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The relationship between supervisory identity development and supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision was investigated in this study. A developmental model of supervisory identity development was utilized, the Supervisor Complexity Model, in both the conceptualization of supervisory identity development and the measurement of supervisory identity development. Consequently, supervisory identity and some factors thought to effect its development are reviewed. Counseling professionals likely to be engaged in providing supervision services were surveyed by mail. Participants completed a measure of supervisory identity development, the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale, and also indicated their supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in the area of supervision. Multiple regression analyses were then performed to examine the relationship between supervisory identity development and supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision. Results indicate that supervisory experience and training in supervision account for a significant proportion of the variance of supervisory identity development scores. The implications of these findings, regarding supervisor development theory and practical applications, are reviewed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

There are few activities within counseling psychology as important as clinical supervision (Bernard, 1998). Through clinical supervision the development of counseling professionals is facilitated and, thus, numerous clients benefit from more advanced care, and are protected from substandard care (Bernard, 1998; Lambert & Ogles, 1997; Watkins, 1991). Supervision services are consequently of pivotal significance to the profession of counseling (Borders & Leddick, 1988; Rich, 1993). Supervision is also a key part of practice for clinical and counseling professionals, as they are likely to spend a large portion of their professional time providing clinical supervision (Robiner, Saltzman, Hobeman, & Schirvar, 1997; Robiner & Schofield, 1990). Clinical supervision has been recognized as so important over the last decade that it has become a distinct specialty with its own journals, books, and credentials (Ellis & Douce, 1994; Riordan & Kern, 1994).

The supervisory process is generally believed to involve three parties: the supervisor, the counselor, and the client. However, when counselors add the role of supervisor to their professional identities a fourth party may be added to this process. Specifically, the supervisor of the counselor in the process of becoming a supervisor. Thus, the supervisory process can include four parties: the supervisor, the supervisor in training, the counselor, and the client.

Styczynski (1980) states that “the transition from supervisee to supervisor marks an important change in professional identity for the clinician” (p. 29). During
this time the supervisee’s role is exchanged for the role of competent counselor and supervisor (Styczynski, 1980). Often this exchange has taken place without the benefit of training and supervision specific to supervisory skills (Baranchok & Kunkel, 1990; Davies, 1997; Johnson & Stewart, 2000; Materna, 1993; Robiner et al., 1997; Styczynski, 1980). Indeed, many new supervisors may lack specific supervisory skills, as few American Psychological Association accredited doctoral programs offer a course in supervision (22%) and few programs require some type of training in supervision (24%) (Materna, 1993). The fact that little training is provided to psychologists is puzzling given that supervision is an integral part of ensuring competent counseling services, and a large amount of time is spent by counseling professionals providing supervision services (Baranchok & Kunkel, 1990; Styczynski, 1980).

Styczynski (1980) indicated that as the field of supervision developed, more attention would have to be paid to the training and credentialing of supervisors. Eighteen years later the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credential has finally been established by the National Board of Certified Counselors (Bernard, 1998). In part, this credential reflects some licensure laws that require supervisors of counselors to demonstrate knowledge and training required to provide supervision (Bernard, 1998).

Over the last few decades great strides have been made in the understanding of how counseling trainees learn and the nature of the supervisory relationship. However, while many advances have been made in the understanding of the supervisory process, the understanding of the development of supervisors themselves remains rudimentary. Thus, supervisor development is a largely untapped area of research (Watkins, 1995b; Worthington, 1987). If an informed perspective on clinical
supervision is to be obtained then an understanding of supervisory development must also be achieved (Watkins, 1995d; Watkins, 1997a).

Many important supervisory research questions remain unanswered. For example, it is not known if supervisory identity development can be facilitated through the gaining of experience as a supervisor (supervised and independent), gaining experience as a counselor (supervised and independent), and training in supervision (formal and self-study).

If it is agreed that supervision is an important function of being a counseling psychologist, it is logical to investigate those factors that may relate to supervisory identity development. If the factors that relate to, and may facilitate, supervisory identity development can be investigated they may indicate how better to address supervisory competence and training needs. Indeed, requirements for supervisory competence may be better outlined and thus the argument for specific credentials of supervisors supported. Watkins (1993) indicates that while skill and identity are two distinct variables, they are complementary concepts that "nourish, support or disconfirm each other, and changes in one often involve some degree of changes in the other" (p. 66).

The Present Study

Discovering the relationship between supervisory identity development and six variables was the goal of the present study. Namely, the relationship between supervisory identity development and independent experience as a supervisor, supervised experience as a supervisor, independent experience as a counselor, supervised experience as a counselor, formal training in the area of supervision, and self-study in the area of supervision was to be explored. Participants who were likely
to regularly provide supervision services were asked to complete a measure assessing supervisory identity development and complete a short demographic questionnaire. Data were then analyzed using multiple regression analyses to investigate the relationship between supervisory identity development and supervision and counseling experience, supervised and independent, as well as the training variables.

A developmental framework was used in the conceptualization of supervisory identity development based on research support and the current popularity of developmental models (Watkins, 1995b; Worthington, 1987). Particularly, the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) of Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) and the Supervisor Complexity Model (SCM) of Watkins (1990a, 1993) are relevant to the conceptualization of supervisory development. The SCM of Watkins (1990a, 1993) was especially relevant as Watkins, Schneider, Haynes, and Nieberding (1995) have produced a theory-based measure of supervisor identity development, which was used in this study. Further information on the SCM is presented later in this chapter.

Importance of the Study

This study has possible far-reaching implications for supervisor training, licensing, and credentials. Should supervisor and counselor experience be shown to be related to increased supervisor identity development, an argument could be made for requiring practical experiences in counseling and supervision before a professional is considered a competent supervisor. Similarly, should training in supervision be related to increased supervisory identity development an argument for mandatory training in supervision could be made. Indeed, Ellis, Ladany, Krengel, and Schult (1996) report that a primary goal of supervision research is to build theory and guide supervision practices. As indicated by Bernard and Goodyear (1992), “Any science of
supervision inevitably will be an *applied science*” (p. 234). Thus, the present study could have some important implications for the training and practice of supervision.

**Definitions**

**Supervisor Experience**

For the purposes of this study supervisor experience was defined as the amount of time, in years, spent in providing clinical supervision services to counselors, either supervised by another supervisor or conducted independently.

**Counseling Experience**

Counseling experience was defined as the amount of time, in years, spent in providing counseling services to clients, either supervised by a supervisor or conducted independently.

**Training in Supervision**

Training in supervision was separated into two different aspects, formal training and self-study. Formal training in supervision referred to the number of courses taken in a formal graduate classroom setting, didactic and practice, and professional workshops attended on the topic of supervision. Supervision self-study referred to the number of publications, classes taught, and workshops presented on the topic of supervision.
Supervision: Definition, Functions, and Identity

Neufeldt, Beutler, and Banchero (1997) define supervision as “a relationship between two or more people whose purpose is the development of the supervisee as a professional psychotherapist” (p. 508). Thus, one of the functions of supervision involves teaching. Bartlett (1983) echoes the importance of this learning function. Supervision as instruction has a very long history in the human services. For instance, Charcot and Bleuler could be said to have followed a traditional tutorial model of supervision when teaching psychotherapeutic treatment to other students and monitoring student provided care (Hess, 1980). Other functions of supervision include overseeing another’s work from a position of authority, evaluation, and monitoring (Carroll, 1996). Nevertheless, the teaching function of supervision that helps develop a supervisee as a professional is still often viewed as a main function of supervision (Watkins, 1997a).

Supervision is also an interpersonal process that encourages the developing and supporting of individuals in their counseling role and also protects clients through the regulation of qualified practitioners (Feltham & Dryden, 1994; Taylor, 1994). Put succinctly, supervision is a way “to change some characteristic of the therapist (e.g., skill level), that in turn will result in the competent delivery of psychotherapy, which in turn will result in positive changes in the patient” (Wampold & Holloway, 1997, p. 19).

Supervisory identity development is the dependent variable of interest in the present study and is defined in relation to the SCM of Watkins (1990a, 1993). Within the SCM, supervisory identity refers to the sense of professional identity one has relating to the role of supervisor and includes aspects related to competency,
autonomy, and awareness. Supervisory identity development was measured by the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS) developed by Watkins et al. (1995). Specifics regarding the SCM are presented later in the present chapter and Specifics regarding the PSDS are presented in Chapter II.

**Literature Review**

There are a number of literature areas that need to be explored if an appropriate background is to be provided for this study. The literature review is provided in a four-step manner. First, a number of influential and historical supervision models will be reviewed. Second, information on counselor developmental models will be presented, including a description of the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) model of counselor development of Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) and Stoltenberg, McNeill, and Delworth (1998). Third, information on supervisor development will be presented, including a description of Watkins’ Supervisor Complexity Model (SCM) of supervisor development (1990a, 1993, 1994). Fourth, a number of variables that research has shown to possibly have an effect on supervisor competency and possibly identity development will be outlined.

**Supervision Models**

**Theoretical Models of Supervision**

Models of supervision help supervisors plan the direction of their work with supervisees and how to accomplish their supervisory goals (Goodyear & Bradley, 1983; Powell, 1998). Some counseling professionals will use a model of supervision that mirrors how they provide counseling services to clients, totally or in part
(Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Borders & Leddick, 1987; Goodyear & Bradley, 1983; Powell, 1998). Indeed, historically theoretical models of supervision were embedded within larger schools of counseling theory (Freeman & McHenry, 1996). Generally these are referred to as theoretical models of supervision and some of the more popular and historically influential models are outlined as follows.

Psychodynamic. Psychodynamic models of supervision have a long history, since supervision was addressed from the beginning of the psychoanalysis movement (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Binder & Strupp, 1997; Edwards, 1997). In general, there are two main models of psychodynamic supervision. First, there is the Budapest School that indicates that supervision is an extension of one’s personal analysis. Second, there is the Viennese School that indicates that supervision should emphasize more didactic teaching, and that one’s personal analysis should be kept mostly separate (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). However, what is seen as important in both schools is the counselor’s own counseling, or unconscious processes (intrapersonal factors), and the relationship between supervisor and supervisee as well as therapist and client (interpersonal factors) (Dewald, 1997).

For instance, one important concept discussed in relation to psychodynamic supervision is parallel process (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Binder & Strupp, 1997; Borders & Leddick, 1987; Hess, 1980; Powell, 1998). Bernard & Goodyear (1992) indicate that parallel process is the phenomenon in which the client/therapist relationship is mirrored in the supervisee/supervisor relationship, or vice versa. As defined by Neufeldt, Iversen, and Juntunen (1995) parallel process is “an unconscious process . . . A way to show the supervisor what it is like to work with this client. A behavioral explanation of the supervision strategy for working with parallel process.
might describe it as modeling" (p. 76). Another example could involve the belief that therapists can reach an impasse with clients due to their own personal difficulties (Hess, 1980). In other words, transference and countertransference can effect counseling and supervision.

**Family Therapy.** Family therapy supervision is often viewed as systemic supervision. This type of supervision is based on systems theory and can take many forms: Structural, Bowenian, and Functional (Powell, 1998). In this form of supervision, supervisory interventions tend to focus on the interconnectedness of family and supervisory systems. One's environment and other cultural conditions are also viewed as important and influential (Liddle, Becker, & Diamond, 1997). Manipulations and paradoxical interventions may be used within supervision to illuminate boundary issues and isomorphism; reciprocal relationships similar to parallel process (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Liddle et al., 1997). The function of interventions utilized is more important than the form in both family therapy and supervision (Powell, 1998).

**Rational-Emotive.** In rational-emotive supervision the primary focus is the transmission of RET skills to the counselor. The use of RET techniques is also utilized in supervision and is viewed as advancing counselor competence (Wessler & Ellis, 1983).

**Additional Theoretical Models of Supervision.** Person centered and behavioral/cognitive-behavioral theories of counseling have also been used to structure supervisory interactions. Thus, the importance of establishing a stable supervisory relationship in which the self-knowledge of the counselor is more
important than technique learning (Patterson, 1983) and the use of role-playing along with rehearsal would be deemed more important than a supervisory relationship (Strosahl & Jacobson, 1986), respectively, when providing supervision services from these perspectives (Goodyear & Bradley, 1983).

