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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Exploring Interpersonal Variables within the Supervisory Relationship: The Role of Supervisory Alliance, Supervisor Style, and Supervisee Attachment

In this chapter, I will provide an introduction to the current study based on relevant literature. I will also describe why this study matters, given the gaps in the current literature. I will shed light on the importance of this study in the supervision and training of future counselors. Lastly, I will report my research hypotheses.

**Statement of the Problem**

Supervision plays an important role in the professional development and training of new professionals. Supervision has been described as a unique relationship that is hierarchical, extends over time, and has simultaneous purposes of further developing the professional functioning of the more junior member; monitoring the quality of professional services offered by the junior member, and overseeing as a gatekeeper for junior members entering the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Like many professions, the clinical supervision of new counselors is paramount to the future of the profession and most counselors have had numerous supervisors throughout their career.

Supervision serves a pivotal role in the professional development and training of new therapists (Ronnestad & Skovhoit, 1993). The supervision of psychotherapy is of particular importance because client-welfare and trainee development rely on effective
supervision (2009). More specifically, researchers have suggested that the supervisory relationship, also conceptualized as the supervisory working alliance, is largely responsible for the changes that occur for the supervisee within the supervision process (e.g., Holloway, 1987).

Interestingly, despite the supervisory working alliance being a critical component of the supervision process and impacting supervisee professional development, little is known about the interpersonal or relational variables that contribute to this important alliance (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Thus, given the critical role that the supervisory working alliance plays in the provision of psychotherapy and supervision and training outcomes, it is important to have a better understanding of interpersonal variables that contribute to the supervisory relationship in order to produce more positive training outcomes.

Unfortunately, little research has examined variables that contribute to the interpersonal process of supervision. Given the lack of research and the critical role of supervision within the profession, it seems essential to further examine the role of interpersonal variables within the supervision relationship that promote strong supervisory alliances and overall positive training outcomes. Supervisory style and supervisee attachment are both examples of interpersonal variables, which have been posited to contribute to the supervisory working alliance. Supervisory style refers to the ways in which supervision is carried out by the supervisor, such as focusing largely on the supervision relationship or on tasks that need to be accomplished. Whereas, supervisee attachment informs how supervisees manage interpersonal closeness and distance within the supervisory relationship. These constructs may be helpful in further understanding the interpersonal variables that contribute to strong alliances and positive training outcomes within supervision.
**Purpose of Study**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the interpersonal factors within the supervisory relationship that facilitate stronger supervisory working alliances and predict training outcomes. This study will also add to the limited literature regarding the role of interpersonal factors within the supervisory relationship. In order to have a better understanding of these interpersonal factors, I surveyed master’s level counselors regarding their perceptions of their supervisor’s supervisory style, their perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, and their adult attachment orientations. I also surveyed the supervisees’ supervisors regarding their perception of their supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance.

The second purpose of this study was to examine the differences in supervisor and supervisee perceptions of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance through the application of a theoretical lens. Previous research suggests using attachment theory to further understand these differences in perception within the supervisory working alliance (e.g., Dickson, Moberly, Marchall, & Reilly, 2011). Thus, it was my belief that supervisees’ attachment orientation would significantly influence supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory style, and the supervisory working alliance, to offer a fuller understanding of the interpersonal dynamics within the supervision relationship.

**Theoretical Background**

**Attachment theory.** Attachment theory offers a helpful framework for understanding how individuals perceive and regulate interpersonal closeness and distance within close relationships. Attachment is considered a long-term continuous connection that one person has with another person who fulfills the individual’s needs for safety and comfort (Obegi & Berant, 2009).
Attachment theory has been widely used within the psychotherapy literature as a lens for conceptualizing interpersonal variables that impact the therapeutic working alliance (Horvath & Bedi, 2002). However, much less research has examined the role at attachment within the supervisory relationship. Therefore, in the current study, I hope to add to the limited research examining the role of attachment within the supervisory relationship and better understand the impact of adult attachment on the supervisory working alliance.

Over time, attachment researchers have somewhat disagreed as to how one’s attachment style should be conceptualized and measured (Obegi & Berant, 2009). Some researchers (e.g., Batholomew, 1990; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) have conceptualized attachment as a categorical construct (i.e., secure, preoccupied, dismissing, & fearful), whereas others (e.g., Fraley & Spieker, 2003) have conceptualized attachment as a two-dimensional (i.e., anxiety and avoidance) construct, viewing attachment orientation as continuous.

Although categorical or typological models of attachment are still referenced, attachment is now most commonly conceptualized as a two-dimensional model of individual differences related to attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety (Brennon, Clark, & Shaver, 1998; Fraley & Spieker, 2003). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, I will be using a two-dimensional model to examine adult attachment orientation.

**Adult attachment and psychotherapy.** Given the limited research related to the role of attachment within the supervisory working alliance, it is necessary to draw upon psychotherapy literature as a guide for how attachment style may influence the supervisory working alliance. Within the psychotherapy literature, researchers have found that a client’s attachment orientation is a critical factor in being able to develop a working alliance within psychotherapy (e.g., Farber & Metzger, 2009). Psychotherapy researchers have consistently shown that insecure attachment
has been generally linked to difficulties developing and maintain alliances within therapy. Whereas, client’s with more secure attachment generally report stronger alliances (Alexander & Anderson, 1994; Farber & Metzger, 2009; Diener & Monroe, 2011).

**Adult attachment and supervision.** Given the psychotherapy research findings, it makes sense that within the supervisory working alliance, supervisee attachment style would also be an important variable in establishment of the alliance. Researchers have also suggested that better understanding adult attachment patterns within the supervisory working alliance would facilitate a better understanding of the personal and relational factors that that contribute to the quality of the alliance (e.g., Dickson, Moberly, Marchall, & Reilly, 2011; Watkins, 2011).

Researchers have found mixed findings related to the role of adult attachment in the establishment and maintenance of a strong supervisory working alliance (e.g., Renfro-Michel, 2006; White & Queener, 2003). For example, Renfro-Michel (2006) found a significant link between supervisee attachment and the supervisory working alliance, whereas White and Queener (2003) did not find a correlation between supervisee attachment and the supervisory working alliance. Given the mixed findings, it has been questioned if the different boundaries within the supervisory relationship, compared to the therapy relationship, impact the role that adult attachment plays within the supervisory working alliance (White & Queener, 2003).

In a related line of inquiry, researchers have also found that supervisee attachment style impacts supervisees’ perception of the supervisory working alliance and supervisees’ perceptions of their supervisor’s attachment patterns (e.g., Dickson, Moberly, Marchall, & Reilly, 2011). Dickson and colleagues, found that supervisees’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance were linked to their perception of their supervisor’s attachment style. They also found that insecurely attached supervisees were more likely to rate their supervisors as having an insecure attachment.
style. This finding suggested that supervisee attachment style could directly and indirectly impact supervisees’ perception of the supervisory working alliance and supervisor variables.

**Supervisory style and supervision.** In order to better understand the factors that contribute to the development of the supervisory working alliance, a few researchers have also incorporated supervisory style. Thus, in the current study, I also incorporated supervisory style in order to better understand the interpersonal factors that contribute to the development of the supervisory working alliance. Supervisory style is highly correlated with the supervisory working alliance, particularly when looking at measurement and scale development (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Supervisory style is described as the behavioral patterns of the supervisor, which illustrate how the supervisor interpersonally approaches and responds to the needs of the supervisee (Holloway & Wolleat, 1981; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). A supervisor’s supervisory style also influences how the teaching and learning occur within the supervisory relationship (Teitelbaum, 1998). Supervisory style is composed of three interrelated constructs or dimensions: An attractive style, an interpersonally sensitive style, and a task oriented style (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). These three dimensions describe how a supervisor approaches the supervision process and the establishment of the working alliance. In the current study these three dimensions (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, & task oriented), were thought of as individual dimensions of supervisory style, as opposed to a more global conceptualization of supervisory style.

Supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance have been examined within the context of supervisor and supervisee perceptions. Researchers have shown that supervisors and supervisees often perceive these constructs differently when responding about the same supervisory relationship (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). Thus, in the current study, I also
examined the difference between supervisor and supervisee perceptions of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance.

**Adult Attachment, Supervisory Style, and Supervisory Working Alliance**

I found no published journal articles that examined supervisory style, supervisee attachment orientation, and the supervisory working alliance. However, two researchers examined these three variables, among their variables of interest. In one study, Kim (1998) found trainee attachment dimensions to predict trainee perceptions of the attractive and interpersonally sensitive dimensions of supervisory style. Kim also found that trainees who were low on attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance, and overall more securely attached, were more likely to view their supervisors’ style as attractive or interpersonally sensitive. Kim’s study plays a critical role in the foundation of the current study. Kim’s study was the first study that began to explore the relationship between supervisee attachment and supervisee perceptions of supervisory style and of the supervisory relationship.

In a similar dissertation study, Spelliscy (2007) examined the role of attachment, supervisory style, and the supervisory alliance in the role of conflict ambiguity. In her study, the supervisory working alliance served as the mediating variable between supervisee variables, specifically supervisee perception of supervisory style, attachment style, and role conflict/role ambiguity. In other words, to what extent does the supervisory working alliance account for the relation between supervisee variables (e.g., supervisory style & attachment style) and conflict/role ambiguity? When considering attachment style, Spelliscy did not find attachment avoidance to have a significant direct effect on the supervisory alliance, which would be expected based on the tenants of attachment theory.

Given the strong theoretical foundation, which would suggest a significant role of
supervisee attachment orientation within the supervisory relationship, the current study, I aimed to further examine these variables (i.e., supervisee attachment, supervisory working alliance, and supervisory style). The mixed findings of Spelliscy’s study, despite strong theoretical underpinnings, further extended the need for these variables to be studied differently, which was the objective of the current study.

In the current study, I further examined the impact of supervisees’ attachment orientation on supervisees’ perception of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. I also examined the lack of congruence between supervisee and supervisor perceptions of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. Previous researchers had shown that an individual’s perception of supervisory style influences their overall perception or rating of the supervisory working alliance. Researchers have also illustrated that supervisee attachment orientations have not been systematically related to ratings of the supervisory working alliance. Thus, a revised framework incorporating supervisory style was necessary to further examine the relationship between supervisee attachment orientation and its impact on the supervision process. Overall, there have been mixed findings regarding the relationship between attachment and the supervisory alliance, despite theoretical assumptions that would argue the impact of adult attachment orientation. Thus, a main goal of this study is to further examine how supervisees’ attachment orientation impacts supervisees’ perception of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance.

Research Questions

In the current study, I examined the following research questions related to the impact of supervisee attachment on supervisee perception/ratings of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. First, (a) to what extent do supervisees’ ratings of supervisory style dimensions
differ from supervisors’ ratings of supervisory style dimensions? More specifically, (b) is there an association between supervisee attachment avoidance or attachment anxiety and the dimensions of supervisory style (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented)? (c) Is there an association between supervisees’ with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance? (d) Is there an association between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational (attractive and interpersonally sensitive) dimensions of supervisory style, compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety?

Second, (a) I examined to what extent supervisee’s perception/ratings of the supervisory working alliance components differ from supervisor’s ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions? More specifically, (b) is there an association between increased supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance?

Thirdly, I examined the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and the impact of supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance on the supervisees’ ratings of supervisory style. In particular, (a) is there a relationship between increased attachment avoidance and rating the supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance? (b) Is there a relationship between increased attachment anxiety and rating the supervisory style more relationally oriented (attractive or interpersonally sensitive), compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety?
Research Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1a:** There are significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory style dimensions.

**Null Hypothesis 1a:** There are not significant differences between supervisee’s and supervisor’ ratings of the supervisory style dimensions.

**Hypotheses 1b:** There are significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of supervisory style (e.g., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented).

**Null Hypothesis 1b:** There are not significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of supervisory style (e.g., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented).

**Hypothesis 1c:** There are significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style.

**Null Hypothesis 1c:** There are not significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style.

**Hypothesis 1d:** There are significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational dimensions (i.e., attractive & interpersonally sensitive) of supervisory style.

**Null Hypothesis 1d:** There are not significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational dimensions (i.e., attractive & interpersonally sensitive) of supervisory style.
**Hypothesis 2a:** There are significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions.

**Null Hypothesis 2a:** There are not significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions.

**Hypothesis 2b:** There are significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (e.g., rapport & client focus).

**Null Hypothesis 2b:** There are not significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (e.g., rapport & client focus).

**Hypothesis 3a:** There are significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment avoidance rating supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance.

**Null Hypothesis 3a:** There are not significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment avoidance rating supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance.

**Hypothesis 3b:** There are significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment anxiety rating supervisory style more relationally oriented (e.g., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety.
Null Hypothesis 3b: There are not significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment anxiety rating supervisory style more relationally oriented (e.g., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety.

In regards to my own predictions for the previously noted research questions, past researchers acknowledged the difference in perception between supervisors and supervisees regarding supervisory style, thus I predicted that supervisors and supervisees would perceive the supervisory style differently within the supervisory relationship (Research Question 1a). I also predicted that supervisee attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance would predict differences in perception/rating of supervisory style (Research Questions 1b, 1c, & 1d). This prediction was based on previous researchers’ findings that attachment patterns influence individual perception.

Past researchers have also acknowledged the differences in perception between supervisors and supervisees regarding the supervisory working alliance, thus I predicted that supervisors and supervisees would perceive/rate the supervisory working alliance differently (Research Question 2a). I also predicted that supervisee attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance would contribute to the differences in perception of supervisory working alliance (Research Question 2b). Although, researchers have concluded mixed findings, this prediction was based on previous findings that attachment patterns have been indirectly related to perception of the supervisory working alliance.

Lastly, I predicted that increased supervisee attachment avoidance would contribute to a more task oriented perception of supervisory style, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance. I also predicted that increased supervisee attachment anxiety would contribute to a more relational perception (i.e.,, attractive and interpersonally-sensitive) of supervisory style,
compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety. These predictions were based adult attachment theory. Past researchers have also illustrated that attachment avoidance is related to promoting distance within interpersonal relationships, which would increase the focus on supervision tasks and lead to additional sensitivity and feelings of internal threat in response to relationally oriented supervision interventions. On the other hand, attachment anxiety is related to a strong desire to feel close within relationships, which would increase the focus on the supervisory relationship and make the focus on tasks less emotionally satisfying.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I will provide a critical review of relevant literature needed to better understand the variables within this study. I will begin by conceptualizing the supervisory working alliance. To further inform what is known about the supervisory working alliance, I will then draw upon the psychotherapy relationship, examining the therapeutic working alliance and its connection to positive therapy outcomes. Next, I will examine supervisory style and adult attachment, again drawing upon the role of adult attachment within the psychotherapy relationship to further substantiate the theoretical underpinnings of supervisee attachment within the supervisory relationship.

**Conceptualizing the Supervisory Working Alliance**

Supervision is critical in the professional development and training of new professionals. Although many authors have offered various definitions of supervision, Bernard and Goodyear (2009) provide the following working definition: Supervision is an intervention provided by a senior (more experienced) member of the profession to a junior (less experienced) member of the same profession. More specifically, the supervisory relationship is evaluative, hierarchical, extends over time, and has simultaneous purposes of further developing the professional functioning of the more junior member; monitoring the quality of professional services offered by the junior member, and overseeing as a gatekeeper for junior members entering the profession (2009).

