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PREScriptive SUPERVIsor VerBAl RESPONDing AND ITS EFFECT UPon Trainee SATISFACTION IN COUNSELING SUPERVISION
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An experimental strategy of supervisor verbal responding was compared to two other strategies. Termed "direct responding," it involved answering trainee requests for information, opinion, or suggestion, by giving information, opinion, or suggestion. Trainee statements of fact or opinion were answered by a request for elaboration. This strategy was compared with a reflective-type response, modeled on base-rate studies of supervisor verbalizations, and with a random-type of response in which supervisor responses were not necessarily related to trainee statements.

The purpose of this study was to determine if a direct strategy of responding to trainee verbalizations would be perceived as superior to a reflective strategy, and to determine if the absence of an implicit strategy affected satisfaction and perception.

Analogue methods were employed. Raters viewed scripted video tapes of three supervisors working individually with a trainee. After viewing each tape, raters completed the Supervisor Rating Scale (SRF) and the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale - Revised (TPRS-R).

Raters comprised a randomly selected group of thirty-seven master's and doctoral-level trainees from the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University.
Analysis of variance, factor analysis, and linear regression analysis were employed in statistical analysis.

Comparison of all three strategies of verbal responding across all dimensions of rater perception and satisfaction proved impossible due to problems with the factor structures of the SRF and the TPRS-R. Analysis of results indicated that subjects were more satisfied with the performance of the direct responding supervisor than the reflective supervisor. The reflective supervisor was rated higher on a measure of trustworthiness than the direct responding supervisor. There was no relationship between these findings and rater age, sex, level of degree pursuing, experience as an individual counselor, and experience as a supervisee.

It was determined that verbal responding style does have an effect upon rater perception and satisfaction, and that the use of a strategy is superior to the absence of a responding strategy.

Theoretical and practical implications were proposed, and recommendations for further research were offered.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The process of counseling supervision may be described, in part, as a reciprocal exchange of messages between a supervisor and a trainee. While descriptions of this exchange range from lecture-like to therapeutic, a general definition of supervision is "a quintessential interpersonal interaction with the general goal that one person, the supervisor, meets with another, the supervisee, in an effort to make the latter more effective in helping people in psychotherapy" (Hess, 1980, p. 25). Guidelines of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) address the identity of the supervisor, his or her goals, and the function of supervision. As cited in Boyd (1978), counselor supervision is:

- Performed by experienced, successful counselors (supervisors) who have been prepared in the methods of supervision.
- Facilitates the counselor's personal and professional development, promotes counselor competencies, and promotes accountable counseling and guidance services and programs.
- Is the purposeful function of overseeing the work of counselor trainees or practicing counselors (supervisees) through a set of supervisory activities which include consultation, counseling, training and instruction, and evaluation. (p.7)

The long-term goal of supervision is to increase the skill of the trainee. However, the most immediately observable, moment-to-
moment product of supervision is the verbal interaction between supervisor and trainee.

The nature and outcome of supervisor-trainee verbal exchanges has recently come under scrutiny. Field studies by Holloway and Wolleat (1981), and Holloway (1982) have produced results to suggest that supervisor-trainee verbal exchanges operate in a reciprocal, predictable manner. Accordingly, statement "x" by one dyad member has been shown to be followed by statement "y" by the other member at a level beyond that of chance.

Observational research by Holloway and Wampold (1983) has shown that the characteristics of these verbal exchanges are strong predictors of supervisor and trainee satisfaction. Such results have prompted Holloway and Hosford (1983) to call for an empirically-based technology of supervision, wherein supervisors are more knowledgable of the effects of their interventions.

Statement of the Problem

Leddick and Bernard (1980) suggested that timing of supervisory feedback corresponding to the needs of the trainee is an issue of considerable merit, but one receiving scant research attention. Regarding timing, Holloway (1983) found that the most often used supervisor responses to trainee verbalizations were all negatively related to supervisory dyad member judgments of satisfaction with supervision. Supervisor statements related positively to satisfaction were the least often used. It was concluded that supervisors often do not approach supervision in a
manner conducive to either their own or the trainee's satisfaction, and that they may be unaware of the impact of their responses. It would appear prudent, given such findings, to further explore the trainee-supervisor verbal interaction under controlled conditions.

To date, there has been no controlled attempt to determine the impact of supervisor verbal responses upon trainee satisfaction with supervision. The purpose of this study was to use analogue methods to determine if trainee perceptions of the supervisor and satisfaction with the supervisory process could be experimentally manipulated by controlling supervisor verbal responses to trainee statements and questions.

Research Objective

The research objective of this study was to manipulate supervisor responses to four classes of trainee verbalizations in an attempt to influence trainee satisfaction with supervision. Trainee verbalizations receiving prescribed responses from the supervisor included: (a) trainee positive social-emotional behaviors, such as self disclosure or praise for the supervisor; (b) trainee negative social-emotional behaviors, such as defensiveness or tension-producing behaviors; (c) trainee requests for information, opinion, or suggestions; and (d) trainee offering information, opinions, or suggestions.

The method entailed using raters, themselves counselor trainees, to view video tapes of staged supervision sessions in
which supervisor responses to the above noted trainee verbalizations had been manipulated. Rater satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor was evaluated using instruments designed to measure satisfaction with supervision and perception of the supervisor.

Significance of the Study

Examination of verbal interactions in supervision has been part of a larger attempt to move supervision out of a theory-bound stage and into an empirical stage. Holloway and Hosford (1983) have suggested that once theory is able to predict the outcome of an intervention, then prescriptive models may be developed. To date, there has been no known test of a model of supervision based on the results of studies of verbal interaction.

The potential value of such a study is illustrated by three points. First, manipulation of supervisor responses provides an increased opportunity and ability to predict the outcome of supervisor verbal interventions. Secondly, such abilities would aid supervisors in relying less on intuitive, unconscious, or vague theoretical strategies, and more on empirically based strategies (Holloway & Hosford, 1983). Third, analogue methods circumvent the potential dangers of counseling trainees being exposed to untested methods of supervision during their work with clients.

The pragmatic value of such a study lies in improved supervisor ability to form a relationship characterized by decreased
trainee defensiveness and resistance. Also, it would aid in establishing a learning atmosphere conducive to satisfaction by both members of the supervisory dyad.

Such propositions are based on the assumption that it is useful to create an atmosphere conducive to trainee and supervisor satisfaction. Theoretically, satisfaction has been associated with the ability to influence attitudes and behaviors (Strong, 1968). A suggestion that such abilities are important for the supervisor would appear to have significant face validity.

Limitations

The present study was conducted using counselor trainees as subjects. Students chosen to be raters in such studies are unlikely to have a history of professional experience either receiving or performing supervision. Due to this, results are generalizable only to other counselor trainees. As the graduate student population of Western Michigan University is presumed to be no different from that of other large institutions, there are no reasons to believe that the results are not generalizable to counselor trainees elsewhere.

Results were also limited by the analogue nature of the experiment. While this limitation is acknowledged, it is noted that such methods serve as a valuable precursor to actual field studies.

The results were limited by the outcome instrumentation employed. Rating scales such as those used here (Likert-type)
measure individual perception have a built-in subjectivity and are generally lacking national-level validation.

No limitations were anticipated with the sampling procedures of the present investigations. Subjects were randomly selected from the research population, and the order of presentation of the experimental conditions to subjects was randomized.

Review of Related Literature

This study was concerned with prescribed supervisor responses to trainee verbalizations. The value of such a study is best understood within the context of prior research in the area of counseling supervision.

Examination of the literature shows that supervision scholars have generally mimicked the theoretical formulations of their colleagues in clinically-based research, under the assumption that the supervisory relationship was similar to the therapeutic relationship (Leddick & Bernard, 1980). Early examples of counseling studies include the work of Tuma and Gustad (1957), who examined counselor-client personality characteristics and their effect upon client learning. Carson and Heine (1962) studied counselor-client Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) profiles and their relationship to counseling success. Cook (1966) researched counselor-client value similarity and client self-evaluation. Further examples would include the voluminous work on facilitative conditions and counseling outcome (Hammond, Hepworth & Smith, 1977).
Researchers examining the supervisory relationship borrowed extensively from these studies. A major assumption was that effective supervisors were similar to effective counselors (Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967). An operational definition of effectiveness has historically been the extent to which a counselor trainee has been satisfied with his or her relationship with the supervisor.

Satisfaction With Supervision

Research by Garfield and Kurtz (1976) indicated that of twelve major activities of psychologists, supervision ranked fifth in terms of time expenditure. Given the relative importance and amount of time devoted to the supervisory process, it would appear that satisfaction with the process should be a variable of considerable importance. Several studies have addressed this issue, although it is of note that no study was found which attempted to experimentally manipulate satisfaction as a dependent variable.