Atheoretical Models of Counselor Supervision

While many supervision theories are extrapolations of counseling modes, some supervision models propose approaches to supervision that are distinct from counseling theory.

Hess's Model. Hess's model of supervision outlines six different supervisor roles, indicating the nature of the supervisor's function. These roles include lecturer, teacher, case reviewer, colleague-peer, monitor, and therapist. Thus, at different times in the supervisory process the supervisor may provide general concepts, train specific skills, be an administrative and clinical guide, share experiences with the supervisee, be an evaluator, and focus on the supervisee's personal growth (Hess, 1980). The model is more descriptive than prescriptive, or explanatory, in nature.

Interpersonal Process Recall. Kagan and Kagan (1997) proposed that by viewing a video or audio tape of a session, trainees can reexperience and learn from the session. This allows the supervisee to explore their actions, thoughts, and feelings that affect the counseling. IPR provides a process by which interactions can be explored in a variety of ways and incorporating a variety of theoretical perspectives.
Developmental Models

Watkins (1993, 1994, 1995a, 1995b) has outlined a number of shared assumptions of developmental models: (a) therapists in training develop and grow, (b) development proceeds through sequenced stages that move from less to more developed stages, (c) within each stage there are many struggles with various developmental issues, and (d) supervision can make use of stage models to help structure supervision for their supervisees benefit.

Some benefits of developmental models include their being useful to supervisors and supervisees of diverse theoretical backgrounds, having direct practice implications, and allow the tracking of progress over time (Watkins, 1995b). Developmental models of supervision have also long been held to be supported by research in the field of supervision (Watkins, 1995b; Worthington, 1987). However, one is warned not to equate experience with developmental level as the two have proven not to be equal in the literature (Watkins, 1995b).

There are many counselor development models. Worthington (1987) in his comprehensive review outlined 16 such models, most of which were similar to one another. Worthington also indicated that there is support for developmental models of counselor development. He indicated that supervisor perceptions are consistent with developmental models, supervisor behavior changes as counselors gain experience, and that the supervision relationship changes as counselors gain experience. In his more recent review of supervision literature, Watkins (1995b) indicates that at least six new developmental models for supervisee development have been proposed. Watkins (1995b) also reports research support for developmental models of supervisees which, broadly stated, indicate growth from a more dependent
trainee requiring a structured and holding environment to a more independent trainee who requires flexibility, a looser holding environment, and a more collaborative supervision relationship.

With at least 22 models of supervisee development to choose from, all of which seem to share core assumptions, there have been calls to place a moratorium on the development of new supervisee developmental models (Borders, 1989; Watkins, 1995b). Indicating that the developmental view of supervision continues to be the zeitgeist in supervisory thinking that it was over a decade ago (Freeman & McHenry, 1996; Holloway, 1987; Holloway & Carroll, 1996). What many authors have called for is a further examination of specific models. The Stoltenberg-Delworth (1987) model, that has recently been revised (Stoltenberg et al., 1998), is viewed as one especially favored for study. Not only does their model contain a full depiction of the supervisee and supervisor process, it also has been the subject of much investigation (Watkins, 1995b). Consequently, a more in-depth review of the Stoltenberg-Delworth (1987) model seems in order. However, one of the precursors to the Stoltenberg-Delworth model will be reviewed first. Namely, Hogan’s (1964) supervision model will be reviewed next.

**Hogan’s Supervision Model.** Hogan (1964) proposed a supervision model consisting of four levels of counselor development and recommended supervisory behaviors for each. Hogan asserted that supervisees move through four stages of development, from extreme dependency on the supervisor to counseling mastery. Beginning stages are marked by supervisee insecurity, dependency, and imitative behavior. At such beginning stages direct instruction and support are suggested supervisory actions. Later stages are characterized by increased competence. At such
later stages confrontation to encourage further counselor growth is suggested. Supervisees demonstrate fluctuating motivation across developmental stages and each stage is characterized by struggles involving dependency versus autonomy and competency versus incompetence. As counselors develop supervision becomes more consultative in nature.

**The Integrated Developmental Model.** Stoltenberg et al.’s (1998) IDM model of counselor complexity builds upon and is further refined than Hogan’s (1964) model. The IDM model indicates that counselors progress through four levels of increasing complexity and competence as they develop their counseling skills. Development is described in terms of three basic structures (autonomy, self and other awareness, and motivation) and across eight specific domains of clinical practice (intervention skill competence, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics). Thus, different levels of development can be reached across different domain areas. Each of the four levels of development indicate what supervisory environments can be provided to facilitate the development of their trainees. A brief outline of the four stages is as follows.

**Level 1** counselors are dependent on their supervisors, insecure about their counseling skills, and highly motivated to do the work of counseling. Consequently, direction is desired in supervision and a supervisor is best advised to provide structure and education regarding counseling.

**Level 2** counselors struggle between dependency and autonomy. They are also likely to be developing insight into their counseling but experience fluctuating motivation. They may vacillate between being overwhelmed and feeling confident.
Supervisors are advised to provide less structure, be empathetic, encouraging, and act as a resource for the counselor trainee.

Level 3 counselors have increased confidence and ability as a counselor. They have an established therapist identity and consistent motivation. Supervisors of counselors at this level are urged to function collaboratively with their trainee and work with less structure in the supervisory relationship.

The final stage of development is the Level 3 Integrated stage. Counselors at this final level are master counselors who will require only occasional collegial consultation with a peer supervisor. They have reached Level 3 across a number of domains and are now becoming integrated across domains. The counselor's professional identity is becoming solid across all of the domains.

**Supervisor Development**

Although there were various supervisor developmental models extant when Worthington (1987) conducted his review on supervision, these models tended to be more general and research on supervisor development was rudimentary (Worthington, 1987). Nevertheless, Worthington indicated that research suggested that there were differences in skillfulness across supervisors, supervisors were not more competent as a function of experience, and supervisors changed little as they gained experience. Watkins (1995b) similarly indicates the development of fewer supervisory development models than counselor models.

In most of the supervisory developmental models, supervisors progressed from being vulnerable and anxious about supervising to becoming more autonomous supervisors wherein a supervisory identity takes form (Watkins, 1995b). Once again, at earlier stages of their own development supervisors are said to require more
structure and a more secure holding environment, whereas at later stages of development the developing supervisor requires more of a collaborative relationship with their supervision supervisor (Clarkson & Gilbert, 1991; Watkins, 1995b).

The similarity between counselor and supervisor developmental models has led some to question if counselor development and supervisor development are in essence the same process (Watkins, 1995b). Both counselor development and supervisor development, however, require different foci and different identities (Stoltenberg et al., 1998; Watkins, 1990a). Four supervisory development models will be reviewed. Specifically, the models developed by Alonso (1983, 1985), Hess (1980, 1986, 1987), Stoltenberg et al., (1998), and Watkins (1990a, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995b; Hillman, McPherson, Swank, & Watkins, 1998). There are other models of supervisory development which tend to share similar basic concepts and assumptions, thus they will not be explored at this time as they add little unique detail to the following discussion. The reader is referred to Watkins (1995c) for a review of supervisory development models.

Alonso's Model

Alonso (1983) describes a model of supervisor development that is both psychodynamic and developmental in nature. The model indicates that supervisors have three basic identity configurations (novice, mid-career, and late career) in which different developmental tasks are met (self and identity, interpersonal, socio-political). Thus, supervisors first struggle with self and identity issues, the supervisor and therapist relationship issues, and then supervisor and administrative concerns. The model is descriptive and lacks specifics regarding how developmental change occurs and how such change can be facilitated. However, this model may be
appropriate for discussing the development of mature and very experienced
supervisors (Heid, 1997).

**Hess’s Model**

Hess (1986) addressed the issue of supervisory development in comparison to
supervisee development. The difference between supervision and counseling was
highlighted, including counseling skill instructional aspects. The beginning stage of
supervisory development is characterized by supervisor insecurity and establishing
counseling expertise with the supervisee. In this early state the supervisor may focus
on client activities or specific techniques as a way to calm anxiety (Blair & Peake,
1995). The exploration stage marks supervisors beginning to establish an
understanding of their role as separate from the counselor role. Behaviors are
modified depending on their impact upon the supervisee. The final confirmation of
supervisory identity stage has the supervisor viewing supervision as separate from but
linked to counseling. During this final stage a focus on the supervisory relationship
can develop along with excitement regarding the supervisory process.

**IDM Supervisor Development Model**

Stoltenberg et al. (1998) indicate that greater role flexibility in meeting the
various training environment needs of supervisees distinguishes advanced from
novice supervisors. The more advanced supervisor is better able to flexibly change
roles for their supervisee’s benefit, whereas the less advanced supervisee tends to rely
on one or two roles. As with the IDM model of counselor development, four stages
are proposed.
The Level 1 supervisor tends to be either anxious or naive and motivated to be supervisor. They usually apply a mechanistic approach and take a strong position as an expert with supervisees. They tend to rely heavily on their past or current supervisory experiences for how to conduct supervision. The Level 2 supervisor views supervision as more complex than initially perceived. Motivation fluctuates and objectivity may be precarious. The Level 2 supervisor may rely on a trusted supervisor or colleague for supervisory advice and suggestions. The Level 3 supervisors experience more stable motivation levels, value supervision as an activity, are interested in improving their supervisory performance, and seek out supervisory consultation as needed. Evaluation becomes a more comfortable process and objective in nature. The Level 3 Integrated (3i) supervisor is a master supervisor. They work well with supervisees at any level of counselor development and can provide supervision to less experienced supervisors.

**Supervisor Complexity Model**

The most written about and elaborate model of supervisor development is the Supervisor Complexity Model. This model was based on the development models of Hogan (1964) and Stoltenberg (1981), later further developed into the IDM of Stoltenberg et al., (1998) (Watkins, 1990a). According to the SCM (Watkins, 1990a, 1993, 1994, 1995b, 1997b; Hillman et al., 1998), supervisors progress through four different stages of development in their progression from novice to more competent and expert supervisors. During each of these stages supervisors have specific tasks to accomplish and responsibilities (Watkins et al., 1995). Development occurs in the form of an increased sense of professional identity. Progress is positive, constructive, and stepwise.
Incorporating the work of early developmental theorists such as Erik Erikson and Jean Piaget, as well as attachment theorists such as Bowlby, supervisors are said to progress through distinct stages in a hierarchical manner leading to increased complexity of tasks and responsibilities. For example, supervisors must address feelings of competency versus incompetency, autonomy versus dependency, identity versus identity diffusion, and self-awareness versus unawareness in each stage and obtain greater complexity as one develops. Each success in dealing with the crises of preceding stages helps the supervisor move ahead and cope with later, more complex, crises. At each crisis point the supervisor is vulnerable to both progression and regression. Both skill and supervisory identity are developed as one moves through the stages, and the existence of an appropriate holding and encouraging environment can facilitate development. An appropriate holding and encouraging supervisory relationship is seen as supporting the individuation and identity development of those involved with the supervision (Watkins, 1990b). As developmental theory and attachment theory are central to Watkins (1990a) model they will be reviewed in turn. The various SCM stages that are outlined by Watkins (1990a) will then be presented.

**Developmental Influence.** Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) and Stoltenberg et al. (1998) indicate that two general views of development exist: mechanistic and organistic. Mechanic views of development use the machine as a basic metaphor and are based on a quantitative paradigm. A stimulus-response and reactive conceptualization of human behavior characterizes this view of development. Change is seen as continuous, additive, and quantifiable over time. This view of a developmental model encourages a dogmatic adherence to such models. The second
type of developmental view is the organistic view. The organistic view posits that “the whole is considerably greater than the sum of the parts” (Stoltenberg et al., 1998, p. 12). This view posits that qualitative changes can be seen in an organism over the course of development. The organism is viewed as active in their own development. Learning is viewed as goal directed. In regards to counselor development, Stoltenberg et al. (1998) indicate that a general increase in knowledge and skill over time is evident but that qualitative differences in the level of complexity of these differs from level to level, changes are both qualitative and quantitative.

