

2-341

852

~~20~~

~~R 245~~

~~R 268~~

~~R 282~~

~~R 291~~

~~R 300~~

~~R 216~~

~~R 229~~

~~D-09~~

DEDICATION

For my brother Ed, who lived more lifetimes than ten of me, who so loved life he never said "No" to it, who left dozens in the realization of love they'd never realized was everyday there; who knew of death before it took him - yet smiled in the knowing, and who touched irrevocably everyone he ever looked upon. This paltry yet impassioned effort, Ed, is my quest for flight and freedom, in memory of you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of a doctoral dissertation is the embodiment of much more than finishing a research exercise. It is the cap on a lengthy trek through a maze of courses, tests, papers, teachers, regulations, forms and feelings. It is a rite of passage.

During one's course through the graduate training program, sustenance is essential to survival - survival of the will. The sustenance required varies according to individual need. Those who were sustaining to me, may or may not know they were so. I would like to let them know.

Bill Kell, the Guru, for his wisdom, patience, love and agelessness of vision.

Jerry Casey, for his anger, indignation, and creative courage. His being is his excellence.

Gary Stollak, for his casual disdain for ritual, his availability and modest militance for belief in one's own assets.

Bert Karon, for his brilliance in knowing, living, and making sense of "id."

Dozier Thornton, for his gentle strength, his insistence on going beyond the apparent, and his aloofness from, yet aspiration for greatness.

i

a

r

b

h

i

h

p

i

h

u

A

w

Will Durant, for his admonition that "Literary immortality is but a moment in geologic time."

Richard Pierce, for his fierce belief in lonely creation and his willingness to "let you in" if you asked.

Sam Plyler, for his gifts of giving when knowledge of return was distant.

Spaulding Rogers, for his mordant wit, unrewarded brilliance and abiding love for man.

Tom Gartland, for his rich sea of pulsing good and bad, his sadness-humor-love, his modest but unmistakable intelligence, and his boundlessly predictable unpredictability.

Bob McElhose, for his artistry, compassion and commitment to ecstasy.

Lynne, for her loving companionship, her untracked psychic depths, her magnificent fecundity and her wisdom in connubial investment.

Walter and Montez Paskowsky for their excellence as humans and for being where they were when they were.

R. V. and I. J. Does for their devotion, patience and unswerving faith.

Liz, Jerry, Pete and Kathy for their love and selves.
And Warren for his "Warrenness".

My clients and trainees, for giving me as much as they were given.

Gwen Norrell for her richness of soul, her spirit and her youth unceasing.

My fellow interns, for their shared pain, joy and listening.

Richie and Jamie, for fulfilling me in ways no one else ever has. And for the innocence and love.

Sue Jennings, for her integrity, poetic spirit, and love for life.

For Hermann Hesse, who said: "I either had to write (this) or be reduced to despair; it was the only means of saving me from nothingness, chaos, and suicide. (This) was written under this pressure and brought me the expected cure, simply because it was written, irrespective of whether it was good or bad. That was the only thing that counted."

For Bob Dylan, Bobby Darin, Lee Erlandson, Alan Watts, Robert Gover, N. Kazantzakis, C. S. Lewis, Ken Kesey, Terry Southern, Lenny Bruce, H. S. Sullivan, W. D. Fairbairn, W. Cosby, J. Bugental, N. Simone, C. Moustakas, M. Gieszer, Aldous Huxley, M. G. and L. Walther, Don Rickles, Tom Paine, Ayn Rand, Milan and Beth Divina, Wayne Perkins and a myriad of other compelling and incorporated men and women who have been cascades of meaning to and for my life.

Thank you all. And to those of you whom I have in the crush of time and dullness of memory forgotten, forgive me. I shall recall you soon and do have you with me now.

ABSTRACT

A PROCESS ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISION IN PSYCHOTHERAPY/COUNSELING TRAINING: ON THE DIMENSIONS OF INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION, CONFLICT CONFRONTATION, AND LEVELS OF SUPERVISOR OFFERED CONDITIONS

By

Richard Bowditch Does

The purpose of this study was to investigate the bearing of distortions in interpersonal perception on conflicts and supervisor confrontations of trainees in psychotherapy supervision. Also evaluated was the relationship between different levels of supervisor offered facilitating conditions (i.e., Empathy, Regard, Genuineness, and Concreteness) and types and frequency of supervisor initiated confrontations (i.e., Experiential, Didactic, Strengths, Weaknesses, Encouragement to Action) of their trainees. Extent of prior supervisor training experience and trainee expectations of supervision were related in a post-hoc manner to the results of the major investigated areas.

It was hypothesized that (1) disagreement between supervisor perceptions of trainees and trainee self-perceptions would be a major source of supervisory conflict,

as measured by frequency or supervisor initiated experiential confrontation (challenging the trainee with a perception at variance with the trainee's perception) of trainees; (2) that over two terms of supervision trainee self-perceptions would shift (if initially at variance) to parallel supervisor perceptions of trainees; and (3) that the content of experiential confrontations would tend to parallel the content of the areas of disagreement between the supervisors' perception of the trainees and the trainees' self-perception.

The participants in the study were Michigan State University Counseling staff members and doctoral level students enrolled in the practicum series offered at the Counseling Center. Their sessions were audio-tape recorded in total during the first practicum term and in part (last sessions) during the second term. Correlational analysis of the obtained data was applied and patterns among the applied measures were presented and discussed.

The following results were obtained:

(1) Discrepancies between trainees' self-perception and supervisors' perception of trainees were not confirmed as the major source of conflict in supervision. It appeared, rather, that for this sample, distortions in trainee perceptions of their supervisors was the main source of supervisory conflict according to the measures utilized.

(2) In parallel fashion, the results did not support the hypothesis that trainee self-perceptions would shift over time to more closely parallel their supervisors' perceptions of them.

(3) Statistical support was given the hypothesis that high facilitating supervisors would more frequently, than low facilitators, experientially confront their trainees.

(4) Extent of prior supervisor training experience was not consistently related to rated level of facilitation conditions.

Overall, it appeared that, as a group, the confrontation patterns displayed by supervisors rated high on the facilitating conditions, were quite similar, whereas the low facilitative supervisors, as a group, displayed considerably more variability in their confrontation patterns. Further research to assess the generality of the findings was suggested.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	
PREFACE	
LIST OF TABLES	
LIST OF APPENDICES.	
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHOD	13
Subjects	13
Interview with subjects.	15
Pertinent trainee background information	15
Pertinent supervisor background information.	18
Training Setting	19
Data Gathering	20
Tests administered	21
Leary Interpersonal Check List.	22
Test administration procedure and rationale	22
Supervisor Outcome rating scale	24
Trainee outcome rating scale.	25
Summary of investigatory procedures---atten- dant hypotheses.	25
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	28
Tape Analysis and reliability.	28
Supervisor Offered Conditions	28
Supervisor Initiated Confrontations	28
Leary Codings	29
Hypothesis I: Shifts in trainee self- ratings	31
Shifts in supervisor self-ratings	33
Hypothesis II: Supervisor experiential con- frontations	37
Supervisor Other confrontations	39

	Page
Hypothesis IIa: Content of supervisor experiential confrontations.	42
Hypothesis III: Supervisor Offered conditions and frequency of confrontations.	52
Post Hoc Analysis.	58
IV. DISCUSSION AND SPECULATIONS.	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	67
APPENDIX	
A Questions Asked Trainees in Pre-Supervision Interviews	71
A1 Questions Asked Supervisors in Pre-Supervision Interviews	72
B Verbatim Report of Supervisor's Responses to Selected Standard Interview Questions	73
C The Interpersonal Check List	77
D Supervisor and Trainee Self and Other ICL Ratings by Terms	78
E Rated Levels of Supervisor Offered Conditions.	79
F Discrepancy Score Indicated Changes in ICL Ratings Between First and Second Term.	80
G Outcome Scales (by Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions).	81
H Experiential Confrontations by Session and Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Discrepancies in Trainee Self-Ratings vs. Supervisor Ratings of Trainees	32
2. Discrepancies Between Trainee ICL Self- Rating and Supervisor ICL Rating of Trainee as a Function of Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions.	34
3. Discrepancies Between Supervisor ICL Self-Rating and Trainee ICL Rating of Supervisor as a Function of Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions.	35
4. Discrepancies Between Trainee Self-Ratings vs Supervisor Ratings of Trainees By Total Number of Subsequent First Term Supervisor Initiated Experiential (and Other) Confrontations of Trainees.	38
5. Discrepancies Between First Term Super- visor Self-Ratings vs Trainee Ratings of Supervisors by Total Number of Sub- sequent First Term Experiential (and Other) Confrontations of Trainees.	40
6. Trainee-Self vs Supervisor-Trainee Ratings and Content of Experiential Confrontations	42
7. Categories of Trainee-Supervisor Self and Other Perception	46
8. High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Total Experiential Confrontations.	53
9. High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Total Didactic Confrontations.	54
10. High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Total Confrontations of Strengths.	55
11. High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Total Confrontations of Weakness	55

Table		Page
12.	High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Total Encouragement to Action.	56
13.	High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Ratio of Total Experiential to Total Weakness Confrontations.	56
14.	High-Low Facilitating Supervisors and Supervisor Shifts in ICL Self-Rating	57

A PROCESS ANALYSIS OF SUPERVISION IN
PSYCHOTHERAPY/COUNSELING TRAINING: ON THE
DIMENSIONS OF INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION, CONFLICT
CONFRONTATION, AND LEVELS OF SUPERVISOR OFFERED CONDITIONS

By

Richard Bowditch Does

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Social Science
Department of Psychology

1969

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Information currently available on the process and outcome of supervisory experience in the training of psychological counselors and psychotherapists suggests the importance of both didactic¹ and experiential instruction (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). The development in the trainee of high levels of "therapeutic conditions," e.g. empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967), is also deemed important, as is the emphasis that training candidates be possessed of personal qualities associated with psychotherapists/counselors who have success in working with their clients, e.g. a commitment to psychotherapy as a life's work and willingness and openness to change (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967); tolerance for ambiguity, i.e., cognitive flexibility (Whitely et. al., 1967), a high acceptance of others (Horsman, 1965); and among others, a perceptual set involving "an internal frame of reference,"

¹Investigators in the areas of "sub-professional" psychotherapy training (e.g. Stollak, 1968; Rioch, 1966) tend to emphasize adherence to primarily didactic training models and have evidence of successful training outcome on that basis.

"an orientation to people," and an "optimistic view of man" (Combs and Soper, 1963).

The foregoing summary briefly encompasses much of the published literature on psychotherapy training. Ostensibly, what is understood about the process of training at present is that successful outcome, i.e., the emergence of counselors/therapists who effect positive change in their clients, seems to be a function of (1) a motivated, reasonably intelligent, interpersonally sensitive, people-liking, trainee who is trusted to work with help-seeking humans in conjunction with (2) a supervisor who provides specific instruction on the tactics of therapeutic change (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967), who offers himself as a model of an effective therapist, who is willing to confront trainee anxiety and conflict in a genuine and realistic fashion and fosters a supervisory atmosphere which permits trainee self-exploration and experimentation, and freedom to err without fear of punitive retaliation (Kell and Mueller, 1966).