Satisfaction and Related Variables

Lemons and Lanning (1979) examined satisfaction secondarily to their study of values and level of communication in supervision. Findings indicated no correlation between supervisory dyad member value similarity and satisfaction, although a relationship was found between high levels of communication and satisfaction with supervision.
Heppner and Handley (1981), in examining the interpersonal influence process in supervision, found a positive relationship between trainee satisfaction and perception of the supervisor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy. They also found a positive relationship between trainee satisfaction and trainee perception of the supervisory relationship as therapeutic. Trainee and supervisor levels of satisfaction were found to be positively related to each other.

In a study by Goodyear, Abadie, and Efros (1984), raters, themselves experienced supervisors, examined a video tape of a therapist supervised for one session by Rudolph Ekstein, Albert Ellis, Erving Polster, and Carl Rogers. Raters perceived therapist satisfaction with supervision to be related to therapist perception of the supervisor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy.

Heppner and Roehlke (1984) examined trainee satisfaction, finding it related to trainee experience as a counselor, and to specific behaviors of the supervisor. Satisfaction in members of a beginning practicum was related to the supervisor focusing on skill acquisition. Satisfaction in an advanced practicum was related to the supervisor offering alternative conceptualizations of client problems. Interns valued supervisors who allowed them to address personal issues. In a related study, Worthington and Stern (1985) found supervisor satisfaction to be related to their own perception of their contribution to trainee improvement, and their own perception of their knowledge of the trainee.
It would appear that the concept of satisfaction, as related to supervision, is one which broadly encompasses a number of relationship variables. Satisfaction appears to be indicative of the level of communication between dyad members, and related to trainee perceptions of the supervisor's personal characteristics. Satisfaction also appears related to perceptions of competence and interpersonal influence.

Given that research addressing satisfaction has shown it to be related to a variety of issues in the supervisory relationship, a further breakdown of the components of satisfaction is presented.

Facilitative Conditions

Fiedler (1950) in his early research on the therapeutic relationship, asked therapists to examine a list of items describing the therapist-client relationship, and choose items describing the ideal relationship. Therapists from divergent schools consistently chose items related to empathy, tolerance, client freedom of choice, and understanding of client feelings. Such items are similar to the facilitative conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness developed by Rogers (1957), and Rice (1980). Hansen, Pound, and Petro (1976), in their review of research on supervision, have in turn reported that facilitative conditions have been the major focus in supervision research.

A representative study of facilitative conditions was conducted by Pierce and Schauble (1970). They assigned trainees to
supervisors previously rated as either high or low empathic counselors. Findings indicated that trainees in the high empathy condition showed increased empathic responding in counseling sessions. Trainees in the low empathy conditions showed no change, or became less empathic in their counseling responses.

These results were not confirmed, however, in a similar study (Wedeking & Scott, 1976) pairing trainees with supervisors rated as showing high or low levels of empathy in supervision. No effect was found on trainee empathy, casting doubt on the development of empathic responding through modeling or through being in the presence of facilitative supervisors.

Birk (1972), in an analogue study, examined the effect upon trainee empathy of receiving either preferred or non-preferred method of supervision. Neither method, preferred or non-preferred, increased trainee levels of empathy toward clients.

Generally, results of these studies have been disappointing in regard to increasing trainee empathy and empathic responding. Training method, supervisor level of empathic responding, and value similarity/dissimilarity have not been shown to be accurate predictors of trainee acquisition of empathy skills.

Perception of the Supervisory Relationship

A number of studies have examined supervisor and trainee perceptions of each other. Bibbo (cited in Stern, 1979) found a positive relationship between supervisor ratings of trainee competence and trainee perception of the relationship, suggesting an
interplay of dyad member perceptions of each other. Bibbo was, however, unable to relate either variable to personality similarity in the supervisory dyad. Similarly, trainee perception of the supervisor as attractive has been found to be related to perception of the supervisor as skillful, although unrelated to supervisor/trainee attitude similarity (Hester, Weitz, Anchor, & Roback 1976). Newton (1976) found no relationship between trainee perception of the supervisor or trainee satisfaction with supervision and the didactic or experiential expectations of the supervisor.

Generally, these studies have shown that supervisor-trainee perceptions of their relationship is not accurately predicted by intrapersonal variables, such as personality characteristics, attitudes, or expectations. Some evidence was found to suggest that perceptions are affected by the interpersonal aspects of the relationship.

**Trainee Performance**

A number of investigators have examined the relationship between trainee overt behaviors and other variables. Davidson and Emmer (1966), interested in the immediate impact of supervisor behavior upon trainee behavior, assigned the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) trainees to one session with either supportive or non-supportive supervisors. They found that trainees in the non-supportive condition spent more time talking about themselves
than did trainees in the supportive condition. Those in the non-supportive condition also rated the concept "supervision" more negatively.

Two studies examined personality variables and trainee effectiveness. Wittmer and Lister (1971) studied the relationship between Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores, Sixteen Personality Factor (16PF) scores, and counselor effectiveness. No relationship was found for GRE scores, and only a moderate relationship for 16 PF scores.

Biasco and Redfering (1976) found evidence of the impact of supervision upon trainee performance. Both counselors and clients in supervised groups were more positive in their judgments of counseling outcome than were counselors and clients in unsupervised groups. Supervision appeared to affect both counselor and client satisfaction with therapy. It was unclear to what extent these findings would generalize to individual supervision.

While studies cited above attempted to correlate performance measures with scores on psychometric instruments, Heppner and Handley (1981) took a different approach. They examined trainee perception of the supervisor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy, and changes in trainee professional behaviors, personal behaviors, and attitudes. Again, no relationship was found.

As Heppner and Roehlke (1984) have pointed out, while supervision has been widely studied, still relatively little is
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known about specific variables which affect the process. Reasons for this are numerous. Bare (1967) originally argued that counselor-client personality similarity studies were limited by their use of measuring instruments such as the MMPI, developed for evaluating abnormality. She also noted that the use of global variables, such as personality, tended to obscure the effects of person-to-person interactions.

Secondly, two articles have pointed out that the supervision process and the counseling process are sufficiently different so as to require different theoretical and empirical approaches (Lambert, 1974; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). Lambert, in his examination of the verbal content in both counseling and supervision, found lower levels of empathy and specificity in supervision sessions as compared to counseling sessions. He concluded that the process of supervision, as generally practiced, may be much more didactic and much less experiential than some theorists believe. Such findings tend to either decrease the importance of facilitative conditions and explain their general failure to operate as predictors of supervision outcome, or to suggest that different conditions are necessary in supervision than in counseling.

It is of note that most studies have shown little relation between supervisory outcome and other global variables. However, positive outcomes fell mainly within the realm of supervisor-trainee communication (Lemons & Lanning, 1979; Pierce & Schauble, 1970).
Research on Dyadic Verbal Interaction

Current studies of verbal interaction in counseling supervision have adopted methods originally used in the field of teacher education. Two approaches were taken within this area of study. Originally, Flanders (1970) was concerned with determining what types of teacher behaviors most influence pupil attitudes and mastery of content. Flander's method of categorizing verbalizations, according to content, was adopted for use in one-to-one teacher-supervisor contact, most notably by Blumberg (1974). Blumberg's method, the system for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction, presently known as the BIA (Blumberg Interactional Analysis), views supervision in a manner in which the teacher is not the sole focus of concern. Rather, the teacher is seen as a member of a dyad, the assumption being that verbalizations of one member influence those of the other, as well as influence the outcome of supervision.

Analysis of verbal interaction, however, has a long history in fields other than teacher and counseling supervision. Rogers and Farace (1975) made reference to studies by Carr (1929) and Thomas, Loomis, and Arrington (1933), who used analysis of verbal interactions in their work in social psychology. Bateson (cited in Raush, 1972) published on the reciprocal nature of human interaction as early as 1935. The 1950s were a period of growth in interest in the workings of small groups (Bales, 1950), as well as on mechanisms of interpersonal control (Bateson, 1958). It was
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also during this period that attempts to categorize verbal interaction and to seek lawful relationships in the verbal interaction of psychotherapy began to accumulate (Auld and Murray, 1955; Auld and White, 1959).

Theoretical Bases of Verbal Interaction

Ekehammar (1974) has concluded that there are three different conceptions of human interaction. The first, personologism, advocates intrapersonal structures, such as traits, as the main determinants of behavior. The second, situationalism, views environmental factors as the main determinants while interactionism, the third, is a combination of the other two. This viewpoint implies that the interaction of person and situation is the major source of variance in behavior.