**Attachment Influences.** Pistole and Watkins (1995) indicate that attachment processes, as proposed by Bowlby (1988), are very relevant to counseling related processes. Specifically, people's normative tendency for proximity in an important relationship that provides safety and security, an anchor for exploration, and emotional distress when the tolerable limits of the relationship are exceeded relate to both counseling and supervision relationships. The existence of a dependable, constant, available, and responsive relationship is proposed as important for human, counseling, and supervisory development.

Clients are seen as being able to change the manner in which their attachment system functions by using the counselor as a secure base for exploring feelings, ways of thinking, and behavior. Clients can use the counseling relationship as a base and explore self and outside aspects. In this way clients can gain perspective on attachment models that are no longer adaptive and make appropriate adjustments.

Similarly, supervisors can use the attachment bond, or elements of attachment, between supervisee and supervisor to enable the supervisee to explore and develop their counseling skills. By providing a secure supervisory base reflecting
initially a close involvement and monitoring, and later a grounding freeing the supervisee to explore their counseling behavior, the supervisor can serve a protective and growth enhancing function. Additionally, supervisors of supervision trainees can utilize attachment bonds and elements to facilitate the supervisory growth of their supervision trainees. This supervisory process is described in more detail in the following sections outlining the SCM.

**SCM Stages.** The SCM describes four stages of supervisor identity development and what tasks appear at each stage. At each stage the supervisor develops greater professional identity, increased acceptance of the supervisee, a less dogmatic approach regarding theory, and increasing confidence in supervisory skills. Development is viewed as both qualitative and quantitative in nature.

Supervisory identity and skill are both viewed as essential variables, which demonstrate development. Changes in one can be caused by or related to the other. Thus, training and experience in supervision are viewed as potentially important. Specifics regarding how training and experience may influence supervisory development are presented in the following Possible Influences on Supervisory Development section, following the outlining of the SCM stages.

**Stage One: Role Shock.** This stage is encountered by a new supervisor when first entering the supervisor role and is characterized by questions of role boundaries and definitions. Counselors may feel like imposter supervisors and wonder if they are professionals or students. Supervisors at this stage are also likely to be concrete in their provision of supervision and thus interventions may appear superficial in nature. Supervisors of supervision trainees at this stage of development are best advised to provide a clear and strong holding environment and thus provide a stabilizing and
soothing function for supervision trainees. Supervision trainees need to be helped to define the supervision relationship at this stage of development.

**Stage Two: Role Recovery and Transition.** This stage is characterized by a more realistic perception of one's weaknesses and strengths as a supervisor. Some confidence in one's abilities as a supervisor develops and the supervisor may be more willing to take risks within the supervisory relationship. However, process and transference/countertransference issues are still not well addressed by supervisors at this stage of development. Supervisors of supervision trainees are urged to loosen the hold of their relationship with the supervision trainee at this stage of development and encourage the trainee's development of autonomy.

**Stage Three: Role Consolidation.** At this stage supervisors have reached a level of increasing consistency in their supervision provision. Supervisors at this level are more realistic about their strengths and weaknesses and can function as a resource for counseling trainees. Supervisors at this level are more likely to adequately address transference, process, and countertransference issues with their counseling trainees.

**Stage Four: Role Mastery.** A supervisor at this stage has a sense of mastery about their supervisory competence. Various issues can be addressed competently by supervisors at this level. If supervision is provided for supervisors at this level it is likely to be collaborative, challenging in nature, and on an as-needed basis.
Possible Influences on Supervisory Development

The present paper will examine four different possible influences on supervisory development: supervisory experience, counseling experience, supervisory training, and personal/relational variables.

Supervisory Experience

Experience as a supervisor has long been believed to have a positive influence on one's development as a supervisor (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Leddick & Dye, 1987). Indeed, a minimum of 100 hours of supervisory experience is required to earn the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credential (Bernard, 1998). However, Watkins (1993) points out that research indicates that supervisors may not develop and become more competent simply because they conduct supervision. This may be the case since without supervision, or training, a supervisor may only consolidate their ineffective supervisory patterns (Watkins, 1997b). Nevertheless, the more supervisory experience a supervisor accumulates the greater opportunity the supervisor will have to confront more developmental challenges and issues and thus prompt supervisory identity development. Experience as a supervisor may not make one a better supervisor, but it is a logical prerequisite for supervisory competence (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Watkins 1995d; Worthington, 1987).

Supervision of supervision, a total of 20 hours, is also required to qualify for the ACS credential (Bernard, 1998) and continuing supervision is recommended for counseling professionals and supervisors throughout their career (Davies, 1997; Watkins, 1997a). It is possible that supervised supervision experience aids one's development as a supervisor more than independent experience due to the greater
amount of reflection, support, and feedback provided by the additional supervisory relationship (Watkins, 1990a). Supervision of supervision can provide attachment components that allow for safety and exploration of supervisory behaviors. In this way environmental supports facilitative of identity development can be encouraged (Watkins, 1993). However, supervision of one’s supervision is reported to be rare (Rodenhauser, 1997) and little researched (Ellis & Douce, 1994; Getz, 1999). Research is needed on the topic of supervision of psychotherapy supervisors as this is an under addressed topic in the supervision literature (Watkins, 1994).

Research supports the idea that supervisory experience can aid supervisory development in some instances, but not in others. Stone (1980) indicated that more experienced supervisors made more planning statements and behaved differently over different levels of supervision experience. Others have found mixed results indicating that experience may be associated with self-efficacy but not one’s style of supervision (Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson, 1997). Some researchers indicate that experience as a supervisor has little effect on supervisory ratings, abilities to assess the developmental level of supervisees, and overall behaviors (Chagnon & Russell, 1995; Schwartz, 1990; Worthington, 1987). Marikis, Russell, and Dell (1985) indicated no difference in planning statements but differences in behavior and supervisee ratings with supervisors with differing levels of experience. It is possible that experience as a supervisor will be more influential in regards to supervisory identity development if paired with supervision of supervision or training. However, since research on the effect of supervisory experience on supervision has just begun, and has provided mixed results, the effect of supervisory experience on supervision and supervisory identity development is not clear.
Counseling Experience

Many authors indicate that to be a competent supervisor one must also be an established and competent counselor (Leddick & Dye, 1987). Styczynski (1980) reports that therapist skills are important as they can be imparted to the trainee and also because many of the skills successful in therapeutic interventions are also relevant to the supervisory relationship to “optimize change and development of the student” (p. 31). The National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) also indicates that in order to be a competent supervisor one must be an accomplished counselor. As a result the ACS credential is available to National Certified Counselors (NCC) with 1,500 hours of direct service to clients and more than 5 years of professional counseling experience (Bernard, 1998).

Research supports the idea that counselors develop as they gain experience, namely supervised experience (Wiley & Ray, 1986). For instance, counselors have been shown to develop a more balanced view of themselves and their clients as they develop (McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985). However, experience alone is not an adequate explanation of counselor development. Instead, development occurs over time as the counselor interacts with the environment and learning occurs, thus changing performance levels (Mead, 1990). Consequently, supervised experience that provides support and is facilitative of development is likely to have a greater impact on counselor development.

Whereas being a competent counselor is a necessary component of being a competent supervisor, counseling skills do not sufficiently enable one to work as an effective supervisor (Clarkson & Gilbert, 1991; Dye & Borders, 1990; Farrell, 1996; Hillman et al., 1998; Watkins, 1992). Indeed, Stoltenberg et al. (1998) indicate that
being a counselor does not sufficiently enable one to supervise others' work. Thus, training and experience as a supervisor are also viewed as important aspects of developing supervisory competence in conjunction with counselor development (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). However, until recently, supervision was not recognized as a distinct realm of activity requiring qualifications other than being an experienced therapist (Rodenhauser, 1997; Watkins, 1991). The effect of counseling experience, independent and supervised, on supervision and supervisory identity has not been investigated.

**Supervisory Training**

Those applying to obtain the ACS credential must demonstrate course work or workshop training in supervision related areas (Bernard, 1998). Indeed, many authors indicate that training in supervision is needed for therapists to develop their supervisory skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Farrell, 1996; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Watkins, 1997a). The training that is recommended includes didactic and practicum experiences, although practicum experiences are less often offered (Hillman et al., 1998). Some even indicate that providing supervision services without training is an indication that one is practicing outside their area of competence and thus is unethical (Blair & Peake, 1995; Borders et al., 1991; Borders & Cashwell, 1992; Carroll, 1996; Harrar, VandeCreek, & Knapp, 1990; Robiner et al., 1997).

supervision training, namely, while the supervisory role is considered important, training in how to be a supervisor is very limited. While training in supervision for doctoral students in counselor education programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs may be required, and recommended for other programs (Borders et al., 1991; Dye & Borders, 1990), many psychologists supervising in pre and post doctoral internship sites report no training in supervision (Johnson & Stewart, 2000; Robiner et al., 1997). Similarly, Baranchok and Kunkel (1990) indicated that the majority of counseling psychology training programs did not require a supervision course. The historical idea that preparation as a counselor is adequate preparation for supervisory functioning may be limiting the requirement of supervisory training in many programs (Baranchok & Kunkel, 1990) and this idea is slowly falling below calls for systematic training in supervision.

Supervisory training could be especially helpful for supervisors in the first stage of supervisory development, role shock. Such training can serve as a buffer for supervisors by indicating what the transition from counselor to supervisor might entail (Watkins, 1990a, 1993). Other authors have also suggested that training can ease the transition from counselor to supervisor or administrator (Mordock, 1990). This transition may be facilitated by the use of structured training, such as manualized supervisor training (Neufeldt, 1994).

Research also supports the need for training by indicating that systematic training is more likely to facilitate counselor growth than less systematic training (Lambert & Ogles, 1997) and that training can help supervisors learn to be flexible in their behaviors with supervisees (Borders, Rainey, Crutchfield, & Martin, 1996). Those who report receiving training in supervision within their graduate programs feel more prepared to supervise upon graduation (Johnson & Stewart, 2000). Indeed,
Borders et al. (1996) reported that students who took a combined didactic and practicum course in supervision were better able to select appropriate supervisory styles and emphasis areas with supervisees, and reported less anxiety and an increase in their beliefs regarding their ability to conduct supervision. Stevens et al. (1997) reported that training had an effect on the dogmatic and supportive supervisory behaviors of supervisors.

Some authors also advocate that continuing education should be sought by those who perform supervision (Davies, 1997). As indicated by Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987), “It seems reasonable at this point to believe that higher functioning supervisors are more effective and that, as with counseling skills, training may improve supervisor functioning” (p. 154). Mead (1990) similarly suggests that training can help inexperienced supervisors in developing their technical skill and interpersonal skills when working with supervisees. However, some research indicates that training is not able to influence supervisory thoughts of students taking a supervision practicum course (Borders & Fong, 1994). Clearly research on supervisory training and the results of supervisory training is needed (Ellis, 1991) and there are models of training supervisors available for study (Bernard, 1981; Bradley & Whiting, 1989; Klein, 1993; Richardson & Bradley, 1984; Sena, 1980).

Finally, whereas the research literature addresses the possible benefits of formal supervisory training on supervisory development and competence, the fact that much exposure to the supervisory knowledge base can be informal has not been addressed. It seems logical that self-study and academic research regarding supervisory issues would also act as a buffer for supervisory development. Some might argue that self-study on any topic can provide the reader with as much, if not more in-depth information, than formal training.
The SCM specifically identifies training as an agent capable of advancing supervisory identity and skill development, as it can aid the acquisition of competencies in interventions and appropriate supervisory tasks and roles. Blair and Peake (1995) similarly assert that adequate training in supervision may help beginning supervisors ease the transition from supervisee to supervisor.

**Personal/Relational Variables**

A supervisor's expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness have been related to supervisory influence, and can have an effect on the impact of supervision (Bartlett, 1983; Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Goodyear & Bradley, 1983). Watkins (1993, 1995d) also indicates that personal variables, such as self-criticality, are likely related to supervisory development. Similarly, differences in gender, power, and theoretical orientation can also be influential (Crespi, 1995; Leddick & Dye, 1987; Taylor, 1994; Winter, 1994). Moreover, the supervisory relationship in terms of empathy, genuineness, and flexibility may also prove significant in supervision (Dye & Borders, 1990; Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990; Goodyear & Bernard, 1998; Leddick & Dye, 1987; Powell, 1991; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993).

