement check (✓) number 4; and if you disagree with the statement place a check (✓) on the number 5.

1 agree
2 mildly agree
3 uncertain
4 mildly disagree
5 disagree

Please check (✓) appropriate number.

1 2 3 4 5 1. The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to a cognitive, instructional relationship established by a teacher with a student.
1 2 3 4 5 2. The supervisory-trainee relationship is cognitive in nature.
1 2 3 4 5 3. The supervisory-trainee relationship is affective/experiential in nature.
1 2 3 4 5 4. The supervisory-trainee relationship takes an intermediate position between purely cognitive or affective/experiential positions.
1 2 3 4 5 5. The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to an affective, facilitative relationship established by a counselor with a client.
1 2 3 4 5 6. The supervisory-trainee relationship involves facilitative, counseling conditions with the trainee.
1 2 3 4 5 7. The supervisory-trainee relationship involves instructional, teaching conditions with the trainee.
1 2 3 4 5 8. The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a teaching and instructional relationship.
The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a counseling and facilitative relationship.

The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to relationships established in teaching.

The supervisory-trainee relationship involves instruction and teaching in addition to a facilitative and counseling relationship with the trainee.

The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a counseling and teaching relationship.
PRE SUPERVISORY SESSION RANKING

Following is a list of statements which attempt to assess your perception and use of supervisory strategy in supervision sessions with counselors-in-training. Please respond to the following twelve statements concerning supervisory strategy by rank ordering the statements (1 through 12) according to your perception and use of supervisory strategy in supervision sessions with counselors-in-training.

1. The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to a cognitive, instructional relationship established by a teacher with a student.
2. The supervisory-trainee relationship is cognitive in nature.
3. The supervisory-trainee relationship is affective/experiential in nature.
4. The supervisory-trainee relationship takes an intermediate position between purely cognitive or affective/experiential positions.
5. The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to an affective, facilitative relationship established by a counselor with a client.
6. The supervisory-trainee relationship involves facilitative, counseling conditions with the trainee.
7. The supervisory-trainee relationship involves instructional, teaching conditions with the trainee.
8. The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a teaching and instructional relationship.
9. The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a counseling and facilitative relationship.
10. The supervisory-trainee relationship is similar to relationships established in teaching.
11. The supervisory-trainee relationship involves instruction and teaching in addition to a facilitative and counseling relationship with the trainee.
12. The supervisory-trainee relationship is primarily a counseling and teaching relationship.
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PRE SUPERVISORY SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questions provide information concerning your conceptualization of counselor supervision, your goals for the supervisory session, and your supervisory behavior in the supervision session. Please respond to every question with your honest response and with an amount of information you consider appropriate.

1. What is your definition of counselor supervision?

2. What do you consider to be the function (i.e., the normal or characteristic activity) of supervision?

3. What do you consider to be the purpose (i.e., the intended result, end, or aim) of supervision?

4. If you presupposed goals for this particular supervisory session, what would they be?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.

5. What supervisory behaviors will you use to attain your stated (or unstated) goals for this particular supervisory session?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.
POST SUPERVISORY SESSION SCALE 1

The purpose of this scale is to assess your satisfaction with the attainment of your stated goals for this particular supervisory session. Please respond to each of your previously stated goals (item number 4 on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire) using the following scale: satisfied, mildly satisfied, uncertain, mildly unsatisfied, or unsatisfied. If you are satisfied with the attainment of the goal place a check (✓) on the number 1; check (✓) number 2 if you are mildly satisfied with the goal attainment; place a check (✓) on the number 3 if you are uncertain; if you are mildly unsatisfied with the goal attainment check (✓) number 4; and if you are unsatisfied with the goal attainment place a check (✓) on the number 5.

1 satisfied
2 mildly satisfied
3 uncertain
4 mildly unsatisfied
5 unsatisfied

Your replies to item number 4 on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire

Please check (✓) appropriate number.