Accordingly, Rausch (1965) has suggested that human interactions occur in sequential chains. At its most basic level, a single interaction may be confined to behavior "x" being followed by behavior "y" on the part of a respondent. More often, a chain of such sequence occurs. Given certain contingencies of behavior, such chains may become highly complex. At issue, given the complexity of the chains, is the question of whether or not behavior "y" follows behavior "x" in a predictable manner. If so, what behavior is then likely to follow "y"?

The attempt to understand human interactions as sequential and predictable has been expressed mathematically in what is known as a
Markov Chain. Such a chain may be represented as a matrix of probabilities that an event, or set of events, will be followed by another event, or set of events (Raush, 1972). In application to human interaction, such a transitional model implies that behavior "x" will not be followed by behavior "y" in a simple, deterministic manner. Rather, behavior "y" has a probability, somewhere between 0.0 and 1.0, of following "x" (Ashby, cited in Raush, 1972).

It would appear that for the probability of a respondent event to rise above 0.0, but not to the level of 1.0 predicted by simple determinism, that stimulus and response must be interdependent, or limiting and controlling of each other. It is in this manner that "x" does not always lead to "y," leading to the assumptions of the Markov Chain. This characteristic has been referred to as a stochastic process (Parzen, cited in Hertel, 1972). As applied to psychotherapy, Hertel (1972) suggested that verbalizations of the dyad members should be studied in terms of their interdependence and their controlling and limiting factors.

Current views of this stochastic process in counseling and supervision may be characterized by what Lichtenberg and Hummel (1976) referred to as an "interlocking" paradigm. The verbal response of dyad member B serves as a reinforcing stimulus for member A's previous response, and as a discriminative stimulus for member A's next response. It is in this regard that dyad member verbalizations may be said to be sequential, repetitive, or probabilistic.
Auld and White (1959) examined verbal transitional probabilities in counselor-client dialogues. They examined the consistency of client speech and the likelihood of client behavior eliciting counselor intervention. Findings were that client sentence topic "N" was highly predictive of the topic of client sentence topic "N + 1." For example, a hostile client verbalization (N) had a probability of .71 of being followed by another client sentence of the same category (N + 1). There was only a .03 chance of sentence "N" being followed by a hostile statement if "N" was something other than hostile in content. This pattern appears stochastic in nature.

Bandura, Lipsher, and Miller (1960) postulated that counselors with high and low levels of anxiety regarding client hostility would respond differentially to client hostility in counseling sessions. It was assumed that high anxiety counselors would use more avoidant responses, such as disapproval, topic change, silence, ignoring or mislabeling, than would low anxiety counselors. Results were that counselors, in general, were inclined to avoid hostility directed at them, although counselors who expressed hostility directly were likely to permit clients to do so.

Frank and Sweetland (1962) examined the effect of various counselor verbal statements upon client responses. Findings were that clarification of feelings and forcing of insight (giving the client the cause of an event, then asking for the effect, or giving
effect and asking for cause) were strongly associated with understanding and insight responses by the clients.

Lichtenberg and Hummel (1976) examined six initial counseling interviews, four by Albert Ellis, and two by Carl Rogers, in a test of the ability of a predictive, Markov Chain mathematical model to explain the verbal exchanges between counselor and client. Results were mixed, suggesting that in two of the six interviews, counselor and client verbal responses were relatively independent of preceding stimulus verbalizations. Four of the six however, did meet assumptions of a probabilistic model.

Lichtenberg and Heck (1979) extended research on probabilistic models by examining the relationship between counselor-client verbal interchanges and counselor cognitive complexity. They found that counselor-client exchanges did not differ between high and low complexity therapists in the initial interview, but did in a second interview. Results indicated that higher complexity counselors used more types of responses to client verbalizations.

Results of a study by Friedlander and Phillips (1984) were strongly supportive of a probabilistic model of verbal interaction. In examining the first two sessions with 14 clients, they found that verbal exchanges between counselor and client were stable and predictable. Repetition and restatement without elaboration appeared to operate as a signal to the previous speaker to elaborate. Topic shifts, interpreted as a struggle for power, were frequent and repetitive.
Studies reviewed above supported the assumption that verbal exchanges between counselor and client operate, to some degree, in a stochastic and probabilistic manner. Hypothetically, statement "x" might be said to have a greater chance of eliciting statement "y" than would statement "z." The importance of this in the counseling arena comes in the potential to determine what type of counselor verbalization is likely to give rise to a desired client response, such as insight.

Experimental tests of the probabilistic model have not yet reached the level of complexity of having the counselor determine, interchange by interchange, what the most useful client verbalization would be in order to foster insight, problem-solving, and so on. However, there have been two close approximations.

Both Hountras and Redding (1969), and Gade and Matuschka (1973) examined the effects of training in interaction analysis upon practicum student performance in counseling sessions. Unfortunately, results were not examined in regard to probabilities of verbal transitions. Results of both studies showed trends toward trained students allowing more client-initiated talk, and using less directive means of influence. Gade and Matuschka also found that their control group, who received Rogerian training, was more directive and controlling than subjects receiving verbal interaction analysis training.

It has been shown that verbal exchanges in the counseling dyad are, to a degree, predictable, and that verbal exchanges are
influenced by prior exchanges, counselor traits, cognitive complexity, and training. Results discussed so far have come from studies of the therapeutic dyad. Results from studies of the supervisory dyad are reviewed below.

Verbal Interaction in Supervision

The issue of verbal interaction in supervision has received research attention, although the number of studies has been small. Holloway and Woileat (1981) adopted Blumberg's System for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction (BIA) to examine variance in supervisor verbalizations across two sessions with a trainee. The BIA, as used by them, contained 10 categories of supervisor verbalizations, four categories of trainee verbalizations, and one category for silence.

Findings were that verbalizations varied widely among supervisors, but that individual supervisor's verbalizations were stable across two interviews with each of two trainees. Results obtained suggested that each supervisor had an identifiable style and that supervisors did not display a wide variety of verbal interventions. They relied mainly upon their own "natural style."

Holloway, in particular, has extended the use of the BIA to the examination of verbal interactions in supervision. In another study (1982) she examined the sequential patterns of verbal behaviors between supervisors and trainees across the third, sixth, and ninth supervision interview. She found evidence that certain
verbal responses appeared to occur, when preceded by particular verbal stimuli, at a rate significantly different than that accounted for by chance. Trainees were most likely to respond to supervisor supportive statements with self-disclosure or praise for the supervisor. Supervisor requests for opinions or suggestions were met with silence at a rate higher than other supervisor statements. Results also indicated that when supervisors gave supportive messages, trainees were least likely to give information, opinions, or suggestions. Supervisors tended to respond to trainee requests for information, opinions, or suggestions with supportive statements. Also, supervisors made supportive statements when trainees gave information or showed positive or negative social-emotional behavior.

Holloway (1982) found that supervisors used supportive responses to a wide variety of trainee verbalizations, including requests for information. Particularly troubling was that supervisors could not give information, opinions, or suggestions and expect to receive a cognitive-type of response (elaboration of ideas). She concluded that supervisors did not use effective strategies in eliciting trainee opinions, self-disclosure, and other cognitive responses. She did conclude that there was evidence that verbal exchanges in supervision were repetitive and predictable.

Given evidence of the repetitive nature of the verbal exchange in supervision, Holloway and Wampold (1983) attempted to relate
verbal interaction patterns to a specific outcome measure. In this case the measure was satisfaction with supervision, and their study was the first of its kind.

Using the BIA to code verbal interactions, Holloway and Wampold (1983) assessed three areas of satisfaction, including supervisor-trainee satisfaction with own performance, other dyad member's performance, and their own level of comfort. Scales used were derived from the previous work of Ashby, Ford, Guerney and Guerney (1957) in their study of counselor-client satisfaction.

Of particular interest to the present study are Holloway and Wampold's (1983) results on trainee satisfaction. Trainees reacted negatively to interactions wherein supervisors asked for information or, without prompting, gave information. Trainees devalued exchanges where their positive social-emotional behaviors (complimenting the supervisor, giving support to the supervisor) were followed by the supervisor giving opinions or suggestions.

Concerning trainee evaluation of their own performance, there was but one positively predictive exchange pattern. This was an exchange in which the supervisor asked for an elaboration after the trainee gave information, opinion, or suggestion. Several exchanges, however, acted as predictors of trainee level of comfort in the supervision session. All had a negative relationship to trainee comfort. Any supervisor statement of a defensive or critical nature was devalued. Exchanges in which a trainee asked a question (request for information, opinion, or suggestion) and was
responded to with another question by the supervisor were predictive of low trainee comfort. The same held true for trainee negative social-emotional behavior (criticism of the supervisor's defensiveness) when it was followed by supervisor defensiveness or criticism.