The strength and nature of the supervisory relationship is said to affect the process of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992) and is itself likely to be affected by personal variables (Ellis, 1991).

The present study did not investigate the relationship of personal or relational variables to supervisory identity development. However, it is likely that such variables are important factors in the development of supervisory identity and competence.
Summary

Supervision research that focuses on the development of the supervisor is rare. Some preliminary studies have been conducted and indicate that there are differences between beginning and more experienced supervisors. However, other research indicates that experience has little effect on supervisory behaviors. Thus, there are few studies that have explored the effect of supervisory experience on supervision, and those studies that do exist present mixed results. Moreover, no studies appear to have explored the effect of supervised supervision on supervisory development. Similarly, while there is abundant research on how counseling experience relates to counselor development, there is little research on how counseling experience, supervised or independent, relates to supervisory development. Finally, whereas training in supervision is generally seen as needed for those who are to provide supervision, and training opportunities are becoming more available, research on the effect training has on supervision and supervisory development is rare but supportive of the effectiveness of training in aiding supervisory development and skill acquisition. However, no research appears to have examined the effect of self-study in the area of supervision to supervisory development. Consequently, the relationship between supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision with supervisory development is unclear.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Past supervision research has focused on the development of counselors (Watkins, 1995d; Worthington, 1987); in contrast the present study focuses on the development of supervisors. The relationship of supervisory identity development with supervisory experience, counseling experience, and supervisory training was explored using survey research in a field setting. A visual depiction of this research can be found in Figure 1.

In this chapter the participant characteristics, independent variable characteristics, dependent variable instrument, data collection procedures, proposed data analysis, and research hypotheses are presented. All participants were treated in accordance with the ethical standards and guidelines set forth by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University and approval for this study was obtained prior to data collection from my doctoral committee and the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of Western Michigan University (Appendix A).

Participants

As the focus of investigation was supervisory identity development, a population likely to be regularly engaged in clinical supervision was chosen for study. Namely, members of the American Counseling Association’s (ACA) Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) who indicated in their ACA ACES
membership applications that they are counselor educators or counselor supervisors. A list of such ACA ACES members was obtained from ACA headquarters. A total of 909 counselor educators and 110 counselor supervisors were listed. The particulars regarding these possible participants were provided on one master list that did not include their subgroup affiliation (counselor educator or counselor supervisor designation). Thus, distinctions between the educators and supervisors could not be made. A random sample of 300 from this population was chosen for study. This sample size was chosen to provide the needed power in the proposed analyses while minimizing the number of surveys to be sent for the study to be completed.

*Figure 1. A Visual Depiction of the Present Study.*

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

This study had six independent variables, which were identified using a demographic questionnaire. The questionnaire was three pages long and took approximately 5 minutes to complete (Appendix B). First, supervisory experience operationalized as the number of years of supervision provided to others was identified. This experience included both independently provided supervision and supervision that was supervised by a higher level supervisor. Second, counseling experience operationalized as the number of years of counseling provided to others was recorded. This experience included both independently provided counseling services and counseling services supervised by a senior level counselor. Third, supervisory training was recorded. This variable included formal instruction, operationalized as the number of courses taken (didactic and practicum) and workshops taken. Self-study in the area of supervision was also examined, operationalized as the number of courses taught, workshops presented, and the number of articles on the topic of supervision published.

Dependent Variable Instrument

The dependent variable in the present study was the supervisor’s identity development level as measured by the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS). The PSDS was developed by Watkins, Schneider, Haynes, and Nieberding (1995) and is based on Watkins’ SCM of supervisory development. The PSDS contains 18 statements to which one indicates the truth of the descriptor for them on a Likert scale (1 = never, 4 = half the time, 7 = always). Four of the items on the PSDS are reverse scored (Items 8, 11, 12, & 17). The PSDS provides one total score.
said to reflect supervisor development. Although supervisory identity development is
described in terms of four distinct stages an attempt was not made to demarcate the
four stages. Rather, PSDS scores were used to generally determine directional
movement in the qualities proposed by the model with higher scores indicating a
higher level of development. The PSDS takes approximately 5 minutes to complete.

Watkins et al. (1995) indicate that the measure can distinguish novice
supervisors from supervisors that have a greater level of experience. They also
reported an Alpha reliability coefficient of .90. Moreover, content validity was
reported to be high as all items on the scale were rated as appropriately measuring
SCM criteria. Hillman et al. (1998) also indicate the PSDS to be stable over a 4-week
period of time ($r = .85$) and demonstrate good internal reliability (split-half reliability
= .95).

Data Collection Procedures

Prospective participants were sent a postcard indicating that in a week they
would be sent a packet containing a short questionnaire and measure of supervisory
identity development and that it would be appreciated if they would take the time to
complete said packet. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1990) indicate that such
introductory letters may help increase participant response rates as prospective
participants are warned of the arrival of the study materials (Appendix C).

A week after the postcards were sent a packet containing the supervisory
identity measure and demographic survey was sent to each prospective participant.
This packet included a cover letter inviting their participation in the research
(Appendix D). A consent document was also enclosed in this packet (Appendix E).
No markings were placed on the PSDS or demographic survey to indicate the
identity of the participant. However, the addressed stamped envelope for the return of the research materials to the researcher included an identifying number for the participant and a box that they could mark to obtain the results of the research (Appendix F). This identification also allowed the researcher to identify who had and had not returned their research materials. The research materials and their identifying envelopes were immediately separated upon receipt.

Three weeks after the initial postcards were sent a follow-up postcard mailing occurred. Postcards were sent to those who had not yet returned their research materials urging them to complete their research packets (Appendix G).

Five weeks after the initial postcards were sent a final follow-up posting occurred. Those who had not yet responded to the research survey were sent another packet of research materials with an adjusted cover letter and another copy of the consent document (Appendix H). Such follow-up mailings have been shown to increases survey response rates (Asch, Jedrziewski, & Christakis, 1997).

Acknowledged Methodological Limitations

A few methodological limitations were acknowledged prior to data collection. Regarding internal validity, this study was to explore supervisory identity development using a cross-sectional design. Thus, causal statements cannot be make regarding the independent variables’ causal effect on the dependent variable. Moreover, a longitudinal design could be better suited for an investigation of a developmental model, but would take a longer time to complete and create some difficulty in finding appropriate participants. Also, at least two possible confounding independent variables were not included in the present study, personality and supervisory relationship variables. These were not measured as the addition of these
variables would have dramatically increased the sample required for study to ensure adequate power, the focus of the present study was on those aspects related to supervisory identity development that are changeable, and to keep the research packets a reasonable size and thus maximizing the return rate. Regarding measurement issues, supervisory experience, counseling experience, and supervisory training were measured in a gross manner. Any differences regarding full versus part-time work were not to be included. Similarly, breadth of experience was not assessed. External validity issues also existed in the design of the present study. Namely, the participants investigated could be considered a constricted sample due to their strong interest in supervision issues by virtue of their involvement in ACA's ACES. A more detailed discussion of these limitations, and others that arose in the course of the study, can be found in Chapter IV.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and frequency statistics were to be computed on all of the data obtained, as appropriate. Where possible group comparisons, gender and education level, were to be made. A reliability analysis was to be conducted on the dependent variable measure (PSDS). The data were explored mainly via the use of multiple regression procedures, forward stepwise. Thus, the data were examined to ensure that the assumptions of multiple regression were fulfilled (distributions examined and correlation matrix computed).

Hypotheses

The present study had three main hypotheses. First, it was hypothesized that supervisory experience would relate positively and significantly to supervisory
identity development, and that supervised supervisory experience would have the more significant relationship with supervisory identity development. Second, it was hypothesized that counseling experience would relate positively and significantly to supervisory identity development, and that supervised experience would be more significantly related to supervisory identity development. Third, it was hypothesized that training in the area of supervision would relate positively and significantly to supervisory identity development, and that formal instruction would relate more significantly to supervisory development. No specific hypotheses were made about the relative importance of supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training to supervisory identity development.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

In Chapter I, the importance of studying supervisory development and
research related to supervisory development were presented. In Chapter II,
participant characteristics, independent variable characteristics, instrumentation, data
collection procedures, proposed data analysis, and hypotheses were presented. This
chapter will focus on the results of the study.

Participant Characteristics

A survey return rate of 58.3% was achieved. Thus, a total of 175 surveys out
of 300 were actually completed and made available for analysis. Return rate specifics
for counselor educators and counseling supervisors, the two subgroups in the ACA
ACES population used, were not available as the participant list obtained did not
specify such specifics.

Please refer to Table 1, Participant Characteristics, located on page 38, for a
summary of participant characteristics. Participants were 98 males (56%), 76 females
(43%), and 1 gender unspecified counseling professionals. Eighty-three percent of the
sample reported that they regularly provide clinical supervision. Those who indicated
they do not regularly provide supervision services often indicated that they were now
retired, or provide such services on an intermittent basis.

Ages ranged from 32 to 70 years of age ($M = 52.5; SD = 7.86$). The sample
consisted mostly of Caucasian/White, African American/Black, Asian American, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Demographic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender ((N = 174))</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Supervision ((N = 174))</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ((N = 168))</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity ((N = 173))</td>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree ((N = 165))</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Specialty ((N = 175))</td>
<td>Counselor Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting ((N = 174))</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple (Community Mental Health, Private Practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials ((N = 169))</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Theory ((N = 174))</td>
<td>Eclectic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiracial individuals (84.6%, 4.6%, 2.9%, and 2.9%, respectively). The Ph.D., Ed.D., and Master’s degrees were most highly represented (52.6%, 33.7%, and 8%, respectively). Most of the participants were counselor educators and counseling psychologists (59.4% and 12%, respectively). Other participants indicated working in counseling and guidance programs or having multiple specialty areas. The majority of participants were employed in an academic environment (68.6%). However, multiple work settings were indicated by many (18.9%) and included community mental health and private practice.

The most popular credentials were the Licensed Counselor credential (58.3%), National Certified Counselor credential (60%), and the Licensed Psychologist credential (23.43%). Seventeen percent of the respondents indicated holding the Approved Clinical Supervisor credential and 56.6% of the respondents held multiple credentials (including LCC, NCC, and LP). The most favored supervisory theoretical orientations were eclectic, developmental, cognitive, person centered, and family systems (56%, 9.7%, 7.4%, 6.9%, and 5.7%, respectively).

Independent Variable Characteristics

Please refer to Table 2, Independent Variable Characteristics, located on page 40, for a summary of the independent variables collected. Participants reported an average of 13.6 years of supervision experience ($SD = 11.2$) and 16.3 years of counseling experience ($SD = 11.1$). Independently provided supervision and supervised supervision averaged 10.4 and 4 years ($SD = 9.33$ and 6.12), respectively. Independently provided counseling and supervised counseling averaged 11 and 6.2 years ($SD = 9.5$ and 6), respectively. An average of 14.3 units of training ($SD = 20.6$) was reported. Formal study and self-study averaged 6.96 and 7.69 units on average.
## Table 2

### Independent Variable Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Experience ($N = 159$)</td>
<td>13.6 years</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Supervision ($N = 149$) Experience</td>
<td>10.4 years</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Supervision ($N = 154$) Experience</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Experience ($N = 172$)</td>
<td>16.3 years</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Counseling ($N = 158$) Experience</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Counseling ($N = 169$) Experience</td>
<td>6.2 years</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Supervision ($N = 174$)</td>
<td>14.3 units</td>
<td>20.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training ($N = 170$)</td>
<td>6.96 units</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study ($N = 170$)</td>
<td>7.69 units</td>
<td>16.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($SD = 9.8$ and $16.18$), respectively. It is interesting to note that $40.6\%$ and $41.7\%$ of the respondents did not have a didactic or practice course in supervision, respectively. Also, $16\%$ and $72\%$ of the participants had attended no workshops or published on the topic of supervision, respectively. Many of the participants did not teach supervision ($53.7\%$) or present on the topic ($55.4\%$) either. A total of $8.6\%$ of respondents reported having no training or self-study in the area of supervision, as recorded in the present study. Regarding supervision and counseling experience, only $4.6\%$ and $2.3\%$ indicated no experience in these areas, respectively.