In a general sense, such understandings are valuable and comprehensive. However, by their very nature they remain as meta-statements regarding the makeup, course and conduct of the supervisory process. These "understandings" consist of extractions from observations and investigations

of various supervisory settings and training models and are, thereby, at least one step removed from the actual ongoing experience. Therefore, though existing information on supervision is substantive and perhaps consensual among informed readers, for the most part it tends to have little bearing on immediate ongoing, troublesome issues in the relationship between supervisor and trainee.

Not clearly explicated in existing literature on training procedures are the effect of differences in orientation as to how psychotherapy training should be conducted, the implication for supervision of disagreement among supervisors (and practitioners in general), the influence on trainee development of inconsistencies in supervisors' judgments as to what constitutes adequate or appropriate trainee therapy functioning,^{2,3} and the often observed, though seldom

²Howard and Correll in a survey of 283 different colleges and agencies engaged in counseling or psychotherapy training observed that "...widely divergent standards of training are being applied to virtually the same product. In one program a given behavior will be accepted at all levels of training, whereas in another setting that same behavior would not even be tolerated in the beginner" (1966, p. 80).

³Cutler (1953) as part of a psychotherapy study utilizing four "competent" Ph. D. psychotherapists (with supervisory experience ranging from 3-18 years) as raters of the relative adequacy with which two therapy trainees handled their clients, obtained inter-judge agreement figures ranging from $r = .04$ to $.19$ with a median of $r = .11$. The author concluded (1953, p. 38) that "the judges who did the adequacy ratings apparently had very different opinions about what constitutes an adequate response."

published, phenomenon of trainee/supervisor discontent and lack of progress with certain supervisory experiences, yet, elation and substantial growth with others.

Extra supervisory information on such subjects as different levels of supervisor skill, differential rates of maturity (of life processes and skills in general), the bearing of different perceptual styles on the definition of reality, the effects of semantic confusion on interpersonal transmissive and receptive communication, and the influence of personal therapy on trainee progress as a student therapist, as well as the effects of personal preference or liking for certain people over others, has some power for explaining why difficulties occur in supervisor-trainee communication, why some trainees progress better with some supervisors than others (and vice-versa), and why supervisors disagree in defining and rating "adequate" trainee functioning. But, it would seem, the answers are incomplete.

The purpose of this study was to analyze in depth a small sample of ongoing supervisory relationships with the goal of clearer demarcation of some of the relationship variables critical to the training process and associative with satisfactory training outcome. By focusing close attention on the complexities of a small sample of supervisory

relationships, it was hoped that a clearer picture of crucial variables would be generated. In particular, this study was addressed to conflict confrontation and determining the variables associated with conflict resolution between supervisor and trainee. Essential concepts relative to this effort were (1) discrepancies in interpersonal perception, (2) confrontation of discrepancies in interpersonal perception, and (3) genuineness and clarity (concreteness) of communication.

Recent studies (Berenson, Mitchell and Moravec, 1968; Anderson, 1968) suggest that therapists operating at high levels of therapeutically facilitating conditions (i.e. empathy, regard, genuineness, concreteness) not only confront their clients more frequently than do low level therapists, but more constructively, i.e. induce more frequent and intense levels of client self-exploration. Other reports (Pierce, Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Pagell, Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967) conclude that both counselors in training and clients converge, over time, upon the level of functioning of their counselor trainers. Carkhuff (1968, p. 120) says it plainer: "Trainees of high level functioning trainers demonstrate uniformly positive change; trainees of low- or moderate-level functioning trainers demonstrate little

no, or deteriorative change (in development of therapeutically facilitating capacity)." Studies such as these, and particularly the conclusions drawn from them by their authors, comprise a disquieting indictment of training programs which allegedly fail to provide for the teaching of the "facilitative conditions" proposed as essential to successful outcome both in clients and trainees.⁴

However, the issue of the universality of the Truax, Carkhuff, Berenson et. al. findings is not an unopen question. The extent of the generality from one or a series of counseling interviews of "high" levels of facilitative conditions has been questioned. Shapiro (1968), with reference to research findings in the area of person perception that behavior is situationally determined, found that the ratings of "therapeutically facilitating" behavior of sixteen clinicians in standardized interview situations varied according to who was doing the ratings. The author noted that self-ratings,

⁴Carkhuff observes (1968, p. 121): "Lay training programs are by and large, simple, rather homogeneous... (and) ...built around the core conditions of understanding, regard and genuineness, both in their didactic teaching for helping and the experiential base provided the trainee. By contrast, the professional training programs are highly complex, heterogeneous, often apparently self-neutralizing admixtures of science and art and research and practice, often with little to bridge the yawning gap."

professors' ratings, peer ratings and interviewees' ratings were insignificantly correlated with genuineness, empathy, warmth, evaluation and potency. Only on the dimension of "activity" were the ratings significantly correlated. The author suggested "that the more passive counselor may be unable to communicate those therapeutic attitudes which he does feel (Shapiro, 1968), "and perhaps more interestingly from the standpoint of supervision, "student clinicians (seem to) behave with a standard interviewee in the same manner as they do with peers themselves, and that professors elicit a completely different set of behaviors (Shapiro, 1968, p. 349)." The latter observation, particularly for "professional" training programs, where the trainee has been accustomed to the kind of diffuse, abstract and not unusually, contradictory, educational atmosphere, implies that the trainee's experiences in his supervisory relationships are crucial to his development as a counselor.

That a closer look at the dimensions of ongoing supervisory relationships in professional settings is important, is born out by such findings as Gabbert et. al. (1967, p. 34) that "much counseling research which does not achieve statistical significance may be the result of inadequate consideration of individual differences among counselors, or possibly,

even among clients" and through extrapolation, between supervisors and trainees.

The problem therefore chosen for this investigation was that of studying the manner in which interpersonal perceptual distortions (conceivable of as "transference" and "counter-transference" distortions between trainee and supervisor) get or do not get, resolved and the subsequent effects on the process and outcome of supervision. A major supposition is that variations in "perceptions" of student therapists by different supervisors are a function of the supervisors' differential responses to the same or different aspects of the students' behavior. Such response differentiation may be a function of varying perceptivity in the supervisors themselves, of varying supervisor nomenclature use or theoretical stance, or of selectively attending to different aspects or levels of the trainees' behavior. More possibilities could be suggested.

However, it is the author's contention that regardless of how the supervisor is perceiving the student or of what aspect or level of the trainee's behavior he is responding to, that the supervisory relationship can be fruitful (a) if the supervisor genuinely confronts the trainee with what he is responding to in the trainee and how he is perceiving (feeling, experiencing, understanding, etc.) what he is

responding to; and (b) if the trainee is sufficiently flexible and open to such a confrontation. Further, it is the author's contention that although the perception participant A has of participant B may be erroneous as far as participant B is concerned, participant A will continue to maintain the perception, (and undoubtedly react to B in accordance with the perception), so long as it is not openly disclosed by him or elicited by the action of the other participant. More simply, so long as the discrepancy in interpersonal perception is maintained, an unclarified conflict will persist. Or the reverse: an unclarified conflict reflects a discrepancy in interpersonal perception.

The essence of this argument is: if you hold to a perception of me which differs from the perception I hold of myself, or vice-versa, then our relationship, our interaction is distorted--or circumscribed. Assuming our communication is genuine and we are open to altering or modifying our perceptions of each other in the light of added information, we can clarify the distortion. To the extent that genuineness or openness to changing perception is absent, or is tentative, distortion will be maintained. If both participants are closed to changing their perceptions, the distortion will (or can) be maintained equally. If one member is closed to modifying his view, and the other is open, the weight of the distortion maintenance will be on the shoulders of the closed member.

Where there are power differentials in a relationship-- as in supervision, where implicitly if not explicitly, the supervisor is in charge, the trainee dependent (in an evaluative sense)-- the member with the greater power holds the key to the maintenance of genuine, open to change, communication.

Personal experience and observation have indicated to the author that certain supervisory relationships (or any relationship for that matter) are not always satisfactory to the participants, yet the individual participants often experience success in other supervisory situations. Perhaps among combinations of individuals, variations in mutual perceptual accuracy, genuineness of communication and openness to alteration of initial perceptions bears on why some relationships are more productive than others.

Specifically in this study we were interested in examining (1) how supervisors "perceive" (i.e. personify, identify, label) their trainees as functioning humans, in contrast to or in conjunction with (2) how the trainees "perceive" themselves and vice-versa, and (3) investigating how dissonant "perceptions" (i.e. where a supervisor identifies a trainee differently from the trainee's identification of himself) are manifested in the supervisory process. Corollary to this was an appraisal of what supervisor qualities

facilitate breaching and mediating dissonant "perceptions" such that both participants come to "perceive" each other more clearly--whether they come to "agree" with their "perceptual" appraisals of one another or not.

Our thesis is that if a trainee perceives himself in a manner discrepant from his supervisor's perception of the trainee (or vice-versa) then this discrepancy represents a potential conflict in their relationship. Subsidiary to this thesis is the assumption that mutually genuine confrontation of discrepancies in interpersonal perception between the participants is essential for conflict resolution and necessary for satisfactory supervisory outcome.⁵

It has been noted (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) that in psychotherapy research, the therapist is best viewed as the variable for investigation, the client as the given or constant. We shall take the analogous view in this study and

⁵ A recent study indicated that "confrontation, defined as the therapist's pointing out a discrepancy between his own and his client's way of viewing a situation, was found to be related to increased client self-exploration when accompanied by high levels of (empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, and self-disclosure). Under low levels of these conditions, confrontation was never followed by increased self-exploration" (Anderson, 1968, p. 411).

focus our primary attention on the supervisor as the agent of change in the trainee.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Nine beginning practicum students enrolled in the doctoral program in counseling psychology at Michigan State University and their nine respective supervisors from the staff of the Counseling Center at Michigan State University constituted the sample studied. All but one of the practicum student subjects had previously earned their MA's, three of them in Rehabilitation Counseling. Some of the subjects had taken previous graduate training at schools other than Michigan State University. However, each of them, in addition to considerable doctoral course work, had pre-practicum counseling training (a course which is taught both as a preparation for entrance into advanced counseling training and a screening procedure for evaluating candidates' qualifications for acceptance into the doctoral counseling program).

Seven of the nine supervisors in the study had earned their Ph.D's and two their MA's. The MA level supervisors were advanced interns on the staff of the Counseling Center.

Both were in the final stages of their doctoral program and completing their Ph.D. degrees, one in clinical psychology, the other in counseling psychology.

East of the nine trainees was initially assigned to be individually supervised, resulting in nine supervisor-trainee dyads. However, two of the supervisors in the sample decided to collaborate: their supervisory unit thereby contained two supervisors and two trainees meeting jointly for their training sessions. Since the basic units for analysis in this study were to be the individual supervisor-trainee pairs, the formation of the multiple supervisory tetrad reduced the number of independently functioning supervisory situations to eight; i.e., seven dyads and one tetrad.⁶

Seven of the nine trainees expressed no preference regarding supervisor assignment as they had never previously met and had no advance knowledge of the available supervisory staff in this sample. Two of the trainees requested assignment to particular supervisors on the basis of brief, casual prior contacts. The balance of the supervisory assignments were made on an essentially arbitrary basis by the staff member in charge of the practicum program, although the designating staff member did know all of the participants - both supervisors and trainees - and attempted to match them

⁶Two weeks after the study had begun, one of the dyadic supervisory pairs was dissolved, reducing the sample size to eight supervisors and eight trainees in six dyads and one tetrad.

according to his judgment of their potential compatability.