Holloway and Wampold (1983) concluded a number of significant points based on these findings. Defensiveness and criticism left both dyad members uncomfortable, and adversely affected satisfaction. Supervisors, and trainees to an extent, rated self and other negatively for the excessive use of supportive communication. Conversely, supervisors who asked for an elaboration following a trainee's expression of an idea, opinion, or suggestion positively affected the self-evaluation of both dyad members.

Of particular note in these results, and earlier ones by Holloway (1982), is that supportive communication, asking for information in response to a trainee's question, and defensiveness following trainee defensiveness are the most often repeated supervisor communication. All are negatively related to dyad member judgments of satisfaction. While supervisor requests for elaboration after a trainee statement of opinion was found to promote satisfaction, it was the least often repeated exchange.

Such findings have been supplemented by those of Rickards (1984). He studied the relationship between verbal patterns in supervision and trainee perception of the supervisor as expert,
attractive, and trustworthy. Results indicated a moderate negative relationship between verbal patterns and trainee perceptions, the strongest correlations being between supervisor critical behavior (giving criticism), and perceptions of him or her as expert, attractive, and trustworthy. Trainees reacted negatively to statements of opinion by the supervisor, although no results were reported on a trainee question/supervisor opinion exchange.

Summary

The analysis of verbal interaction in dyads has been discussed in terms of its use in the fields of teacher supervision, counseling, and counseling supervision. Research in counseling supervision has generally imitated counseling outcome research in its initial emphasis on global variables, such as personality or values, as correlates of outcome. Current studies of supervision verbal patterns were preceded by studies of verbal patterns in counseling.

Present studies of the verbal interaction in supervision, while limited in number, have produced findings to suggest that the supervisory verbal exchange is repetitive, predictable, and predictive of dyad member satisfaction.

Following, in Chapter II is presented the design and method of the present study, including population characteristics, sampling procedures, and statistical methods employed. Chapter III contains the results of the study. Chapter IV contains conclusions, and recommendations based upon the findings.
Population and Sample

Identification of a population and sample is a crucial step in designing a study to examine supervisor and trainee verbal interaction. For the present study, approval was obtained from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, Western Michigan University, to obtain a random sample of graduate students from the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology.

Population

The population of trainees for this study was defined as 204 master's and doctoral-level graduate students enrolled in all classes in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University, during the Fall semester of 1986. The listing of students was supplied by the Office of Institutional Research.

Sample

It was determined that a total of at least 30 subjects were necessary for the present study, given its intent and design. A total of 60 names were randomly chosen from the population, 30 of whom were master's-level, 30 of whom were doctoral-level. Random
selection was accomplished through the use of a random numbers table. Thirty-seven subjects responded to a mailed invitation to take part in the experiment.

Setting

The present study was sponsored by the Department's Center for Counseling and Psychological Services as part of its mission statement of investigating the counseling and supervisory processes. Laboratory areas of the Center were used for exposing the subjects to the materials of the experiment. This study was supported by a grant from The Graduate College, Western Michigan University.

Criteria Instruments

The instruments used to assess satisfaction were the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale - Revised (TPRS-R) and the Supervisor Rating Form (SRF). The TPRS-R was derived (Holloway & Wampold, 1983) by making minor wording changes in the Client Personal Reaction Scale (CPRS), by Ashby, Ford, Guerney, and Guerney (1957). It contains 12 questions, which break into three independent factors. The factors include evaluation of self-performance, evaluation of the other dyad member's performance, and level of comfort during the session. Items are rated on a 5 point Likert-type scale. Validity studies by Holloway and Wampold (1984) revealed an internal consistency (alpha) for each subscale which averaged .78. Minor wording changes were made in the TPRS-R to reflect the fact that the instrument was being completed by raters.
The SRF (Rickards, 1984) was used to measure subjects' perception of the supervisor as expert, attractive, and trustworthy. It is an adaptation of the Counselor Rating Form (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), and consists of 36 bipolar adjective pairs with seven points between each pole. Each of the three dimensions is measured by 12 separate items. The dimensions are based on Strong's (1968) hypothesis that expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness influence perception. Barak and LaCrosse were able to demonstrate a 75 percent or above inter-rater agreement on which dimensions the adjective pairs belonged to. These findings were also supported by factor analysis of the instrument. Minor wording changes were made in the SRF to reflect the fact that it was being completed by raters in the present study.

Procedures

Prior to collection of data, subjects were given an information sheet to read, describing in general terms what they were expected to do. Informed consent was obtained following standards established by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee.

Subjects were told that they were to view videotaped excerpts from individual supervision sessions between a trainee and three experienced supervisors. They were told that the sessions which they were to view were the third meeting between the trainee and each supervisor. Additionally, subjects were told that the trainee
had been previously trained to make certain memorized statements about her client when signaled by a light outside of the supervisor's viewing range. This statement was included to decrease subject suspicion regarding the repetition of trainee statements with each supervisor. Subjects responded to the SRF and TPRS-R at the end of each tape. Thirteen viewing sessions were necessary in order to accommodate all of the subjects. The order of presentation of the tapes was varied randomly for each viewing session.

Three experimental conditions were used. Each took the form of a 15 minute video tape of a staged supervision session. The characteristics of the trainee-supervisor verbal exchanges had been predetermined by the investigator, with the trainee and three supervisors having been trained prior to filming to respond to each other along certain guidelines. These guidelines included 14 categories of possible trainee statements, based upon Blumberg Interaction Analysis (BIA) categories. There were 11 possible supervisor responses, again based upon BIA categories. In all interactions, the trainee was shown making a statement, then the supervisor was shown responding. Following the interaction, there was a brief pause during which time the video and sound were faded out for 10 seconds before another trainee-supervisor interchange was shown.

The types of trainee verbalizations employed were trainee positive social-emotional behaviors, including self-disclosure and
praise for the supervisor; trainee giving information, opinions, and suggestions; trainee asking for information, opinions, and suggestions; and trainee negative social-emotional behaviors, including defensiveness and tension-producing behaviors.

The nature of the supervisor responses to the trainee varied according to the three research conditions, and are discussed below. Trainee verbalizations for all research conditions were held constant, although their order was varied between conditions.

**Condition 1 (the "reflective" Condition)**

Verbal exchanges found by Holloway (1982) and by Holloway and Wampold (1983) to occur at a relatively high frequency in supervision were used in this script. The type of trainee verbalization occurring first are separated by a slash mark from the type of supervisor response used in this condition: (1) trainee positive social-emotional verbalization/supervisor gives opinion, suggestion, or supportive communication; (2) trainee asks for information, opinion, or suggestion/supervisor asks for information; (3) trainee negative social-emotional behavior/supervisor critical or defensive remark. Any trainee statements falling outside of these categories received a reflective response. Supervisors were randomly assigned to conditions. The supervisor for this condition was a male, doctoral-level counseling psychologist employed in private practice, who had completed graduate practica in supervision.
Prior research had indicated that the types of supervisor responses listed in numbers 1 through 3 above had been found to be negative correlates of satisfaction in studies employing naturalistic observation. No prior attempt had been made to replicate these findings under controlled conditions.

**Condition 2 (the "direct" Condition)**

Verbal exchanges in this condition included: (1) trainee positive social-emotional behavior/supervisor makes brief reflective acknowledgement, then redirects; (2) trainee gives information, opinion, or suggestion/supervisor asks for elaboration; (3) trainee asks for information, opinion, or suggestion/supervisor gives information, opinion, or suggestion, or forces insight (gives cause and asks for effect); (4) trainee negative social-emotional behaviors/supervisor makes reflection of feeling content and redirects for further exploration of the content. The supervisor randomly assigned to this condition was a female doctoral-level counseling psychologist employed in a private practice setting, who had completed graduate practica in supervision.

Responding directly to the intent of the trainee verbalization (eg., answering a request for information by giving information) had been found to be a positive correlate of satisfaction in prior research by Holloway and Wampold (1983). No attempt had been made to replicate these findings under controlled conditions.
Condition 3 (the "random" Condition)

In this condition, supervisor responses to trainee verbalizations were randomized. Trainee verbalizations were the same as in conditions 1 and 2. Supervisor responses were randomly selected from the supervisor response repertoire listed in the BIA. The supervisor for this condition was a male MSW-level social worker employed in private practice, who had completed graduate practica in supervision.

Table 1, a complete list of trainee verbalizations for each research condition, and supervisor responses, is depicted below.