Further examination of the independent variables indicated some interesting subgroup differences, all were tested at the .05 alpha level of significance unless otherwise stated. Participants who indicated regularly conducting supervision
reported significantly higher levels of training in supervision than those participants who reported not providing regular supervision services; Bonferroni adjusted, equal variances not assumed, $t = 3.09, p < .003$ (mean difference 8.21). No differences were found between those regularly providing supervision and those not regularly providing supervision in regards to supervision experience and counseling experience.

An ANOVA with post hoc (Tukey HSD) tests also indicated that those participants who had multiple specialty practice areas reported more counseling experience than those participants specializing in counselor education or counseling and guidance ($F = 2.94, p < .022$). Those indicating multiple specialty areas indicated 21.69 ($SD = 14.67$) years of counseling experience whereas counselor educators and counseling and guidance professionals indicated 15.03 ($SD = 10.13$) and 14.05 ($SD = 12.63$) years of experience, respectively. Those with different specialty areas did not differentially report supervision experience or training levels.

Those with different degrees also did not indicate different supervision experience, counseling experience, or training levels.

Male participants were significantly older than female participants; Bonferroni adjusted, equal variances not assumed, $t = 3.55, p < .000$ (mean difference 4.06). Male participants had significantly higher levels of supervision experience than female participants; Bonferroni adjusted, equal variances not assumed, $t = 4.10, p < .000$ (mean difference 6.47).

Not all participants completed all of the independent variable items on the demographic survey. A total of 16 and 3 participants failed to record whether they had any supervisory or counseling experience, respectively. Moreover, many respondents indicated confusion regarding supervised supervision experience. As having one’s supervision supervised by a more experience supervisor is a new
concept, it seems understandable that confusion occurred around this question. Also, one participant did not record if any training had ever occurred in the area of supervision.

Dependent Variable Characteristics

Participants in the present study obtained PSDS scores ranging from 52 to 126 ($M = 108, SD = 12.2$). Seventy-nine percent of the respondents scored above 100 on the PSDS. Scores can range from 18 to 128 on the PSDS.

The alpha coefficient for the 18 PSDS items was .95 ($N = 156$).

The majority of participants answered all of the questions on the PSDS; however, 19 individuals left one or more items blank. Generally such missing items were accompanied by written comments such as “does not apply to my method of supervision.” Questions 5 and 14 were the items most often left blank. Question 5 refers to becoming a supervisor as an ongoing process, whereas Question 14 deals with transference and countertransference issues. It is possible that these were unanswered items due to the fairly mature and experienced nature of the sample and theoretical biases, respectively. When items were left blank, they were simply omitted from the sum of the PSDS total score. It was decided that replacement scores (replacing the missing scores with the mean or modal answer given by that participant) would not be suitable since such a replacement score may ignore the fact that the SCM proposes such constructs are important in supervisory identity development, and to ignore such constructs may indicate a lower level of identity development. Thus, replacing missing values with a replacement score could have artificially raised PSDS scores.
Further examination of PSDS scores indicated some interesting group differences. Those who indicated providing supervision on a regular basis reported significantly higher PSDS scores than those who do not ($t = 2.522, p < .017$, mean difference = .8.48, unequal variances not assumed).

An ANOVA and post hoc tests (Tukey HSD) also indicated that certain specialty areas scored differently on the PSDS. Those specializing in counselor education scored higher than those specializing in counseling and guidance ($F = 2.49$, $p < .045$). Those specializing in counselor education and those specializing in counseling and guidance scored on average 110.34 ($SD = 10.67$) and 101.12 ($SD = 18.29$), respectively. Other specialty areas did not differ significantly from one another on the PSDS.

An ANOVA, with post hoc tests for three groups suggested by Howell (1997) indicated that a significant difference existed between PSDS scores for those holding different degrees ($F = 11.02, p < .000$). Post hoc Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) tests indicated that Ph.D. and Ed.D. holders scored significantly higher than Master degree holders on the PSDS. Those holding Ph.D., Ed.D., and Master degrees scored on average 110.37 ($SD = 9.06$), 109.07 ($SD = 12.69$), and 94.64 ($SD = 20.49$) on the PSDS. There was no significant difference between Ph.D. and Ed.D. holders on the PSDS, and there was no significant difference between the PSDS scores of men and women.

Data Analysis Preparation

The data were to be explored mainly using multiple regression procedures. Thus, the data were examined to ensure that the assumptions of multiple regression analyses were fulfilled. First, response rates were examined in comparison to the
number of variables to be run in the multiple regression procedure to ensure adequate power existed to detect a significant relationship among variables (Bausell, 1986). Second, the variables to be run in the multiple regression procedures were examined to ensure that the mean was an appropriate descriptor of the variables (Bausell, 1986). Third, a correlation matrix was examined to ensure that multicollinearity was not a problem (Bausell, 1986; Licht, 1995). Fourth, the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable were examined for deviations from linearity (SPSS, 1999).

Although the study began with the intent of running the analyses utilizing six independent variables, the variables were collapsed across their general categories to create three composite independent variables. This decision was made in order to increase power in the study, as Bausell (1986) suggests a minimum of 25 subjects per variable and 175 participants barely met this standard.

Also, initial investigations of the six independent variables indicated high skewness and kurtosis ratios. As the proposed multiple regression analyses to be run on the data assume that the arithmetic mean is an appropriate descriptor of the variables involved (Bausell, 1986) transformations designed to increase the normal distribution of the variables were investigated. Square root transformations on the six independent variables failed to lower skewness and kurtosis ratios to an acceptable level, <2, (SPSS, 1999) for 8 of the 12 ratios. After combining the six independent variables into three composite variables, the ratios were lowered. For a listing of the six independent and three composite independent variable skewness and kurtosis scores please see Appendix I, Independent Variable Skewness and Kurtosis Scores. Thus, independent and supervised supervision experience were combined into a composite supervision experience score, independent and supervised counseling
experience were combined into a composite counseling experience score, and formal and self-instruction were combined into a composite training score. Consequently, a total of three composite versus six predictor variables were used in the multiple regression analyses due to the low survey return rate and the highly nonnormal distributions of the more detailed independent variable levels.

A visual examination of the three composite independent variable distributions and an empirical examination of skewness and kurtosis scores indicated that these variables continued to be skewed and peaked, and, thus, did not conform to a normal distribution. All of the independent variables had a positively skewed and leptokurtic distribution. A logarithmic transformation was deemed inappropriate due to the existence of zero values within the independent variable data. A square root transformation of the data facilitated the approximation of a normal distribution for the purposes of analysis. The square root transformation successfully facilitated the approximation of a normal distribution for supervision experience and counseling experience. However, while training total became more normally distributed the distribution remained positively skewed and leptokurtic. Indeed, the skewness and kurtosis ratios, although lessened, continued to indicate a nonnormal distribution for training total with a ratio >2 (SPSS, 1999). As the transformation of the independent variables helped the distributions become more normal in shape, transformed independent variable scores were utilized in the multiple regression analyses. Please refer to Appendix J for before and after transformation skewness/kurtosis ratio chart comparisons, frequency distributions, and normal probability plots for the composite independent variables.

The distribution of PSDS scores was examined visually and empirically utilizing skewness and kurtosis ratios. This examination revealed that the distribution
was not normal in nature. The distribution was negatively skewed and leptokurtic. Watkins et al. (1995), as well as Hillman et al. (1998) have indicated that individuals tend to rate themselves highly on the PSDS. As the proposed multiple regression analysis to be run on the data assumes that the arithmetic mean is an appropriate descriptor of the variables involved (Bausell, 1986) transformations designed to increase the normal distribution of PSDS scores were investigated. As a result, both a logarithmic and a square root transformation were attempted on the data. However, neither transformation generated a more normal distribution. Consequently, PSDS scores were left untransformed for data analysis (Appendix K).

A correlation matrix was calculated between supervision experience (independent and supervised), counseling experience (independent and supervised), training in supervision (self and formal training), and PSDS scores. The independent variables were examined for multicollinearity among the independent variables as high multicollinearity can result in statistical inference and theoretical interpretive problems when conducting multiple regression analysis (Licht, 1995). If a large (.80) correlation exists between any two of the independent variables they are likely to be measuring the same variable and, thus, a combination of the two should be used in the regression analysis (Licht, 1995). Bausell (1986) suggests that correlations greater than .70 be considered indicative of multicollinearity. No correlations above .67 were noted and, thus, multicollinearity was not considered a problem.

Low correlations were found between the each of the subvariables that were used to create the three composite independent variables used in this study. Independent and supervised supervision correlated, but not significantly ($r = .072$, $p > .05$). Independent and supervised counseling experience were significantly
correlated \((r = .006, p < .05)\). Self-study and formalized study in the area of training were correlated significantly \((r = .353, p < .01)\).

The three composite independent variables all correlated significantly with PSDS scores. Supervision experience, counseling experience, and training correlated .229, .222, and .232 significantly \((p < .01)\) with PSDS scores, respectively. Experience as a supervisor correlated significantly with experience as a counselor \((r = .667, p < .01)\) and training in supervision \((r = .303, p < .01)\). Counseling experience was also correlated with training in supervision \((r = .153, p < .05)\). The significance of all of the above correlations were further examined utilizing the Larzelere and Mulaik test (adjusted Bonferroni procedure) to control for group wise error (Howell, 1997). The significance of all of the correlations remained the same except for the correlation between counseling experience and supervision training, which did not indicate significance at the adjusted level of significance. The correlation matrix for the above variables can be found in Appendix L and the Larzelere and Mulaik adjusted Bonferroni results can be found in Appendix M.

Once multicollinearity was investigated the relationships between the three composite independent variables and PSDS scores were investigated to ensure that the relationships were indeed linear. All three independent variables were shown to have linear relationships with PSDS scores. Supervision experience was linearly related to PSDS scores \((F = 8.26, p < .005)\). Counseling experience was linearly related to PSDS scores \((F = 9.67, p < .002)\). Total training was also linearly related to PSDS scores \((F = 9.49, p < .003)\). Deviations from linearity were not significant for supervision experience, counseling experience, and training with PSDS scores \((F = .76, p > .82; F = 1.46, p > .062; \text{and } F = .89, p > .662, \text{respectively})\).
Main Analyses

The main null hypotheses explored were: (a) that experience as a supervisor (independent and supervised) would not predict PSDS scores more accurately than the means of the variables, (b) that counseling experience (independent and supervised) would not predict PSDS scores more accurately than the means of the variables, and (c) that training in supervision (formal and self-study) would not predict PSDS scores more accurately than the means of the variables. In the present study it was hypothesized that supervisory experience would significantly predict supervisory identity development, and that supervised supervisory experience would have the more significant relationship with supervisory identity development. Second, it was hypothesized that counseling experience would significantly predict supervisory identity development, and that supervised experience would be more significantly related to supervisory identity development. Third, it was hypothesized that training in the area of supervision would predict significantly supervisory identity development, and that formal instruction would relate more significantly to supervisory development. No specific hypotheses were developed about the relative importance of supervisory, counseling, and training to supervisory identity development.

As the SCM does not indicate which independent variable would have a greater effect on supervisory identity development in order to investigate the relationship between supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training with PSDS scores a forward, stepwise, multiple regression using the .05 alpha level for inclusion and .1 alpha level for removal was performed on the 175 participants. Missing data were treated as missing pairwise only. The decision was made not to
remove data in a listwise fashion, as that was seen as unnecessarily excluding information from certain participants and lowering the power of the analysis. The decision was also made not to replace missing values with group means as missing values can not be safely assumed to be reflective of group means, and indeed may reflect lower than average values. Similarly, missing values were not replaced with zero values. As previously indicated, in order to better satisfy the underlying assumptions of multiple regression analyses transformed values were utilized for the three independent variables, but not the dependent variable, in analyses.