Within psychotherapy, a central purpose of supervision is fostering supervisee professional development, in addition to monitoring client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).
Researchers have shown that the supervisory relationship is a critical factor in the professional development and training of supervisees (Ronnestad & Skovhoit, 1993). Referencing the supervisory relationship, Holloway (1997) described this interpersonal process as the primary vehicle through which the supervisee engages in supervision and achieves the goals of the supervision process. Although the supervisory relationship, often conceptualized as the supervisory working alliance, is one of many outcomes associated with the supervisory process, Holloway (1987) suggested that the supervisory working alliance is largely responsible for the changes that occur in the supervisee within supervision. Similar to Holloway, Bernard and Goodyear (2009) reiterated the importance of the supervisory working alliance and described numerous positive outcomes that can result from a strong supervisory working alliance, which include: stronger adherence to suggested interventions, supervisee’s increased willingness to self-disclose, and overall satisfaction with supervision.

Although a strong alliance is critical to effective supervision and has been liked to numerous training outcomes, there are many factors that can impact alliance development. Of the many supervisor and supervisee factors described by Bernard and Goodyear (2009), the supervisor’s style and supervisee attachment orientation are considered two key interpersonal factors that impact the development of the supervisory working alliance. Although, understanding interpersonal variables, such as supervisory style and supervisee attachment, within the supervisory alliance is essential, there is little research. Thus, further research regarding supervisee and supervisor interpersonal variables is critical to better understanding the supervisory working alliance and ensuring better training outcomes.

Due to the lack of research surrounding the supervisory working alliance, researchers have drawn upon decades of psychotherapy literature in conceptualizing the supervisory working
alliance. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) point out that of the similarities that exist between the processes of counseling and supervision, the centrality of the interpersonal relationship is the most striking. Thus, the first step in conceptualizing the supervisory working alliance and the role of interpersonal variables is to turn to what researchers know about the therapeutic working alliance.

**Therapeutic Working Alliance**

The therapeutic working alliance is one of the most widely studied process-outcomes variables (e.g., Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Horvath, Del Re, Fluckiger, & Symonds, 2011). The working alliance is defined as the strength and quality of the partnership or collaboration between the client and therapist (Horvath & Bedi, 2002). The definition of the working alliance grew out of decades of research and theory. As early as the 1900’s, Sigmund Freud was interested in understanding the collaboration and cooperation that occurred between the client and therapist within psychoanalysis (Messer & Wolitzky, 2010). In the early 1940’s, Freud generated ideas regarding the possible contributions of the client to the therapy process (Esman, 1990). Freud’s early examination of the client’s contributions to the therapy relationship served as a springboard for later researchers to further examine the relational dynamics within the psychotherapy relationship.

During the 1950’s and early 1960’s (e.g., Stone, 1961; Zetzel, 1956), Ralph Greenson was the first to coin the term “Working Alliance” and what he described as the “real relationship” between client and therapist (Shane & Shane, 1992). Greenson’s understanding of the working alliance was influenced by Zetzel’s (1956) paper titled “Current Concepts of Transference” where she introduced the concept of the therapeutic alliance and its importance. Moreover, Greenson’s “real relationship” can be thought of as the more conscious, rational
(“non-neurotic”) relationship or rapport between the client and the therapist (Shane & Shane, 1992). Similar to Greenson, Horvath and Bedi (2002) suggested that the working alliance is a conscious and purposeful part of the therapeutic relationship, with a distinguishing emphasis on collaboration.

In addition, Greenson (1967) believed that traditional psychotherapy concepts, such as gathering client data and facilitating client insight were not sufficient for change, pointing to the working alliance as a critical component for client change. Similar to Greenson, Shane and Shane (1992) insisted that the working alliance, and its development, is crucial for lasting change in therapy. Borden (1979) also posed that the strength of the working alliance is a large, if not the sole, contributor to effective psychotherapy. Bordin extended Greenson’s pioneering work and also became a key contributor in understanding with working alliance.

Fusing past contributions from psychoanalysis and Greenson (1967), Bordin (1979; Bordin, 1983) conceptualized the working alliance in psychotherapy as including three features: (1) mutual agreement and understanding of the goals of psychotherapy, (2) the tasks of the client and the therapist, and (3) the bonds between the client and the therapist. Regarding goals in psychotherapy, Bordin described that if there is not a basic level of understanding and agreement involved between the individuals in the relationship change goals will not be met. Change goals point to what the individual, group, or family would like to get out of therapy, for instance, improved feelings about oneself or a better quality relationship with a family member. The agreed upon change goals may exist in the form of feelings, thoughts, or actions. The strength of the working alliance will be impacted by the clarity and the mutuality of the agreement between the individuals (Bordin, 1983).

In addition to mutual agreement of change goals, the strength of the working alliance also
depends on mutual agreement of the tasks that are imposed on each individual as a result of the change goals (Bordin, 1983). Within the therapeutic relationship, these tasks are typically assigned by the therapist and are often determined by the therapist’s theoretical orientation or involve the therapist’s personal therapeutic style and approach to the therapy process. How well the individual seeking change understands the relationship between the assigned tasks and the change goals will also impact the strength of the working alliance (Bordin, 1983).

In addition to goals and tasks, Bordin (1983) describes the important feature of bonds within the working alliance. Bonds develop out of a shared experience, regardless of whether the experience is pleasant or not (Bordin, 1983). Bordin posited that feelings of liking, caring, and trusting make up the bond that forms between individuals. The bonds between individuals are also further influenced by public/private dimension of the relationship. Specifically, the level of collaboration will be impacted by the amount of sharing of private thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that occur as part of a specific therapeutic task (Bordin, 1983).

Aside from various conceptualizations of the working alliance, researchers have agreed that the working alliance is a key factor in psychotherapy and is often referred to as a single construct (Bordin 1983; Horvath & Bedi, 2002; Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000). The concept of the working alliance is now conceptualized and utilized by most therapeutic traditions as a single pantheoretical factor, which promotes client change (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Bordin (1979) points out that it is the strength, rather than the kind, of the working alliance that matters in determining psychotherapy outcomes. Measurement has played a pivotal role in demonstrating the strong connection between the strength of the working alliance and psychotherapy outcomes.

**Measurement of the working alliance.** The Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) is the most frequently used measure of the working alliance within psychotherapy studies (Martin,
Garske, & Davis, 2000). Martin, Garske, and Davis (2000) found in their meta-analysis that the WAI was the most frequently used measure in their sample of studies. The WAI provides an overall alliance score and also assesses Bordin’s (1979) three alliance features (goals, tasks, & bonds). Being that the WAI was designed to measure alliance factors in various kinds of therapy and to measure underlying theoretical constructs of the alliance, the WAI is likely to be appropriate for most research projects (Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000). Overall, measurement of the working alliance has led numerous psychotherapy researchers to examine the statistical relationship between the working alliance and psychotherapy outcomes. This relationship is important to the current study because it greatly informs how researchers think about the supervisory working alliance and supervision outcomes.

**Connection between working alliance and psychotherapy outcomes.** Researchers repeatedly illustrated the critical connection between the working alliance and psychotherapy outcomes. Four major meta-analyses have been conducted to date. Horvath and Symonds (1991) conducted the first major meta-analysis and highlighted significant developments in the working alliance research. Horvath and Symonds examined the results of 24 studies focusing on the quality of the working alliance and therapy outcome. They found that the working alliance is a moderately robust variable linking psychotherapy process to outcome and found an effect size of .26. Although the effect size is not extremely large, it is comparable to that of other critical psychotherapy variables (Horvath & Symonds, 1991), which means that the working alliance holds significant weight as a determinant for effective psychotherapy. Horvath and Symonds also found that when considering client and therapist ratings of the working alliance, it is ultimately the clients’ perspective of the working alliance was the most predictive of treatment outcomes. Horvath and Symond’s study is central in beginning to understand the power of the working
alliance in achieving therapy goals, symptom reduction, and other desired psychotherapy outcomes (Egan, 2010; Falkenström, Grandström, & Holmqvist, 2014).

In a related study, Martin, Garske, and Davis (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of 79 studies examining the relationship between the working alliance and psychotherapy outcomes. They found the working alliance to be moderately related to outcome with an effect size of .22, which is slightly lower than the finding of Horvath and Symonds (1991). Martin, Garske, and Davis not only provided further validation regarding the importance of the working alliance, they also posed that the client will experience the relationship as therapeutic regardless of other psychological interventions. This is a major finding because it illustrates the importance of the working alliance above and beyond the specific theoretical orientation used. Martin, Garske, and Davis also found that clients tend to view the therapeutic relationship consistently over time, which means that establishing a strong working alliance with clients early in the therapeutic relationship is key.

Furthermore, Horvath and Bedi (2002) conducted a large meta-analysis based on the two studies already mentioned and an additional 10 studies. Across all studies, Horvath and Bedi found an effect size of .25, similar to the effect size found in other studies (e.g., Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Horvath, Del Re, Fluckiger, & Symonds, 2011). Horvath and Bedi stressed the importance of the working alliance and, similar to Horvath and Symonds (1991), reiterated the importance of the client’s perspective and ratings of the working alliance in psychotherapy outcomes. Horvath and Bedi further explained that initial differences in ratings of the working alliance occurred because the client and therapist approached the initial working alliance from two different perspectives. Clients are driven by their own needs for safety and their level desire to engage in the therapeutic process, whereas, therapists respond to the emerging alliance in light
of their theoretical orientation. Thus, even though these initial differences in perspectives of the working alliance would be expected, this conceptualization is important because it stressed the need for therapists to keep the interpersonal needs of clients as a priority over their theoretical approach. Horvath and Bedi illustrate that not only is the working alliance central, but keeping the client’s interpersonal needs as a top priority is key to the initial development of the working alliance and the promotion of positive psychotherapy outcomes.

Lastly, Horvath, Del Re, Fluckiger, and Symonds (2011) described the working alliance as one of the most widely researched topics in the psychotherapy literature. They found over 7000 items using key words: working alliance, helping alliance, alliance, or therapeutic alliance in their search of electronic databases. In contrast to previous meta-analyses, Horvath et al.’s search extended to material available in French, German, and Italian, in addition to English. They found an effect size ranging from .249 to .301 within a 95% confidence interval. Horvath et al.’s findings are similar to those in the three previous studies mentioned, making the overall relationship between working alliance and psychotherapy outcome robust (Horvath, Del Re, Fluckiger, & Symonds, 2011). In contrast to the perspective of Martin, Garske, and Davis (2000), Horvath and associates clarified that the working alliance is not separate from therapeutic interventions or theoretical orientation. The working alliance is an essential an inseparable part of every aspect of therapy (Horvath et al, 2011).

Overall, psychotherapy researchers have repeatedly recognized the critical importance of the working alliance in positive therapy outcomes. In agreement with the four previous meta-analyses and other psychotherapy researchers, Safran, Muran, and Proskurov (2009) stressed that the quality of the therapeutic alliance is the strongest predictor of psychotherapy outcome. Given the intimate connection between the practice of psychotherapy and the practice of supervision,
more recently researchers have extended understandings of the therapeutic working alliance to
the supervisory process (Hess, 1980; Rønnestad & Shovholt, 1993).

Supervisory Working Alliance

Holloway (1997) described having a strong working alliance as a primary goal within the
supervision process. She added that, within this relationship, the supervisor designs specific tasks
and teaching strategies aimed at enhancing the professional development of the supervisee.
Similar to Holloway, Haber (1996) emphasized the supervisory relationship within the
supervision process. Haber further described the ongoing supervisory relationship as a “relational
dance” between the supervisor and supervisee. He elaborated that often this relational dance is
unknown or minimized within the supervisory relationship. He emphasized that, within the
ongoing supervisory relationship, the relationship and chemistry of the “dancers” may be more
essential and powerful than the technical aspects of this relational dance. Thus, he further agreed
with Holloway, and suggested that more attention needed to be directed toward the relational
process of supervision, as opposed to the tasks and goals of supervision.

Although many researchers believe that the relational components of the supervisory
working alliance are of central importance, the current working definition of supervisory
working alliance lacks an emphasis on the role of relational components in the establishment of
the alliance (e.g., Haber, 1996; Holloway, 1997; Muse-Burke, Ladany, Deck, 2001; Watkins,
2011). In defining the supervisory working alliance, Bordin (1983) extended his model
conceptualizing the therapeutic alliance to the supervision of psychotherapy. According to
Bordin, similar to the therapeutic working alliance, the supervisory working alliance is also made
up of three aspects: goals, tasks, and bonds. To begin, Bordin described the types of goals that
the supervisee might obtain from the supervision process. Goals might include: (1) mastery of a
specific skills, (2) further developing one’s own understanding of clients, (3) increasing one’s awareness of process issues, (4) increasing awareness of self and one’s impact on the process, (5) moving toward learning and mastery by overcoming personal and intellectual obstacles, (6) strengthening one’s understanding of concepts and theory, (7) stimulating research, and (8) maintaining standards and ethics of service. Parallel to the psychotherapy process, the strength of the working alliance in supervision is likely impacted by the clarity and the mutuality of the agreed upon goals between the individuals (Bordin, 1983).

In addition to potential goals within supervision, the degree to which the supervisor and the supervisee understand the tasks that they must complete is important. Supervision tasks are drawn from both therapeutic and didactic orientations and are connected to the goals of supervision (Bordin, 1983). Tasks in supervision may include: (1) the supervisee preparing an oral or written report in order to receive feedback and meet the supervision goal of mastering a specific skill, (2) observing the supervisee’s therapy session with clients (e.g., through videotape) and providing feedback to the supervisee to meet goals regarding increased awareness of process issues, and increasing self-awareness and impact of self on the process, or (3) selecting a problem or concern for presentation by the supervisee, such as the therapeutic working alliance (Bordin, 1983).

Lastly, bonds are required within the supervisory relationship and exude qualities similar to that of a teacher and student or therapist and client (Bordin, 1983). This emotional bond emerges between the supervisee and supervisor as they spend time together and carry out the supervision process (Muse-Burke, Ladany, & Deck, 2001). Muse-Burke, Ladany, and Deck (2001) described the emotional bond as feelings of liking, caring, and trusting that develop between the supervisee and the supervisor. Although Bordin (1983) argued that the evaluative
nature of supervision makes bonding more difficult. Overall, understanding the supervisory working alliance in terms of goals, tasks, and bonds has been important in its conceptualization. In addition to conceptualizing the supervisory working alliance, measurement has also been critical in understanding the supervisory working alliance. Measurement allows researchers to better understand the specific components of the working alliance, specifically from the individual perspectives of the supervisor and supervisee.

**Measurement of the supervisory working alliance.** Efstation, Patton, and Kardash (1990) developed the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) to measure the working alliance in counselor supervision. The SWAI is conceptually based on the work of Greenson (1967), Pepinsky and Patton (1971), and others (e.g., Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). The SWAI contains three supervisor factors (Client Focus, Rapport, & Identification) and two supervisee factors (Rapport and Client Focus). According to Efstation and colleagues, the chosen arrangement of factors, as mentioned previously, best represented the perspective of supervisor and supervisee. Scores on the SWAI were found to have adequate reliability. Evidence of convergent and divergent validity was also established by examining the relation between the SWAI and selected scales from the Supervisory Style Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

Being that the SWAI offers both a supervisor form and a supervisee form, comparison between both perspectives is feasible (Efstation, et al., 1990). Efstation and colleagues report substantial differences between supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, however, there being some overlap, indicated by comparison of Rapport and Client Focus factors on both forms. They suggested that a supervisor’s perception of the supervisory working alliance may be influenced by their theoretical orientation. Overall, these differences in perception of the supervisory working alliance are important in understanding
what supervisory factors are important to supervisors and supervisees. Although understanding the factors that affect perception is complex, examining interpersonal variables begins to examine variables that impact individual differences in perception.