1 2 3 4 5 1. Your firstly stated goal for this particular supervisory session.
1 2 3 4 5 2. Your secondly stated goal for this particular supervisory session.
1 2 3 4 5 3. Your thirdly stated goal for this particular supervisory session.
1 2 3 4 5 4. Your fourthly stated goal for this particular supervisory session.
1 2 3 4 5 5. Your fifthly stated goal for this particular supervisory session.
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
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POST SUPERVISORY SESSION SCALE 2

The purpose of this scale is to assess your satisfaction with your stated supervisory behaviors (item number 5 on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire) used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session. Please respond to each of your previously stated supervisory behaviors using the following scale: satisfied, mildly satisfied, uncertain, mildly unsatisfied, or unsatisfied. If you are satisfied with the supervisory behavior place a check (√) on the number 1; check (√) number 2 if you are mildly satisfied with the supervisory behavior; place a check (√) on the number 3 if you are uncertain; if you are mildly unsatisfied with the supervisory behavior check (√) number 4; and if you are unsatisfied with the supervisory behavior place a check (√) on the number 5.

1 satisfied
2 mildly satisfied
3 uncertain
4 mildly unsatisfied
5 unsatisfied

Your replies to item number 5 on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire

Please check (√) appropriate number.

1  2  3  4  5  1. Your firstly stated supervisory behavior used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session.
1  2  3  4  5  2. Your secondly stated supervisory behavior used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session.
1  2  3  4  5  3. Your thirdly stated supervisory behavior used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session.
1  2  3  4  5  4. Your fourthly stated supervisory behavior used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session.
1  2  3  4  5  5. Your fifthly stated supervisory behavior used to attain your goals for this particular supervisory session.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eye Contact - 10 seconds or less duration</th>
<th>Head Movement - Combined up and down or side to side movement</th>
<th>Smiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Up and Down Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Side to Side Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Movement</td>
<td>Body Orientation</td>
<td>Body Posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbs, hands,</td>
<td>Change in</td>
<td>Matched or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legs and feet</td>
<td>direction</td>
<td>mirrored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement to</td>
<td>toward trainee</td>
<td>posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legs</td>
<td>Leaning</td>
<td>&amp; Farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCORE SHEET 3 (NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR - FREQUENCY DATA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocal Characteristics</th>
<th>Pauses or Hesitations - Unfilled or filled - 5 seconds or less duration</th>
<th>Voice Loudness - 5 decible fluctuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Laughing</td>
<td>1. Filled Pauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yawning</td>
<td>2. Unfilled Pauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sucking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sneezing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clearing of Throat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coughing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sniffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES TO ITEMS 1 THROUGH 3 ON THE PRE-SUPERVISORY SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE

Supervisor A

Definition

Supervision involves the creation of a teaching/learning climate where an inexperienced trainee learns how to counsel from an experienced counselor.

Function (the normal or characteristic activity)

A combination of affective/cognitive strategies and interventions designed to cause trainee introspection.

Purpose (the intended result, end, or aim)

To teach a neophyte how to counsel.

Supervisor B

Definition

Supervision is a learning situation but closer to that which occurs in counseling than it is in classroom.

Function (the normal or characteristic activity)

Growth of the student counselor because a safe climate is provided for the student to analyze and explore his relationship with clients.

Purpose (the intended result, end, or aim)

To help the student grow and develop in the counseling relationship.
Supervisor C

Definition
A teaching experience.

Function (the normal or characteristic activity)
To teach.

Purpose (the intended result, end, or aim)
A competent counselor.

Supervisor D

Definition
Supervisory feedback concerning how a counselor is structuring an interaction with a client.

Function (the normal or characteristic activity)
Feedback.

Purpose (the intended result, end, or aim)
To help the counselor better facilitate a client-counselor relationship.

Supervisor E

Definition
Enhance effectiveness of counseling by trainee by facilitating trainee self-awareness, developing skills, strategies, etc.

Function (the normal or characteristic activity)
Facilitate self-awareness and its impact on counseling process; develop knowledge and understanding of client - his behaviors, feelings of self - (gestalt) and how it affects counseling process; develop expertise in strategies and interventions designed to produce client change.
**Purpose (the intended result, end, or aim)**

Develop self awareness and self acceptance; develop understanding of client resulting in ability to intervene.