Three of the trainees were females; six male. Seven of the supervisors were male, two female. Five of the supervisory pairs were same sex matched: two were female-female pairs; three were male-male. One supervisory male-female pair was established, and the remaining supervisory combination consisted of three males and one female (the multiple supervisory situation).

Interview With Subjects

Prior to the start of the practicum supervision, the author conducted individual interviews with each of the participants to obtain relevant background information. Each of the trainees was asked the same questions as was each of the supervisors (see Appendices A and A₁ for a list of the respective questions).

Pertinent Trainee Background Information

Trainees ranged in age from 25 to 40: four were in their mid or later twenties, five were between 30 and 40.

Three were married, two with children of pre-teen or teen-age and one with an infant; four were single, and two were divorced. Each of the married or divorced trainees

had had periods of interruption in their graduate work during which time they had either been engaged in full time counseling psychotherapy or therapy related activities, and/or in the case of the women had intermittently remained at home to have and be with their children. Two of the single trainees had had virtually uninterrupted graduate work, and two had worked full time for one year in counseling settings between the completion of their MA's and the start of their Ph.D. program.

Five of the trainees had had or were currently involved in personal counseling or therapy. Of the remaining four, three began individual counseling subsequent to the start of supervision.

Their stated preferences for theories of, approaches to, or styles of conducting counseling/therapy were mainly eclectic - though all trainees indicated that a particular theory or approach tended to predominate in their counseling experience, e.g. "psychoanalytic", "social-learning", "Neo-Rogerian", "Ellisian". Trainee expressions as to felt adequacy of their present stage of development as a counselor varied from considerable doubt of self to extreme self-assurance.

Seven trainees were pursuing a Ph.D. in counseling psychology, one in educational psychology and one was undecided as to whether he wanted to complete a Ph.D. The trainees'

respective prior counseling/therapy training and/or experience varied from admittedly "quite limited" to avowedly "quite extensive". Four of the trainee subjects had had the majority of their prior training/experience with a college client population. The balance of the trainees had had previous training/experience with hospitalized, outpatient, or community clinic clients or with children. The extent of their described prior participation in and experience with supervision was variable: four reported previous supervision as ranging from virtually none or infrequent, and five indicated previous supervision as considerable and regular, i.e., commensurate with their training programs. Each of the five trainees reporting prior training under more than one supervisor also indicated varying degrees of satisfaction with their respective experiences and correspondingly implied (some more openly than others) varying "expectancies" with regard to their upcoming practicum supervision, e.g. optimism vs. skepticism. Those trainees reporting minimal prior supervision also expressed differential expectations for their imminent supervision, e.g. optimism vs. skepticism. Although with only two exceptions the trainees clearly expressed a desire for supervision to be a growth experience for them, some of the trainees were clearly optimistic toward, excited about, looking forward to, and less threatened by, apprehensive of, or fearful of the evaluative aspects inherent in,

the supervision of their counseling work.

Pertinent Supervisor Background Information

As noted previously, seven of the nine participating supervisors were Ph.D's; three of these were in clinical psychology, four in counseling psychology. Six of the seven Ph.D. supervisors had earned their degrees within the last two years; one had had his Ph.D. for five years at the time of the study. The two remaining supervisors were completing their Ph.D. requirements during the course of this investigation.

Eight of the nine participating supervisors had had extensive prior counseling/psychotherapy experience with a college population. Three (the two MA's and one Ph.D) of the supervisors had limited prior experience in counseling/psychotherapy training (0-3 trainees at MA-Ph.D level), four (all Ph.D's) had supervised from four to nine trainees prior to this study, and two (Ph.D's) had supervised 20 or more trainees.

All of the supervisors emphasized the training relationship and its interpersonal nature as crucial to the process of trainee growth in supervision. All stressed the importance of providing a supervisory atmosphere geared to

facilitating greater depth of trainee involvement with self and clients. All indicated reliance on a balance of didactic instruction and experiential (urging trainee self-reference vis a vis relationships with client and supervisor) focusing, with the level of emphasis appropriate to the level of trainee functioning (see Appendix B for a verbatim report of participating supervisors' responses to standard interview questions).

Training Setting

The advanced practicum program is a three term undertaking. Each of the nine supervisory pairs meets two hours weekly throughout each nine week term to discuss trainee problems and progress with their assigned counseling cases. The trainees are expected to have at least 20 contact hours with clients (singly or in combination) over each term. Each of the trainee counseling interviews was recorded and available for playback during each supervisory session. In addition to their individual supervision, the trainees all meet together once weekly with a staff member who conducts a group supervisory session, and once weekly with two other staff members who conduct a group therapy session geared to fostering greater openness and freedom of discussion, as well as mutual understanding, among the trainees. No attempt was

made to control for the influence of group supervision, group therapy or, for those trainees so involved, individual therapy, as the setting for the study was a naturalistic one. However, all of the trainees were exposed to the same group experiences and all were free to seek individual therapy. Hence, to a great extent their total training experience was similar - the individual trainees themselves and their individual supervisors remaining the distinct entities in the study.

Data Gathering

All of the nine participating supervisors and trainees agreed to have their weekly individual supervisory sessions tape recorded and made available for analysis. Anonymity of the participants was to be protected by erasure of all personal references and through assurance that the analysis of the tapes would not be undertaken until the participants had completed their practicum series.

The first practicum term for this sample ran from January to March, 1968 (Winter term), and the second from March to May, 1968 (Spring term). All of the individual supervision sessions held during the Winter term were recorded, while only the last two sessions of the Spring term were transcribed. Throughout these two terms it was expected

that each trainee would continue to be individually supervised by the same supervisor.⁷

No information was given the participants regarding the specific foci or goals of the study, although all were well aware in the more general sense that "what goes on" in supervision was obviously going to be looked at. As all of the participants had prior experience with audio recordings and/or visual observation of their therapy activities, it was assumed that the recording of their supervisory sessions would not constitute a major source of anxiety. Furthermore, as the participants, particularly the trainees, were aware that the investigator was a graduate student, the potential "evaluatory" onus of analyzing their training progress was diminished. Whether the same held true for the supervisors is not as readily assumed.

Tests Administered

Leary Interpersonal Checklist (See Appendix C) and Supervision Outcome Rating Scale--(Supervisor and Trainee Forms)-(see below).

⁷ Although the advanced practicum training series consists of three terms of supervision, typically there is a break (for summer) between the second and third terms and supervisor assignment often changes as staff members relocate or are reassigned. Hence, in the interest of studying continuity of trainee-supervisor development within manageable proportions, only the Winter and Spring terms of the practicum series was recorded.

Leary Interpersonal Checklist

Test Administration Procedures and Rationale

Early in the first term of supervision and again, late in the second term, the supervisor and trainee of each supervisory pair rated himself and his co-participant (Self- and Other-ratings) on the Leary Interpersonal Checklist. The self-rating involves what Leary defines as a "Level II Analysis": the individual's perception of his own interpersonal impact or stimulus value. The other-rating is referred to as a "Level I Analysis": a description of an individual's interpersonal impact on others.

Thereby was obtained from each supervisory pair, an initial (early first term) and a final (late second term) interpersonal perception profile: a picture of how the supervisors rated themselves on the ICL and how they rated their trainees; plus a picture of how the trainees rated themselves on the ICL and how they rated their supervisors.

Scoring of the ICL's filled out early in the supervision provided a basal index of how the participants in each supervisory pair perceived himself and each other. The final ICL ratings, when scored, reflected both an index of how the members of the supervisory pairs perceived themselves and one another after two terms, plus providing a basis for comparing the extent of change in Self and Other perception over the course of two terms of supervision.

The obtained ICL profiles provided a picture of the characteristic style of interpersonal functioning of each of the participants: (1) as they saw themselves, and (2) as perceived by their co-participant. The scored profiles reflect, relative to established norms, not only the dominant Self and Other perceived "style" of each participant, but also whether the "style" is flexible or rigid.⁸ Any discrepancies ("D" scores) between these Self and Other ratings were used as indices of potential conflict between the participants of each supervisory pair. That is, it was assumed that if supervisor A had a different perception of trainee B than trainee B had of himself (or vice-versa), then, given that supervision is a process involving the efforts of one or both participants to facilitate greater accuracy of self-perception ("congruence") of the other, and greater accuracy of mutual interpersonal perception in order to foster clarity of interpersonal communication, then, discrepancies between, for example, the trainee's perception

⁸Leary observes (1957, p. 243): "Variability is involved in almost every aspect of personality...conflict, ambivalence, defense mechanisms, growth, change, improvement in therapy--all these phenomena have the basic factor in common--one unit of measure varies in relation to another. It is a major thesis ...that all change phenomena are to a certain extent, functions of a general rigidity-oscillation factor...(which is)...measurable and predictable in terms of the time and the amount of variability. The amount and kind of variability...defines the type and intensity of conflict...(and the)...tendency to change or to maintain a rigid adjustment."

of himself and the supervisor's perception of the trainee, implies the potential for conflict when, or if, the discrepancies are actually confronted in the supervisory session.

Analogously, with reference to psychotherapy process, it has been observed that the way a therapist rates his client on the ICL may reflect "conscious countertransference", e.g. "the therapist may see the client as deferent and dependent. Whereas the way the client rates his therapist may reflect 'conscious transference', in that the client may see the therapist as rejecting and dominating"(Leary, 1957, p. 144).

Plainly, perceptual distortion is always possible and needs to be recognized and clarified if psychotherapy, or, we maintain, supervision is to progress. For the purpose of this study we assumed that the confrontation of "perceptual distortions" between supervisor and trainee are central to the development of the participants.

Supervisor Outcome Rating Scale
(Administered at the End of Each Practicum Term)

"In my judgment the trainee I supervised
this term evidenced growth in personal
awareness and counseling skill as follows:"

0	1	2	3	4	5
Decrease	No	Slight	Moderate	Above	Exceptional
	Change	Change	Change	Average	Change
				Change	

Trainee Outcome Rating Scale

(Administered at the End of Each Practicum Term)

"In my judgment my experience in individual supervision this term has been associated with felt growth in personal awareness and counseling skill as follows:"

0	1	2	3	4	5
Decrease	No	Slight	Moderate	Above	Exceptional
	Change	Change	Change	Average	Change
				Change	

Subjects' responses to these outcome scales were related in a post-hoc manner to the results of the ICL and tape analysis. However, it was anticipated that members of supervisory pairs characterized by effective conflict resolution, as measured by increased congruence in ICL Self and Other ratings, would evidence greater satisfaction with outcome than those pairs who less effectively resolved ICL implied conflict.

Summary of Investigatory Procedures
Attendant Hypotheses

(1) Over the course of two terms of supervision, changes in the discrepancies between trainee self-perception and supervisor perception of trainee were appraised. These changes were measured by comparison of initial vs. final trainee Leary ICL self-ratings and supervisor Leary ICL ratings of trainee.

Assumption 1

The supervisor, by virtue of more extensive training and experience, will be more realistic in his appraisal of the trainee's functioning as a person and as a counselor/therapist, than will be the trainee himself.

Assumption 1a

Some evidence exists (Rogers, 1968) that one of the outcomes of successful group psychotherapy was that the patients came to see themselves as others see them. A comparable process would seem likely for psychotherapy trainees: Waltz and Johnston (1963) discovered that pursuant to viewing themselves on video-tape, counseling trainees became less positive in their description of themselves, but their self evaluation was more in line with their supervisor's description of them.