Regarding the increased complexity of the supervisory relationship, Horvath and Bedi (2002) pointed out that the ability to develop a positive working alliance does not seem to be a direct function of either experience or training, which further suggests the importance of interpersonal variables. When examining interpersonal variables within the supervisory working alliance, previous researchers have suggested examining the supervisor’s supervisory style (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). Supervisory style has been closely connected with the supervisory working alliance and begins to provide understanding of interpersonal variables within the supervisory working alliance (2001).

**Supervisory Style**

Supervisory style describes the patterns of a supervisor’s behaviors used within a supervision session, including how supervisors’ interpersonally approach and respond to the needs of the supervisee (Holloway & Wolleat, 1981; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). Supervisory style also affects how the teaching and learning occur within the supervisory relationship (Teitelbaum, 1998).

A supervisor’s supervisory style is determined by various factors. The supervisor’s personality (e.g., interpersonal variables) and the supervisor’s focus of supervision (e.g., client, therapist, supervisory relationship) impact their supervisory style. Also, adherence to a particular theoretical orientation can shape a supervisor’s techniques and contribute to a supervisor’s supervisory style (Teitelbaum, 1998). A supervisor’s supervisory style is often consistent and operates similarly across supervision sessions with different supervisees (Neufeldt, Beutler, &
Regarding specific types of supervisory styles, Usher and Borders (1993) found that supervisees generally prefer a supervisor who is relationally oriented (attractive or interpersonally sensitive) rather than task oriented. Ladany, Walker, and Melincoff (2001) also noted that an attractive supervisory style seems to account for all parts of the supervisory alliance (goals, tasks, and bonds). A supervisor with an attractive supervisory style is supportive, friendly, open, and flexible. In contrast, a task-oriented style may only account for agreement on tasks and lack a focus on the goal and bond components of the supervisory alliance. Thus, specifically a task-oriented supervisory style may fail to incorporate important relational and interpersonal components, which affects the level of potential professional growth achieved during supervision. Given that supervisory style is an important variable in the supervision process, the measurement of supervisory style is essential to further examine the perspectives of supervisors and supervisees.

Friedlander and Ward (1984) were the first to operationalize and create a measure of supervisory style. They described supervisory style as being composed of three interrelated constructs: An attractive style, an interpersonally sensitive style, and a task oriented style. To measure supervisory style, Friedlander and Ward developed the Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI) to specifically measure supervisory style. The SSI is a self-report measure that consists of 33 descriptors (e.g., sensitive, focused, trusting, informative). The SSI consists of both a supervisor and a supervisee form. Thus, the SSI allows for both supervisors and supervisees to describe the supervisory style, which is helpful in understanding the aspects of the supervisory relationship that are important from each perspective.

Being that supervisees are in the role of learner within the supervisory relationship,
understanding the supervision-related factors that foster engagement and further training is important. Teitelbaum (1998) described the supervisory style as having a profound impact on how supervisees experience themselves and their work within the supervisory relationship. More specifically, Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) found, in their study of 105 trainees, that the more attractive or interpersonally sensitive their supervisors were in their style, the less likely they were to reveal neutral counseling experiences. Whereas, the more task-oriented the supervisors were, the less likely supervisees were to reveal personal issues or counseling successes. In other words, supervisees whose supervisors had a relational (e.g., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) supervisory style felt more comfortable and were more likely to reveal personal information. These findings suggest that a supervisee’s level of comfort is important and is tied to feelings of safety and security. The supervisees’ perceptions of safety within the supervisory relationship impacted their feelings of closeness (shared personal information) or distance (did not share personal information) to their supervisor and effected their engagement in the supervisory process.

When further examining perception of supervisory style and its relationship to the supervisory working alliance, Ladany, Walker, and Melincoff (2001) found that supervisors’ perceptions of their supervisory style was related to their perceptions of the supervisory working alliance. In other words, supervisors’ perceptions of the supervisory relationship were related to how supervisors believed they approached the supervisory process. These findings are important because each component of the supervisory style contributes uniquely to the supervisory alliance and if a supervisor approaches supervision with one predominant style, a weakened supervisory alliance will result (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). The findings of this study also provide evidence that perception of supervisory style matters in overall perception of the supervisory
Thus, continued examination of supervisors’ and supervisees’ perceptions of the supervisory style and its relationship to the quality of the supervisory working alliance is critical to learning about supervisee engagement in supervision. Bordin (1983) suggested that the quality of the supervisory working alliance is far more vital to positive training outcomes than the particular supervision model or approach. Given that the quality of the supervisory working alliance is essential to positive training outcomes, better understanding of interpersonal factors that affect perception is needed.

In order to further understand the impact of interpersonal variables on supervisee perception, a theoretical framework is needed. When thinking of a suitable framework, Bordin (1979) suggested that individual personality styles and an individual’s comfort with closeness influence the supervisory relationship (Byrd, Patterson, & Turchik, 2010). More specifically, Watkins (1995; Pistole & Watkins, 1995) argued that supervision is an attachment process, which includes the development and the eventual loosening of an affectional bond. Thus, exploring the impact of attachment on perceptions of the supervisory process is needed. Adult attachment theory provides the necessary theoretical framework to explain relational closeness and distance within the supervisory relationship and how perceptions of the supervisory relationship are influenced.

**Adult Attachment Orientation**

Attachment theory helps explain individuals’ comfort with interpersonal closeness and distance within relationships. Thus, attachment theory provides a useful lens through which to examine the interpersonal dynamics that affect supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory style and of the supervisory working alliance. Researchers have examined adult attachment within the
context of psychotherapy and supervision. Horvath and Bedi (2002) suggested that the client’s attachment orientation is an important factor in establishing and maintaining a working alliance. Given the connection between psychotherapy and supervision, the role of adult attachment orientation and needs to be considered when examining the supervisory working alliance. Dickson, Moberly, Marchall, and Reilly (2011) suggested that examining individual attachment patterns would help better understand the supervisory relationship and the personal factors that contribute to a positive working alliance. In order to understand how relational closeness and distance are navigated within the supervision relationship, it seems important to first understand the background and measurement of adult attachment theory and the connection between adult attachment theory and psychotherapy.

**Foundations of attachment theory.** Attachment is described as the long-term continuous connection that one person has with another person who fulfills the individual’s needs for safety and comfort (Obegi & Berant, 2009). An individual’s attachment orientation is developed and established in childhood as a result of interactions with primary caregivers. In an optimal attachment bond, the caregiver provides a comforting presence for the child that reduces anxiety and promotes a feeling of security. It is from this secure-base that the child is able to leave the attachment figure and explore the surrounding environment (Bowlby, 1969, 1988). Researchers have shown that distance is not always met with increased proximity and security by the parent or caregiver, which often leads to variations in the attachment system of the child. Cassidy (2008) argued that several different attachment behaviors are organized within the child in response to a specific history of internal and external signals. The behaviors that the child chooses are the ones that the child finds most helpful in the moment, in order to achieve proximity to the attachment figure and feel a sense of safety and security during times of distress.
Bowlby theorized that beginning in early infancy, individuals’ working model of attachment allows him or her to begin to understand patterns of interaction with their caregiver that have already occurred and have come to recognize what the caregiver will do next (Wallin, 2007). Working models of attachment describe the patterns through which an individual comes to view themselves in relation to others. Batholomew (1990) described four different working models of attachment, which included: (1) Secure attachment: Secure individuals are comfortable with intimacy (closeness) and autonomy (distance) and have a positive view of self and others (e.g. I am comfortable depending on others and having others depend on me), (2) Preoccupied attachment: Preoccupied individuals fear abandonment, desire extreme closeness, and are overall preoccupied with relationships. These individuals have a negative view of self and positive view of others (e.g., I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others and worry they won’t like me as much as I like them), (3) Dismissing attachment: Dismissing individuals are uncomfortable with closeness and dependence. These individuals have a positive view of self and negative view of others (e.g., I am comfortable without close relationships and it is important that I am self-reliant) and (4) Fearful attachment: Fearful individuals fear intimacy and are socially avoidant. These individuals have a negative view of self and others (e.g., I am uncomfortable getting close to others, although I would like close relationships it is hard for me to trust others) (Hazen & Shaver, 1987). Individuals with these various models of self and others then act in specific ways (e.g., move closer or create distance) when in close relationships, especially when feeling scared, fearful, and unsafe. As a result of internal working models, researchers became interested in the underlying beliefs that lead to these variations in attachment style.
More recently, researchers have determined two underlying dimensions of attachment, which describe less secure attachment behavior. These dimensions include: (1) the anxious monitoring of the psychological proximity and availability of an attachment figure and (2) the regulation if attachment behavior regarding attachment-related concerns (Hazen & Shaver, 1987; Fraley & Shaver, 2000). For example, to regulate attachment-related anxiety individuals seek contact with an attachment figure (move closer to attachment figure) or individuals withdraw and attempt to handle the threat alone (distance self from attachment figure). Individuals decisions, often unconscious, to move close or distance during times of threat are responsible for individual differences in attachment-related anxiety (desire closeness) and attachment-related avoidance (desire distance) (Fraley & Shaver, 2000).

Although categorical or typological models of attachment are still referenced, attachment is frequently conceptualized as a two-dimensional model of individual differences related to attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety (Fraley & Spieker, 2003). To further understand attachment as a two-dimensional model it is important to turn to the measurement of adult attachment because conceptualizations of adult attachment have been closely linked with its measurement.

**Measurement of adult attachment.** As the measurement of adult attachment has evolved, so have researchers’ conceptualizations of adult attachment. The Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) was the first measure of attachment (Daniel, 2006). The AAI is an hour-long, 20 questions, structured interview that assesses an individual’s “states of mind” with respect to attachment (Daniel, 2006). These “states of mind” are assumed to be partially operating outside of conscious awareness. The AAI asks individuals about their childhood attachment patterns and the impact of these patterns. Hesse (2008) described the AAI as asking about general
relationships with parents, salient separations and impact on adult personality, experience of loss of significant persons through death, descriptions of abuse experiences, and lastly the nature of current relationship with parents. Overall, the AAI places a large emphasis on how the person speaks about their childhood, rather than the content of what the individual says (Hesse, 2008).

In contrast to the development approach of the AAI, Hazen and Shaver (1987) emerged from the social psychology perspective and were the first to develop a self-report instrument to measure adult attachment patterns within romantic relationships. The original Hazen and Shaver measure of romantic attachment is a brief forced-choice measure asking participants to think about how they generally experience and act in romantic relationships. The descriptions offered referred to an individual’s characteristics desires, feelings, and behaviors (Crowell, Fraley, & Shaver, 2008). The measure acknowledged three attachment styles: secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent, which ultimately put people into attachment categories based on their responses to this self-report measure (Fraley & Phillips, 2009).

After considering the AAI and the Hazen and Shaver measure, Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) provided an interpretation of four attachment working models, based off of Bowlby’s working models of self and other (attachment figure). These working models, as previously mentioned, describe an individual’s internal mental roadmaps of how he/she relates to others (Daniel, 2006). To measure these working models of attachment the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) was developed (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). As also previously mentioned, researchers have since determined that each working model is composed of attachment-related avoidance and attachment-related anxiety.

In order to measure the two underlying components of attachment avoidance and anxiety, Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) developed the Experiences in Close Relationship Scale
The ECR is particularly important because it was developed through examining and combining all previous self-report measures of attachment, recognizing that everyone is working off of the same two dimensions: anxiety and avoidance (1998). The ECR is made up of two 18-item subscales: Anxiety and Avoidance, which assess romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance. Then, the ECR yields a measure of the participants’ attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety, which represents how he/she generally approaches close relationships. Conceptualizing attachment as these two-dimensional constructs allows researchers to also make use of Bartholomew’s four attachment styles, which can also be conceptualized as linear combinations of anxiety and avoidance (Fraley & Phillips, 2009). The ECR’s ability to allow researchers to conceptualize attachment as two dimensions and make use of Bartholomew’s four attachment styles has attributed to its popularity.

The ECR (along with its derivatives) is currently the most commonly used measure of adult attachment is often recommended for clinical or research purposes when wanting to assess adult attachment through self-report (Fraley & Phillips, 2009). Using self-report measures of adult attachment, such as the ECR, within a clinical context can facilitate insight and understanding into individuals’ maladaptive patterns (Fraley & Phillips, 2009).

Thus, the measurement of adult attachment and its application to psychotherapy and supervision serves an important role in regards to the working alliance. Ultimately, these two attachment dimensions, anxiety and avoidance, are pivotal to understanding supervisees’ reactions of closeness (anxiety) and distance (avoidance) within the supervisory working alliance. First, it is important to examine clients’ desires for closeness and distance within the psychotherapy relationship because it will inform our understanding of supervisee attachment-related anxiety and avoidance.
**Adult Attachment Orientation and Psychotherapy**

A therapist can serve as an important figure in the attachment process of a client (Ainsworth, 1989). An individual’s attachment system can be activated by any close, intimate relationship that evokes the potential for love, security, and comfort. Bowlby (1988) argued that the psychotherapy relationship contains many features, which activate an adult client’s ingrained attachment style, including behaviors and expectations. The therapist’s role is to help the client deconstruct the attachment patterns of the past and to construct new ones in the present (Wallin, 2007). As written by John Bowlby (1988) “… the therapist’s role is analogous to that of a mother who provides her child with a secure-base from which to explore the world” (p. 140). Bowlby (1988) discussed that similar to a parent or caregiver, the therapist offers emotional availability, a comforting presence, emotional regulation, and a secure base from which the client can explore.

Although there is evidence that the psychotherapy relationship mimics the parent-child relationship in several ways, specifically examining the impact of client attachment on the therapeutic working alliance is critical in order to further our understanding of supervisee attachment within the supervisory working alliance.

**Client attachment orientation and working alliance.** Individual differences in attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance impact clients’ ability to develop close relationships, including the working alliance. Alexander and Anderson (1994) specifically described how clients with various attachment styles might approach therapy and the development of a working alliance. These authors also noted that securely attached clients likely have a stronger working alliance with their therapist because secure clients are likely more self-confident, trusting, to be able to moderately seek closeness, expressive, more effective at resolving conflict, and more likely to have longer and more satisfying relationships in general.
In contrast to secure clients, insecure clients may have greater challenges establishing a working alliance. More specifically, Farber and Metzger (2009) explained that preoccupied clients may present as clingy and dependent with less ability to manage their emotions. Preoccupied clients are also likely to express less self-worth, assertiveness, and sense of control. For clients with a preoccupied attachment style, or higher attachment anxiety, it is as if the base is only partially secure (Farber & Metzger, 2009). For instance, the client trusts the therapist enough to share all of her worries, but not enough to take in whatever wisdom the therapist has to offer. Whereas, they suggested that dismissive clients are more uncomfortable and avoidant of intimacy, not confident about the ability of others, very self-reliant, easily frustrated by others, and may deny actual problems while experiencing covert symptoms of anxiety. Thus, dismissive clients are more likely to present to therapy as if they do not have any problems and present their history in an overly positive light. Also, clients with a dismissing attachment style, or higher on attachment avoidance, send the message that they do not really need the therapist, the therapist is not important and could be replaced by anyone, and the client does not use the therapist to work on herself, but to criticize others in her life, which is much less dangerous (Farber & Metzger, 2009). Overall understanding, from a theoretical perspective, how adult attachment impacts the development of a therapeutic working alliance informs the work of psychotherapy researchers.