*Supervisor F*

**Definition**

Blank

**Function (the normal or characteristic activity)**

Providing a facilitative relationship leading to the counselor's better understanding of what he is doing and why he's doing it and how it is affecting the client.

*Supervisor G*

**Definition**

Assisting trainee in developing awareness and skill in counseling relationships through mutual reactions to counseling sessions.

**Function (the normal or characteristic activity)**

Discuss role and function of supervisor and trainee, facilitate examination of sessions - explore alternative methods.

*Supervisor H*

**Definition**

A facilitative, freeing relationship which allows the trainee to examine his counseling experiences, how he feels about them, and help him see how he can change and achieve particular goals.
Function \textit{(the normal or characteristic activity)}

Helping the trainee realize what he has achieved or not achieved in his counseling, how he feels about himself in the facilitative counseling relationship, and realize how he can further his goals in counseling.

Purpose \textit{(the intended result, end, or aim)}

To enable the trainee to more nearly fulfill any potential he has as a counselor.
APPENDIX E

SUPERVISORS' STATED SESSION GOALS AND BEHAVIORS ON THE PRE SUPERVISORY SESSION QUESTIONNAIRE (ITEMS 4 AND 5)

Supervisor A

Goals
To assist Dan to evaluate client's impact on him; to evaluate counselor strategies instituted by Dan; to assist Dan to become more confrontative with client.

Supervisory behaviors
Intervention through analysis of conflict; confrontation via direct questions; understanding via relationship; respect for Dan as a person.

Supervisor B

Goals
To check on whether Gary is willing to take risks; to check on pace - he tends to get ahead of the client; to check on "open ended questions" vs. questions that can be answered yes of no.

Supervisory behaviors
Questions; exploration of alternative behaviors; reinforce Gary's positive traits; reflection; thinking out loud with him.

Supervisor C

Goals
Improve counselor behavior; assist counselor understand his client; promote student interest in counseling; help develop student confidence; help identify his orientation.
Supervisory behaviors

Focus on client dynamics; offer praise and encourage; ask questions about client; ask counselor to evaluate his/her performance; identify counselor techniques; offer suggestions for alternative behaviors.

Supervisor D

Goals
None

Supervisory behaviors

Process variable in counselor; structure; theory approach.

Supervisor E

Goals
None

Supervisory behaviors

Reflect and clarify trainee's feelings and its relation to counseling process; question trainee i.e.: emotional theme and gestalt of client; check on intervention strategies i.e.: behavioral goals.

Supervisor F

Goals
Provide a safe learning environment; by reflection and questions help the counselor to clarify his role; by reflection and questions help the counselor to recognize discrepancies in role and behavior; provide feedback for learning purposes; identify goals and home work.

Supervisory behaviors

Attention; reflection; questions; confrontation; offer hypotheses for better facilitation.
Supervisor G

Goals

Establish an atmosphere of trust; examine the counseling relationship in terms of relationships, content, direction; trainee have an increased awareness of the counseling session under consideration; a plan for the next counseling session.

Supervisory behaviors

Overview of session provided by supervisor; option of joint comments; questions - recommendations; empathic understanding; warmth; openness; genuineness.

Supervisor H

Goals

Free the particular student (help him relax and express himself) for greater spontaneity; gain a better idea of "where he is coming from" in his counseling approach; help him realize what he can give to a counseling session to achieve his goals; help him better understand where his counselee is coming from; elicit from him other ideas he sees as possibilities in working with his client.

Supervisory behaviors

A relaxed concern and interest in him (nonverbal as well as verbal); listening and eliciting rather than merely telling; reinforce the positive rather than only tearing at the negative; utilize modeling behavior in the form of warmth and spontaneity; feel with him not only to his client on the tape but to him which is a form of modeling behavior also, this will enable me to help him see and feel other responses to his client.
APPENDIX F

RESULTS OF TRAINING PROCEDURES TO
ESTABLISH INTERJUDGE AGREEMENT

Two judges, independent of the Department of Counseling and Personnel, are selected to observe and respond to eight videotaped supervisory sessions, and receive training in the areas of counselor educator supervisory and nonverbal behavior. The training of judges includes: (a) reading selected supervision and nonverbal communication material; (b) didactic instruction in the areas of supervisory strategy and nonverbal behavior; and (c) observing a videotaped supervisory session, prepared by the investigator, for training in the identification and measurement of supervisory and nonverbal behavior.