Hypothesis 1

Over the course of two terms of supervision, the trainees' ICL self-ratings will shift to be more in line with the supervisors' ICL ratings of the trainees' that is, initially high discrepancy scores between supervisors' ICL ratings of trainees and trainees' ICL self-ratings will, toward the end of the second term of supervision, shift to low or insignificant discrepancy scores.

(2) Additionally appraised was the frequency of supervisor initiated confrontation of trainee functioning, and the parallels between the content of the area(s) of confrontation and the content of the discrepancies between supervisor ICL rating of trainees and trainee ICL self-rating.

Hypothesis 2

The greater the initial discrepancy score between supervisor ICL rating of trainee and trainee ICL self-rating, the greater will be the conflict in communication (as measured by frequency of supervisor initiated experiential confrontation) between the participants.

Hypothesis 2a

The content of the areas of trainee functioning experientially confronted by the supervisor will tend to parallel the content of the areas of discrepancy existing between supervisor ICL ratings of trainee and trainee ICL self-ratings.

(3) Finally appraised was the relationship between the level of supervisor offered facilitating conditions and the types of supervisor initiated trainee confrontations. Also appraised was (a) the frequency and (b) the extent that the supervisor confronts the trainee in the areas where the supervisor's ICL indicated perception of the trainee is discrepant with the trainee's ICL indicated self-perception.

The latter appraisal can also be viewed as an external validation of the "genuineness" scale, i.e., the extent to which the supervisor is genuine in verbally confronting the trainee with his ICL indicated perceptions of the trainee.

Hypothesis 3

Supervisors rated highest in level of expressed "empathy", "positive regard", "genuineness" and "concreteness" will experientially confront the trainee in the areas of ICL indicated discrepancy more often than the supervisors rated lowest in level of facilitating conditions.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND GENERAL DISCUSSION

Tape Analysis

Discussion is included in this section in as much as the study is highly interpretative in nature and design.

During the course of the first term of supervision, each of the weekly supervisory sessions were audio tape recorded. In order to confine the study to manageable proportions, it was decided to focus primary attention on the analysis of the unfolding supervisory relationships during the first term of supervision--a period of eight to ten consecutive weekly sessions. However, in order to provide a basis for comparative analysis, the last two supervisory sessions of the second practicum term were also recorded.

Three levels of analysis of the supervisory tapes were undertaken: (1) An independent rating of the level of supervisor offered facilitating conditions (i.e., Empathy, Regard, Genuineness, and Concreteness). These ratings were performed by two independent experienced therapist raters. The ratings for each of the seven supervisory pairs were done on audio-taped seven minute supervisor-trainee interaction sequences taken at three different points (approximately

100', 400', and 700') from a session early in the first term of supervision and from a session late in the second term. Total agreement on rate-rerate reliability was obtained. Inter-correlations between the two raters* were as follows: Empathy, $r = .906$; Positive Regard, $r = .981$; Genuineness, $r = .960$; Concreteness, $r = .989$.

Mean levels of performance at the beginning and end of supervision for the eight supervisors were obtained. (2) The second level of analysis undertaken involved a tabulation from typescripts of all of the supervisory sessions of the frequency of the rated type and content of supervisor confrontation of trainees. The determination of types of confrontation was based on a method devised and described by Anderson (1968) and extended and refined by Berenson, Mitchell, and Moravec (1968). Confrontations fall into four categories: (1) Experiential - defined as the supervisor pointing out something about the trainee or something the trainee is doing (in the supervision or with clients, or both) which is discrepant with the way the trainee perceives himself or what he is doing; (2) Didactic - defined in terms of the supervisor responding to the trainee's (a) misinformation, (b) lack of information, or (c) need of information

*The author expresses his sincere thanks to the raters, Richard Pierce and Robert McElhose.

regarding the structure or function of the supervisory process;

(3) Confrontations of (a) Strengths - whenever the supervisor focused on the trainee's constructive resources, or (b) Weaknesses - whenever the supervisor emphasized the trainee's liabilities or pathologies; and (4) Encouragement to Action - whenever the supervisor urges the trainee to act in some constructive manner and/or discourages a passive stance, either (a) in working with his clients or (b) in elaborating on his feelings, hunches, or ideas about his clients or about himself.

Preliminary training trials for the two therapist raters produced an interrater $r = .95$, ($N=64$), across all confrontation types. It was discovered that supervisor utterances were often rated as containing more than one confrontation element, e.g., Didactic and Weakness. For the research data analysis of confrontations, it was decided that whenever the raters coded multiple confrontations in one uninterrupted supervisor utterance, only the consensual elements would be utilized. This decision is in keeping with Anderson's (1968) method of tallying and evaluating only those confrontation elements which raters mutually agreed upon. (3) The third level of analysis involved Leary

Level 1 codings into one of the eight octants by two trained therapist raters of all supervisor statements previously rated as experientially confronting, and the trainee response thereto. Preliminary training for Leary ratings resulted in intercorrelations of $r = .67$ (agreement within same octant, $N = 63$ statements rated) and $r = .78$ (agreements within one octant, $N = 63$). Additional training on Leary codings was initiated and on subsequent trials an interrater, same octant agreement of $r = .89$, $N = 47$ (statements rated) was obtained and deemed satisfactory for proceeding with the major analysis.

Hence the three levels of analysis employed provided (1) an overall appraisal of supervisor offered facilitative conditions, (2) a picture of the frequency and kind of supervisor initiated trainee confrontation (i.e., "style" of supervisor confrontation), and (3) an analysis of the content of the supervisor initiated experiential confrontations and the trainee response thereto.

Hypothesis I

Initially high discrepancy scores between first term supervisors' ICL ratings of trainees and trainees' ICL self-ratings will, toward the end of the second term of supervision, shift to low or insignificant discrepancy scores.

Results

The expectation that initially high "D" scores⁹ between trainee ICL self-ratings and supervisor ICL ratings of trainees would consistently occur, was not confirmed (see Table 1). Four of the supervisor-trainee pairs evidenced no discrepancy in their first term ratings, i.e. supervisors attributed the same personality characteristics to their trainees as their trainees ascribed to themselves. Two pairs evidenced moderate initial discrepancy (ratings between one and two octants apart); two high (ratings two octants or more apart). Appendix D contains a complete list of supervisor-trainee ICL ratings.

TABLE 1
DISCREPANCIES IN TRAINEE SELF RATINGS VS.
SUPERVISOR RATING OF TRAINEES

Supervisory Pair	Term 1 "D"	Term 2 "D"	Rater Shifting	Extent Of Shift
A ₁	44 (mod)	0	Supervisor	(mod)
A ₂	0	0		
B	0	0		
C	81 (hi)	0	Supervisor	(hi)
D	0	0	Both	
E	81 (hi)	44	Trainee	(mod)
F	0	41	Trainee	(mod)
G	44	44		

⁹"D" scores reflect intensity of difference between Self and Other ratings as a relative algebraic function of the distance between points on the "interpersonal circle;" the more discrepant the ratings, the higher the D score. See Leary (1957), Table 58, pp. 498-499, for conversion norms.

In a descriptive sense Hypothesis 1 would seem to receive some support in that three of the four pairs evidencing initial discrepancies shifted to no or decreased discrepancy at the end of the second term. However, in two of these instances it was the supervisor who shifted the rating of the trainee, not the trainee of himself. Furthermore, half of the sample started with complete agreement between trainee self-ratings and supervisor ratings of trainees. Thus is rendered suspect the notion that the predominant process in supervision involves trainees beginning supervision with distorted self-perceptions that supervisors focus on, and facilitate more accurate trainee self-perception, with ultimately the trainee coming to perceive himself as his supervisor sees him.

In order to seek some perspective, however, on the relationship between trainee-supervisor or perceptual discrepancies and supervisory process, it was decided to extend the proposed analysis to examine changes in supervisor ratings of trainees vs. trainee self-ratings as a function of level of supervisor offered facilitating conditions. Supervisors rated above 2.5 on Empathy, Positive Regard, Genuineness and Concreteness were designated as offering high levels of facilitating conditions; those below 2.5 on the four scales were designated as offering low levels. (See Appendix E for the complete ratings on supervisor offered conditions.)

TABLE 2
DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN TRAINEE ICL SELF-RATING AND
SUPERVISOR ICL RATING OF TRAINEE AS A
FUNCTION OF LEVEL OF SUPERVISOR
OFFERED CONDITIONS

	Term 1 "D"	Term 2 "D"
HIGH N = 4	0	0
	81	0
	0	41
	44	44
LOW N = 4	44	0
	0	0
	0	0
	81	44

Inspection of Table 2 indicates that in this sample, no differences in "D" scores by level of supervisor condition occurred during the first term, but by the end of the second term the low level supervisors rated their trainees with slightly less discrepancy than the high level supervisors. The present sample size is too small to assess the significance of either the absence or presence of a relationship between level of supervisor offered conditions and accuracy of supervisor perception of trainee. The trend of this sample, however, is in the direction of independence between supervisor condition and degree of agreement between supervisor rating of trainee and trainee self-rating.

Shifts In Supervisor Self-Rating

Although no predictions were made regarding the possible bearing of differences between supervisor self-perception and trainee perception of supervisor, the information was available and analyzed. Table 3 contains the results vis a vis high and low level operating supervisors.

TABLE 3

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SUPERVISOR ICL SELF-RATING AND
TRAINEE ICL RATING OF SUPERVISOR AS A FUNCTION OF
LEVEL OF SUPERVISOR OFFERED CONDITIONS

	Term 1 "D"	Term 2 "D"	Rater Shifting	Extent Of Shift
HIGH	91	114	Supervisor	Slight
	41	83	Trainee	High
	91	0	Trainee	High
	26	84	Supervisor	Moderate
LOW	0	44	Supervisor	Slight
	0	0	Neither	-
	81	0	Both	Slight (Both)
	105	81	Trainee	Slight

Inspection of Table 3 indicates that over the two terms:

(1) more than half of the trainees each term maintained a different perception of their supervisors than their supervisors did of themselves; (2) the supervisors shifted their ratings of themselves as frequently as, but less sweepingly than, did the trainees of their supervisors; and (3) there was a slight tendency for the trainees of the low facilitating supervisory group to perceive the supervisors more accurately than the trainees of the high facilitating supervisors. The first two observations merely describe the distribution of the data from this sample and, as such, have face validity. The third, however, imputes a relationship between variables which may or may not be invariant. A larger sample would be required to assess its significance. However, as this study was conceived of as hypothesis generating, we mention the possibility that low facilitating supervisors may be perceived more accurately by trainees than high facilitators.

Before moving to the results of the other hypotheses and a more complex analysis of the overall data, a comparison of Table 2 and 3 is in order. As a group, both in the first and second terms, the supervisors tended to more accurately perceive their trainees than did the trainees perceive their supervisors. By the end of the second term, five of the

supervisors rated their trainees as their trainees rated themselves (i.e., "D" = 0) and three perceived their trainees in a manner only moderately discrepant from their trainees' self perception.