Mallinckrodt, Gantt, & Coble (1995) examined the impact of client attachment styles on the counseling relationship. Using the Client Attachment to Therapist Scale (CATS), they found that clients who scored high on the Secure subscale perceived their therapists as accepting and emotionally responsive. Whereas, clients who scored high on the Preoccupied subscale seemed to desire a disbanding of normal boundaries within the therapy relationship. The findings of this study suggest that preoccupied clients’ need for closeness and avoidant-fearful clients need for
distance will impact the development of the working alliance.

Similarly, Satterfield and Lyddon (1998) examined client attachment styles in relationship to components of the working alliance (e.g., goals, tasks, bonds, & global). They found that secure attachment was significantly associated with the bonds and goals components of the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) as well as overall global ratings of the working alliance. This suggests that clients who view themselves as worthy of love and support and are comfortable with closeness and distance within relationships are more likely to form emotional bonds and negotiate goals with their therapists. Whereas, similar to the findings of Mallinckrodt and colleagues, Gantt, and Coble (1995) found a negative correlation between clients with a fearful attachment style and the bonds scale, which suggests these individuals feel a sense of unworthiness and expect others to be untrustworthy and rejecting. Feeling emotionally close to the counselor and and developing a therapeutic alliance will be difficult for fearful clients (Satterfield & Lyddon, 1998). Both Mallinckrodt and colleagues and Satterfield and Lyddon found that developing a therapeutic alliance with fearful clients will be difficult, which would be expected given adult attachment theory.

Furthermore, in their meta-analysis, Diener and Monroe (2011) examined 17 independent samples. They found that greater attachment security was associated with stronger working alliances in therapy, whereas, greater attachment insecurity was associated with weaker alliances. Their findings also support the much earlier findings of Mallinckrodt and colleagues (1995). Importantly, Diener and Monroe found that client-rated alliance demonstrated a more significant relationship with the working alliance than therapist-rated alliance. Similarly, Sauer, Anderson, Gormley, Richmond, and Preacco (2010) examined client attachment style, the working alliance, and client response to therapy. They also found that more secure clients reported having stronger
Overall, psychotherapy researchers have consistently shown that secure adult attachment orientations are linked with stronger working alliances. Whereas insecure adult attachment has been linked to difficulties developing a long-term working alliance. Given these findings, it makes sense that supervisees’ attachment styles would also impact the development of the supervisory working alliance. Watkins (2011) further suggested that attachment theory provides a helpful lens to better understand the relational needs within supervision.

**Adult Attachment Orientation and Supervision**

Understanding the supervisory relationship from an attachment perspective better prepares supervisors to meet the individual safety needs of each supervisee. Similar to therapy, supervisees’ feelings of safety play a large role in the development and maintenance of the supervisory alliance (Teitelbaum, 1998). Teitelbaum argues that feelings of safety within the supervisory relationship are central to the supervisee feeling freer to expose their work and being able to learn during the supervision process. Although not all supervisees may have the same needs regarding felt safety, Teitelbaum believes that this supervisee need has long been underestimated.

In order to provide a supervisory relationship that promotes safety, understanding the attachment needs of supervisees is important. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) asserted that supervisee attachment style plays a critical role in the quality of the supervisory working alliance. Although, psychotherapy researchers have stressed the importance of the relational process within the therapeutic working alliance, little research has examined adult attachment orientations and the supervisory working alliance. It has been suggested that this limited research may be due to the lack of a suitable framework (Riggs & Bretz, 2006). Thus, a helpful
framework is necessary to better understand the role of supervisee attachment orientation in the supervisory relationship. Despite a potentially suitable framework, some researchers have attempted to examine the role of supervisee attachment patterns in the development of the supervisory alliance.

**Supervisee attachment orientation and the supervisory working alliance.** When examining supervisee attachment, researchers have used Bowlby’s (1977) pathological attachment patterns, which are extensions of the adult attachment styles mentioned previously. In other words, pathological attachment patterns are used to describe how extreme attachment insecurity can impact professional functioning as a supervisee. Bowlby identified two primary pathological attachment patterns, which include: (a) compulsive self-reliance, representing an extreme form of avoidant attachment, characterized by a highly disorganized false self, mistrust, fear of dependency on others that serves to protect from feelings of rejection and (b) compulsive caregiving, representing unwillingness to accept help from others (Dickson, Moberly, Marshall, & Reilly, 2010).

Bernard and Goodyear (2009) further described these two types of pathological attachment patterns. They suggested that a compulsive caregiving supervisee has a strong desire to “rescue” clients and may quickly reduce the client’s concerns at the expense of letting the client fully explore their issues. Whereas a compulsively self-reliant supervisee may refuse and resist the help offered by the supervisor. Pathological attachment patterns are important to consider within the supervisory relationship because these patterns can greatly disrupt the supervisory working alliance and hinder overall professional development.

In a study that examined pathological attachment patterns, Dickson, Moberly, Marshall, and Reilly (2011) found that compulsive self-reliance was negatively related to ratings of the
supervisory working alliance. Dickson and associates explained that compulsively self-reliant supervisees may not enter the supervisory relationship with a dismissive attitude, but dismissiveness may be used as a way to regulate emotion, particularly if strong negative emotions are experienced within supervision. Riggs and Bretz (2006) described this dismissive process as a largely unconscious attempt to undermine the supervisory relationship or weaken the supervisory alliance. According to these authors, for dismissive (compulsively self-reliant) supervisees to begin to regard the supervisory relationship as a relationship that can be relied upon, it is important that supervisors challenge the supervisee’s typical emotional and relational attachment patterns.

In a similar line of inquiry, Dickson and colleagues (2011) suggested that despite the potential challenges of self-reliant supervisees, academic programs view these personality characteristics favorably. Specifically, they found that the academic nature and challenging requirements of clinical psychology programs, self-reliance is a personality quality that both trainees and course programs give value to and may be seen as necessary for the graduate school experience. Thus, it is possible that difficulties in this area may remain unnoticed because trainees view compulsive self-reliance as a “safe” way to express their insecurities within the supervisory relationship (Riggs & Bretz, 2006). Compulsive self-reliance may become problematic, however, if the supervisee devalues the advice or feedback received from the supervisor. Neswald-Mccalip (2001) provided an example of an overly self-reliant supervisee not responding to feedback and attempting to solve problems on his or her own, regardless of whether the self-reliant supervisee actually has the necessary skills. Thus, compulsive self-reliance may be a quality that is initially welcomed within clinical training programs, but this quality may lead to a weakened supervisory alliance and overall a more difficult supervisory...

Aside from compulsive self-reliance, there are mixed findings regarding the overall role of supervisee attachment within the supervisory working alliance. For example, Renfro-Michel (2006) found a correlation between healthy supervisee attachment and supervisory alliance, whereas White and Queener (2003) did not. Borders (1989) suggested that the supervisory alliance was affected by supervisee’s characteristics, such as interpersonal maturity, clinical experience level, and relationship style. On the other hand, White and Queener (2003) did not find that the supervisees’ attachment styles predicted either supervisor or supervisee ratings of the supervisory working alliance. They proposed that no significant findings were found because supervisees’ attachment is less likely to be relevant and is less likely to influence the supervisees’ perceptions of the supervisory relationship due to the different boundaries within the supervisory relationship, compared to the therapy relationship.

In a similar study, Dickson and associates (2011) found that supervisees’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance were associated with their perception of their supervisor’s attachment style. That is, they found that insecure supervisees were more likely to rate their supervisor as having an insecure attachment style. Interestingly, supervisees’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance were not associated with their own attachment styles. They also found that insecure supervisees were more likely to rate their supervisor as having an insecure attachment style. This finding is meaningful because it illustrates that supervisee attachment may be indirectly effecting the supervisory working alliance. In other words, if supervisees’ ratings of their supervisors’ attachment style are associated with their ratings of the working alliance and insecure supervisees are more likely to rate their supervisor as insecure, then supervisee attachment is an important factor in the development of the working alliance. On the surface, the
findings of Dickson and associates replicate the findings of White and Queener (2003), but closer examination reveals that supervisee attachment indirectly affects working alliance by impacting their perception of the supervisor. Thus, the relationship between supervisee adult attachment orientation and the supervisory working alliance are likely indirectly related.

Riggs and Bretz (2006) also questioned the role of attachment processes in influencing supervisees’ perceptions of the working alliances. They found, using path analysis, that parental indifference, compulsive self-reliance, and perceived supervisor attachment style play an important role in shaping the supervisory alliance. More specifically, they found that supervisees who saw their supervisors as securely attached evaluated the goal and task components of the supervisory working alliance more positively, compared to supervisees who perceived their supervisors as more dismissing or preoccupied. Unlike Dickson and Colleagues (2011), Riggs and Bretz found that supervisee attachment did impact the supervisory alliance. Even though they suggested supervisee attachment patterns matter in the establishment of the supervisory working alliance, due to the hierarchical nature of the supervisory relationship, most of the responsibility for the quality of the supervisory relationship lies with the supervisor. Riggs and Bretz suggested that supervision that directly considered the interpersonal styles of the supervisor and supervisee facilitated the uncovering of maladaptive attachment patterns, providing an opportunity for supervisees to override attachment avoidance or anxiety in order to promote growth and enhance their clinical skills.

Similarly, Foster (2002) examined the role of supervisee perception and ratings of the supervisory working alliance. He found that compared to supervisees who rated themselves as having a secure attachment to their supervisors, those with more of a fearful or preoccupied attachment to their supervisors were less interested in their work, less able to use self-referenced
perceptions to understand their clients, and less advanced in their general development as a clinician. His findings ultimately revealed detriment to the supervisees’ professional growth in several areas, as result of insecure adult attachment orientations. Unlike the previous studies mentioned, Foster does not minimize the role of supervisee attachment and concluded that supervisors and supervisees have different perceptions of supervisee’s attachment style and how their attachment style relates to the supervisee’s professional development and the supervisory working alliance. Foster’s conclusion aligns with the working alliance literature suggesting that supervisors and supervisees perceive the working alliance differently. Thus, supervisors and supervisees understand key components of supervision differently.

In order to examine how attachment orientation impacts perception, it seems important to look at all three variables. Examining the supervisory working alliance, supervisory style, and supervisee attachment orientation will provide a new and necessary framework from which to examine the role of interpersonal variables (e.g., supervisory style and adult attachment) within the supervision relationship. Increased knowledge regarding the role of these interpersonal variables in the overall supervisory working alliance is key for increased training effectiveness.

**Supervisory Working Alliance, Supervisory Style, and Supervisee Attachment Orientation**

Despite the need, I found no published journal articles have examined the supervisory working alliance, supervisee attachment orientation, and supervisory style. Two dissertation studies exist where researchers have attempted to better understand the relationship between these three variables among other variables of interest. These two key dissertation studies are described below.

Kim (1998) was interested in supervisee perceptions of supervisory bond and the supervisory style among a sample of 233 counselor trainees across the United States. Kim’s
sample was largely White (75%) and female (76%). Using multiple regression analysis, trainee dimensions of attachment predicted a significant amount of variance in satisfaction with supervision, perceptions of supervisory bond, and perceptions of supervisory style. Only two of the five attachment dimensions, assessed by the Attachment Style Questionnaire, proved to contribute more than other dimensions, which were Preoccupation with Relationships and Confidence. Importantly, Kim’s findings supported trainee attachment dimensions playing a role in predicting trainee perception of the attractiveness of the supervisor’s style. Similarly, attachment dimensions were also found to significantly predict trainee perceptions of the interpersonally-sensitive supervisory style. Overall, Kim found that more secure trainees (e.g., low on attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance) were more likely to view their supervisors’ style as attractive or interpersonally sensitive. Thus, more secure trainees, who have a positive view of self and more confidence in relating to others, tended to be more satisfied within their overall supervision experience. Kim’s study is of central importance to the current study because it is the first study that begins to explore the relationship between trainee attachment orientations and trainee perceptions of supervisory style. However, the current study made a few notable improvements, such as also examining the relationship between supervisee attachment orientations the supervisory working alliance.

In a related dissertation study, Spelliscy (2007) examined the role of attachment, supervisory style, and the supervisory alliance in the role of conflict ambiguity. She collected data from 200 graduate (master and doctoral) students in APA accredited counseling psychology programs across the United States. Spelliscy’s sample was also largely White (76%) and Female (83%). She claimed that both attachment and supervisory style are variables that have been shown to impact the working alliance. Spelliscy’s statistical path analysis model predicted that,
when taken from a supervisee’s perspective, the supervisory style and the supervisee’s attachment-related anxiety or avoidance predicted the supervisory working alliance. In her study, the supervisory working alliance served as the mediating variable between the supervisee variables (e.g., perception of supervisory style and attachment style) and role conflict/role ambiguity. Similar to studies previously mentioned, Spelliscy did not find attachment avoidance to have a significant direct effect on the supervisory alliance, which would have been expected based on attachment theory. The findings of this study are important because Spelliscy posited that supervisee attachment and supervisory style impact the supervisory alliance even though this is not what she found, specifically related to attachment avoidance. Thus, the findings of this study further extend the need for these variables to be studied in a different conceptual and methodological way.

**The Current Study**

Although researchers have begun to examine the role of supervisee attachment within the supervisory alliance, many questions still remain. More specifically, much is still unknown about how supervisee attachment orientations affect the role of perception within the supervisory alliance. Particularly, in this study I examined the impact of supervisee attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety on supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. I also examined the difference between supervisee and supervisor perceptions of the supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. Past researchers showed that an individual’s perception of supervisory style influences their overall perception or rating of the supervisory working alliance. Researchers also illustrated that supervisee attachment orientation has not been directly related to ratings of the supervisory working alliance. Thus, a revised framework incorporating supervisory style was necessary to further examine the relationship
between supervisee attachment orientation and its impact of the supervision process. Thus, the primary purpose of this study was to examine how supervisees’ attachment-related avoidance and attachment-related anxiety influence supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory styles and supervisory working alliances.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this chapter, I will describe the following: (a) Participants, (b) Instruments, (c) Procedures, and (d) Statistical Analyses. First, I will describe the basic demographic information of the participants. Second, I will describe the psychometric properties of each instrument used in the study. Instruments will measure, supervisee attachment orientations, supervisory style, and the supervisory working alliance. Third, I will describe the procedures of the study, including how the data was collected. Lastly, I will discuss the correlation and regression models that were used to analyze the data.