As evidenced in Tables 3 and 4, two independent variables were identified that contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .128, $F = 11.33$ ($df = 2, 155$), $p < .000$. They were, in order of importance, supervision experience and training. The best single predictor of PSDS scores was experience providing supervision. This variable explained 8.3% of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores, which was statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis that supervision experience would not better predict PSDS scores than the averages of the variable was rejected.

The second best predictor of PSDS scores was training in supervision. This variable explained 4.4% of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores, which was also statistically significant. Thus, the null hypotheses that supervision experience and training in supervision would not better predict PSDS scores than the averages of these variables were rejected.

As evidenced in Table 5, the current results failed to reject the null hypothesis that counseling experience would not better predict PSDS scores than the average of his variable.
Table 3

Multiple Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adjusted ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 ) Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(^{a,c} )</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>11.6658</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{b,c} )</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>11.4166</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience.  
\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training Total.  
\(^c\) Dependent Variable: PSDS Score.

Table 4

Multiple Regression ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(^{a,c} ) Regression</td>
<td>1926.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1926.541</td>
<td>14.156</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>21230.057</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>136.090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23156.598</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{b,c} ) Regression</td>
<td>2953.989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1476.995</td>
<td>11.332</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20202.609</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>130.339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23156.598</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience.  
\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training Total.  
\(^c\) Dependent Variable: PSDS Score.

A visual examination of the residuals indicated that they appeared to be generally normally distributed. The Normal P-P plots for the unstandardized, deleted, studentized, and studentized deleted residuals were similarly distributed in shape (Appendix N). However, an examination of the Partial Regression Plot seemed to
Table 5

Multiple Regression Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded Variables</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{a, c} Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.146\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Supervision</td>
<td>.218\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.808</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{b, c} Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.160\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Supervision Experience.
\textsuperscript{b} Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training in Supervision.
\textsuperscript{c} Dependent Variable: PSDS.

indicate a lack of homogeneity in PSDS variance when charted against both supervision experience and training. PSDS scores tended to center around the 0 and the 0 to -2 areas for supervision experience and training, respectively. However, neither of these tendencies appeared extreme and as indicated by Pedhazur (1997), multiple regression analyses tend to be robust to assumption violations such as this (Appendix O).

Further examination of residuals indicated the existence of three outliers, defined as residuals more than three standard deviations away from the mean. However, upon examination the identified cases did not appear to mere aberrations but valuable data indicative of lower PSDS score values. All of the cases identified as outliers had PSDS scores less than 100, something that only occurred in 21% of the respondents. Removing these cases added to the skew of the PSDS distribution already evident. Nevertheless, another forward stepwise regression was run on the
data set minus the three identified outliers in case these cases were unduly influencing the multiple regression results. Two independent variables were identified that contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .085, $F = 7.09$ (df = 2, 152), $p < .001$. They were, in order of importance, supervision experience and training. Counseling experience did not contribute significantly to the variance explained. The best single predictor of PSDS scores was experience providing supervision. This variable explained 5.4% of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores, which was statistically significant. The second best predictor of PSDS scores was training in supervision. This variable explained 3.1 of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores, which was also statistically significant. The relative importance of the predictors remained unchanged. Tables 6, 7, and 8 contain the multiple regression results and ANOVA tables for this analysis.

Two additional variations of the main multiple regression analysis were performed. Namely, the forward stepwise regression analysis was calculated while replacing missing values with the mean of the missing variable and also by excluding

| Table 6 |
| Multiple Regression Results No Outliers |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience.
b Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training Total.
c Dependent Variable: PSDS Score.
Table 7

Multiple Regression ANOVA Table No Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a, c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>867.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>867.068</td>
<td>8.809</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15059.753</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15926.821</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;b, c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1359.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>679.556</td>
<td>7.091</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14567.710</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15926.821</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience.

<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training Total.

<sup>c</sup> Dependent Variable: PSDS Score.

Table 8

Excluded Variables No Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a, c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Supervision</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;b, c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Supervision Experience.

<sup>b</sup> Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Supervision Experience, Training in Supervision.

<sup>c</sup> Dependent Variable: PSDS.

listwise cases that contained any missing variables. These two additional analyses were run as they represent common ways in which missing data are utilized/excluded in multiple regression analyses. The results of the analysis using means for missing...
values indicated two predictor variables, training and counseling experience. This combination of variables accounted for 13.4% of the variance in PSDS scores, \( F = 13.27 \) (\( df = 2, 172 \)), \( p < .000 \). Training and counseling experience accounted for 7.7% and 5.7% of the variance, respectively. The results of the analysis excluding cases listwise when missing values were present indicated two predictor variables also, training and counseling experience. This combination of variable accounted for 16% of the variance in PSDS scores, \( F = 14.31 \) (\( df = 2, 150 \)), \( p < .000 \). Training and counseling experience accounted for 9.2% and 6.8% of the variance, respectively.

Post Hoc Analyses

A number of additional multiple regression analyses were performed on subsets of the sample. Forward stepwise multiple regression procedures, excluding missing values pairwise, were run on all participants who reported conducting supervision on a regular basis, men, women, those above the mean age of participants, and those equal and below the mean age of participants. These analyses were performed so as to explore possible group differences since certain group differences appeared to exist upon initial examination of the data. It was thought that: (a) those who provide supervision on a regular basis may have their PSDS scores influenced more by different variables than the entire sample; (b) a gender difference may exist, suggesting relative differences in variable importance relating to PSDS scores; and (c) more mature versus younger individuals may have their PSDS scores influenced differently by the independent variables.

Two final analyses were also conducted. One explored the possible existence of an interaction effect by including the product vectors of supervision experience * training, counseling experience * training, and supervision
experience * counseling experience. An analysis including product vectors was performed as some researchers utilize this procedure to investigate interaction effects. The other explored the relationship between the three composite independent variables and the dependent variable without any data transformations. An analysis on all of the nontransformed variables was conducted as some researchers are not in favor of data transformations.

The multiple regression procedure on all those who reported conducting supervision on a regular basis indicated two independent variables contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .102, $F = 7.519$ ($df = 2, 133$), $p < .001$. They were, in order of importance, training and counseling experience. The best single predictor of PSDS scores was training which explained 7.4% of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores; this was statistically significant. The second best predictor of PSDS scores was counseling experience. This variable explained 2.7 of the variability among individuals with respect to their PSDS scores; this was also statistically significant.

The multiple regression procedure on the men in the sample indicated one independent variable, supervision experience, contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .122, $F = 12.26$ ($df = 1, 88$), $p < .001$. The multiple regression procedure on the women in the sample similarly indicated one independent variable, training, contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .075, $F = 5.38$ ($df = 1, 66$), $p < .023$.

The multiple regression procedure on the more mature participants in the current sample, over 53 (the average for the entire sample) years of age, indicated one independent variable, supervision experience, contributed significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .066, $F = 4.35$ ($df = 1, 62$), $p < .041$. However, the regression procedure on the younger participants, 53 years of age or younger, indicated two
independent variables, training and counseling experience, contributed significantly to
the overall $R^2$ of .174, $F = 9.06$ ($df = 2, 86$), $p < .000$. Training accounted for 11.3%
and counseling experience for 6.1% of the variance in PSDS scores.

The contribution of three product vectors in addition to the three composite
independent variables (supervision experience * training, counseling experience *
training, and supervision experience * counseling experience) was explored. The
regression procedure indicated three independent variables, supervision experience,
training, and supervision experience * training, contributed significantly to the overall
$R^2$ of .159, $F = 9.74$ ($df = 3, 154$), $p < .000$. The reader is reminded that supervision
experience and training were significantly correlated (Bonferroni corrected $r = .302$,
$p < .007$) and that the current study design is nonexperimental in nature. Thus,
Pedhazur (1997) indicates that such results cannot be considered as indicative of an
interaction as an interaction can only occur when two variables are not correlated and
when the study design warrants. The results were presented here simply for the sake
of completeness.

Finally, a multiple regression analysis run on the nontransformed data
indicated two independent variables, training and counseling experience, contributed
significantly to the overall $R^2$ of .089, $F = 7.59$ ($df = 2, 155$), $p < .001$. Training
accounted for 5.4% of the variance and counseling experience accounted for 3.5% of
the variance in PSDS scores. These results are presented for those researchers weary
of data transformations.

Results Summary

In summary, 11 separate multiple regression analyses were run on the sample,
or subsets of the sample. The amount of PSDS score variance accounted for by the
various independent variables, and combinations of variables, ranged from a low of 6.6% to a high of 17.4% for the more mature and younger subsections of the sample, respectively. Nine of the 11 analyses indicated training explained a statistically significant proportion of PSDS score variance. Five of the analyses reported counseling experience, and 4 reported supervisory experience explained a significant proportion of PSDS score variance. Supervisory experience and counseling experience did not both explain a statistically significant proportion of supervisory identity development score variance together in any of the multiple regression models. Please refer to Table 9 on page 58 for a chart summarizing the different multiple regression analyses performed and their summary results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Subset/Procedure</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Variables Identified as Significantly Contributing to PSDS Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample, forward stepwise,</strong></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>• Supervision Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Minus Outliers, forward stepwise,</strong></td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>• Supervision Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample, forward stepwise,</strong></td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>missing values replaced with mean values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Sample, forward stepwise,</strong></td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>missing values excluded listwise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample subset: Supervision Regularly Provided,</strong></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample subset: Men,</strong></td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>• Supervision Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample subset: Women,</strong></td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample subset: Age&gt;53,</strong></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>• Supervision Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Subset: Age=&lt;53,</strong></td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Vector Exploration,</strong></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>• Supervision Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nontransformed Data,</strong></td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forward stepwise, exclude missing values casewise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Counseling Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter the findings of the study are summarized, results are related to current literature, and the possible implications of the results are outlined. In addition, the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are presented.

Summary

Clinical supervision aids in the development of counseling professionals and protects clients from substandard care. Clinical supervision also is a key aspect of practice for counseling professionals. Consequently, supervision services are of great significance to the profession of counseling and counseling psychology. Nevertheless, few counseling professionals complete formal course work or practica in the area of supervision and, thus, many may be ill prepared for assuming the role of supervisor.

Over the last few decades great strides have been made in understanding the development of counselors and supervisory processes. However, the understanding of the development of supervisors themselves remains rudimentary and remains a largely untapped area of research. The research project just presented was designed to explore this generally untapped area. Namely, the relationship between supervisory identity development and supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision was the focus of the present study. If variables related to supervisory identity development could be investigated it could help identify how to aid counseling professionals assume the supervisor role in a competent manner.
A number of research areas were reviewed, in order to provide an appropriate background for the study. Theoretical and atheoretical models of supervision were presented, due to their popularity and historical importance. An overview of developmental models was also presented, and included a description of the Integrated Developmental Model of counselor development. The more popular supervisor development models were then presented, including the Supervisor Complexity Model which was used as the theoretical basis of this study. In the review of the SCM the developmental and attachment influences of the model were discussed and the stages of the model outlined. The SCM stages are (a) Role Shock, (b) Role Recovery and Transition, (c) Role Consolidation, and (d) Role Mastery, and outline the development of the supervisor from a novice to a more competent and expert supervisor. Development occurs in the form of increased professional identity and competence, progress is positive and constructive, and development involves the new supervisor addressing feelings of competency versus incompetency, autonomy versus dependency, identity versus identity diffusion, and self-awareness versus unawareness.

Four possible influences on supervisory identity development were then reviewed: supervisory experience, counseling experience, training in supervision, and personal/relational characteristics. Past research indicated mixed results regarding the effect of supervisory experience on supervisors, had not examined the effect of counseling experience on supervisors but the effect is assumed positive, and supported the benefits of training in the area of supervision but did not include informal self-study in the area of supervision. Personal/relational characteristics were not examined in this study.
In this study a random sample of 300 counseling professionals likely to be engaged in providing supervision services were surveyed by mail (ACA/ACES members). A maximum of four mailings were used to help increase the survey response rate. Participants completed a measure of supervisory identity development, the PSDS, and also indicated their supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in the area of supervision (e.g., how many courses and workshops on the topic of supervision had been completed). General demographic characteristics were also collected. A moderate response rate was achieved and respondents were fairly evenly split between genders. The majority of the sample provided regular clinical supervision and respondents tended to be mature, Caucasian/White, and doctoral level counselor educators. Most of the respondents had a substantial amount of supervision and counseling experience. A fairly high amount of training in the area of supervision was also reported. Respondents tended to score high on the PSDS, indicating confidence in their identity as supervisors.