However, by the end of the second term only three of the trainees perceived their supervisors as their supervisors did themselves, one moderate discrepancy occurred, while four trainees perceived their supervisors in a manner highly discrepant from the supervisors' perceptions of themselves. Thus, for this sample, supervisors perceived their trainees as their trainees perceived themselves twice as frequently as the trainees accurately perceived their supervisors, and when discrepancies occurred, the supervisors evidenced considerably less distortion than did the trainees. A major implication of this result is that the nature of a trainee's perception of his supervisor may be a major factor in supervisory process - perhaps more crucial than the supervisor's perception of the trainee.

Hypothesis II

The greater the initial discrepancy score, "D", between supervisor ICL rating of trainee and trainee self-rating, the greater will be the conflict in communication (as measured by frequency of supervisor initiated experiential, "E", confrontation

between the participants.

Results

By inspection alone (see Table 4 for data) it is clear that H_2 is not confirmed by the data from this sample, by total number of E's as a function of "D" score: H_2 : High "D's", $\Sigma E's = 24$ (4 + 17 + 7) Mod "D's", $\Sigma E's = 21$ (7 + 0 + 14) No "D's", $\Sigma E's = 40$ (9 + 10 + 1 + 20).

TABLE 4

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN TRAINEE SELF-RATINGS VS
SUPERVISOR RATINGS OF TRAINEES BY TOTAL NUMBER OF
SUBSEQUENT FIRST TERM SUPERVISOR INITIATED EXPERIENTIAL
(AND OTHER)* CONFRONTATIONS OF TRAINEES

PAIR**	"D"	ΣE	ΣD	ΣS	ΣW	ΣA
1 A ₁ T ₂	84	4	49	4	28	13
2 C	81	17	122	25	29	53
3 E	81	3	52	8	1	19
4 A ₂ T ₂	66	7	62	9	19	10
5 A ₁ T ₁	44	0	45	4	12	11
6 G	44	14	145	15	13	53
7 A ₂ T ₁	0	9	39	3	12	13
8 B	0	10	155	15	104	31
9 D	0	1	117	16	10	19
10 F	0	<u>20</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>38</u>
		85	902	121	240	260
	\bar{x}	10.6	112.7	15.1	30	32.5
	median	12	116	15	21	27

* ΣE = total number (per supervisory pair)
of supervisor initiated experiential
confrontations over the first term
of supervision

ΣD = total didactic confrontations

ΣS = total confrontation of strengths

ΣW = total confrontation of weaknesses

ΣA = total encouragements to action

** N = 10 since in the multiple pair each trainee rated each supervisor and vice-versa

The rank order r between difference scores ("D") among first-term trainee self-rating vs supervisor ratings of trainees and the subsequent frequency of supervisor initiated experiential confrontations of trainees was insignificant (r rank = $-.12$). Hence, for the sample, discrepancies ("D") between trainees' self-perception and supervisor perception of trainees were virtually independent of subsequent supervisor experiential confrontations. Thus, further tentative support is given to the notion that "distortion" in trainee self-perception is not the major factor associated with the generation of those supervisory conflicts which are characterized by the supervisor disagreeing with a trainee perception, i.e., experientially confronting the trainee.

Similarly, no significant rank order r 's existed between trainee-self and supervisor-trainee "D's" and subsequent other forms of confrontation, e.g. "D" x Σ Didactic, $r = -.15$; "D" x Σ Strengths, $r = -.10$; "D" x Σ Weaknesses $r = +.25$; "D" x Σ Act, $r = -.15$. In this sample, then, as a group, no significant correlations existed between early trainee-supervisor disagreements on perception of trainee and ensuing first-term supervisory confrontations.

Discrepancies Between Supervisor-Self vs. Trainee-Supervisor Ratings By Type of Confrontation

An analysis of Table 5 indicates that the combined total of first term experiential confrontations (ΣE 's) occurring

in those trainee-supervisor pairs evidencing a high degree (range, "D" = 81 to 105) of initial supervisor-self vs trainee-supervisor rating discrepancy was greater ($N = 5$, $\sum E's = (3 + 20 + 9 + 7 + 1) = 40$) than the combined sum of the E's occurring in those pairs with moderate (range "D" = 26 to 41) discrepancy ($N = 3$, $\sum E's = 17 + 4 + 14 = 35$) which was in turn greater than the summed E's for the no discrepancy pairs ($N = 2$, $\sum E's = 0 + 10 = 10$).

TABLE 5

DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN FIRST TERM SUPERVISOR SELF-RATINGS
VS TRAINEE RATINGS OF SUPERVISORS BY TOTAL NUMBER
OF SUBSEQUENT FIRST TERM SUPERVISOR EXPERIENTIAL (AND
OTHER) CONFRONTATIONS OF TRAINEES

PAIR	"D"	$\sum E$	$\sum D$	$\sum S$	$\sum W$	$\sum A$
1 E	105	3	52	8	1	19
2 F	91	20	116	22	12	38
3 A ₂ T ₁	91	9	39	3	12	13
4 A ₂ T ₂	84	7	62	9	19	10
5 D	81	1	117	16	10	16
6 C	41	17	122	25	29	53
7 A ₁ T ₂	41	4	49	4	28	13
8 G	26	14	145	15	13	53
9 A ₁ T ₁	0	0	45	4	12	11
10 B	0	<u>10</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>31</u>
		85	902	121	240	260
\bar{x} :		10.6	112.7	15.1	30	32.5
median:		12	116	15	21	27

Although r rank "D" x ΣE for all pairs was non-significant ($r = +.17$), some tentative support is lent the notion that distortions in trainee perceptions of supervisors may be more crucial to the understanding of conflicts ("experiential") in supervision than are distortions in trainee self-perception.

Rank order correlations between discrepancy scores and the other types of rated confrontations were as follows:
 "D" x Σ Didactic = $-.37$; "D" x Σ Strengths = $-.05$; "D" x Σ Weaknesses = $-.56$; "D" x Σ Action = $-.08$.

Though non-significant, there exists a trend for an inverse relationship between supervisor confrontation of "weaknesses" in trainees and the degree of distortion in trainee perception of supervisors ($r = -.56$). In other words, the higher the distortion in trainee perception of supervisor, the less frequently did the supervisor confront trainee "Weakness". In converse terms, supervisors of trainees evidencing low-moderate or no distortion in perception of their supervisors, confronted weakness in their trainees 3.4 times more frequently than did supervisors of trainees evidencing high distortions in perception of supervisors. This pattern occurred independently of level of supervisor condition offered, i.e., there were two high level and two low level supervisors in the high and low-moderate trainee distortion groups. Possible implications of this trend will be pursued in the analysis of Hypothesis 2a.

Hypothesis IIa

The content of the areas of trainee functioning experientially confronted by the supervisor will tend to parallel the content of the areas of discrepancy existing between supervisor ICL ratings of trainee and trainee ICL self-ratings.

Results

Of the four supervisory pairs evidencing initial discrepancies between trainee self-perception and supervisor perception of trainee, only one of the supervisors initiated experiential (E) confrontations of his trainee predominantly in the area of his ICL indicated discrepancy. Table 6 contains the breakdown.

TABLE 6

TRAINEE-SELF VS SUPERVISOR-TRAINEE RATINGS AND CONTENT OF EXPERIENTIAL CONFRONTATIONS

T Self Rating	S Rates T	Total E's	Areas Confronted
AP	DE	3	J, M, G
BC	DE	4	H ₂ , C, F
NO	JK	17	J, K ₁₀ , H ₁₆ , O ₁
AP	BC	14	M ₇ , BC ₃ , AP ₂ , B&I, D&G

Clearly, the contents of the experiential confrontations initiated by the supervisors of this sample did not consistently parallel the contents of the areas of initial discrepancy between supervisor perception of trainee and trainee self-perception. It would appear, then, that neither the frequency, nor the content of experiential confrontations are consistently direct correlates of supervisor disagreement with trainee self description.

However, one supervisor did consistently confront his trainee experientially in the content area of their ICL indicated discrepancy. The pattern that emerged in this particular supervisory dyad (which is not clearly pictured in the data of Table 6) was one of consistent supervisor experiential confrontation of perceived excessive passive, conforming and dependent trainee behavior (JK). The trainee's pattern of reaction was (1) initial partial agreement/disagreement, e.g. tentative collaboration (L) followed by some resistance (F) in the effort to label (defend) the behavior being confronted as "responsible, generous and kind" (NO), rather than conforming-dependent; followed by (2) increased agreement (LM) with supervisor experiential focusing and recognition of the relevance of the supervisor observation for change desired by the trainee; and finally (3) an emerging

trainee resistance (B) to being labeled conforming and dependent as trainee autonomy increased. By the end of the second term, initial ICL indicated discrepancies were resolved.

Interestingly, it was the supervisor's perception of the trainee which changed, rather than the trainee's self-perception: the supervisor's 2nd term ICL rating of the trainee shifted to conform with the trainee's first term ICL self-rating (NO), suggesting that the supervisor then perceived the trainee as a nurturant, generous, responsible personality without the underlying passive dependent conforming elements which were initially perceived. A possible implication of this is that the supervisor's perception of the trainee involved a focusing on the characteristics of the trainee which were antagonistic to the credibility (as far as the supervisor was concerned) of the trainee's self-perception. The trainee was originally self described as a dominant and affiliative individual. The supervisor initially saw the trainee as a submissive and affiliative individual. However, by the end of two terms of supervision, the supervisor was perceiving the trainee as dominant and affiliative.

The pattern which emerged in this particular supervisory pair suggested a comparison with the other dyads along the dimension of trainee self-perceptions as primarily

affiliative/disaffiliative and dominant/submissive vs their supervisors' perceptions of them.

Leary's circumplex model of interpersonal attributes can be divided roughly into four quadrants along axes of dominance-submission and hate-love.

Quadrant 1:	dominance-disaffiliation	DE-BC
2:	dominance-affiliation	AP-NO
3:	submission-affiliation	JK-LM
4:	submission-disaffiliation	HI-FG

Part of Q1 shades into Q4 where DE meets FG
 Part of Q2 shades into Q1 where AP meets BC
 Part of Q3 shades into Q2 where LM meets NO
 Part of Q4 shades into Q3 where HI meets JK

Grouping the trainee first and second term self-ratings vs supervisor ratings of trainees into their respective circumplex quadrants provides a graphic presentation of shifting Self and Other perception over the course of supervision. As similar data on supervisor self-perception and trainee perception of supervisors was available, this was also included. Table 7 contains this information.

One clear pattern evidenced in this table is that, although in the first term three of the trainees perceived themselves as dominant and affiliative (Q2), none of the supervisors perceived any of the trainees as such. And conversely, although two of the supervisors perceived themselves as submissive-disaffiliative (Q4), none of the trainees

perceived any of the supervisors as submissive.

TABLE 7

CATEGORIES OF TRAINEE-SUPERVISOR SELF AND
OTHER PERCEPTION

		Q ₁ DOM-DIS	Q ₂ DOM-AFF	Q ₃ SUB-AFF	Q ₄ SUB-DIS
TERM 1	T-Self	3	3	2	0
	S-T	5	0	*3	*1
	S-Self	4	2	0	2
	S-T	4	4	0	0
TERM 2	**T-Self	4	3	0	0
	S-T	5	2	0	0
	S-Self	5	0	2	1
	T-S	3	5	0	0

*The two supervisors in the multiple tetrad disagreed on their rating of one of their trainees

**One of the trainees left supervision at the end of the first term, reducing the sample to seven in the second term.

By the end of the second term, two of the trainees were perceived as dominant-affiliative by their supervisors, but none of the supervisors were perceived as submissive by any of the trainees. This pattern tends to suggest a "built-in" trainee perception of supervisors as dominant individuals; a perception which, in this sample, did not shift over time and exposure to their supervisors who themselves shifted in their judgments of their relative dominance and submissiveness.