Participants

Participants for this study (approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board: See Appendix A) were graduate students in counselor education and counseling psychology from a large Midwest University in the United States. In addition to graduate students, participants also included the graduate students’ supervisors. Graduate student participants were drawn from two campus locations at the same university. The counseling practicum course and the master’s level internship supervisory course were selected as recruitment sources for this study because within each course the student/trainee received regular (e.g., weekly) supervision as a necessary requirement for the course. As mentioned, the graduate students’ clinical supervisors were also recruited for participation in this study.
A total of 98 graduate student supervisees, who were nonrandomly selected, provided their contact information to learn more about the study. Seventy-nine supervisees (80% response rate) chose to participate in the study after receiving an email with a link to the online survey inviting participation. The 79 supervisees ranged in age from 23 to 62 years old (M = 30.6, SD = 7.4). There were 66 (83.5%) female and 13 (16.5%) male participants. A total of 68.4% (n = 54) reported being White/European American, 19% (n = 15) Black/African American, 5.1 % (n = 4) Hispanic/Latino, 1.3% (n = 1) Asian American/Pacific Islander, 3.8% (n = 3) from multiple races, and 2.5% (n = 2) other. Supervisees, on average, had been in their graduate program for 2.51 years (SD = .782) and had an average of 12.18 sessions (SD = 7.59) with their supervisor at the time of participation in this study. A total of 41.8% (n = 33) supervisees reported their graduate training program as being counseling psychology, 20.3% (n = 16) marriage and family therapy, 19.0% (n = 15) school counseling, 15.2% (n = 12) clinical mental health counseling, and 3.8% (n = 3) college counseling. A total of 45.6 % (n = 36) supervisees reported training at a college counseling center, 16.5% (n = 13) psychology training clinic, 11.4 % (n = 9) private practice, 11.4% (n = 9) K-12 school system, 6.3% (n = 5) community mental health center, 6.5% (n = 5) hospital, and 2.3% (n = 2) other. A total of 50.6% (n = 40) of supervisees reported that they participated in individual supervision and 49.4% (n = 39) reported that they participated in triadic supervision. A total of 62.0% (n = 49) of supervisees were enrolled in counseling practicum and 38.0% (n=30) were enrolled in their internship. Lastly, a total of 43.0% (n =34) of supervisees reported that their primary theoretical orientation in their counseling work was Behavioral/Cognitive, 16.4% (n = 13) Humanistic/Experiential, 11.4% (n = 9) Interpersonal, 10.1% (n = 8) Other, 8.8% (n = 7) Systems, 6.3% (n = 5) Psychodynamic, and 3.8% (n =3) did not respond to this item.
In addition to supervisees, a total of 44 licensed supervisors were recruited. Twenty-six unique supervisors (59% response rate) chose to participate in the study, after receiving an email with a link to the online survey inviting participation. However, it is important to note that 10 supervisors had several supervisees participate in the study and thus were recruited multiple times to participate, giving a total of 54 total supervisor responses. The supervisors ranged in age from 25 to 61 years old (M = 39.5, SD 11.9). There were 14 (53.8%) female and 12 (46.2%) male participants. A total of 73.1% (n = 19) reported being White/European America, 15.4% (n = 4) from multiple races, and 11.5% (n = 3) Black/African American. A total of 26.9% (n = 7) of supervisors reported having a doctoral degree, 65.1% (n = 17) of supervisors reported having a master’s degree, and 7.1% (n = 2) reported having a bachelor’s degree, but were currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program. A total of 27.0% (n = 7) of supervisors reported their primary work setting being at a University, 23.1% (n = 6) College Counseling Center, 15.1% (n = 4) Psychology Training Clinic, 11.5% (n = 3) Private Practice, 7.7% (n = 2) Hospital, 7.7% (n = 2) Community Mental Health, 3.8% (n = 1) K-12 school system, and 3.8% (n = 1) Other. Lastly, a total of 57.7% (n = 15) of supervisors reported that their primary theoretical orientation in their counseling work was Other, 23.1% (n = 6) Psychodynamic, 3.8% (n = 1) Behavioral/Cognitive, 3.8% (n = 1) Systems, 3.8% (n = 1) Humanistic/Existential, and 7.7% (n = 2) did not rate a primary theoretical orientation.

**Instruments**

**Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI).** The SWAI is a self-report instrument designed by Efstation, Patton, and Kardash (1990) to measure the working alliance in counselor supervision. Within supervision, the working alliance is defined as the overall relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee in which supervisors act to intentionally
influence their supervisees through the use of technical knowledge and skill and in which supervisees actively work towards displaying the given knowledge and skill (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). There are two versions of the SWAI, one to be completed by the supervisor and one to be completed by the supervisee.

The supervisor version consists of a 23-items with factor loadings related to “Client Focus,” “Rapport,” and “Identification.” Client Focus reflects the emphasis that the supervisor places on facilitating the supervisees understanding of the client, Rapport reflects the supervisor’s effort to establish rapport with supervisees through support and encouragement, and Identification reflects the supervisor’s perception of the supervisee’s identification with the supervisor (Efstation et al.). The supervisor version consists of a 7-item likert scale anchored from 1 (almost never) to 7 (almost always). Examples of items on the supervisor version include: “My trainee works with me on specific goals in the supervisory session (client focus),” “I make an effort to understand my trainee (rapport),” and “My trainee appears to be comfortable working with me (identification).”

The trainee/supervisee version consists of 19-items with factor loadings on “Client Focus” and “Rapport.” Client Focus reflects, from the supervisee’s perspective, the emphasis that the supervisor places on facilitating the supervisees understanding of the client. Whereas Rapport reflects, from the supervisee’s perspective, the supervisor’s effort to establish rapport with supervisees through support and encouragement. The supervisee version also consists of a 7-item likert scale anchored from 1 (almost never) to 7 (almost always). Examples of items on the trainee version include: “My supervisor makes an effort to understand me (rapport),” and “I work with my supervisor on specific goals in the supervisory session (client focus).”

Regarding reliability of the SWAI (N = 90), alpha coefficients, measuring internal
consistency reliability for the Supervisor scales were .71 for Client Focus, .73 for Rapport, and .77 for Identification. Alpha coefficients for the Trainee scales were .90 for Rapport and .77 for Client Focus (N=178) (Efstation et al., 1990). In terms of validity estimates, correlations among the three Supervisor scales (Client Focus, Rapport, and Identification) from the SWAI ranged from .23 to .26. Whereas, correlations between the Rapport and Client Focus scales on the Trainee version of the SWAI were .47 (Efstation et al., 1990).

**Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (ECR).** The ECR is a 36-item, self-report instrument designed by Brennan, Clark, and Shaver (1998) to assess general patterns of adult attachment in close/romantic relationships. The ECR is made up of two 18-item subscales: Anxiety and Avoidance. According to Fraley and Shaver (2000), attachment anxiety represents an individual’s tendency to experience “anxiety and vigilance concerning rejection and abandonment” in romantic relationships, whereas attachment avoidance reflects “discomfort with closeness and dependency or a reluctance to be intimate with others” (pp.142-143). This measure assesses typical experiences in a romantic relationship so if the participant is not currently in a romantic relationship the measure can still be completed. Participants are asked to read each statement and answer using a 7-point likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (agree strongly). Sample items representing the Avoidance subscale include: “I find it hard to allow myself to depend on romantic partners” and “I prefer not to be close to romantic partners.” Sample items representing the Anxiety subscale include: “I often worry that my romantic partner doesn’t really love me” and “My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.” Thus, the ECR yields a measure of the participant’s attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety. Attachment avoidance measures the tendency to be emotionally distant in relationships, whereas, attachment anxiety measures the tendency to overly reliant and desiring extreme emotional
closeness in relationships. As previously mentioned, there is a general consensus among many attachment researchers that adult attachment orientation is best conceptualized in terms of two primary dimensions, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2009).

Regarding reliability and validity of the ECR, Brennan et al. (1998) report internal consistency in a sample of undergraduates with coefficient alphas of .91 and .94 for the anxiety and avoidance subscales respectively. Other studies of undergraduate students (e.g., Lopez & Gormley, 2002; Vogel & Wei, 2005; Wei, Mallinckrodt, Russell, & Abraham, 2004) have also found high levels of internal consistency for the Anxiety dimension (α ranges from .82 to .92) and on the Avoidance dimension (α ranges from .91 to .95). Validity of scores from the ECR is also supported by a positive correlation between attachment avoidance and ambivalence/anxiety as measured by the Relationship Questionnaire (RQ: Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

In further reviewing the measurement of attachment-related constructs, Lopez and Gormley (2002) found that test-retest reliabilities over a 6-month period were .68 (Anxiety dimension) and .71 (Avoidance dimension) for the ECR. Both subscales (Anxiety and Avoidance) of the ECR will be used in this study to measure supervisees’ attachment orientation.

**Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI).** The SSI is a 33-item, self-report measure developed by Friedlander and Ward (1984) to measure the supervisor’s supervisory style within the supervisory relationship. Supervisory style refers to the supervisor’s specific and unique way of approaching and responding to supervisees and carrying out supervision (Holloway & Wolleat, 1981). There are two different sets of instructions for the inventory. One set of instructions is for supervisors, asking them to indicate their perceptions of their style as a supervisor. Another set of instructions is for supervisees, asking them to indicate their perception of the style of their most recent supervisor. Both supervisor and supervisee are asked to describe the supervisory
style using the list of descriptors provided. The SSI consists of a 7-item likert scale anchored from 1 (Not very) to 7 (Very). Examples of descriptors include: committed, evaluative, therapeutic, and trusting.

In developing the SSI, Friedlander and Ward (1984) initially developed the measure using ratings by (a) supervisors (e.g., directors of psychology internship training programs) and (b) practicum and internship trainees. The final instrument was cross-validated on two new samples, which consisted of professional supervisors in universities and college counseling centers and trainees in psychology, psychiatry, and social work. In these four studies, there were relationships between the SSI scales and (a) training context, (b) supervisor’s theoretical orientation, (c) trainees’ level of experience, and (d) trainees’ reported level of satisfaction with supervision were tested.

Factor analyses on the SSI revealed three factor loadings: (a) Factor 1 reflected a collegial dimension of supervision and was designated as Attractive, with descriptors (e.g., warm, supportive, friendly, open, flexible) loading highly on this factor (≥ .50); (b) Factor 2 indicated a relationship-oriented approach to supervision (e.g., invested, committed, therapeutic, perceptive) and was designated as Interpersonally Sensitive; and (c) Factor 3 was designated as Task Oriented because items loaded highly on this factor reflected a content-focused supervision style (e.g., goal-oriented, thorough, focused, practical, structured) (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

In regards to the reliability of the SSI, Cronbach’s alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of each of the three scales separately and combined. For both versions of the instrument, alphas ranged from .76 to .93 (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Next, item-scale correlations were obtained; these correlations ranged from .70 to .88 for the Attractive Scale, from .51 to .82 for the Interpersonally Sensitive scales, and from .38 to .76 for the Task Oriented
scale. Test-retest reliabilities of the ratings of mater-level trainees (N = 32) for the combined scales (.92) and for each scale separately: Attractive (.94), Interpersonally Sensitive (.91), and Task-Oriented (.78). Regarding convergent validity, inter-correlations of doctoral practicum students’ ratings of supervisors on the three SSI scales with the three composite variables from Stenack and Dyes’ (1982) teacher, counselor, and consultant items (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The attractive scale was highly correlated with the counselor and consultant items (r>.65) and less correlated to teacher items (r = .42). The interpersonally sensitive scale correlated highly with the teacher, counselor, and consultant items (r = .60). The task oriented scale correlated the most with teacher items (r = .61) and the least with counselor items (r = .21) (Friedlander & Ward). Thus, the SSI will be used in this study to measure supervisee and supervisor perceptions of the supervisor’s style.

Procedures

This study was approved by the Human Subjects Institutional review Board (HSIRB) (see Appendix A). Participation in this study occurred online. However, participants were recruited via in-person class announcements (supervisees) or emails (supervisors). First, permission was obtained from faculty members to come and recruit from their classes. During in-class recruitment, the primary research read the recruitment script (see Appendix B) and students were asked to provide their name, e-mail/mailing address, and their supervisors’ name and contact information, if they were interested in learning more about participation in the study. Interested individuals then received an e-mail from the primary researcher providing more information about the study and a link (from Survey Monkey®) to the study measures. This design was chosen because although the Internet provides great potential for collecting data, recruitment rates are typically low (Koo & Skinner, 2005). Koo and Skinner suggest that researchers using
the Internet for recruitment purposes should focus on ways to improve the perceived legitimacy of invitation to participate. Thus, recruiting in-person not only provided a personal connection to the research study, but also improved the legitimacy and likely led to more successful recruitment.

Even though participants were recruited in-person (supervisees) or via e-mail (supervisors), all participants completed all study measures online. Thus, the online presentation of the study measures allowed supervisees and their supervisors to complete the study measures at their convenience, which may have increased their likelihood of responding.

Regarding supervisee recruitment, during the in-person class announcement, the primary researcher read the recruitment script to supervisees (see Appendix B). Following recruitment, supervisees, who were interested in learning more about the study, provided their name, e-mail address, and mailing address. Interested supervisees were informed that they would receive an e-mail (see Appendix D) from the primary researcher containing a link to the online survey, using Survey Monkey®. The survey contained the informed consent (see Appendix F), demographic questions (see Appendix H), and study measures (see Appendix I). Specifically, supervisees were asked to report the following demographic information: age, gender, race, academic program/degree specialty, current level of training, description of supervision experience (individual or triadic), primary theoretical orientation, supervision setting, number of sessions with supervisee, date supervision began, length of each supervision session, and total number of sessions expected with supervisor. Interested supervisees were also asked to provide their mailing address in case their $5 Bigby gift card, a token of appreciation noted in the recruitment script, would need to be mailed to them.

Regarding supervisor recruitment, once a supervisee completed the study measures, the
primary researcher emailed the following recruitment script to the supervisee’s current supervisor (see Appendix C). Following recruitment, interested supervisors received an e-mail (see Appendix E) containing a link to the online survey, using Survey Monkey®. The survey contained the informed consent (see Appendix G), demographic questions (Appendix H), and study measures (Appendix I). Specifically, supervisors were asked to report the following demographic information: age, gender, race, degree, years in the profession, primary theoretical orientation, supervision setting, number of sessions with supervisee, date supervision began, length of each supervision session, and total number of sessions expected with supervisee.

In terms of linking supervisee and supervisor data, each supervisee and supervisor were assigned a numerical code linking de-identified supervisee and supervisor data. Interested supervisees and supervisors were provided a numerical code in their recruitment email. Supervisees and supervisors were to enter this code, when prompted, at the beginning of the online survey, prior to answering demographic information or related study measures.

The survey was hosted on Survey Monkey®, which is a secure, password protected, website designed for online data collection. After clicking on the link, participants were presented with an informed consent document. After agreeing that they had read the informed consent, participants were asked to provide their four-digit code (provided in their recruitment email) and then were directed to complete demographic items and study measures. If participants did not agree to the informed consent document, then the window closed and engagement with study related material was complete. The informed consent process likely took about 5 minutes and completion of the study measures took approximately 15 minutes. Thus, total participation in the study likely took about 20 minutes (participation for supervisors likely took slightly less time due to one less measure needing completion).
After completing the survey, participants were thanked for their participation, provided with a brief debriefing statement, and provided contact information for the university counseling center and the research supervisor in case a participant had an adverse reaction to any of the survey items.

Importantly, participants received individualized links to the survey website. This allowed the researcher to numerically code and track who had participated in the study, as well as connect supervisee data with the appropriate supervisor data. No identifying information was linked to the data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, I will describe and summarize the statistical analyses carried out to evaluate the research questions and hypotheses discussed in earlier chapters. First, I will describe the data screening process. The means, standard deviations, and $r$ correlations are calculated using SPSS statistical software. Next, I will discuss the preliminary analyses that were run to determine correlations between supervisee attachment orientation, supervisory style, and the supervisory working alliance. Lastly, I will present the additional statistical analyses that were used to further evaluate the research questions and hypotheses.