Due to the variables having a nonnormal distribution data analysis was not straightforward. The initial six independent variables (independent supervisory experience, supervised supervisory experience, independent counseling experience, supervised counseling experience, formal training in supervision, and self-study in supervision) were collapsed into three variables (supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision) which then underwent a square root transformation to more adequately approximate a normal distribution so that the multiple regression assumption that the mean is an appropriate measure of the variables could be fulfilled. No such transformation fulfilled this assumption for the dependent variable measure, PSDS scores. No nonlinear or multicollinearity difficulties were evident in the data.
Multiple regression analyses (forward stepwise) were then performed to examine the relationship between supervisory identity development and supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision. The main results indicated that supervisory experience and training in supervision accounted for a significant portion of supervisory identity development variance. Additional post hoc analyses similarly indicated that training in supervision explained a statistically significant proportion of supervisory identity development score variance, while supervisory experience and counseling experience were variously identified as explaining a statistically significant proportion of supervisory identity development score variance. Supervisory experience and counseling experience did not both explain a statistically significant proportion of supervisory identity development score variance together in any of the multiple regression models.

Discussion and Conclusions

Supervisory Experience

Descriptive statistics indicated that participants had substantial supervision experience which was expected given the group chosen for study; i.e., ACA ACES members who indicated being counselor educators or supervisors. Supervision experience accounted for a significant portion of supervisory identity development variance in the main analysis. Thus, supervision experience adds significantly to the prediction of supervisory identity scores, and was also true when the more mature subset of the sample was examined with a separate multiple regression analysis. One can conclude from this result that supervisory experience, or a variable related to both supervisory experience and identity development, has a positive effect on
supervisory identity development. This finding was in support of the first hypothesis proposed in this study.

In the sample tested, the more experience one had as a supervisor was related to supervisory identity development which is a result expected by some, but not all, researchers and theorists. Experience as a supervisor is seen by many as a requirement for supervisory growth. However, researchers have also indicated that mere experience as a supervisor does not necessarily make one a better supervisor or lead to increased development (Watkins, 1995d; Worthington, 1987).

It is possible that the environments in which the participants worked were sufficiently collegial in nature to provide for a supportive environment conducive to supervisory identity development as proposed by the SCM. Thus, in essence a large portion of the supervisory experience may have been provided in an atmosphere that was supportive in a way that facilitates exploration via a secure base leading to greater supervisory identity development, versus “independent” in nature assumed not to relate to supervisory development. However, this is speculation regarding the academic environment many of the participants worked within, as in the present study it was not possible to directly investigate the difference between independent supervision experience and supervised supervision experience.

The results of the present study seem to indicate that supervisory experience is related to supervisor identity development. Thus, it may be beneficial to require potential supervisors to have such experience, or are provided with supervision of their early supervision experiences, as is required by the ACA’s Approved Clinical Supervisor credential.
Counseling Experience

Demographics also indicated that the sample investigated reported a substantial amount of counseling experience. However, the main analysis indicated that counseling experience did not add significantly to the prediction of supervisory identity development scores. This finding was not in support of the second hypothesis proposed in this study. However, additional analyses indicated that counseling experience did add significantly to the prediction of supervisory identity development scores for those who indicated providing regular supervision services and the younger participants.

Many researchers and theorists indicate that having counseling experience and being a competent counselor are necessary but not sufficient to being a supervisor. The lack of main results suggesting that counselor experience significantly relates to supervisory identity development seems to support this notion. Moreover, the supplementary findings that younger supervisors' counseling experience scores can add to the accuracy of supervisory identity development score prediction also supports this notion, as younger supervisors may still be developing the minimum counseling base necessary for maximum supervisory development. Once a certain level of counseling experience is reached, the variable may no longer add to supervisory identity development. The relative influences of independent and supervised counseling experience were not investigated in the present study.

It may be interesting to note that in the main analysis and also the supplementary analyses, supervision experience and counseling experience were never paired together in a regression equation as significantly predicting supervisory identity development scores. Supervisory and counseling experience were also
significantly and moderately correlated with each other. Thus, it is possible that both variables are related to a more global experience variable which relates to supervisory identity development. As a consequence, once one variable is placed in a regression equation to predict supervisory identity scores there is not enough variance distinctive to the other variable to add to the prediction. This more global variable could be related to general counseling related experience or exposure to supervision role models. However, this possibility is only tentative as counseling and supervision are distinct activities, despite their similarities.

The present results do not seem to suggest that counseling experience is necessary, past a minimum level, for supervisory identity development. However, as the sample investigated tended to be a mature and experienced sample it is possible that the supervisory identity development of younger and less experienced groups could be more influenced by counseling experience. The results of the present study do not clearly support nor refute the ACA's Approved Clinical Supervisor credential requirement for counseling experience. However, it does appear that a minimum amount of counseling experience is needed for supervisory identity development and competence.

Training in Supervision

A fairly high level of training was reported by participants. Moreover, training was the one independent variable most often identified as contributing significantly to supervisory identity development score predictions. Indeed the only analysis run that did not identify training as a significant predictor of supervisory identity development was the analysis involving the more mature and male subsets, possibly explained by
the fact that training in the area of supervision is a recent development in doctoral programs. This finding was in support of the third hypothesis proposed in this study.

These results indicate that training, or a factor related to training and supervisory identity development, has a positive influence on supervisory identity development. Previous research and theorists seem to support this notion. Indeed, despite the fact that many do not have supervisory training an official part of their university training there have been many calls for more training in this important area. This result would seem to reiterate the importance of training, or gaining knowledge through self-study, in supervision for those who provide supervision, as is required by the ACA’s Approved Clinical Supervisor credential.

Implications

The results obtained support that experience in the provision of supervision can aid in supervisory identity development. As supervisory identity development is theoretically linked, in the SCM, to supervisory competence it is suggested that new supervisors gain experience and have supervision of their supervision experiences to aid in their skill development so that their identity as a supervisor can be established. The results also suggest that a minimum amount of counseling experience is required for supervisory identity development. Consequently, new graduates who are placed in supervisory roles are encouraged to continue gaining counseling experience to aid in their development as supervisors. Finally, as training in the area of supervision is clearly related to supervisory identity development these results support the position that those who are to provide supervision services gain either formal training in the area or undertake serious self-study in the area of supervision. In summary, the results of the present study support the requirements set forth by the ACA for the
Approved Clinical Supervisor credential and further indicate the necessity for training and experience in the area in which counseling professionals plan to practice.

Limitations

Internal Validity Issues

This study explored supervisory identity development using a cross-sectional survey design. Thus, causal statements cannot be made regarding the independent variables' causal effect on the dependent variables. Also, a longitudinal design could be better suited for an investigation of a developmental model (Watkins, 1995b, 1995d), but would involve a greater time commitment and finding an appropriate number of participants could be difficult.

An additional limitation could be the fact that at least two possible confounding variables were not included in the present study. Specifically, personality attributes and dispositions and supervisory relationship variables.

Measurement Issues

In retrospect, the demographic survey used to collect information regarding supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision could have been designed to better facilitate data collection. As many participants indicated not currently providing supervision services but that they had in the past, Question 7 could have been worded, "Do you or have you ever regularly provided clinical supervision to therapists or therapist trainees?" Similarly, Questions 10 through 15 could have been designed so that participants would just indicate the number of courses, workshops, and publications in which one was involved. This may have
lowered the number of participants who checked "yes" but did not indicate a number (thus producing less accurate/usable data).

Also, although participants had no difficulty understanding what was meant as independent and supervised counseling experience, there was confusion regarding what was meant by supervised supervision versus independent supervision experience. Consequently, a brief definition of these could improve the fullness and accuracy of the responses to these questions. However, the demographic survey was designed with ease of completion in mind. Adding explanations and more explanatory sections versus check boxes, could have increased the time and effort taken to complete the measure and thus reduce the response rate obtained.

Another methodological difficulty in the present study involves the gross estimates of supervisory experience, counseling experience, and supervisory training used to facilitate data collection. Supervisory experience was measured as years providing supervision. Details regarding part-time or full-time experience, or the number of different supervisees seen and at what level of development were not obtained. However, some authors indicate that such breadth of experience can have a facilitative developmental effect. Similarly, counseling experience details were not obtained. Training in supervision also was a global measure lacking certain detail, yet may have not measured an important aspect of self-training in supervision. Namely, time spent reading journals, books, and discussing supervision related matters. Such details were not utilized as standardizing the number of discussions/items read or the time spent in such activities appeared clearly problematic and difficult for busy professionals to estimate quickly and report on a survey instrument.

The specificity of the independent variables was further reduced by the decision to utilize three composite versus the six independent variables to increase
power, thus not allowing for differential analyses involving supervised and independent experience and formal versus self-study.

The PSDS performed well as a measure, as good reliability was demonstrated. However, Questions 5 and 14 were left blank by a number of participants. The lack of full PSDS scores may have had an unknown effect on the analyses.

**Statistical Issues**

Certain multiple regression assumptions were violated in the present study. For example, the nonnormal distribution of PSDS scores violated one of the assumptions of multiple regression analyses. Namely, that the mean is an appropriate measure of the variables involved (Bausell, 1986). Training total also violated the assumption that the mean is an appropriate measure of the variables involved. One more violation of the assumptions of multiple regression occurred. The homoscedastic nature of error variance was mildly violated. Luckily, Licht (1997) reports that such violations tend not to be problematic. As stated by Pedhazur (1997) "It has been demonstrated that regression analysis is generally robust in the face of departures from assumptions" (p. 34).

**External Validity Issues**

The participants investigated in the present study may also be a constricted sample in terms of supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training due to the participants’ strong interest in supervision issues by virtue of their involvement in ACES. Indeed, the sample obtained tended to be mature in nature and have a great deal of experience. It is possible that a younger and less experienced sample would
provide different results. Finally, many of the respondents were from an academic environment and it is possible that those providing supervision in other environments would produce different results. Focusing future research in settings outside of academe would head one of Borders' (1989) moratoriums on supervision research, namely to focus on non academic settings, and continue a trend towards more realistic field studies in supervision research (Ellis et al., 1996).

Summary and Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined the little investigated relationship between supervisory identity development and supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision. Indeed supervisory development in general is not a highly investigated topic. It was found that supervisory experience and training related to supervisory identity development, suggesting the possible importance of these variables for supervisory development and limited support for the SCM of supervisory development. These are new findings in a new area of supervision research. However, the sample, supervisors within a mostly academic environment, and the methodology involved, survey cross-sectional research, are often used in the investigation of supervision. Those who investigate supervisor development in the future may be best advised to continue to explore supervisory identity development but do so using different methodology and different populations.

Consequently, future researchers are encouraged to continue to investigate the importance of experience, supervision and counseling, and training in supervision for supervisory identity development. However, methodologically, future research is advised to avoid cross-sectional research and investigate development longitudinally. Future research is also advised to investigate the different effects of supervised versus
independent experience and formal versus self-study in the area of supervision. More
detailed, less global measures, of experience could also be utilized. Future studies
could be designed to explore possible interaction effects between experience,
supervisory and counseling, with training.

Additional variables, such as personality variables, including self-esteem, or
variability in supervisory experience may also be fruitfully explored for their
relationship to supervisory identity development. The investigation of critical
instances in the provision or receiving of supervision may also prove fruitful
regarding supervisory identity development. Also, many different populations could
be explored including younger and less experienced supervisors, counseling or
clinical psychologists (versus counseling educators), and those who provide the
majority of their supervision in nonacademic settings. Supervisory identity
development could also be related to various aspects concerning the provision of
supervision. For instance, the amount and focus of supervisor planning statements.