Specifically, the training videotape is used to establish interjudge agreement regarding the identification and assessment of supervisory strategies, satisfaction variables, and nonverbal behaviors, prior to observing and assessing the study's eight videotaped supervisor-trainee sessions.

The Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire, indicating stated session goals and supervisory behavior, is completed by the investigator prior to filming the training tape of his supervisory session with the counselor-trainee.

The judges observe the training tape in reference to supervisory strategy, satisfaction variables, and nonverbal behaviors and according to the viewing phases presented in chapter two. Judges respond to the training tape and the investigator's responses on the pre-session
questionnaire by completing the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking and Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2.

The results of the training procedure and judges' subsequent responses to the observed, training videotape provide the following indications of interjudge agreement.

In relation to supervisory strategy, judges assess the investigator's supervisory approach, as observed on the training videotape, by responding on the Pre Supervisory Session Scale and Ranking. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient reveals statistically significant agreement between ranked, judges' ratings of supervisory strategy as indicated on the pre-session scale and ranking instruments, \( r_s (6) = 1.0, p < .02 \).

Judges' assessments of satisfaction with goal attainment and supervisory behavior are provided by their observing the training tape and completing Post Supervisory Session Scale 1 and 2. The post-session scales are completed by judges in reference to the investigator's stated session goals and behaviors on the Pre Supervisory Session Questionnaire. Again, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient provides a statistically significant correlation between rankings of judges' satisfaction with attainment of stated session goals and supervisory behavior, \( r_s (8) = .82, p < .05 \).

The Kendall coefficient of concordance is used to indicate interjudge agreement regarding the observed frequency of the investigator's nonverbal behaviors in the training videotape. A statistically significant association is indicated among the ranked, nonverbal frequency data of the two judges, \( W (20) = .98, p < .01 \).
On the basis of these results, sufficient and statistically significant interjudge agreement is established to investigate the study's questions and hypotheses concerning the identification and assessment of supervisory strategies, satisfaction variables, and nonverbal behaviors.
APPENDIX G

SUPERVISORS' PROXEMIC BEHAVIORS
(PHYSICAL DISTANCE AND SEATING ANGLE)

FIGURE 1
SUPERVISOR A'S PROXEMIC BEHAVIOR

○ - Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

● - Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor A is 43 inches (1.09 m) and the seating angle is 70 degrees.
FIGURE 2
SUPERVISOR B'S PROXEMIC BEHAVIOR

○ - Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

● - Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor B is 50 inches (1.27 m) and the seating angle is 26 degrees.
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FIGURE 3
SUPERVISOR C'S PROXEMIC BEHAVIORS

- Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

- Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor C is 48 inches (1.22 m) and the seating angle is 80 degrees.
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- Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

- Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor D is 50 inches (1.27 m) and the seating angle is 45 degrees.
- Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

- Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor E is 53 inches (1.35 m) and the seating angle is 53 degrees.
SUPERVISOR F’S PROXEMIC BEHAVIORS

○ - Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

● - Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor F is 41 inches (1.04 m) and the seating angle is 73 degrees.
FIGURE 7
SUPERVISOR G'S PROXEMIC BEHAVIORS

O - Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

- Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor G is 42 inches (1.07 m) and the seating angle is 95.5 degrees.
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FIGURE 8
SUPERVISOR H's PROXEMIC BEHAVIORS

- Indicates chair arrangement prior to the supervisory session. A physical distance of 41 inches (1.04 m) and a seating angle of 73 degrees is established between supervisor and trainee prior to each supervisory session.

- Indicates chair movement and arrangement following the supervisory session. Following the supervisory session the physical distance between trainee and supervisor H is 41 1/2 inches (1.05 m) and the seating angle is 74 degrees.