Data Screening

Survey Monkey® is a secure online survey development software. The use of Survey Monkey® for data collection eliminates potential errors due to data entry. Participants entered their responses directly into Survey Monkey®. The surveys were set up so that participants could not move on to the next question until they had answered the current item, which greatly decreased the likelihood of missing data. With regards to five survey items, the question response requirement had to be removed so that participants could rate items 1-6 or enter “other” responses for the items. Once participants had begun completing the survey there were limited editing options, thus making the questions not require an answer the best option to allow for flexibility of responses. Two questions where participants had to rate items 1-6 (in regards to their theoretical approach); some participants (1 to 6 participants depending on item) did not rate all of the six options for each question. Overall, seven participants started the survey and did not complete it. A total of 105 participants (supervisees and supervisors) completed the
survey for this study. However, there were a total of 133 responses given that multiple supervisors completed the study for several supervisees.

The data were carefully examined for outliers. However, like many studies within the social sciences, this study involves the use of 7-point Likert scales, which are ordinal in nature so each item has a natural ceiling and floor (Normal, 2010). Given the nature of the data set and data collection method (i.e., data were collected online using 7-item Likert scales and entered directly into online survey site by participants), the likelihood of the data being illegitimate is unlikely (e.g., due to data errors, mis-reporting, sampling error,) (Osborne, 2004). Thus, outliers were considered a legitimate part of the data set and were not removed. An additional reason I decided to not remove any outliers from the data set was because upon comparison of the 5% trimmed mean (i.e., the mean if the lower and upper 5% of values for each variable were removed) and the actual mean for the variables, there was minimal difference (Nicholson, 2016). Upon comparison, the difference between the actual means and the trimmed means ranged from .02 to .15. Thus, the presence of any outliers did not greatly affecting the interpretation or analysis of the data.

Regarding normality, many variables of this study were skewed. Osborne (2010) states that ideally the skew should fall within the range -0.80 and 0.80 (closer to 0.00 the better) and the kurtosis should fall closer to 0.00 (using SPSS). In the current study, the skew ranged from -1.743 to .947 and the kurtosis ranged from -.987 to 2.875. However, skewness and nonnormality are common within Likert data and the Pearson correlation is robust with respect to skewness and nonnormality (Normal, 2010). Norman (2010) suggests that, more broadly, parametric statistics are robust, with respect to skewness and nonnormality.
Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations varied slightly when compared to the means and standard deviations found in other clinical sample (see Tables 1 and 2). Regarding the Experience in Close Relationship Scale, measuring adult attachment, the means and standard deviations for the current study were slightly lower than other studies (e.g., Spelliscy, 1999). Regarding the Supervisory Style Inventory, the means and standard deviations of this study where, overall, slightly lower than other studies (e.g., Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005). Regarding the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, the means and standard deviations for this study were slightly higher than other studies (e.g., Efstation et al., 1990).

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to running multiple regression analyses, I checked the data to make sure that it met three assumptions of multiple regression: linearity of relationships, homoscedasticity, and the absence of multicollinearity. To assess violation of these assumptions, the standardized residual plots were examined.

With regard to multicollinearity, Licht (1995) indicates that multicollinearity between independent variables becomes problematic when the correlations of Pearson r exceed 0.80. Regarding supervisee data, Table 3 shows that there were two r correlations between independent variables SS-Attract and SWA-Rap and independent variables SS-Attract and SWA-InterSen that exceeded 0.80 for supervisees. Although highly correlated, independent variables SS-Attract and SS-Rap and independent variables SS-Attract and SS-InterSen are not used in statistical models together to answer the proposed research questions, in other words, the multicollinearity that exists should not impact the results of this study. Regarding supervisor data, Table 4 shows that no r correlations exceeded 0.80.
Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Supervisee Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Rap</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Client</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 79; ECR-Anx = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale – Anxiety, ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Avoidance, SS-Attract = Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonally Sensitive, SS-Task = Supervisory Styles Inventory-Task Oriented, SWA-Rap = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Rapport, SWA-Client = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Client Focus.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Rap</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Client</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* $N = 54$; SS-Attract = Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonally Sensitive, SS-Task = Supervisory Styles Inventory–Task Oriented, SWA-Rap = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Rapport, SWA-Client = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Client Focus, SWA-Identification = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – Identification.
Table 3

Correlation Matrix for Criterion and Predictor Variables (Supervisee Ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ECR-Anx</th>
<th>ECR-Avd</th>
<th>SS-Attract</th>
<th>SS-InterSen</th>
<th>SS-Task</th>
<th>SWA-Rap</th>
<th>SWA-Client</th>
<th>SWA-TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.812***</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>.743**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Rap</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.846**</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Client</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.637**</td>
<td>.741**</td>
<td>.727**</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-TS</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.778**</td>
<td>.816**</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.914**</td>
<td>.941**</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 79; ECR-Anx = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale – Anxiety, ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale – Avoidance, SS-Attract = Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonally Sensitive, SS-Task = Supervisory Styles Inventory-Task Oriented, SWA-Rap = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Rapport, SWA-Client = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Client Focus, SWA-TS = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – Total Sum. *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001
Table 4

Correlation Matrix for Criterion and Predictor Variables (Supervisee Attachment and Supervisor Ratings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ECR-Anx</th>
<th>ECR-Avd</th>
<th>SS-Attract</th>
<th>SS-InterSen</th>
<th>SS-Task</th>
<th>SWA-Rap</th>
<th>SWA-Client</th>
<th>SWA-TS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td></td>
<td>.281*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>.281*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>-.277*</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.696**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Rap</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.313*</td>
<td>.294*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Client</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-TS</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>.603**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 54; ECR-Anx = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Anxiety (Supervisee), ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships Scale-Avoidance (Supervisee), SS-Attract = Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonally Sensitive, SS-Task = Supervisory Styles Inventory-Task Oriented, SWA-Rap = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Rapport, SWA-Client = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Client Focus, SWA-TS = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – Total Sum. *p<.05 **p<.01
Hypothesis Testing

**Hypothesis 1a:** There are significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors' ratings of the supervisory style dimensions.

**Null Hypothesis 1a:** There are not significant differences between supervisee’s and supervisor’s ratings of the supervisory style dimensions.

To test null hypothesis 1a, an Independent Samples T-Test was used to determine the difference between supervisee’s ratings of supervisory style components and supervisor’s ratings of supervisory style dimensions (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, & task oriented). As shown in Table 5, the difference between supervisees and supervisors ratings on the SS-Attract and SS-InterSen was significant ($p>.05$), whereas, the difference between supervisees and supervisors ratings on the SS-Task dimensions was not significant. In total, given that there was a significant difference in ratings on one of the three dimensions of supervisory style, Null Hypothesis 1a was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1b:** There are significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of supervisory style (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented).

**Null Hypothesis 1b:** There are not significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of supervisory style (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented).

To test Null Hypothesis 1b, a Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine the contribution of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance in the difference in ratings
Table 5

Summary of Independent-Samples T-Test Analysis for Supervisory Style and Mean Differences in Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Supervisee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>5.860</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.381</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-.518</td>
<td>-.913</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.913, -.123</td>
<td>-2.604*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>5.738</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.099</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>-.719</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.719, -.002</td>
<td>-1.998*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>5.372</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.448</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.452, .300</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SS-Attract = Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonally Sensitive, SS-Task = Supervisory Styles Inventory-Task Oriented

*p<.05  **p<.01
regarding the dimensions of the supervisory style for supervisees (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, task oriented). As shown in Table 6, attachment anxiety was a significant predictor of the rating difference among supervisors and supervisees on interpersonal sensitivity. However, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance were not significant predictors in the rating difference amongst supervisees and supervisors on attractive and task oriented. Thus, given that rating differences on one of the three dimensions of supervisory style was predicted by attachment anxiety, Null Hypothesis 1b was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1c:** There are significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style.

**Null Hypothesis 1c:** There are not significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style.

To test the Null Hypothesis 1c, a Pearson $r$ correlation was calculated for the scores for the measures of attachment avoidance (ECR-Avd) and supervisory style on the dimension of task oriented (SS-Task). As shown in Table 2, a correlation was between ECR-Avd and SS-Task ($r = .087$). This correlation was not significant and therefore we failed to reject Null Hypothesis 1c

**Hypothesis 1d:** There are significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational dimensions (attractive & interpersonally sensitive) of supervisory style.

**Null Hypothesis 1d:** There are not significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational dimensions (attractive & interpersonally sensitive) of supervisory style.

To test the Null Hypothesis 1d, a Pearson $r$ correlation was calculated for the scores for the measures of attachment anxiety (ECR-Anx) and supervisory style on the dimension of relational dimensions.
Table 6

Multiple Regression Analyses on Dimensions of Supervisory Style Rating Differences for Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Attractive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>4.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>-2.667</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Interpersonally Sensitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Task Oriented

Note: N = 79; ECR-Anx = Experiences in Close Relationships-Anxiety, ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships-Avoidance   *p<.05   **p<.01
attractiveness (SS-Attract) and interpersonal sensitivity (SS-InterSen). As shown in Table 2, a correlation was calculated between ECR-Anx and SS-Attract ($r = -.067$) and between ECR-Anx and SS-InterSen ($r = .035$). These correlations were not significant and therefore we failed to reject Null Hypothesis 1d.

**Hypothesis 2a:** There are significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions.

**Null Hypothesis 2a:** There are not significant differences between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions.

To test Null Hypothesis 2a, an Independent Samples T-Test was used to determine the difference between supervisees’ ratings of supervisory working alliance dimensions and supervisors’ ratings of supervisory working alliance dimensions (i.e., rapport & client focus). As shown in Table 7, the difference between supervisees and supervisors ratings on the SWA-Client Focus dimension was significant ($p>.05$), whereas, the difference between supervisees and supervisors ratings on the SWA-Rap dimension was not significant. In total, given that there was a significant difference in ratings on one of the two dimensions of supervisory working alliance, Null Hypothesis 2a was rejected.

**Hypothesis 2b:** There are significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., rapport & client focus).

**Null Hypothesis 2b:** There are not significant relationships between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., rapport & client focus).

To test Null Hypothesis 2b, a multiple regression analysis was used to determine the
Table 7
Summary of Independent Samples T-Test for the Supervisory Working Alliance and Mean Differences in Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Supervisee</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Rap</td>
<td>5.868</td>
<td>6.031</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.542, .216</td>
<td>-.852</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA-Client</td>
<td>6.635</td>
<td>5.868</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.337, 1.197</td>
<td>3.539*</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SWA-Rap = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Rapport, SWA-Client = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Client

Focus *p < .05 **p < .01
contribution of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance, above and beyond, the difference in ratings regarding the dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., rapport and client focus)? As shown in Table 8, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance were not significant predictors in the rating difference amongst supervisees and supervisors on rapport or client focus. Thus, we failed to reject Null Hypothesis 2b.

**Hypothesis 3a:** There are significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment avoidance rating supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance.

**Null Hypothesis 3a:** There are not significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment avoidance rating supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance.

To test Null Hypothesis 3a, SS-Task scores were added as the first step of the hierarchical multiple regression with the supervisory working alliance as the criterion variable. Then, SS-Task and ECR-Avd were added as the second step of the hierarchical multiple regression with the supervisory working alliance as the dependent variable. These results are presented in Table 9. SS-Task was a significant predictor of the supervisory working alliance accounting for 49% of the variance (Multiple R = .700, R$^2$ = .490, Adjusted R$^2$ = .484, F$_{\text{Change}}$ = 74.090, p = .000). However, ECR-Avd did not account for significant additional variance (Multiple R = .705, R$^2$ = .497, Adjusted R$^2$ = .483, F$_{\text{Change}}$ = 37.495, p = .000). Thus, we failed to reject Null Hypothesis 3a.
Table 8

Multiple Regression Analyses on Differences for each Dimension of Supervisory Working Alliance Rating for Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.422</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Rapport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.851</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Client Focus

*Note: N = 79; ECR-Anx = Experiences in Close Relationships – Anxiety, ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships – Avoidance

*p > .05  **p > .001
Table 9
Hierarchical Regression Analyses with Supervisory Style Inventory-Task Oriented and Experiences in Close Relationships-Avoidance as Predictors for Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.181</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>8.608</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>4.337</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Task</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>8.657</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Avd</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.974</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 79; SS-Task = Supervisory Style Inventory-Task Oriented, ECR-Avd = Experiences in Close Relationships - Avoidance

*p > .05  **p > .001
**Hypothesis 3b:** There are significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment anxiety rating supervisory style more relationally oriented (i.e., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety.

**Null Hypothesis 3b:** There are not significant relationships between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment anxiety rating supervisory style more relationally oriented (i.e., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety.

To test Null Hypothesis 3b, SS-Attract and SS-InterSen scores were added as the first step of the hierarchical multiple regression with the supervisory working alliance as the criterion variable. Then, SS-Attract, SS-InterSen, and ECR-Anx were added as the second step of the hierarchical multiple regression with the supervisory working alliance as the dependent variable. These results are presented in Table 10. SS-Attract and SS-InterSen were significant predictors of the supervisory working alliance accounting 71% of variance (Multiple R = .844, $R^2 = .712$ Adjusted $R^2 = .704$, F$_{change} = 93.973$, $p = .000$). However, ECR-Anx did not account for significant additional variance (Multiple R = .844, $R^2 = .712$, Adjusted $R^2 = .701$, F$_{change} = 61.909$, $p = .000$). Thus, we failed to reject Null Hypothesis 3b.
Table 10
Hierarchical Regression Analyses with Supervisory Style Inventory-Attractive and -Interpersonal Sensitive, and Experiences in Close Relationships - Anxiety as Predictors for Supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>1.847</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>4.895</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-Attract</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>3.468</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-InterSen</td>
<td>-1.160</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-Anx</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 79; SS-Attract = Supervisory Style Inventory-Attractive, SS-InterSen = Supervisory Style Inventory – Interpersonal Sensitive, ECR-Anx =Experiences in Close Relationships - Anxiety

*p < .05 **p<.01
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I will discuss the implications of the findings in this study. First, I will
discuss the findings of the main research questions and analyses in reference to possible
explanations of the findings based on past literature. Then, I will discuss additional findings from
exploratory analyses. Lastly, I will address limitations of the current study, as well as,
implications for practice and future research.

The purpose of this study was to examine how supervisees’ attachment orientations
influenced supervisees’ perceptions of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance.
More specifically, a primary aim of this study was to examine how supervisee attachment
anxiety and attachment avoidance impacted supervisee ratings of the dimensions of supervisory
style (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented) and of the supervisory working
alliance (i.e., rapport & client focus). In this study, I also examined the difference between
supervisee and supervisor ratings of the supervisory style and supervisory working alliance
dimensions. Lastly, I was interested in exploring attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance as
a moderator variable between supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance.

Previous researchers have examined the role of supervisee attachment within the
supervisory relationship. Researchers have shown that an individual’s perception of supervisory
style influences their overall perception or rating of the supervisory working alliance, in other
words supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance are highly correlated (Friedlander
& Ward, 1984). However, previous researchers have illustrated mixed findings in regards to the
role of adult attachment within the supervisory working alliance (i.e., Renfro-Michel, 2006;
White & Queener, 2003). Thus in the current study, I used a revised framework, incorporating supervisory style, to further examine the relationships between adult attachment and the supervisory working alliance.