As distinct groups, over two terms, the supervisors altered their interpersonal perceptions of the trainees as frequently, though less radically ($N = 4$; "D" = 22-48), as the trainees changed their perceptions of the supervisors ($N = 4$; "D" = 26-91). However, as paired dyads, whereas four trainees changed their ratings of their respective supervisors, only three of the supervisors shifted their views of their respective trainees. Appendix F gives the figures on all the combinations of supervisor and trainee ICL rating shifts over the two terms. From Appendix F a most interesting observation occurs: six of the supervisors of this sample altered their self-perceptions over the two terms, whereas only three of the trainees shifted in their self-ratings.

If we assume that changes in supervisor ICL self-rating are at least in part relative to their relationship with their respective trainees (and/or relative to their co-supervisor

in the case of the multiple supervisory tetrad) some interesting speculations come to light. Three of the six supervisors whose self-ratings changed were involved with trainees whose self-ratings did not change; and two of these three supervisors were co-trainers (A_1 and A_2). Co-supervisors A_1 and A_2 worked with a trainee whose self rating was high BC, a competitive-narcissistic personality, both at the beginning and at the end of supervision. Supervisor A_2 rated the trainee BC at the beginning and end of supervision, whereas supervisor A_1 gave the trainee an initial DE, a punitive-aggressive personality, but shifted to BC at the end. Supervisor A_1 also self rated as high BC at the beginning of the first term, but by the end of the second term shifted to a self rated AP, an autocratic-managerial personality with a power orientation. Supervisor A_2 started with a self-rating of low HI, a modest, sensitive, self-effacing personality, and ended with a self-rating of high HI touching on JK, a pattern suggestive of increasing submissiveness and dependency. Not only did the trainee self rate BC both terms, but also rated supervisor A_1 as BC over both terms, suggesting that the trainee tended to see supervisor A_1 as he did himself, i.e., to identify with him. Additionally, the trainee rated supervisor A_2 as an AP personality, controlling and autocratic.

It is likely that the competitive styles of supervisor A_1 and the trainee may have conflicted considerably with supervisor A_2 's more modest and non-competitive approach and resulted in supervisor A_2 's second term shift to a self rating of heightened dependency and submissiveness and withdrawal. In tandem, occurred supervisor A_1 's shift to an AP or power orientation, perhaps as an effort to alter the configuration of the relationship thus far. That the nature of the interrelationships affected both supervisors' functioning is further borne out through reference to the data on the analysis of supervisor offered facilitating conditions. At the outset of the supervision, supervisor A_2 was rated as functioning in the high range of Empathy, Regard, Genuineness and Concreteness, while supervisor A_1 was rated low. By the latter part of the second term, these figures were reversed.

A somewhat similar pattern emerged in a third supervisor whose trainee evidenced no change in ICL self rating over two terms (supervisory pair G). Over both terms the trainee rated himself as a AP personality, dominant-controlling. The supervisor saw the trainee from the start as BC, competitive-exploitive-narcissistic, and did so also at the end. Whereas the supervisor rated himself initially in the AP octant, as did the trainee throughout, the supervisor's second term self

rating shifted to DE, aggressive-punitive-challenging. Interestingly, the trainee rated his supervisor over both terms as an NO personality: kindly, generous and responsible.

An examination of the supervisor outcome scales (see Appendix G) indicates that at the end of the first term supervisor G rated the trainee as evidencing positive growth in personal awareness and counseling skill. But by the end of the second term the supervisor altered his rating from positive growth to no growth. Furthermore, an analysis of the audiotape of the supervisor's experiential confrontations of the trainee during the first term indicated that the preponderance of the supervisor's confrontation emphasis was on reacting to the trainee as a potentially more selfless, loving and dependency seeking person than the trainee described himself. Not until late in the second term did the supervisor begin to more consistently confront what he perceived as exploitive elements in the trainee's functioning with clients and others.¹⁰ The trainee was never clearly rejecting of the supervisor's confrontation, positively or negatively toned; just consistently disagreeing, yet solicitous of the supervisor's opinion.

What these two supervisory relationships seem to have in common is (1) both involved supervisors who initially

¹⁰Interestingly supervisor G's first term rating on Genuineness was 2.42, while by the end of the second term Genuineness was rated 3.10. Raters' subjective reactions to the difference were that the supervisor was "holding back" from expressing "negative feelings" during the first term.

rated themselves in the same personality category as did their trainees, but rated their trainees differently than the trainees did themselves; and (2) both were characterized by shifts in the ICL indicated self-perceptions of the supervisors rather than the trainees.

What may have happened was that the partial identification between supervisor and trainee on the basis of their commonalities in self-perceived style resulted in a temporary gloss over the issue of the discrepancies between the supervisor's perception of the trainee and the trainee's perception of himself. Additionally, it would seem, in the first supervisory pair cited, in conjunction with the supervisor and trainee similarities in self-perception, the trainee tended to perceive supervisor A_1 as he perceived himself, thus laying the ground for assuming the supervisor operated with a style and intent comparable to the trainee's. And in the second example, although the trainee rated his supervisor as evidencing a different style of functioning (NO) than his own (AP), he perceived the supervisor in a manner (kind, generous, nurturant, loving) which easily permitted the trainee to assume his supervisor was highly accepting of him just the way he was. In both instances, therefore, the supervisor's potential impact for influencing change in the trainee was diluted, and conceivably contributed to the

supervisor's second term alteration in self-perception in an attempt to dislodge the trainee perceived equilibrium in the relationship, raise trainee anxiety and make clear that discrepancies in perspective exist.

Supervisor G's second term self-rating indicates that he was perceiving himself as more of an aggressive critic (DE) of his trainee than a tolerant teacher (AP). This shift parallels the supervisor's increased second term emphasis on experiential confrontation of perceived negative trainee attributes as opposed to his predominant first term emphasis on positive trainee attributes. Although speculations about group trends remain tentative due to variations in interactions within supervisory pairs, the patterns in perceptual shifts emergent among individual pairs would appear to give credence to the use of ICL ratings for explaining how and why supervisors and trainees alter/do not alter their stances to one another.

Hypothesis III

High level supervisors ($E, R, G, C \geq 2.5$) will experientially confront their trainees more frequently than low level supervisors ($E, R, G, C < 2.5$).

This hypothesis was supported at the .05 level according to Tukey's (1959) two sample test. Four of the eight supervisors were rated high on facilitating conditions, four low. The total number of experiential confrontations made over the first term by each supervisor was tallied. Table 8 contains the results.

TABLE 8

	HIGH FACILITATING	LOW FACILITATING
Total number	16	3
experiential	20	1
confrontations	17	10
	14	4
<hr/>		
	N = 67	N = 18
	\bar{x} = 16.7	\bar{x} = 4.5
	S.D. = 2.15	S.D. = 3.4

As is apparent, in no case did a high level supervisor experientially confront his trainee(s) less frequently than did a low level supervisor. Additionally, much greater variability in frequency of experiential confrontation occurred in the low level supervisors than the high. A tabulation of the time and clustering of experiential confrontations was carried out (see Appendix H). In addition to more frequently confronting trainees experientially, high level supervisors tended to confront sooner and more systematically (i.e. in sequential "clusters") than did the low supervisors.

Further analysis of levels of facilitating conditions vs other rated confrontations were undertaken. Table 9 contains the results for didactic confrontations. There were no significant differences between high and low level supervisors and the frequency with which they didactically confronted their trainee(s), although again, greater variability in frequency of didactic confrontations occurred in the low level supervisors.

TABLE 9

	HIGH	LOW
Total	101	52
Didactic	116	117
Confrontations	122	155
	145	94
	N = 484	N = 418
	\bar{x} = 121	\bar{x} = 104.5
	S.D. = 15.8	S.D. = 37.3

Considering the frequency of confrontation of strengths (Table 10) as a function of supervisor level, although not statistically significant, there is a clear trend for the high facilitating supervisors to more frequently confront trainee strengths than the low supervisors.

TABLE 10

	HIGH	LOW
Total	12	8
Confrontations	22	16
Of Strength	25	15
	15	8
N = 74		N = 37
\bar{x} = 18.5		\bar{x} = 9.3
S.D. = 5.47		S. D. = 8.93

Similarly, with confrontation of weakness vs level of supervisor condition (Table 11), although differences are not statistically significant, the extreme variability in confrontation of weaknesses among the low group of supervisors continues to suggest the possibility of a greater inconsistency of functioning among individuals who evidence low levels of the facilitative conditions than those operating at higher levels.

TABLE 11

	HIGH	LOW
Total	31	1
Confrontations	12	10
Of Weakness	29	104
	13	40
N = 85		N = 155
\bar{x} = 21.2		\bar{x} = 38.7
S.D. = 8.79		S.D. = 40.18

The analysis of variations in frequency of Encouragement to Action as a function of supervisor level (see Table 12) evidences non-significant differences, though again, the low group is more variable than the high.

TABLE 12

	HIGH	LOW
Total	23	19
Encouragement	38	61
to Action	53	31
	53	24
	N = 167 \bar{x} = 41.8 S.D. = 11.33	N = 135 \bar{x} = 33.8 S.D. = 16.85

These findings suggest an analysis of ratio of confrontations by level of supervisor offered conditions.

TABLE 13

	HIGH	LOW
Ratio of Total	16:31	3:1
Experiential to	20:12	1:10
Total Weakness	17:29	10:104
Confrontations	14:13	4:40

As is apparent, the high level supervisors confronted their trainees within a ratio range, Experiential:Weakness of 1:2, 2:1, or 1:1, whereas the low level supervisors evidenced a ratio range of 3:1 or 1:10.

Clearly, the low functioning supervisors, as a group, operated with considerably less consistency of response to their trainees than high functioning supervisors. And, as high level supervisors shifted their ICL self-ratings over the two terms as frequently and in similar degree as did low level supervisors (see Table 14), it would appear that the seeming greater consistency for high level supervisors is independent of changes in supervisor self perception. However, since our detailed confrontation analysis covered only the first term, we do not have available the distribution of confrontations for the second term of supervision and can only tentatively assume that the confrontation patterns of high and low condition supervisors remained constant.

TABLE 14

	HIGH "D"	LOW "D"
Supervisor	32	0-44
Shifts in ICL	26-48	44
Self-Rating	0	0
	66	44

To the suggestion that the supervisors rated low on facilitating conditions and high on confrontations of weaknesses, may have had particularly hostile-alienating-disaffiliative (and therefore less likeable) trainees, can be observed that the high functioning supervisors were involved with as many self-rated (as well as supervisor rated) dominating-disaffiliating and hostile trainees as were the low rated supervisors. It seems that what and how a supervisor chooses to respond to in a trainee is less a function of the behavior and personality configuration of the trainee than it is of the operating style of the supervisor.

Post Hoc Analysis

Extent of prior supervisory experience appeared to be independent of supervisor offered conditions in this sample. In the high and low categories, respectively, there were three supervisors with limited prior supervisory experience (N=0-10 trainees supervised) and one with extensive prior experience (N=20 or more trainees supervised). This tends to parallel the findings of Berenson, et. al. (1968) that level of facilitating conditions is independent of length of therapy experience.