Table 1
Supervisor Responses to Trainee Verbalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainee Statement</th>
<th>Reflective</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Random</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
<td>gives information</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
<td>forces insight</td>
<td>gives clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggestion</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
<td>gives suggestion</td>
<td>asks for evaluation of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
<td>gives clarification</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation of supervision</td>
<td>asks for information</td>
<td>gives evaluation</td>
<td>makes negative value judgement of trainee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee Statement</td>
<td>Supervisor Response</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainee offering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>gives</td>
<td>praises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>evaluates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggestion</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>gives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>reorients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation of supervision</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-disclosure</td>
<td>gives opinion</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>gives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praise for supervisor</td>
<td>gives opinion</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defensive behavior</td>
<td>defensive</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>asks for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td>makes reflection</td>
<td>asks for</td>
<td>gives praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that while all of the possible verbal interchanges shown above appear relatively simple, they are better described in the true context in which they occurred. While an initial attempt to use a script was tried, the quality of the filmed...
interchanges was determined to be too unrealistic to pass as an excerpt from a supervision session. The therapists serving as supervisors in the experiment were redirected to use their own words in responding to the trainee, with the rule being that they had to deliver the type of responses shown above. The verbalizations of the trainee, who was a doctoral student in special education, and who was able to successfully use a script, remained constant across her contact with each supervisor. Only the order of her statements varied.

Confounding Variables

A major source of variance in counseling dyad studies has been adequately demonstrated to be nonverbal behavior. Tepper and Haase (1978) have suggested it is the strongest source of variance. Others (Claiborn, 1979; Fretz, Corn, & Tuemmler, 1979; Lacrosse, 1975; Strong, Taylor, Bratton, & Loper, 1971) have suggested it is simply an important aspect of communication outcome. More moderate views (Nagala, Nay, & Seidman, 1983; Seay & Altekruse, 1979) suggested that neither verbal nor nonverbal behaviors are properly understood without consideration of the interaction between the two.

Due to the potential of nonverbal interaction to confound the perceptions of raters in an experiment involving viewing a supervision session, raters received only brief glimpses of the trainee on the stimulus tapes. Additionally, the supervisor was shown only from the mid-trunk upward during the majority of his or
her verbalizations, masking as many nonverbal behaviors involving the hands, legs, and lower body as possible.

Statistical Hypotheses

Three research questions were framed. The first asked if there was a relationship between rater perception of the supervisor as expert, as attractive, and as trustworthy, and supervisor verbal response condition. The second asked if there was a relationship between rater satisfaction and supervisor verbal response condition. The third asked if there was a relationship between SRF and TPRS-R scores and a cluster of demographic variables including rater age, sex, level of degree pursuing, individual counseling experience, and experience as a supervisee. The questions are reframed below, in null hypothesis form, to permit statistical analysis.

Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant differences on SRF scores between verbal responding conditions 1, 2, and 3.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant differences on TPRS-R scores between verbal responding conditions 1, 2, and 3.

Hypothesis 3

There will be no relationship between demographic variables and SRF and TPRS-R scores.
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A one-way analysis of variance was employed to examine hypotheses 1 and 2. Hypothesis 3 was examined through use of linear regression. Following initial hypothesis testing, a factor analysis was performed on the SRF and the TPRS-R. A one-way analysis of variance was performed on these factors to determine the existence of significant differences. A confidence level of .05, typical of other similar studies, was employed.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

In Chapter III the results of statistical analyses conducted to test the procedures described in Chapter II are presented. They will be discussed in terms of implications for the original research questions and hypotheses, as well as post-hoc questions pertinent to the study and its implications.

Data Analysis

Three research questions were developed and were stated in null hypothesis form. Results of the analysis of the null hypotheses are presented here.

Hypothesis 1

There are no significant differences on SRF scores between verbal responding conditions 1, 2, and 3.

A one way analysis of variance was conducted on each of the three dimensions comprising the SRF (expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness). Descriptive statistics for this analysis are indicated in Table 2.
Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for SRF Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRF dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>49.49</td>
<td>15.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>31.51</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>50.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>49.86</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=37

Results of the analysis of variance are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3
Analysis of Variance of SRF Scores Between Reflective, Direct, and Random Condition Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRF dimension</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>6985.00</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>3925.00</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>6183.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05

N=37
df=2
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Significant differences between the three conditions were found. Based on these results, it was determined that the three supervisors were differentially perceived by the raters on dimensions measured by the SRF. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 2

There are no significant differences on TPRS-R scores between verbal responding conditions 1, 2, and 3.

A one way analysis of variance was conducted on each of the three dimensions comprising the TPRS-R (satisfaction with the supervisor and with the trainee, and overall level of comfort). Descriptive statistics for this analysis are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for TPRS-R Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPRS-R dimension</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with trainee</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall level of comfort</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=37
Results of the analysis of variance are shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance of TPRS-R Scores Between Reflective, Direct, and Random Condition Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPRS-R dimension</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>634.90</td>
<td>39.65</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with trainee</td>
<td>305.00</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall level of comfort</td>
<td>420.10</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<.05  
N=37  
df=2

Significant differences between the three conditions were found. Based on these results, it was determined that the three supervisors were perceived differentially by the raters on dimensions measured by the TPRS-R. The null hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

There is no relationship between demographic variables and SRF and TPRS-R scores.

A factor analysis was conducted on the variables of rater age, sex, level of degree pursuing, experience as an individual counselor, and experience as a supervisee (see Table 6).
Table 6

Factor Analysis of Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree pursuing</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a Counselor</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a Supervisee</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All other variables failed to reach the predetermined cutoff loading of ≥ + .70

One factor was retained, a combination of level of degree pursuing, counseling experience, and supervision experience. The common theme of this factor appears to be experience, as measured either by level of graduate study presently completing, and hours engaged in counseling or in supervision. Since this factor explained a greater percentage of variance than either of the three variables which comprised it, it was used for a regression analysis against SRF and TPRS-R scores. Regression analysis was run against the SRF dimensions of expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness and the "experience" factor. No dimension proved to be an accurate predictor of experience. Similarly, regression analysis was run against the TPRS-R dimensions of satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor, satisfaction with the performance of the trainee, and overall level of comfort. No dimension proved to be an accurate predictor of experience.
Summary of Rater Perceptions on SRF and TPRS-R Dimensions

Results thus far have supported the rejection of null hypotheses 1 and 2. These results are further summarized below, for each instrument.

SRF

Analysis of the results obtained indicated that the direct responding supervisor was perceived as more expert than either the reflective supervisor ($F = 36.85, p = .0000$) or the random responding supervisor ($F = 72.08, p = .0000$). There was no significant difference between the reflective and random supervisors on the expertise dimension ($F = 1.94, p = .17$).

When examined on the attractiveness dimension, no difference was found between the reflective and direct supervisors ($F = .87, p = .35$). Both were found to be superior to the random supervisor.

When examined on the trustworthiness dimension, the direct supervisor was found to be superior to the reflective ($F = 11.13, p = .0013$) and random responding supervisor ($F = 72.00, p = .0000$). The reflective supervisor was perceived as superior ($F = 22.97, p = .0000$) to the random responding supervisor.

Results of the analysis of variance indicate that the supervisor using the direct method of responding to trainee verbalizations was perceived by raters as more expert and more trustworthy than the supervisors using the reflective and random methods, but equal in attractiveness to the reflective responding supervisor.
The direct responder was perceived as more attractive than the random responder. The reflective responder was found to be more trustworthy than the random responder, more attractive, but not more expert. The random responder was not rated superior to the other supervisors on any dimension.

TPRS-R

Analysis of the results obtained indicated that raters were more satisfied with the performance of the direct responding supervisor than either the reflective ($F = 32.09, p = .0000$) or random responding supervisor ($F = 87.76, p = .0000$). The reflective supervisor's ratings for satisfaction were superior to those of the random responder ($F = 5.73, p = .0193$).

Raters were more satisfied with the performance of the trainee when she was working with the direct responder than with either the reflective ($F = 6.32, p = .0142$) or random responding supervisor ($F = 45.78, p = .0000$). They rated her higher when working with the reflective supervisor than with the random responding supervisor ($F = 23.63, p = .0000$).

Rater overall level of comfort with the supervision process was higher for the direct responding condition than for either the reflective ($F = 17.70, p = .0001$) or random condition ($F = 59.48, p = .0000$). The reflective condition was found to be superior to the random condition ($F = 10.12, p = .0022$).

Analysis of the results indicated that the direct supervisor was rated higher on all dimensions of the TPRS-R than the reflective
or random responding supervisors. The reflective supervisor was, in turn, rated higher on all dimensions than the random responding supervisor.