Given the limited amount of supervision literature, it has been necessary to draw upon findings from within the psychotherapy literature to further support the importance of this study. Within psychotherapy, clients’ attachment orientation has been shown to be an important factor in the development of the working alliance. Generally, clients with a secure attachment form stronger alliances within the therapeutic relationship (e.g., Mallinckrodt, Gantt, & Coble, 1995; Diener & Monroe, 2011). Multiple meta-analytic studies have (1) linked the strength of the therapeutic alliance to positive therapy outcomes and (2) revealed that it is ultimately the client’s perspective of the working alliance that predicts treatment outcomes (e.g., Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Martin, Garske, & Davis, 2000). Therefore, given what can be drawn from the psychotherapy literature, theoretically speaking, it seemed likely that adult attachment orientation would play a role within the supervisory relationship as well.

**Supervisee Attachment Orientation and Supervisory Style**

In Hypothesis 1a, I stated that significant differences exist between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory style dimensions. The results yielded a significant difference between supervisee and supervisor ratings on the dimension of Attractiveness and Interpersonal Sensitivity. Kim (1998) reported that trainee attachment was predictive of trainee perception of the attractiveness of the supervisor’s style. In the current study, Attractiveness and Interpersonal Sensitivity were the only dimensions of supervisory style that supervisees perceived significantly different than their supervisors. Taken together, the findings of this study and Kim’s study may suggest that Attractiveness may be more susceptible to being influenced by
the supervisees’ attachment anxiety. Also, Attractiveness and Interpersonal Sensitivity are likely dimensions of supervisory style where supervisees and supervisors may be less likely to share similar perspectives.

In Hypothesis 1b, I stated that significant relationships exist between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the dimensions of supervisory style (i.e., attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented). Results of this study suggested that supervisee attachment anxiety was a significant predictor of the rating difference among supervisors and supervisees on interpersonal sensitivity. It seems important to draw upon psychotherapy literature to help inform our understanding of this finding. Psychotherapy literature suggests that it is the client’s perspective of the working alliance that is predictive of treatment outcomes (Martin, Garske, and Davis, 2000). Therefore, within the supervisory relationship, it may be the supervisee’s perspective that is the most predictive of supervision outcomes. This finding suggests that supervisee attachment anxiety may contribute to the difference between supervisee and supervisor perspective. Being that it is often helpful if supervisees and supervisors perceive the relationship similarly, supervisee attachment anxiety may be an important factor for the supervisor to consider when establishing and maintaining a supervisory relationship. It may also be helpful for supervisors to facilitate conversations with their supervisees related to their level of interpersonal anxiety and how this may impact the supervisory relationship.

In Hypothesis 1c, I stated that there are significant associations between supervisees with increased attachment avoidance and the task oriented dimension of supervisory style. Similarly, in hypothesis 1d, I stated that associations would exist between supervisees with increased attachment anxiety and the relational dimensions (i.e., attractive and interpersonally sensitive) of
supervisory style. Unfortunately, this study did not find supervisee attachment avoidance to be related to supervisee’s ratings of the task oriented dimension of supervisory style. This study also did not find supervisee attachment anxiety to be related to supervisee’s ratings of the interpersonal sensitivity and attractive dimensions of supervisory style.

In Hypotheses 1c and 1d, I was interested in testing whether supervisee attachment orientation would be predictive of supervisee perception of the supervisory style. In the current study, I found that supervisee attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety were not related to supervisees’ ratings of supervisory style. These findings are inconsistent with previous research findings. For example, Kim (1998) found that attachment dimensions (i.e., anxiety and avoidance) played a significant role in predicting supervisee perception of the attractiveness and interpersonal sensitivity of the supervisor’s style.

**Supervisee Attachment Orientation and the Supervisory Working Alliance**

In Hypothesis 2a, I stated that significant differences would exist between supervisees’ and supervisors’ ratings of the supervisory working alliance dimensions. As expected, the current results yielded a significant difference between supervisee and supervisor ratings on the dimension of Client Focus. However, the difference in supervisee and supervisor ratings on the dimensions of Rapport was not significant. This finding may suggest that supervisees and supervisors perceive supervision work revolving around the client differently. While it seems that many supervisors often attend to possible differences in perspective related to rapport, this finding suggests that it may also be important for the supervisor to discern differences in perspective related to client focus that may exist.

In Hypothesis 2b, I stated that significant relationships exist between or among supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance and the difference in rating on the
dimensions of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., rapport and client focus). This study did not find supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance to be a contributing factor in the difference between supervisee and supervisor ratings of the Rapport and Client Focus dimensions of the supervisory working alliance. Being that the average supervision relationship was 12 sessions, it may be that the supervisory relationship did not have enough time to become an attachment-like relationship.

Despite Bernard and Goodyear (2009) assertion that supervisee attachment style is a critical factor that impacts the quality of the working alliance. The findings of the current study were not significant, but are consistent with previous research findings. In fact, there have been consistently mixed findings related to the overall role of supervisee attachment orientation and the supervisory working alliance (i.e., Renfro-Michel, 2006; White & Queener, 2003). Although, the findings of the current study are not particularly surprising, given past supervision literature, it seems that supervisee attachment would impact the quality of the working alliance, particularly given the large amount of findings supporting a similar relationship within the psychotherapy literature. Potential boundary differences (e.g., role of power, evaluative component) and the limited length of the supervisory relationships, particularly in this study, may make development an attachment-like relationship difficult, thus playing a role in the relationship between attachment and the supervisory working alliance.

**Supervisee Attachment Orientation as a Moderator**

In Hypothesis 3, I stated that significant relationships exist between or among the supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment avoidance rating supervisory style more task oriented, compared to supervisees with less attachment avoidance. Whereas, in hypothesis 3b, I stated that significant relationships exist between or among the
supervisory working alliance and supervisees with increased attachment anxiety rating supervisory style more relationally oriented (i.e., attractive or interpersonally sensitive) compared to supervisees with less attachment anxiety.

I found no published journal articles that have examined the supervisory working alliance, supervisee attachment orientation, and supervisory style. However, one dissertation has examined the role of these three variables. Spelliscy (2007) claimed that both attachment and supervisory style were variables that have been shown to influence the supervisory working alliance. Spelliscy’s hypothesized that supervisory style and supervisee attachment anxiety or attachment avoidance would predict the supervisory working alliance, when considered from the supervisee’s perspective. Interestingly, Spelliscy did not find attachment avoidance to have a significant direct effect on the supervisory working alliance, which one would predict based on attachment theory. Thus, this study examined these variables using different methods and statistical analyses to examine to what extent supervisee attachment orientation moderated the relationship between supervisee and supervisor ratings of supervisory style and supervisory working alliance (dependent variable). Similar to Spelliscy, the findings of this study revealed that supervisee attachment avoidance did not account for significant additional variance when examining the relationship between supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. Again, it may be that the supervisory relationship did not have enough time to become an attachment-like relationship.

Similarly, supervisee attachment anxiety did not account for significant additional variance within the relationship between supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance. Thus, this study did not find supervisee attachment orientation to be a moderating variable between supervisory style and supervisory working alliance. Given the theoretical basis
attachment theory, it is surprising that supervisee attachment orientation did not account for a significant amount of additional variance. However, continuing to explore the role of supervisee attachment orientation within the supervisory working alliance, in new ways, seems important, given the strong theoretical backing of attachment theory.

**Exploratory Analyses**

Outside of the initial research questions, I found an interesting finding related to the impact of supervisee attachment orientation on supervisor’s ratings of supervisory style. Specifically, in the current study, supervisee attachment anxiety was found to be significantly correlated with supervisor ratings on the interpersonal sensitivity dimension of supervisory style (see Table 2). Given the limited supervision-related research in this area, it is necessary to pull from what is known within the psychotherapy literature to further understand the importance of this finding. Within the psychotherapy literature, Daly and Mallinckrodt (2009) found that therapists described, after initial engagement, gradually increasing the therapeutic distance for more anxiously attached clients, which then requires the clients to manage the resulting feelings of frustration while learning to function more independently. Whereas, when working with more avoidantly attached clients, therapists would gradually decrease therapeutic distance help clients overcome their fears of closeness and intimacy. Thus, it may be important for supervisors, like therapists, to adjust their interpersonal distance (creating more distance over time) for more anxiously attached supervisees.

**Limitations**

In terms of limitations, the generalizability of the research findings is often a concern and the current study is no exception. Participants were recruited from a large Midwest university and from the surrounding community, the sample was one of convenience and thus not random.
nor representative of all counselors in training and their supervisors. Importantly, the sample was largely composed of White females, making generalizability to other gender and racial identities difficult. I was also specifically interested in recruiting master-level counselors in training and their current supervisors and used convenience sampling, making generalizability to other educational levels also difficult. Future researchers should aim to recruit participants from various professional settings, with different training backgrounds, and from across a larger geographical region. A less homogeneous sample would greatly increase generalizability and improve external validity.

An additional limitation of this study was the relatively low number of participants. Although participants were recruited across two semesters, overlapping of potential participants within the recruitment pool was an unforeseen obstacle that limited the total number of participants who had not previously completed the study, and thus were eligible to participate. Also, collecting data from a “dyad” poses additional challenges, as the researcher is reliant on both participants, supervisee and their supervisor, to complete the study measures.

Another limitation is the self-report nature of the instruments used in this study. Self-report measures are vulnerable to intentional and unintentional distortions by every participant (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). For example, (a) participants may respond in a manner, which they believe will support the researcher’s hypotheses, (b) participants may respond in a way that is believed to make them look good, or (c) participants may respond in a way, which they believe is socially desirable (Heppner et al., 2008). Thus, it is important for researchers to be cautious about drawing conclusions from any single measure.

A final limitation is the inattention given to other critical factors that impact the supervisory relationship. For instance, Queener and White (2003) suggested that there are
different boundaries within the supervisory relationship, compared to those of the therapy relationship. Power may be a helpful factor to examine, when considering different boundaries within the supervisory relationship (Doloriert, Sambrook, & Stewart, 2012). Investigating the role of perceived power on part of the supervisor and supervisee may be an important factor.

Supervision also has an evaluative component, which is inherent in supervision that may impact the boundaries within the supervisory relationship. Also, having a more heterogeneous sample of supervisors and supervisees may also shed light on the role of power and various socio/cultural identities within the supervisory working alliance.

**Implications for Practice and Future Research**

The findings of this study, taken within the context of past psychotherapy and supervision research, have potential implications for the work of clinical supervisors. The current findings also begin to lay the groundwork for future research regarding the supervisory relationship. The findings of this study help us begin to understand the potential importance of a flexible supervisory style. Given the individual differences in supervisee attachment orientation, supervisors might find that altering their supervisory style to meet the interpersonal needs of the supervisee to be helpful. Researchers have argued the importance of supervisor flexibility and being able to ensure congruence between supervisory style and student’s needs, noting that it is unacceptable for supervisors to have one set supervisory style (e.g., Malfoy & Webb, 2000; Pearson & Brew 2002). Similarly, Daly and Mallinckrodt (2009) argued that facilitating change within the therapy relationship occurs through careful regulation of interpersonal distance between the client and therapist, which when applied to the supervisory relationship also suggests the importance of supervisor interpersonal flexibility.

This study also suggests that it may be important for future researchers to examine
additional supervisory variables in order to better understand the role of supervisee attachment within the supervisory relationship. White and Queener (2003) suggested there being different boundaries within the supervisory relationship, compared to the psychotherapy relationship. Although a power differential exists within both relationships, the role of evaluation within the supervisory relationship greatly increases the power differential. For example, the role of power, and fear of the evaluative component, within the supervisory relationship may impact the expression of supervisee attachment or supervisees’ perception of supervisory style. Given the strong theoretical underpinnings of attachment theory, it was surprising that supervisee attachment was not found to impact perceptions of supervisory style and supervisory working alliance as predicted. Thus, it may be important that future researchers examine the supervisory relationship later on in its development, once the relationship has had time to develop into an attachment-like relationship. Lastly, a strength of the current study is that both supervisee and supervisor perspectives of supervisory style and supervisory working alliance were examined. Future researchers may want to continue to examine both perspectives, but also consider the role of the supervisor’s attachment orientation. Better understanding of supervisor and supervisee expectations of the supervisory relationship may also be important to consider. Future research of adult attachment within the supervisory relationship is important because it may contribute to what we know about the formation of a strong supervisory working alliance and promote positive training outcomes.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Given the extensive amount of psychotherapy research illustrating the important role of adult attachment orientation within the therapeutic working alliance, the need to understand the role of adult attachment within the supervisory relationship still seems important. The findings
of the current study illustrated important correlations between supervisee attachment anxiety and supervisees’ perception of interpersonal sensitivity. The current findings also suggested that supervisees and supervisors do not perceive the attractive and interpersonal sensitivity dimensions of supervisory style and the client focus dimension of the supervisory working alliance in the same way. This finding highlights the importance of having discussions or processing aspects of supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance within the supervision relationship to better understand differences in perception between supervisor and supervisee, so these perception differences do not negatively impact the effectiveness of supervision.

Lastly, this study suggested that supervisors adjust their supervisory style (i.e., become more interpersonally sensitive) when supervisees are more anxiously attached. Thus, supervisors who are able to alter the interpersonal distance within the supervisory relationship based on the interpersonal variables of the supervisee (i.e., attachment style) may have a stronger supervisory alliance, which could contribute to more positive training outcomes. Most importantly, this study begins to lay the groundwork for future studies and adds to the limited research examining adult attachment within the supervisory working alliance.
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Recruitment Script for Supervisees

My name is [researcher’s name] from the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study designed to gather information about your experiences in supervision and interpersonal relationships. This research may benefit the profession by adding to what is known about the supervisory relationship. I am interested in the overall responses of all the people who participate in this study, not individual responses. Supervisors will not have access to any of the information collected. Any student 18 years of age or older and is currently enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is eligible to participate in this study. This includes students who are in the following programs: (a) Counseling Psychology, (b) College Counseling, (c) School Counseling, (d) Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling, (e) Clinical Mental Health Counseling, and (f) Rehabilitation Counseling.

Participation in this study will take a total of 15-20 minutes. If you choose to participate in this study you will first go to an online link and will be provided with and can read the informed consent document. It is estimated that this will take about 5 minutes. After providing informed consent, you will then provide demographic information and answer a series of questions about your current supervisory relationship. This portion of the study will likely take no more than 15 minutes.

The risks associated with this study are minimal. Although you will be asked to provide personal information about yourself and your supervisory relationship, the information that you provide will be de-identified in order to protect your identity. The benefit of participating in this study is learning about this research once your participation is complete and having the opportunity to reflect on your current supervisory relationship.

If you would like to learn more about participating in this research study, please write your name and preferred e-mail address, and your supervisor’s contact information (e.g. name and email) on the piece of paper that you will be provided. If you do not currently have your supervisor’s contact information, a follow-up email will be sent to you in order to gain this information. I will use this information to send out a link to the online questionnaire and to contact your supervisor regarding possible participation in this study.

As a token of appreciation participation participants will be offered a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for their participation.