Comparison of pre-supervision interviews with trainees on the issue of their "set" or expectation for supervision with subsequent data revealed that those three trainees most

ambivalent about or negatively disposed to and apprehensive of supervision were (1) all self-rated in the dominant-disaffiliative quadrant of the interpersonal circle, (2) clearly more argumentative and confronting of their supervisors in the early stages of supervision (although trainee initiated confrontations were not codified in this study, they were observed), (3) older than the other trainees and had had prior interruptions in their graduate training when they had worked in professional capacities. Other trainees indicating more "positive" expectations of supervision were variously more passive-conforming and passive-aggressive according to self and supervisor ratings.

CHAPTER IV

FURTHER DISCUSSION AND SPECULATIONS

The one statistically significant result of this study was that supervisors rated high on Empathy, Positive Regard, Genuineness and Concreteness experientially confronted their trainees more frequently than low rated supervisors. This finding parallels the results of Anderson's (1968) and Berenson's et. al. (1968) studies which indicated that high level psychotherapists experientially confronted their clients more frequently than low level psychotherapists. Associated with the higher frequency of therapist initiated experiential confrontations was a greater degree of client self-exploration, i.e., exploration of previously non-revealed or non-aware of personally relevant material.

Extent of trainee self-exploration subsequent to experiential confrontation was not measured in this study, although a content analysis of trainee responses to each experiential confrontation was undertaken. As noted in the Results section, the content of these trainee responses did not consistently parallel the areas of disagreement suggested by the discrepancies between the first-term trainee ICL self-ratings and

the supervisor ICL ratings of the trainees. However, the content analysis suggested variations in the extent of trainee acceptance, rejection, and partial acceptance/rejection of the supervisor experiential utterances.

Contextually, supervision differs essentially from psychotherapy in that trainees are not defined as clients. Hence, trainees, as their supervisors, are less likely to be anticipatory of a dependency relationship centrally involving self-exploration. Rather trainees, it is surmised, are more oriented to an independency relationship, wherein they can gain, through supervisory advice and direction, greater counseling/therapy skill, that is, implicitly, greater independence.

One of the most common trainee complaints heard in (or inferred from) the audio tapes of this study¹¹ was that trainees resented being urged to analyze themselves from a standpoint different from their typical self-view, i.e., self-exploration (from someone else's point of view).

It would appear then that counseling/psychotherapy trainees in general are likely to be more resistant than clients to examining themselves from a perspective at variance from their usual manner of self-analysis (possibly because they have less need for change). Furthermore, trainees are likely to be more wary of agreeing to a need for self-exploration (with

¹¹The complaints were for the most part expressed in reference to the group supervision, in which all the trainees participated, rather than regarding their individual supervision.

its attendant implication of dependency), given their need for demonstrating to their supervisors, their capability as counselors/therapists in training. The paradox then is how to get help in developing therapy skills without appearing to be too badly in need of it, i.e., maintain an individually acceptable margin of independence as a capable practitioner, while simultaneously expressing a tolerable reliance (dependence) on the supervisor for adding to existing skills and thereby increase independence.

From this speculated framework, we shall proceed to discuss the possible implications of the non-significant, but potentially heuristic trends observed in the data of this study. Particularly relevant is the seemingly consistent trend for trainee distortions in perception of supervisors to be more of a basis for supervisory conflict than distortions in trainee self-perception. We suggest that the perceived credibility-trustworthiness of the supervisor is a major factor in trainee acceptance of supervisor urgings to view differently and conceivably alter contemporary styles of functioning. It is further suggested that supervisory impact on trainees is strongly related to the degree to which the trainee perceives the supervisor within a reasonable margin of comparability to the supervisors perception of himself.

That is to say, it is crucial (1) that the trainee see his supervisor as a trustworthy (i.e., not destructive)¹² and believable source of independency facilitation, and (2) that the trainee perception of the supervisor reasonably parallel the supervisor's perception of himself.

When these two conditions are not met (as they typically are not early in supervision), the supervisory relationship is unstable, potentially conflictual and needing of mutual confrontation and resolution. Seemingly, level of supervisor offered facilitating conditions plays a crucial role in the trainee perceived credibility and trustworthiness of the supervisor. However, it is suggested, no matter how facilitating the supervisor may be if the trainees perception of the supervisor remains unacceptably dissonant with the supervisor's perception of himself, conflict will persist. This speculation implies a supervisor's need to be perceived and responded to

¹²Journard (1969, pp. 174-176) observes: "No one can know me truly unless I wish to be known. If I trust you, you don't have to peek or cross-examine. I'll let you see and know anything you wish. If you try to know me, or something about me with neither my knowledge or consent, I deem it an invasion of my space and I defend myself . . ." Perhaps trainee trust of the supervisor not only facilitates trainee self-disclosure, but also permits the trainee to "take" supervisory offerings.

in the manner in which they wish to be perceived and responded to.

We suggest here that a possible reason for the high percentage (six of eight) of shifts in supervisors ICL indicated self-perception over two terms, was at least in part due to the fact that the shifting supervisors were not sufficiently satisfied with the way their trainees were perceiving and reacting to them. Consequently, the supervisors altered their styles of relating to their trainees, (and isomorphically their self-definitions relative to their trainees), in an attempt to enhance the likelihood of having a desired impact on them. Such a process is a likely corollary of supervisor frustration over feeling of insufficient trainee growth (i.e., trainee acceptance and integration of supervisor offerings).

It is further suggested that high level supervisors have a greater likelihood of experiencing a desired impact on their trainees and tend to more consistently receive feedback from trainees that they are profiting from such impact. Therefore, it is likely that the high level supervisors develop a generically more consistent pattern or style of functioning vis a vis trainees; whereas the low level supervisors, receive less consistent desired trainee feedback and hence tend to operate in a more variable manner, patterning their approaches

in reaction to particular individual trainees rather than presenting a relatively stable style arrived at through internal validation of its effectiveness.

Perhaps much of the disagreement among supervisory personnel as to optimal methods of operation is associated with the extreme variability in response to and confrontation of trainees which seems to characterize the low facilitating supervisors. Subsequent research might well be addressed to longitudinal analyses of patterns of confrontation in high and low level supervisors over a number of different supervisory situations, i.e., same supervisors with different trainees. Also, it would seem useful to further investigate the prevalence of supervisor shifts in self-perception as a function of frustration with trainee performance.

Clearly, a major implication of this study is the unfeasibility of predictions regarding supervisory process based on uni-directional analysis. Supervisory interactive process may be more a function of trainee perception of supervisors than it is of supervisor perception of trainees. Furthermore, trainees may have as much impact on supervisor self-perception as the converse.

Finally, it is suggested that, even for supervisors who offer high levels of facilitating conditions, initial delays

in genuinely¹³ confronting trainees with conflictual material may dilute or negate the impact of subsequent confrontations. There seems to be a tendency for some trainees to perceive their supervisors (and others, no doubt) stereotypically, and to resist entreaties to alter their perspectives if they are confronted after having had time to stabilize their perceptions.

A major drawback of this study was the failure to provide for an analysis of level of facilitating conditions offered by trainees in their practicum work over the course of supervision. Nevertheless, we can cite the recent work of Pierce and Schaubel (1969 in press), which suggests that trainees rated level of facilitating conditions tend to rise or fall to the level of conditions offered by their supervisors. Subsequent research in this area might address itself not only to the issue of changes in trainee facilitating conditions, but also to the influence of trainee initiated confrontations of supervisors.

¹³The author observed in this study that some of the supervisors seemed to initially hold back on or mute their "genuine" reactions to their trainees. The existing Genuineness scale, both the Truax and Carkhuff version, does not contain clear provision for rating the extent to which therapist/supervisor offerings are congruent with therapist/supervisor feelings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, S.C., "Effects of confrontation by high-and-low-functioning therapists", J. of Counsel. Psychol., 15 (5), 1968.
- Berenson, B. G., Mitchell, K. M., and Moravec, J.A., "Level of therapist functioning, patient depth of self-exploration, and type of confrontation", J. of Counsel. Psychol., 1968, 15(2), 136-139,
- Carkhuff, R. R. "Lay us. professional counseling", J. Counsel. Psychol., 15(2), 1968, 117-126.
- Carkhuff, R. R. and Bereson, B. G., Beyond counseling and psychotherapy, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Combs, A. W. and Soper, D. W. "The perceptual organization of effective counselors.", J. Counsel. Psychol., 1963, 10, 222-226.
- Cutler, R. The relationship between the therapist's personality and certain aspects of psychotherapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Univ. of Mich., 1954.
- Gabbert, K. H., Ivey, A. E., and Miller, C. D., "Counselor assignment and client attitude." J. of Counsel. Psychol., 1967, 14, 131-136.
- Horsmann, Virginia, "Critical factors in differentiating between effective and ineffective counselors." Dissertation Abstracts, 1956, 26(2), 1170-1171
- Howard, A. and Correll, P. "Evaluating psychological interns." J. of Consult. Psychol., 1966, 30(1), 78-80.
- Jourard, S., "You are being watched." Contemporary Psychology, March, 1969, 14(3), 174-176.
- Kell, B. L. and Mueller, W. J. Impact and Change: A Study of Counseling Relationships, Appleton-Century-Croft, New York: 1966.

- Leary, T. Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality, The Ronald Press Co., New York, 1957.
- Pagell, W. Carkhuff, R. R. and Berenson, B. G. "The predicted differential effects of high and low-level functioning counselors upon counselee level of functioning," J. of Clin. Psychol., 1967, 22, 215-218.
- Pierce, R., Carkhuff, R. R. and Berenson, B. G., "The differential effects of high and low functioning counselors upon counselors in training." J. of Clin. Psychol., 1967, 22, 212-215. ✓
- Pierce, R. and Schauble, P. "Graduate school training on the facilitative conditions: The effects of individual supervisors." Unpublished manuscript, 1969, Michigan State University.
- Rioch, Margaret J. "Changing concepts in the training of therapists." J. of Consult. Psychol., 1966, 30, 283-289. -
- Rogers, A. H., "Videotape feedback in group psychotherapy." Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1968, 5 (1), 37-39.
- Shapiro, J. G., "Perception of therapeutic conditions from different vantage points." J. of Counsel. Psychol., 1968, 15(4), 346-350.
- Stollak, G. E. "The experimental effects of training college students as play therapists," Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1968, 5 (2), 77-80.
- Truax, C. B. and Carkhuff, R. R., Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and Practice, Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
- Tukey, J. W., "A quick compact, two sample test to Duckworth's specifications", Technometrics, 1959, 1, 31-48.
- Whitely, J. M., Sprinthall, N. A., Mosher, R. L., and Donaghy, R. T., "Selection and evaluation of counselor effectiveness," J. Couns. Psychol., 1967, 14(3), 226-234.
- Walz, G. R. and Johnston, J. A. "Counselors look at themselves on video-tape." J. Counsel. Psychol., 1963, 10, 232-236.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Questions asked Trainees in Pre-Supervision Interview

1. What is your previous practicum experience, i.e. number of courses and where; number of cases seen?
2. What is your prior practical, counseling therapy work experience?
3. Describe the impact of your pre-practicum experience and its bearing on your expectations for the upcoming practicum supervision.
4. What are your notions regarding the purpose or goal of supervision i.e. what do you seek from supervision?
5. What are your educational goals?
6. Age? Have you had individual therapy?
7. Did you choose your supervisor for next term?
8. What theory or theories of counseling/therapy do you mainly adhere to or follow in your work?