Additional Analysis

While it was anticipated that significant differences between the three verbal responding conditions would exist for SRF and TPRS-R dimensions, it was important to further refine the results by examining the underlying factor structure of each questionnaire. This was done in order to determine if they measured what they purported to measure. In the following section the makeup of the factor structure for each instrument is discussed.

SRF Factors

Prior research (Barak & LaCrosse, 1975) indicated that the SRF was composed of three factors: rater perception of the person being rated as expert, as attractive, and as trustworthy. A different factor structure was found in this investigation.

Examination of factors for the reflective responding condition indicated a total of eight factors. Six factors were found for the direct responding condition, and six factors were found for the random responding condition.

For the reflective condition, the first factor was composed of two items, both of which had been reported to be measures of trustworthiness. Factor 2 was composed of two items, both measuring
attractiveness. Factor 3 was composed of six items, all of which measured expertise. Five other factors emerged, each composed of only a single item or multiple items not exceeding a factor loading of plus or minus .70.

Six factors were found for the random responding condition. The first, composed of eight items, contained seven items measuring expertise, and one measuring trustworthiness. The second contained six items, five measuring attractiveness, one measuring trustworthiness. All other factors were composed of single items, or of multiple items not exceeding a factor loading of plus or minus .70.

In summary, for the reflective condition, the three factors found approximated the earlier reported factor structure of expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. A single factor was found for the direct responding condition, which appeared to measure trustworthiness. For the random responding condition, two factors appeared to measure expertise and attractiveness, respectively.

**TPRS-R Factors**

The factor structure obtained for this instrument differed in many regards from that earlier noted by Holloway and Wampold (1984). The first factor for both the reflective and direct conditions appeared to be identical to the factor noted by Holloway to measure satisfaction with the supervisor. The exception to this is that question 7, reportedly a measure of overall comfort, appeared in the first factor for the direct responding condition. The first factor
found in the random responding condition was completely unlike the first factors of either Holloway's study or the present study. It was composed of two items purported to measure overall comfort, and one purported to measure satisfaction with the trainee's performance.

Understanding of the remaining factors is considerably less clear. Factor 2 for the reflective condition was composed of one item measuring overall comfort, and one item measuring satisfaction with trainee performance. Factor 2 for the random condition was composed of a single item measuring satisfaction with the supervisor.

Factor 3 for the reflective condition was limited to one item measuring overall comfort. For the random condition, it was composed of one item measuring satisfaction with the trainee, and one item measuring overall comfort.

In summary, results indicated that one meaningful factor emerged for further analysis, it being a measure of satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor for the reflective condition and the direct condition.

Analysis of Emerged Factors

Due to the apparent weakness of the factor structures obtained for the research instruments, a decision was made not to make further use of scores for the original dimensions of the SRF and the TPRS-R. It was believed that such an analysis would be spurious in
many regards. Instead, the factors obtained in this investigation, when meaningful, were employed for final analysis.

As evidenced in Table 7, four factors emerged from items comprising the SRF and TPRS-R. These factors did not emerge for all three verbal responding conditions, however. The factors and their respective conditions were as follows: expertise (random, reflective); attractiveness (random, reflective); trustworthiness (direct, reflective); satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor (direct, reflective).

Table 7
Factors Obtained From the SRF and the TPRS-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor dimension</th>
<th>Verbal condition appearing in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Random reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>Random Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Direct Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>Direct Reflective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Linear Regression
Each of these factors was regressed against the experience factor. Results are shown in Table 8.
Table 8
Regression Analysis of SRF and TPRS-R Factors Against the Experience Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor and condition</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient with experience factor</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise (Random)</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise (Reflective)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness (Random)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness (Reflective)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53 - 01</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness (Direct)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17 - 01</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness (Direct)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor (Direct)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.35 - 02</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor (Reflective)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33 - 02</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=37
df=1,35

Analysis of the results indicated that the experience factor had no ability to predict the scores of each outcome factor. It was
concluded that rater level of degree pursuing, experience being supervised, and experience as an individual counselor had no effect upon the manner in which the raters perceived the supervisors in the three verbal responding conditions.

**Results of Analysis of Variance**

Although the attempt to explain factor structure through use of experience-related variables failed, it remained important to determine if the factors which could be said to have meaning differed significantly across verbal responding conditions. Where possible, pairwise comparisons were run, using analysis of variance. Table 9 depicts descriptive statistics for this analysis.

**Table 9**

Descriptive Statistics for SRF and TPRS-R Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness*</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise*</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness*</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor**</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Low scores are desirable.
**Note. High scores are desirable.
N=37
Results of the analysis of variance are shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Analysis of Variance for SRF and TPRS-R Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and conditions</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness (Random, Reflective)</td>
<td>4299.00</td>
<td>166.60</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise (Random, Reflective)</td>
<td>3584.00</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness (Direct, Reflective)</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.0226*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor (Direct, Reflective)</td>
<td>1993.00</td>
<td>84.20</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the results indicated that when comparing for attractiveness, the reflective supervisor was superior to the random responding supervisor. No comparison was possible for the direct responding supervisor.

When compared for expertise, the reflective supervisor was found superior to the random responding supervisor. No comparison was possible for the direct responding supervisor.

For trustworthiness, the reflective supervisor was found to be superior to the direct responding supervisor. No comparison was possible for the random responding supervisor.
When satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor was examined, the direct responding supervisor was found to be superior to the reflective supervisor. No comparison was possible for the random responding supervisor.
Thrity-seven masters and doctoral-level students served in an analogue experiment to determine if counselor supervisors making reflective, direct, or random responses to counselor trainee verbalizations would be differentially perceived by raters. And, if so, could the differences be accounted for by selected experience-related variables? Raters were presented with video tapes, each approximately 15 minutes in length, depicting excerpts of three supervisors working with the same trainee. In the present study, the methods of supervisor verbal responding were described as reflective, direct, and random. Raters evaluated each supervisor in terms of expertise, attractiveness, trustworthiness, satisfaction with the performance of the supervisor, satisfaction with the performance of the trainee, and rater overall level of comfort with the supervisor.

Initial evaluation indicated that the supervisor in the direct responding condition was perceived as more expert and more trustworthy than either the reflective or the random responding supervisor. She was perceived as equal in attractiveness to the reflective supervisor. Additionally, raters were more satisfied with her performance, indicated a higher overall level of comfort, and were more satisfied with the performance of the trainee when compared to the reflective and random responding supervisors.
Further examination at the factor level considerably clouded the obtained results. The factor structure of the SRF and the TPRS-R proved unstable, and did not allow comparisons of the three methods of verbal responding at the factor level. The two most useful comparisons, those between the reflective and direct supervisors, showed the reflective supervisor to be superior to the direct responder on a measure of trustworthiness. Analysis at the factor level showed the direct responding supervisor to be superior to the reflective supervisor on a measure of satisfaction with supervisor performance. An experience-related factor failed to account for any of these differences.

Discussion and Conclusions

The most disappointing aspect of this investigation was the failure of the SRF and the TPRS-R to produce stable and meaningful factors so that comparisons could be made on perceptual and satisfaction outcome scores for three models of responding to trainee verbalizations in supervision. The failure of the TPRS-R is perhaps the most easily understood. It is comprised of 12 items, themselves the results of a factor analysis of the original 32 items of the Client Personal Reaction Scale. It is possible that the small number of items comprising its present form make further factor analysis quite difficult. It is also noted that Holloway included factor items with loading exceeding plus or minus .35 in her factor study of the TPRS-R, whereas factors in the present study were
limited to those exceeding a factor loading of plus or minus .70. Post hoc analysis appeared to support the idea of excluding factor items with loadings below .70, as inclusion would have resulted in more items which appeared to belong to disparate dimensions of the original instrument. The process of making "sense" out of the factors would have been much more difficult than that already encountered.

A second question may be raised about the nature of both the SRF and the TPRS-R. It is unknown if either has been used before to rate conditions such as a "direct" manner of responding, or a "random" manner. It is possible that the instruments are not sensitive to the type of perceptions such conditions generate in raters.

It can be stated with some conviction that, within the limits of this study, the experimental method of direct responding had an impact upon the raters. Raters were more satisfied with the performance of the direct responder than with that of the other two supervisors. While perhaps of no surprise, it was also noted that raters uniformly rejected the performance of the random responding supervisor. It appeared that the raters were quite sensitive to the nature of the supervisors' responses in the stimulus tapes, even though trainee-supervisor interactions were often quite brief.