Does anyone have any questions at this time? If you have questions later, please contact the lead student investigator at kathryn.e.wierda@wmich.edu.
Appendix C

Recruitment Script for Supervisors

My name is [researcher’s name] from the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study designed to gather information about you and your supervisee’s experiences in supervision. [Supervisee’s first name] has already agreed to participate in this study. I am interested in the overall responses of all the people who participate in this study, not individual responses. Any supervisor who is currently supervising a supervisee enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is eligible to participate in this study.

Participation in this study will take a total of 15-20 minutes. If you choose to participate in this study you will first go to an online link and will be provided with and can read the informed consent document. It is estimated that this will take about 5 minutes. After providing informed consent, you will then provide demographic information and answer a series of questions about your current supervisory relationship. This portion of the study will likely take no more than 15 minutes.

The risks associated with this study are minimal. Although you will be asked to provide personal information about yourself, and your supervisory relationship, the information will be de-identified in order to protect your identity. The benefit of participating in this study is learning more about this research once your participation is complete and having the opportunity to reflect on your current supervisory relationship.

If you would like to learn more about participating in this research study, please respond to this email. I will use your email address to send out a link to the online research questionnaire.

As a token of appreciation participants will be offered a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for their participation.

Do you have any questions at this time? If you have questions later, please contact the lead student investigator at kathern.e.wierda@wmich.edu.
Hello,

This is [researcher name] and I am contacting you regarding your expressed interest in participating in my research study. As a reminder, this study involves completing a series of questions that address aspects of your current supervision experience. Any student who is currently enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is eligible to participate. In addition, you must be 18 years or older to participate in this study. Participation in this study will take a total of 15-20 minutes. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Although you will be asked to provide personal information about your supervisory relationship, the information that you provide will be de-identified in order to protect your identity. The benefits of participating in this study include learning about this research once your participation is complete and having a chance to reflect on your current experience in supervision.

If you are still interested in participating in this study, please follow the link below.

[Link will go here]

and reference this numerical code: [assigned numerical code provided]

As a token of appreciation you will be offered a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for your participation.

Thank you,

[Researcher name]
Hello,

This is [researcher name] and I am contacting you regarding your expressed interest in participating in my research study. As a reminder, this study involves completing a series of questions that address aspects of your current supervision experience with [supervisee’s first name]. Any supervisor who is currently supervising a student currently enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is eligible to participate. Participation in this study will take 15-20 minutes. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Although you will be asked to provide personal information about your supervisory relationship, the information that you provide will be de-identified. The benefits of participating in this study include learning about this research once your participation is complete and having a chance to reflect on your current experience in supervision.

If you are still interested in participating in this study, please follow the link below.

[Link will go here]

and reference this numerical code: [assigned numerical code provided]

As a token of appreciation you will be offered a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for your participation.

Thank you,

[Researcher name]
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Informed Consent (Supervisees)

Western Michigan University
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Dr. Eric Sauer
Student Investigator: Kathryn Wierda
Title of Study: Exploring Interpersonal Variables in Supervision: The Role of Supervisory Alliance, Supervisory Style, and Supervisee Attachment

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "Exploring Interpersonal Variables in Supervision: The Role of Supervisory Alliance, Supervisory Style, and Supervisee Attachment." This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
The purpose of this study is to gather information about supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervisory relationship. We are interested in the overall responses of all of the people who participate in this study, and not the responses of any one participant.

Who can participate in this study?
Any graduate student who is enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is invited to participate in this study. In addition, you must be 18 years or older to participate in this study.

Where will this study take place?
Data will be collected via the Internet at locations determined by the participants.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a series of questions about yourself and your current experience with supervision.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
Participation in this research will take 15-20 minutes. Specifically, it is estimated that it will take about 5 minutes to complete the informed consent process and up to another 15 minutes to complete the included questionnaires.

What information is being measured during the study?
Information related to your current supervision experience will be collected during this study.
Are there any risks or costs associated with participating in this study?
You will be asked to provide personal information about yourself and your supervision experience. However, your personal information will be assigned to a code number and only a code number will be used to label your data, not a name. The principle and student investigator will be the only people who have access to the data. Your supervisor will not have access to your responses.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?
When your participation is complete, you will be given an opportunity to learn more about this research, which may be useful to you in understanding yourself. This experience will also provide you with an opportunity to reflect on your current supervision experience.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study?
You will receive a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for participating in this study.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?
Your name will not appear anywhere on the data; only a random code number will be used. Only the principal and student investigator will have access to this data. All data will be kept secure, in accord with the standards of the University, Federal regulations, and the American Psychological Association. In addition, results of this research study may be published or presented; however, study findings will only be reported in aggregate and no individual identifying information will be reported.

What if you want to stop participating in this study?
If you decide now or at any point to withdraw this consent or stop participating, you are free to do so at no penalty to yourself. Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Dr. Eric Sauer at (616) 771-4171 or eric.sauer@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

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. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study.

Please Print Your Name

Participant’s signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
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Informed Consent (Supervisors)

Western Michigan University
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Dr. Eric Sauer
Student Investigator: Kathryn Wierda
Title of Study: Exploring Interpersonal Variables in Supervision: The Role of Supervisory Alliance, Supervisory Style, and Supervisee Attachment

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled “Exploring Interpersonal Variables in Supervision: The Role of Supervisory Alliance, Supervisory Style, and Supervisee Attachment.” This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
The purpose of this study is to gather information about supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervisory relationship. We are interested in the overall responses of all of the people who participate in this study, and not the responses of any one participant.

Who can participate in this study?
Any supervisor who is currently supervising a student currently enrolled in CECP 6120 or CECP 6130 is invited to participate in this study.

Where will this study take place?
Data will be collected via the internet at locations determined by the participants.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to respond to a series of questions about your current experiences within supervision.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
Participation in this research will take 15-20 minutes. Specifically, it is estimated that it will take about 5 minutes to complete the informed consent process and up to another 15 minutes to complete the included questionnaires.

What information is being measured during the study?
Information related to your current supervision experience will be collected during this study.

Are there any risks or costs associated with participating in this study?
You will be asked to provide personal information about yourself and your supervision
experience. However, only a code number will be used to label your data, not a name. Data will only be accessed by the research team and your supervisee will not have access to your responses.

**What are the benefits of participating in this study?**
When your participation is complete, you will be given an opportunity to learn about this research, which may be useful to you in understanding yourself. This experience will also provide you with an opportunity to reflect on your current supervision experience.

**Is there any compensation for participating in this study?**
You will receive a $5 Bigby Coffee gift card for participating in this study.

**Who will have access to the information collected during this study?**
Your name will not appear anywhere on the data; only a random code number will be used. Only the principal and student investigator will have access to this data. All data will be kept secure, in accord with the standards of the University, Federal regulations, and the American Psychological Association. In addition, results of this research study may be published or presented; however, study findings will only be reported in aggregate and no individual identifying information will be reported.

**What if you want to stop participating in this study?**
If you decide now or at any point to withdraw this consent or stop participating, you are free to do so at no penalty to yourself. Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Dr. Eric Sauer at (616) 771-4171 or eric.sauer@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

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. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study.

Please Print Your Name

___________________________________  ____________________
Participant’s signature    Date
Appendix H

Demographic Questions

Demographic Questions (supervisee)

Please provide the numerical code that you received from the researcher (in prior email):

__________________________

What is your age? ____

What is your gender identity?

_____ Female _____ Male
_____ Transgender _____ Other

What is your supervisor’s gender identity?

_____ Female _____ Male
_____ Transgender _____ Other

What is your racial identity?

_____ African-American/Black (not Hispanic)
_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
_____ Asian American or Pacific Islander
_____ European American/White (not Hispanic)
_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ From Multiple Races
_____ Other (please specify)

What is your supervisor’s degree/license?

_____ Degree (M.A., Ph.D., etc.)
_____ License (LPC, LP, etc.)

What is your academic program?

_____ Counseling Psychology
_____ School Counseling
_____ College Counseling
_____ Clinical Mental Health Counseling
_____ Marriage and Family Counseling
Rehabilitation Counseling

What year in the program are you?

- First year
- Second Year
- Other

What is your current level of training?

- Beginning Practicum (CECP 6120)
- Internship (CECP 6130)

Using a 6-point scale where 1 = Low and 6 = High, please rate how much you believe in and use techniques from the following theoretical orientation for counseling/therapy:

- Psychodynamic
- Behavioral/Cognitive
- Humanistic/Experiential
- Interpersonal
- Systems
- Other

To the best of your knowledge, using a 6-point scale where 1=Low and 6=High, please rate how much your supervisor believes in and uses techniques from the following theoretical orientation for counseling/therapy:

- Psychodynamic
- Behavioral/Cognitive
- Humanistic/Experiential
- Interpersonal
- Systems
- Other

Setting where you currently receive training:

- College Counseling Center
- Community Mental Health Center
- Hospital
- Psychology Training Clinic
- Private Practice
- (Please specify:____________________)

Number of supervision sessions to date: _______

Date you began supervision with your supervisor: _______
Hours of supervision per week:_______
Type of Supervision that occurs with your primary supervisor:

_____ Individual
_____ Triadic (two supervisees and one supervisor)

Estimate the total number of sessions that you will meet with your supervisor: ______
**Demographic Questions (supervisor)**

Please provide the numerical code that you received from the researcher (in prior email):
__________________________

What is your age? _____

What is your gender identity?

______ Female _______ Male
______ Transgender _______ Other

What is your supervisor’s gender identity?

______ Female _______ Male
______ Transgender _______ Other

What is your racial identity?

______ African-American/Black (not Hispanic)
______ American Indian or Alaskan Native
______ Asian American or Pacific Islander
______ European American/White (not Hispanic)
______ Hispanic/Latino
______ From Multiple Races
______ Other (please specify)

What is your supervisor’s degree/license?

______ Degree (M.A., Ph.D., etc.)
______ License (LPC, LP, etc.)

Using a 6-point scale where 1 = Low and 6 = High, please rate how much you believe in and use techniques from the following theoretical orientation for counseling/therapy:

______ Psychodynamic
______ Behavioral/Cognitive
______ Humanistic/Experiential
______ Interpersonal
______ Systems
______ Other

To the best of your knowledge, using a 6-point scale where 1=Low and 6=High, please rate how much your supervisee believes in and uses techniques from the following theoretical orientation for counseling/therapy:
_____ Psychodynamic
_____ Behavioral/Cognitive
_____ Humanistic/Experiential
_____ Interpersonal
_____ Systems
_____ Other

Setting where you currently work:

_____ College Counseling Center
_____ Community Mental Health Center
_____ Hospital
_____ Psychology Training Clinic
_____ Private Practice
_____ (Please specify:_____________

Number of supervision sessions to date: ______

Date you began supervision with your supervisee: _______

Hours of supervision provided to supervisee per week: ______

Type of Supervision that occurs with your primary supervisee:

_____ Individual
_____ Triadic (two supervisees and one supervisor)

Estimate the total number of sessions that you will meet with this supervisee: ______
Appendix I

Study Measures

*Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) - Supervisee Form*

Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of your work with your supervisor. Respond to each statement by indicating the appropriate point of following **7-point scale**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel comfortable working with my supervisor.
2. My supervisor welcomes my explanations about the client's behavior.
3. My supervisor makes the effort to understand me.
4. My supervisor encourages me to talk about my work with clients in ways that are comfortable to me.
5. My supervisor is tactful when commenting about my performance.
6. My supervisor encourages me to formulate my own interventions with the client.
7. My supervisor helps me talk freely in our sessions.
8. My supervisor stays in tune with me during supervision.
9. I understand client behavior and treatment technique similar to the way my supervisor does.
10. I feel free to mention to my supervisor any troublesome feelings I might have about him/her.
11. My supervisor treats me like a colleague in our supervisory session.
12. In supervision, I am more curious than anxious when discussing my difficulties with clients.
13. In supervision, my supervisor places a high priority on our understanding the client's perspective.
14. My supervisor encourages me to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.
15. My supervisor's style is to carefully and systematically consider the material I bring to supervision.
16. When correcting my errors with a client, my supervisor offers alternative ways of intervening with that client.
17. My supervisor helps me work within a specific treatment plan with my clients.
18. My supervisor helps me stay on track during our meetings.
19. I work with my supervisor on specific goals in the supervisory session.
Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI)- Supervisor Form

Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of your work with your supervisee. Respond to each statement by indicating the appropriate point of following 7-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I help my specific supervisee work within a specific treatment plan with his/her client.
2. I help my supervisee stay on track during our meetings.
3. My style is to carefully and systematically consider the material that my supervisee brings to supervision.
4. My supervisee works with me on specific goals in the supervisory session.
5. In supervision, I expect my supervisee to think about or reflect on my comments to him or her.
6. I teach my supervisee through direct suggestions.
7. In supervision, I place a high priority on our understanding of the client’s perspective.
8. I encourage my supervisee to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.
9. When correcting my supervisee’s errors with a client, I offer alternative ways of intervening.
10. I encourage my supervisee to formulate his/her own interventions with his/her client.
11. I encourage my supervisee to talk about the work in ways that are comfortable for him/her.
12. I welcome my supervisee’s explanations about his/her client’s behavior.
13. During supervision, my supervisee talks more than I do.
14. I make an effort to understand my supervisee.
15. I am tactful when commenting about my supervisee’s performance.
16. I facilitate my supervisee’s talking in our sessions.
17. In supervision, my supervisee is more curious than anxious when discussing his/her difficulties with me.
18. My supervisee appears to be comfortable working with me.
19. My supervisee understands client behavior and treatment techniques similar to the way I do.
20. During supervision, my supervisee seems able to stand back and reflect on what I am saying to him/her.
21. I stay in tune with my supervisee during supervision.
22. My supervisee identifies with me in the way that he/she thinks and talks about his/her client.
23. My supervisee consistently implements suggestions made in supervision.
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Supervisory Style Inventory (SSI)

For supervisees’ form: Please indicate your perception of the style of your current or most recent supervisor of psychotherapy/counseling on each of the following descriptors. Respond to each statement by indicating the appropriate point of following 7-point scale.

For supervisors’ form: Please indicate your perceptions of your style as a supervisor of psychotherapy/counseling on each of the following descriptors. Respond to each statement by indicating the appropriate point of following 7-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. goal-oriented
2. perceptive
3. concrete
4. explicit
5. committed
6. affirming
7. practical
8. sensitive
9. collaborative
10. intuitive
11. reflective
12. responsive
13. structured
14. evaluative
15. friendly
16. flexible
17. prescriptive
18. didactic
19. thorough
20. focused
21. creative
22. supportive
23. open
24. realistic
25. resourceful
26. invested
27. facilitative
28. therapeutic
29. positive
30. trusting
31. informative
32. humorous
33. warm
**Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR)**

The following statements concern how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it using the following 7-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>neutral/mixed</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
2. I worry about being abandoned.
3. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
4. I worry a lot about my relationships.
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.
13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.
16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.
25. I tell my partner just about everything.
26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.
31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.
32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.
33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.
Appendix J

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for your participation in this study! We hope that the information we gather from your participation will allow us to better understand the interpersonal dynamics within the supervisory relationship. This issue is of particular concern to counseling psychologists who are involved in the training of beginning counselors. If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, please contact Dr. Eric Sauer at (616) 771-4171 or eric.sauer@wmich.edu. Additionally, if you have experienced a strong emotional reaction to any of the questionnaires please do not hesitate to contact Counseling Services at (269) 387-1850.