Historically, one was considered able to conduct supervision if they were a
competent counselor. It is now recognized that being a competent counselor is not
sufficient for being a competent supervisor. Training and experience, supervision and
counseling, are now seen as needed for competency as a supervisor. The results of
this study support the importance of training and experience in supervision for
supervisory identity development. Future research can further investigate these
relationships and provide guidelines for enhancing supervisory development.
Enhancing supervisory identity development could relate to supervisory competence
and thus the development of countless numbers of supervisees, consequently
improving the counseling services clients receive.
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Demographic Survey
Demographic Survey

1. Age ______

2. Gender
   ______ Female     ______ Male

3. Race/Ethnicity
   ______ African-American/Black  ______ Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)
   ______ Asian-American          ______ Alaskan Native/American Indian
   ______ Caucasian/White         ______ Pacific Islander
   ______ Multiracial
   ______ Not listed, please indicate

4. Highest Degree Obtained ______

5. Specialty
   ______ Clinical Psychology     ______ Counseling & Guidance
   ______ Counselor Education     ______ Social Work
   ______ Counseling Psychology
   ______ Other, please indicate

6. Work Setting
   ______ Private Practice        ______ Hospital
   ______ Academic Department     ______ Student Counseling Center
   ______ Community Mental Health ______ Medical School
   ______ Outpatient Clinic
   ______ Other, please specify

7. Do you regularly provide clinical supervision to therapists or therapist trainees?
   ______ yes     ______ no
8. Your License/Credential Status

________ Licensed Psychologist  ________ National Certified Counselor
________ Licensed Counselor  ________ Approved Clinical Supervisor
________ Certified Social Worker
________ Other, please specify ________________________________

9. Theoretical Orientation Used In Clinical Supervision

________ Behavioral  ________ Psychodynamic/analytic
________ Cognitive-Behavioral  ________ Relational
________ Developmental  ________ Rational-Emotive
________ Family Systems  ________ Person Centered
________ Eclectic, please specify ________________________________
________ Other, please specify ________________________________

10. Have you had a graduate university didactic course in clinical supervision?

________ yes, please indicate how many didactic supervision courses have you had ______

________ no

11. Have you had a graduate university practicum course in clinical supervision?

________ yes, please indicate how many supervision practicum courses have you had ______

________ no

12. Have you ever attended a workshop in clinical supervision?

________ yes, estimate the number of supervision workshops you have attended ______

________ no
13. Have you ever taught a course in clinical supervision (practicum & didactic)?
   ______ yes, estimate the number of supervision courses you have taught ______
   ______ no

14. Have you presented a workshop on clinical supervision?
   ______ yes, estimate how many supervision workshops you have presented ______
   ______ no

15. Have you professionally published on the topic of clinical supervision?
   ______ yes, how many articles on supervision have you published ______
   ______ no

16. Supervised Therapy Experience (experience you have had providing therapy that was supervised)
   ______ years*

17. Independent Therapy Experience (experience you have had providing therapy that has not been supervised)
   ______ years*

18. Supervised Clinical Supervision Experience (experience you have had providing supervision to therapists that has been supervised)
   ______ years*

19. Independent Clinical Supervision Experience (experience you have had providing supervision to therapists that has not been supervised)
   ______ years*

*If your experience level is 1 to 12 months, please indicate one year of experience.
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Postcard One
Dear ACES Member:

My name is Nadine Pelling and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Western Michigan University. I am studying the development of supervisors for my doctoral dissertation and in just one week I will be attempting to gather data for my dissertation. Consequently, in about a week you will receive a small research packet containing a demographic survey and a measure of supervisory development. The entire packet should take about ten minutes for you to complete. I would greatly appreciate it if when you receive this packet you complete the materials and return them to me in the envelope provided. Additional information about the study will be contained in the packet.

Thank you in advance for your participation,

Nadine Pelling
Appendix D

Cover Letter One
Dear ACES Member:

My name is Nadine Pelling and I am a doctoral student in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department at Western Michigan University. You may recall that I sent you a postcard last week informing you that I would be sending you this research packet.

I am conducting a research project entitled “Supervisory Development and its relationship to supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision.” Consequently, I am collecting information on the development of supervisors and relating it to supervisory and therapy experience as well as supervisory training. By participating you would be contributing to a new area of research which may assist future beginning supervisors and thus therapists and clients.

Participation will involve one demographic survey and one measure of supervisory development. Together these measures should take about ten minutes to complete. Please return the enclosed measures to me via the addressed stamped envelope provided and indicate on the back of the envelope if you would like a copy of the results of this study sent to you. You will notice that the back of the envelope has an identification number. This is so I can take you off of my mailing list when the materials are returned and place you on the list to receive the study results, if you so wish. Your responses will be promptly removed and separated from the identifying envelope and all responses will be confidential.

If you have any questions or concerns you may contact Dr. Robert Betz at (616) 387-5107, Nadine Pelling at (616) 342-9195, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the vice president for research at (616) 387-8298.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nadine Pelling
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Consent Document
Supervisory Development and Its Relationship to Supervisory Experience, Counseling Experience, and Training in Supervision
Robert L. Betz, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Nadine Pelling, M.A., Student Investigator

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “Supervisory Development and Its Relationship to Supervisory Experience, Counseling Experience, and Training in Supervision” designed to explore the relationship of certain variables to supervisory development. This project is being conducted by Dr. Robert L. Betz and Nadine Pelling from Western Michigan University, Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology. This research is being conducted as part of the doctoral dissertation requirement for Nadine Pelling.

The research involves a demographic survey, which gathers information on your age, gender, education, and professional therapy experience. The research also involves a measure of supervisory development, the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale. Participation should take about ten minutes in total. Your replies will be confidential, which means that your name will not appear on any papers on which information is recorded. A separate master list with participant names will be held only until the results of the study are complete so that research results, if requested, can be sent to the participants. Once the study is complete the list will be destroyed. All other forms will be held in a locked file at Western Michigan University for three years and then destroyed.

You may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. You may skip any questions you wish to leave blank. Please return the survey and measure in the enclosed addressed and stamped envelope. Returning the materials indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Robert L. Betz at (616) 387-5107, Nadine Pelling at (616) 342-9195, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the vice president of research at (616) 387-8298.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature.
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Envelope
Would you like to receive a copy of the results of this study?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]
Appendix G

Postcard Two
Dear ACES Member:

Two weeks ago I sent you a demographic survey and a measure of supervisory development and asked you to complete and return them to me. I have not yet received the materials from you. Whereas I realize that you are likely busy it is imperative to my research that I receive these materials from you. If you have already returned the survey, perhaps it has crossed this note in the mail, I thank you. If you have not completed the research packet I ask that you do so at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your participation,

Nadine Pelling
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Cover Letter Two
Dear ACES Member:

My name is Nadine Pelling and I am a doctoral student in the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department at Western Michigan University. A few weeks ago I sent you a research packet and asked for your participation in a research project entitled "Supervisory Development and its relationship to supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision." Consequently, I am collecting information on the development of supervisors and supervisory and therapy experience as well as supervisory training.

I have not received any materials from you. If you have already filled out the materials and sent them back to me, perhaps they have crossed this letter in the mail, there is no reason for you to complete the enclosed materials a second time. However, if you have not yet completed the materials I am enclosing a new set and ask for your participation. By participating you would be contributing to a new area of research which may assist future beginning supervisors and thus therapists and clients.

Participation will involve one demographic survey and one measure of supervisory development and should take about ten minutes to complete. Please return the enclosed measures to me via the addressed stamped envelope provided and indicate on the back of the envelope if you would like a copy of the results of this study sent to you. You will notice that the back of the envelope has an identification number. This is so I can take you off of my mailing list when the materials are returned and place you on the list to receive the study results, if you so wish. Your responses will be promptly removed and separated from the identifying envelope and all responses will be confidential.

If you have any questions or concerns you may contact Dr. Robert Betz at (616) 387-5107, Nadine Pelling at (616) 342-9195, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at (616) 387-8293, or the vice president for research at (616) 387-8298.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nadine Pelling
Appendix I

Skewness and Kurtosis Scores for the Six Independent and Three Composite Independent Variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Study</th>
<th>Self-Study Counselling Experience</th>
<th>Supervised Supervision Experience</th>
<th>Independent Supervision Experience</th>
<th>Supervised Counselling Experience</th>
<th>Supervision Experience Total</th>
<th>Counseling Experience Total</th>
<th>Training Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skewness</strong></td>
<td>5.700</td>
<td>3.638</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>1.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Error of Skewness</strong></td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurtosis</strong></td>
<td>47.969</td>
<td>15.544</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>8.264</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>5.480</td>
<td>4.848</td>
<td>2.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Error of Kurtosis</strong></td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Before and After Transformation Skewness/Kurtosis Ratio Chart, Frequency Distributions, and Normal P-P Comparisons for the Independent Variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervision Experience</th>
<th>Counseling Experience</th>
<th>Training Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Untransformed Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness Ratio</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skewness/Std. Error of Skewness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis Ratio</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>31.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kurtosis/Std. Error of Kurtosis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Square Root Transformed Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness Ratio</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skewness/Std. Error of Skewness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis Ratio</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kurtosis/Std. Error of Kurtosis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervision Not Transformed

- Frequency

- Supervision

- Std. Dev = 11.18
- Mean = 13.6
- N = 159.00

Supervision Square Root Transformed

- Frequency

- Supervision

- Std. Dev = 1.50
- Mean = 3.4
- N = 159.00
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Normal P-P Plot of Supervision
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Normal P-P Plot of Transformed Supervision
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Appendix K

PSDS Skewness and Kurtosis Scores
and Distribution Characteristics
### Before and After Transformation Skewness and Kurtosis Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>PSDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAW DATA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness Ratio</td>
<td>-9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skewness/Std. Error of Skewness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis Ratio</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kurtosis/Std. Error of Kurtosis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Square Root Transformed Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness Ratio</td>
<td>-11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skewness/Std. Error of Skewness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis Ratio</td>
<td>18.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kurtosis/Std. Error of Kurtosis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logarithmic Transformed Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness Ratio</td>
<td>-13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skewness/Std. Error of Skewness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis Ratio</td>
<td>26.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kurtosis/Std. Error of Kurtosis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSDS Log Transformed

Std. Dev = .06
Mean = 2.033
N = 175.00
Normal P-P Plot of PSDS

Observed Cum Prob

Expected Cum Prob

Normal P-P Plot of Square Root PSDS

Observed Cum Prob

Expected Cum Prob
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Appendix L

Correlation Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSDS</th>
<th>Supervision Experience Total</th>
<th>Counseling Experience Total</th>
<th>Training Total</th>
<th>Self Study</th>
<th>Formal Instruction</th>
<th>Independent Counseling Experience</th>
<th>Supervised Supervision Experience</th>
<th>Independence at Supervision Experience</th>
<th>Counseling Experience Supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>.303*</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.673*</td>
<td>.552*</td>
<td>.651*</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.185*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.661*</td>
<td>.317*</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.852*</td>
<td>.821*</td>
<td>.523*</td>
<td>.523*</td>
<td>.523*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.232*</td>
<td>.303*</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.100*</td>
<td>.887*</td>
<td>.773*</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.289*</td>
<td>.252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.217*</td>
<td>.887*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>.319*</td>
<td>.295*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.773*</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.324*</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Counseling Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.673*</td>
<td>.652*</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.275*</td>
<td>.204*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.255*</td>
<td>.684*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervised Supervision Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.552*</td>
<td>.329*</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.318*</td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td>.255*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.265*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.152*</td>
<td>.651*</td>
<td>.621*</td>
<td>.252*</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.109*</td>
<td>.684*</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Experience Supervised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.523*</td>
<td>.031*</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slg. (2-talled)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Appendix M

Larzelere and Mulaik Adjusted Bonferroni Correlations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Alpha/(k-I+1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Experience and Counseling Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Study and Self-Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Total and Supervision Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Total and PSDS Scores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.008 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Experience and PSDS Scores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Experience and PSDS Scores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.013 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Total and Counseling Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.017 Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Supervision and Supervised Supervision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Counseling and Supervised Counseling Experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

Multiple Regression Residual Charts
Histogram

Dependent Variable: PSDS

Regression Standardized Residual

Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual

Dependent Variable: PSDS
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Appendix O

Multiple Regression Homogeneity of Variance
Partial Regression Plot
Dependent Variable: PSDS

Supervision

Partial Regression Plot
Dependent Variable: PSDS

Training
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