The results, though limited, were expected in many ways. While it was known that many of the types of responses employed in the "reflective" model were negative correlates of satisfaction in prior
naturalistic studies, it was unknown if such results could be reproduced in a controlled setting. Likewise, it was known that many of the types of responses used in the "direct" model were positive correlates of satisfaction from naturalistic settings. No prior studies had examined direct-type supervisor response styles at the level of stimulus and respondent verbalizations. The results of this study add credence, if falling considerably short of proof, to the assumption that responding to the intent of a trainee's verbalization (eg., giving information in response to a request for it) may enhance supervisory dyad satisfaction and leave the trainee with a more positive perception of the supervisor.

The failure of the experience factor to predict patterns of perception and satisfaction is puzzling in some ways. Research by Worthington and Stern (1985) had previously demonstrated that trainee perception of the supervisory relationship was affected by gender. Heppner and Roehlke (1984) found trainee satisfaction in supervision to be related to experience as a counselor, so there was some indication that such experience-type factors would influence these results.

This proved not to be the case. It may be that other variables will serve to predict dimensions of satisfaction, such as level of communication offered by the supervisor, or trainees' perceptions of their own instructional needs. Optimism for the discovery of causal factors can only be guarded, as this investigation, like many before it, produced interesting but unexplained results.
Limitations of the Study

As noted in Chapter I, a number of limitations have affected the outcomes and usefulness of this study. One major limitation was that the raters used in the experiment were masters and doctoral-level trainees in counselor education and counseling psychology. As such, their opinions and perceptions were not necessarily reflective of those of professional counselors or professional supervisors.

Great concern was taken to ensure that the raters were randomly sampled from the larger population of their peers at Western Michigan University. Given that the investigation did not rest upon a sample of convenience, it may be stated with some conviction that the results of this study are rather widely generalizable to other trainees at major institutions. There is no reason to believe that the responses of the raters employed in this study would be unlike those of trainees in similar programs.

Two major theoretical limitations were noted. First, the tapes viewed by the raters were analogue supervision sessions. This limitation was a necessary part of the experiment, it being designed to determine if manipulation of a supervisor's response to a trainee verbalization could cause differential perception of the supervisor. The study is also seen as limited in a second way by the fact that raters were not allowed to view complex chains of interactions between trainee and supervisor.
Theoretical and Practical Implications

The broadest implication of this study is that a consulting, nontherapeutic method of supervision, one in which a supervisor gives direct answers to questions posed by a trainee, may provide the trainee with a more satisfying supervisory experience. It is suggested that supervisors may do well to pay closer attention to what the trainee is asking for in supervision.

The impact of direct responding on rater perception was seen in another finding. Raters were asked to judge the performance of the trainee in this experiment. In examining original SRF and TPRS-R scores, it was noted that satisfaction with the trainee was higher in the direct responding condition than in the other conditions. This result was obtained even though the trainee made the same statements to each supervisor, with only the order of her statements varying. In no case was a trainee-supervisor-trainee interaction observed, so there was no chance for raters to observe how the trainee would react to the supervisor's response.

It appears that the net effect of direct responding was to influence the entire gestalt of the supervisory interchanges being viewed. Its influence was broad to the point of extending itself positively to perception of the trainee.

Some caution must be taken with any suggestion that a model of supervision should be based on what has herein been termed "direct" responding. As noted earlier, research by Heppner and Roehlke (1984) indicated that satisfaction in members of a beginning
practicum was related to the supervisor focusing on skill acquisition. Advanced practicum trainees valued supervisors who offered alternative conceptualizations of client problems. Interns valued supervisors who allowed them to address personal issues. While this study differed by finding no causal link between experience and ratings, Heppner and Roehlke appear to raise an important developmental issue. It may be beneficial to use direct responses with trainees with relatively little counseling or supervision experience. It may also be these trainees who make the most statements conducive to a direct response by the supervisor.

Of a more practical and realistic nature, it must also be stated that the direct responder did not make only direct responses. Examination of the tape indicates that she often acknowledged what the trainee was saying, by means of a mild reflection or summary, before giving her direct response. This same pattern is somewhat true also for both the reflective and random responding supervisors. In this regard, all of the supervisors shared a certain similarity in the manner in which they formulated their verbal responses. It should be suggested that the real power of direct responding may lie in the fact that, as practiced in the present study, it is composed of both an acknowledgement of the trainee's concerns and a highly focused response true to the original intent of the trainee's question or statement.

Direct responding is an issue which is ripe for further discussion and research by the two major schools of supervision, the
didactic-cognitive and the experiential. As Lambert (1974) noted, the day-by-day performance of a trainee may be enhanced by a didactic approach, while long-term effectiveness may be "more directly related to the level of (facilitative) conditions in the supervisory relationship" (p.60). It is anticipated that supervisors in the didactic-cognitive school may embrace the implications of this study, while those of the experiential school may reject them as oversimplified or not providing sufficient depth of analysis in supervision. Others of a more eclectic viewpoint may not perceive any basic rift between the two schools, and chose to use a direct method of responding when it appears useful for their purposes.

The point here is to neither reject didactic methods, nor to shun a therapeutic model of supervision. It appears that both schools would do well to heed Holloway and Hosford’s (1983) conclusion that supervisors are often less knowledgeable of the effects of their interventions than would be ideal.

Results of this study may also be of interest to those who examine dyadic interactions out of a stochastic model, one in which moment-by-moment verbal interchanges are examined for the effect they have upon future exchanges. Research by Hountras and Redding (1969) and Gade and Matuschka (1973) showed that counselor trainees trained in analyzing verbal interactions, using the same categories to classify statements which were used in this investigation, were less directive in their methods of influence, and less controlling...
than their Rogerian-trained counterparts. It may be implied that learning to recognize the nature of a trainee verbalization and respond directly to it decreases any subjective feeling on the part of the trainee of being overly controlled by the supervisor. It may improve trainee perceptions, particularly in the early stages of the supervisory relationship, that their own needs are being recognized and met.

It may appear, at first glance, that the findings of this investigation imply that the supervisor should remain in a passive role, one of asking for elaboration, or providing information, opinion, or suggestions at the behest of the trainee. Rather, it is suggested that the supervisor can more successfully orient the flow of verbal interchanges toward elaboration, opinion, insight, or problem solving, by remaining in a respondent position than by entering the supervisory hour with unprompted questions or overt attempts to control the interaction. Common sense indicates that most trainees, whose subordinate positions are rife with apprehension and anxiety, desire being valued as much as counseling clients. To listen to their thoughts first, then to guide supervision by specific direct requests for elaboration of ideas and insights would appear highly desirable. Should the results of other research be believed, this is not often found in the reality of the supervisory hour. A ground rule which states "answer a question not with a question, not with a reflection, but with a response which matches the intent of the question" may appear overly simple. It appears that in some cases it may be quite necessary.
Recommendations for Further Research

This investigation may be seen as the second step in a three step process. Other investigators discovered the link between what has been called direct responding and satisfaction by members of the supervisory dyad. Their observations were correlational in nature. This study was the first known attempt to determine if the naturally observed phenomena in research conducted by those such as Holloway could be replicated under controlled conditions. The next step would appear to be to train counseling supervisors in the methods of verbal analysis, and then to replicate this experiment in a naturalistic setting.

Should this be accomplished, a wide variety of supervision styles would be available for comparison. These would include, but would not be limited to, Rogerian, cognitive, psychoanalytic, rational emotive, developmental, and object relations approaches.

As seen in this study, careful attention will have to be paid to the outcome instruments employed. It is possible that the conclusions of this study may have been much stronger had the SRF and the TPRS-R maintained their factor integrity.

There is an ethical consideration in a study such as this one. Findings were strongly suggestive of the notion that perception and satisfaction can be manipulated quite easily by the use of certain types of responses. Little value can be seen in an attempt to raise one's ratings at the exclusion of providing trainees with a setting conducive to learning, exploration, and growth as a therapist. It
would appear to be exceptionally valuable to determine if use of a direct type of responding would enhance learning or enhance the rapidity of skill acquisition. This should be the ultimate focus of future investigations.
Questionnaire

There are five possible answers to each item in the questionnaire. They are:

1. Not characteristic of my feelings about the supervision session.
2. Slightly characteristic of my feelings.
3. Moderately characteristic of my feelings.
4. Quite characteristic of my feelings.
5. Highly characteristic of my feelings.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on the computer answer sheet for each question, answering about your feelings on the supervision session you just observed. Please do not write on this questionnaire.