Appendix A₁

Questions asked supervisors in Pre-Supervision Interview

1. What has been your prior supervisory experience, i.e. number of trainees, at what level, where?
2. What has been your prior counseling/psychotherapy experience i.e. how long been working as counselor/psychotherapist.
3. Did you know your trainee prior to this assignment?
4. What theory or theories of counseling/ psychotherapy and mode of supervision do you mainly adhere to?
5. What are your goals for supervision i.e. what do you believe is important to accomplish?

APPENDIX B

VERBATIM REPORT OF SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES TO SELECTED STANDARD INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

4. Counseling/psychotherapy theory espoused?

" . . . relationship focus . . . people change by having different kinds of experiences in counseling relationships . . . "

" . . . relationship orientation with analytic underpinning, but mainly a developmental model - notion of 'delayed adolescence' useful: college students are bound to home, indecisive, afraid of disappointing parents if they make decisions on their own . . . "

" . . . interpersonal, phenomenological approach, with some leanings toward rational therapy . . . "

" . . . Sullivanian interpersonal approach . . . "

" . . . interpersonal phenomenological . . . "

" . . . interpersonal with analytic emphasis . . . "

" . . . relationship oriented . . . "

" . . . interpersonal orientation with attention to trainee dynamics . . . opening them up and expanding them, and tying to the impact of the trainees dynamics on client."

4. Mode of supervision favored?

" . . . parallels therapy approach with relationship

emphasis. Trainee dynamics inclusive with his growth as a therapist . . . "

" . . . experiential emphasis . . . "

" . . . mainly experiential; don't believe in pushing trainee into therapy, but will exercise short-term like therapy as relevant to supervisory problems . . . believe there is a distinction between therapy and supervision . . . "

" . . . mixture of didactic and experiential . . . depending on the trainee, the balance varies . . . "

" . . . mainly experiential with didactic as appropriate . . . some role playing. Focus on trainee's work with clients as jumping off point to other areas . . . "

" . . . heavily experientially oriented . . . "

" . . . experiential framework with appropriate didactic instruction . . . try to work at the level of the trainee's functioning . . . "

5. Goals of supervision?

" . . . help trainee attain an accurate impression of the impact he has in interaction with clients . . . make him as aware as possible of his potential for sensitivity and appropriate reactivity and help him to develop tools which will facilitate continued growth . . . help him to conceptualize about therapeutic process in interpersonal terms . . . only distinction between supervision and therapy are setting some limits on each . . . when supervision gets to

be therapy it's when we've forgotten about the trainees relationship with his client . . . "

" . . . to get the trainee to get involved with clients and use that involvement in conjunction with outside life. . . "

" . . . try to provide a climate in which trainee is able to utilize himself more fully as a therapist . . ."

" . . . not handy hint on things to say and do . . . that doesn't facilitate growth . . . have to cut through facades of (functioning) and get the trainee to use his anxiety . . ."

" . . . particularly with new (beginning) trainees:
(1) encouragement, (2) try to get trainee aware of whatever feelings he has so he can use them, (3) help him to become aware of the impact he has on others and (4) to use his capacities to operate effectively in therapy and (5) Try to get him open to learn . . . don't see it as an enterprise geared to controlling trainee behavior for fear he might damage his client . . . try to get him to see cause and effect in his work and living . . . "

" . . . through the supervisory relationship help trainee with hang ups with clients by expressing feeling as a guide to working them through . . . help trainee to find his strengths and use them . . . "

" . . . primary goals (to foster): an understanding of trainees own dynamics, professional growth, an awareness of the relationship of client dynamics to the trainees dynamic self . . . "

" . . . to help them (trainees) in whatever way seems appropriate depending on their level . . . help them to develop their own perceptiveness, skills, and sensitivity relative to the level of their functioning . . . hopefully to undo any rigidity carried over from academic, intellectual orientation . . . with beginning practicum student, the more time with the same supervisor the better: At least 20 hours, preferably more . . . If not directive and didactic emphasis would be necessary . . . "

THE INTERPERSONAL CHECK LIST - FORM IV

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Able to give orders | 41. Encouraging to others |
| 2. Appreciative | 42. Enjoys taking care of others |
| 3. Apologetic | 43. Expects everyone to admire him |
| 4. Able to take care of self | 44. Faithful follower |
| 5. Accepts advice readily | 45. Frequently disappointed |
| 6. Able to doubt others | 46. Firm but just |
| 7. Affectionate and understanding | 47. Fond of everyone |
| 8. Acts important | 48. Forceful |
| 9. Able to criticize self | 49. Friendly |
| 10. Admires and imitates others | 50. Forgives anything |
| 11. Agrees with everyone | 51. Frequently angry |
| 12. Always ashamed of self | 52. Friendly all the time |
| 13. Very anxious to be approved of | 53. Generous to a fault |
| 14. Always giving advice | 54. Gives freely of self |
| 15. Bitter | 55. Good leader |
| 16. Bighearted and unselfish | 56. Grateful |
| 17. Boastful | 57. Hard-boiled when necessary |
| 18. Businesslike | 58. Helpful |
| 19. Bossy | 59. Hard-hearted |
| 20. Can be frank and honest | 60. Hard to convince |
| 21. Clinging vine | 61. Hot-tempered |
| 22. Can be strict if necessary | 62. Hard to impress |
| 23. Considerate | 63. Impatient with others' mistakes |
| 24. Cold and unfeeling | 64. Independent |
| 25. Can complain if necessary | 65. Irritable |
| 26. Cooperative | 66. Jealous |
| 27. Complaining | 67. Kind and reassuring |
| 28. Can be indifferent to others | 68. Likes responsibility |
| 29. Critical of others | 69. Lacks self-confidence |
| 30. Can be obedient | 70. Likes to compete with others |
| 31. Cruel and unkind | 71. Lets others make decisions |
| 32. Dependent | 72. Likes everybody |
| 33. Dictatorial | 73. Likes to be taken care of |
| 34. Distrusts everybody | 74. Loves everybody |
| 35. Dominating | 75. Makes a good impression |
| 36. Easily embarrassed | 76. Manages others |
| 37. Eager to get along with others | 77. Meek |
| 38. Easily fooled | 78. Modest |
| 39. Egotistical and conceited | 79. Hardly ever talks back |
| 40. Easily led | 80. Often admired |

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 81. Obeys too willingly | 109. Spineless |
| 82. Often gloomy | 110. Stern but fair |
| 83. Outspoken | 111. Spoils people with kindness |
| 84. Overprotective of others | 112. Straightforward and direct |
| 85. Often unfriendly | 113. Stubborn |
| 86. Oversympathetic | 114. Suspicious |
| 87. Often helped by others | 115. Too easily influenced by friends |
| 88. Passive and unaggressive | 116. Thinks only of self |
| 89. Proud and self-satisfied | 117. Tender and soft-hearted |
| 90. Always pleasant and agreeable | 118. Timid |
| 91. Resentful | 119. Too lenient with others |
| 92. Respected by others | 120. Touchy and easily hurt |
| 93. Rebels against everything | 121. Too willing to give to others |
| 94. Resents being bossed | 122. Tries to be too successful |
| 95. Self-reliant and assertive | 123. Trusting and eager to please |
| 96. Sarcastic | 124. Tries to comfort everyone |
| 97. Self-punishing | 125. Usually gives in |
| 98. Self-confident | 126. Very respectful to authority |
| 99. Self-seeking | 127. Wants everyone's love |
| 100. Shrewd and calculating | 128. Well thought of |
| 101. Self-respecting | 129. Wants to be led |
| 102. Shy | 130. Will confide in anyone |
| 103. Sincere and devoted to friends | 131. Warm |
| 104. Selfish | 132. Wants everyone to like him |
| 105. Skeptical | 133. Will believe anyone |
| 106. Sociable and neighborly | 134. Well-behaved |
| 107. Slow to forgive a wrong | |
| 108. Somewhat snobbish | |

APPENDIX D

Supervisor and Trainee Self and Other ICL Ratings by Term

Term	Pair	Trainee-Self	Supervisor-Trainee	Supervisor-Self	Trainee-Supervisor
1	A ₁ T ₁	BC	DE	BC	BC
2	A ₁ T ₁	BC	BC	AP	BC
1	A ₂ T ₁	BC	BC	HI*	AP
2	A ₂ T ₁	BC	BC	HI/JK	AP/BC
1	A ₁ T ₂	LM*	FG	BC	AP*
1	A ₂ T ₂	LM*	HI	HI*	NO
(Term 2 data not available on T ₂ who dropped out of supervision)					
1	B	DE	BC/DE	BC	BC/DE
2	B	DE	BC/DE	BC	BC/DE
1	C	NO	JK	DE	BC*
2	C	NO	NO	DE	NO
1	D	JK	JK	BC	NO
2	D	NO	NO	AP	AP
1	E	AP/NO	DE	DE/FG	NO
2	E	BC	DE	DE	AD
1	F	BC	BC	LM/NO	DE*
2	F	DE*	BC	LM/JK	LM
1	G	AP	BC	AP	NO
2	G	AP	BC	DE*	NO

* Indicates low score for the octant category indicated--all other scores were moderate to high.

APPENDIX E

Rated Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions

Pair	Term	Empathy	Regard	Genuineness	Concreteness
A ₁	1	1.33	1.33	1.5	1.5
	2	2.75	2.67	2.58	2.75
A ₂	1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	2	2.33	2.17	2.17	2.0
B	1	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33
	2	1.83	1.42	1.67	1.50
C	1	3.33	3.0	3.33	3.5
	2	3.08	3.75	3.75	3.25
D	1	2.0	1.83	1.83	1.66
	2	1.83	2.0	2.0	2.0
E	1	2.08	2.0	2.0	2.0
	2	2.0	2.08	2.08	2.0
F	1	2.5	2.67	2.83	2.58
	2	3.33	3.42	3.33	3.17
G	1	2.83	2.66	2.42	2.5
	2	3.25	2.92	3.10	3.33

APPENDIX F

Discrepancy Score ("D") Indicated Changes In ICL Ratings Between First and Second Term

	T self	S-T	S self	T-S
Pair				
A	T ₁ none	S ₁ 26 S ₂ none	S ₁ 44 S ₂ 32	T ₁ none none
B	none	none	none	none
C	none	48	none	66
D	48	48	44	26
E	44-48	0-44	0-44	26
F	41	none	26-48	91
G	none	none	66	none

APPENDIX G

Outcome Scales (By Level of Supervisor Offered Conditions)

		<u>Term 1</u>		<u>Term 2</u>	
	Pair	Trainee	Supervisor	Trainee	Supervisor
HI	G	4	4	4	1
	C	4	4	4	4
	F	1	1	4	4
	A ₂ T ₁	3	3	3	3
LO	E	3	3	3	4
	D	4	4	4	4
	B	3	3	3	3
	A ₁ T ₁	3	2	3	3

APPENDIX H

Experiential Confrontations By Session And Level Of Supervisor Offered Condition

		<u>Session</u>										Total E
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
HIGH		-	-	1	2	3	-	2	5		3	16
		2	5	5	-	3		2				17
		-	3	2	-	-	15	-	-			20
		-	5	-	5	3	-	1				14
				2	1		1					4
		1	-	1	-	7	1					10
LOW								1				1
					2	1						3

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103063446