Question #

1. I sometimes felt like the trainee was being put on the spot.
2. I gained more respect for supervision as a result of observing this supervisor.
3. At times, I would have hesitated to tell the supervisor what I was really thinking, had I been the trainee.
4. I sometimes resented the supervisor's attitude toward the trainee.
5. Many of the things the supervisor said really hit the nail on the head.
6. Sometimes the supervisor seemed to twist around the things said by the trainee to mean something different than what the trainee intended.
7. I got irritated at some of the supervisor's remarks.
8. The supervisor's attitude gave me hope that I can really get something out of supervision.
9. I was eager to hear what the supervisor had to say.
10. I don't know exactly why, but I would have felt nervous during the interview, had I been the trainee.
Question #
11 Sometimes, after the supervisor said something, I believe the trainee just couldn't think of any response.
12 I felt the supervisor wanted the trainee to come to some conclusions about the client, but I didn't know exactly what.

Below you will find a number of pairs of adjectives. The adjectives are opposites of each other. Your task is to determine which part of the range (1 to 7) between each pair best describes the supervisor you have just observed. Continue to mark your answers on the computer answer sheet. Please do not write on this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</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>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illogical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbiased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignorant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disrespectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unappreciative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>casual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>insightful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>compatible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>skillful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>agreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>形容词</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>unreliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>confident</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>insincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>likeable</td>
<td>unlikeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>unprepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>analytic</td>
<td>diffuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

150 Please indicate your age category on the computer answer sheet.

1 = 20 to 25 years
2 = 26 to 30 years
3 = 31 to 35 years
4 = 36 to 40 years
5 = 41 years or older

151 Please indicate your sex.

1 = male
2 = female

152 Please indicate the degree you are presently working on.

1 = M.A.
2 = Ed.D.
Question #
153 Please indicate the category for the approximate number of hours you have completed in individual supervision.

1 = none
2 = 1 to 10 hours
3 = 11 to 25 hours
4 = 26 to 50 hours
5 = 51 to 100 hours
6 = 101 to 200 hours
7 = 201 to 300 hours
8 = 301 to 500 hours
9 = 501 hours or over

154 Please indicate the category for the approximate number of hours of actual individual counseling you have done. You may include individual counseling done during a practicum or internship.

1 = none
2 = 1 to 10 hours
3 = 11 to 25 hours
4 = 26 to 50 hours
5 = 51 to 100 hours
6 = 101 to 200 hours
7 = 201 to 300 hours
8 = 301 to 500 hours
9 = 501 hours or over

155 Please indicate your experimental control number. Ask the experiment supervisor for this number.
Appendix B

Trainee Statements
Trainee Statements

Opening Statement

I'd like to talk about my client, (name), today. Do you remember him from last time?

Trainee Asking for Clarification

You said something last session about his depression being his anger turned inward, and how that had a bad effect on his self-concept. I'm not sure I understand what you mean by that.

Trainee Giving Opinion

No, I'm not sure the guy isn't drinking too much. I really don't think he is. That's just my opinion. He doesn't seem to be the type. I mean, he talks a lot about going to church and that kind of thing, and he looks pretty clean cut. He just doesn't strike me as a big drinker.

Trainee Giving Suggestion

I'll tell you what would really help me here. I'd like you to observe us sometime through the one-way mirrors. I think that would help me figure out what it is I should be doing, or if I'm not doing something I should be doing. I'd like for you to do that.

Trainee Asking for Information

You said a couple of weeks ago that I needed to find out more about his family history. What kinds of things are important for me to find out about?

Trainee Making Self-Disclosure

It's just that when I get into this kind of stuff it makes me wonder if I'm really doing my job right. I worry about really understanding what the client is like outside of these sessions, you know? I wonder if my picture of him is accurate. (brief pause) I guess what I'm saying is that I wonder if this guy is pulling the wool over my eyes, or sucking me into his side of the story. It gets pretty confusing to me. Sometimes I wonder if I'm cut out for this type of work. That's pretty frightening too, after all the time and money you spend to go back to grad school and all. Sometimes I just don't know.
Trainee Asking for Opinion

When he talks about wanting to hurt himself or something, I get the impression that he doesn't really mean it. What do you think?

Trainee Asking for Suggestion

What I was wondering, then, was where do you start with a guy like this. He's got several problems, and when I try to get him to talk about one, he switches to another. Like, if I ask him about his job search, he goes off onto his arguments with his wife. I mention that, and he talks about being depressed. Where do you go with a guy like this?

Trainee Asking for Evaluation of Supervision

How do you think we're doing in terms of understanding him?

Trainee Giving Information

I'm a little puzzled about him. He came in pretty upset yesterday, sort of depressed. He didn't have any suicidal thoughts or anything. But he seems really down. Remember, he lost his job about a month ago and hasn't been able to find any work. He and his wife are arguing about it a lot, and I think he's been drinking more than usual lately.

Trainee Giving Evaluation of Supervision

There's still a few things I need to understand better. I think we're doing a pretty good job. I think we've done good with looking at the part depression plays in his life, I'm pleased with that. Sometimes you and me, mainly me, we get off track. I think sometimes we wander off the subject too much. Overall, I'm pretty pleased, though.

Trainee Praise for Supervisor

I think that's a really neat idea, I hadn't thought about asking him to do that. I like that idea a lot.

Trainee Defensiveness

I don't understand why you said that. I know it's one thing to have some doubts about yourself. I wasn't telling you that I felt like my client was too much for me to handle, though. I think I can do the job. I know I can do the job.
Trainee Giving Clarification

That's a hard question, I guess I don't exactly know what I mean by "depression." Let me think about that for a second. (brief silence) Well, his mood seems down, pessimistic. It's like he thinks that nothing will change and he's got a pretty rotten future to look forward to. So that's one thing, his mood is down. He's not suicidal, in fact he says that killing yourself is a stupid way to avoid solving your problems. His affect is sort of dull, if you know what I mean. Like bland, nothing strikes him as funny. No sense of humor. Oh, he talks about not being able to enjoy anything, even the things he used to really like. Like fishing, going to movies, that sort of thing. His movements seem sort of slow also, kind of like it's a struggle for him to get up out of the chair at home to turn the channel on the tv. He also said he was pretty irritable, kind of prone to do the "kick the dog" syndrome when he comes home from looking for work. All of that stuff is what I was talking about when I said I thought he was depressed.

Trainee Silence

(No trainee verbalizations.)
Appendix C

Informed Consent
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this research is to examine the verbal interaction between counseling supervisors and counseling trainees.

Procedures: Subjects will view a series of three video tapes, each fifteen minutes in length, in which a counseling trainee and a counseling supervisor are discussing a client. At the end of each video tape, each subject will be asked to rate the supervisor on several dimensions of his or her performance by use of a paper and pencil questionnaire.

Confidentiality: The data collected in this experiment will be held in confidence. The published dissertation will not contain any subject names, and only age categories, gender, and level of enrollment (masters or doctoral program) will be included with the data.

Participation: Participation in this research is voluntary. Volunteers may cease participation at any time, and may have all data from their participation excluded from published results. Participation in the experiment will in no way affect the student status of the participant.

Faculty supervision: Professor Robert Betz, Ph.D., is the research supervisor for the study.

I have had an opportunity to review and ask questions regarding my participation in the research project described above. I agree to voluntarily participate in the research project as a subject. This informed consent expires as of 12/1/86.

Signed: ____________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________
Statement to Subjects

Today you will view three video tapes. They are excerpts from hour-long supervision sessions between three professional supervisors and a counselor trainee. The trainee had met with each supervisor for supervision sessions on two prior occasions. Each supervisor has been provided with a complete case record of the client being discussed. The case record contains progress notes, test results, and a psycho-social history.

The counselor trainee had previously been trained to make certain statements about the client when signaled by a light which was outside of the supervisor's viewing range. The supervisors were unaware of the signaling technique. Each supervisor had been asked to conduct the session as they normally would.
Appendix E

Letter to Subjects
Dear CECP Student:

Your name has been randomly chosen from a list of graduate students in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University, to participate in a research study on the relationship between counselor trainees and their supervisors. The study is being sponsored by the Center for Counseling and Psychological Services.

Participants will view three fifteen minute video tapes, each excerpted and edited from hour-long supervision sessions between a professional supervisor and a counseling trainee. You will be asked to fill out a questionnaire after viewing each tape. A total of ninety minutes of your time will be required.

I have attached a list of the times the video tapes will be shown during the first week of November. Please choose a time that is convenient for you, and keep the list as a reminder of the date and time you will view the tapes. Tapes will be shown in the conference room of the CPS clinic, located in 3109 Sangren Hall.

Please take a moment to fill out the questions below, and return them in the enclosed, stamped envelope. Please keep your copy of the scheduled times for viewing the tapes.

Yours,

Robert Betz, Ph.D.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


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


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


