Valuing Experience: Assessing Constructivist Approaches to Counselor Supervision

by

Erin M. Halligan Avery


Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy


Supervised by Professor Douglas Guiffrida and Professor Martin Lynch

Education

Margaret Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development


University of Rochester

Rochester, New York

2015

UMI Number: 3703229

UMI

Dissertation Publishing

UMI  3703229

ProQuest®

## Dedication

In loving memory of my Grandpa Helvie (affectionately known as "Dumb-Dumb").

**Biographical Sketch**

Erin M. Halligan was born in Baldwinsville, New York. She attended Oswego State University, and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology (with honors). The author earned her Master of Science degree from The College at Brockport in Counselor Education. She began doctoral studies in Counselor Education and Supervision at the University of Rochester in January of 2009. She pursued her research in constructivist approaches to counselor supervision under the direction of Professor Douglas Guiffrida.

**Acknowledgements**

I decided in my sophomore year of college that I wanted to continue going to school for my Ph.D. I spoke with my adviser and mentor, Dr. Gary Klatsky, about my options, and he was confident that I would get accepted into multiple colleges and would have my choice of programs. Junior year I started applying—a tedious task. More tedious, however, was waiting for the responses. I still remember the day I went to my Hart Hall mailbox and received my first letter from Wagner College, "Thank you for your interest in our program. I regret to inform you that you have not been selected as a candidate at this time…" I'm not sure what the rest of the letter said. I simply remember feeling embarrassed, rejected, and shocked. This was the first time in my 20 years of life that something I had planned didn't work out as expected. Nine more rejection letters followed over the next month and a half, each one less painful and more numbing than the one before. My best friend Renee (who was also applying for Ph.D. programs and receiving rejection letters) and I came to find the process quite comical. When the last rejection letter hit my mailbox, I knew I had to take a different path. What I didn't know was how rich, meaningful, and purposeful this unanticipated path would be in developing the woman and scholar I am today.

It has been 12 years since I stood at my Hart Hall mailbox anxiously awaiting my fate. In this 12 years, my life has unfolded in so many unique and incredible ways, from obtaining a graduate assistantship in the health science department at The College at Brockport, switching from a masters program in psychology to a masters program in counseling, meeting Susie Welsh who encouraged me to apply for a resident director

position (which kick-started my career in student affairs), and suffering through my first

bought of depression while I worked full time, wrote my masters thesis, went to school

part-time, tried to manage an internship that started at 6am, and was diagnosed with

migraines.

In 2008 I received the letter I so desperately wanted five years earlier- I had been

accepted into The Warner School of Education's doctorate in Counseling and Counselor

Education program! I deferred for a year (this girl needed a mental break!) and landed a

job as a disability support coordinator in the Learning Assistance Services office at UR.

My program of study began in the spring of 2009 when I first met Dr. Doug Guiffrida.

Little did I know that this meeting was the first of many I would have with a man who

would become one of my strongest supporters, a passer-of-opportunities, my introduction

to the field of counselor supervision, and a pain in my side when it came to dissertation

edits! Doug's confidence in my abilities as a teacher and a writer, at times, surpassed my

own. He pushed me to expand my research, included me in multiple conference

presentation submissions, provided me with co-teaching opportunities (which later turned

into solo-teaching opportunities), and invited me to be a guest presenter in many of his

classes. I learned from Doug the importance of mentoring young professionals and

investing in students. I appreciate and respect Doug on many levels and look forward to

our continued partnership as Counselor Education colleagues.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Martin Lynch, advisor of my dissertation

committee. Martin taught the first course I took as a doctoral student, group counseling

concepts. I still remember standing outside of the room before our first class and fearfully

anticipating the experience. Was I going to be the youngest student in the class? Was I smart enough to handle the content? Was the professor going to be personable? Martin's calm demeanor, ease with explanations, and openness to the experience of the class truly set the stage for the rest of my experience at Warner. I went on to take Martin's quantitative and advanced quantitative research design courses in the years that followed. To this day, I am in awe of his ability to make such complex material manageable and digestible. So manageable, in fact, that some nights I would leave class feeling as confident about my statistical abilities as a 30-year statistician! (Yes, this feeling often subsided within three hours after class). Martin's expertise with quantitative methods has vastly improved my dissertation, and I have learned so much from him via chapter revisions and sit down conversations to review my work. I appreciate his keen attention to detail, editing style, and availability (even 4,500+ miles away in Russia) to tend to my chapter revisions.

Dr. Carol Podgorski of the Family Therapy Training Program at The University of Rochester Medical Campus has added a unique and rich perspective to my dissertation as well as my overall view of supervision. Upon meeting Carol for the first time, she presented me with her supervision prospectus—such an interesting read—that really gave me an idea of how she conceptualized supervision and her work with students. I knew after reading this document that she was going to be a valuable committee member who would stretch me to think about supervision from various perspectives and would offer years of experience through her comments and suggestions. I am appreciative to Carol for

her thoughtful review of my chapters and for agreeing to take me on as a doctoral student among her many other obligations and responsibilities as program director.

Completing this dissertation was the most challenging goal I have ever set out to accomplish. I struggled, inwardly and outwardly, on many occasions. In fact, I almost resigned myself to this process once, if not twice, convinced that a dissertation was a Rubik's cube with multiple missing stickers. During the two and a half years it took me to complete these five chapters I felt elated (when I turned my proposal in to Brenda), defeated (when I made every single chapter edit and the chapter still wasn't good enough to pass), incompetent (pretty much all of Chapter 4), and eager (when I could see the light at the end of the tunnel). So many emotions are wrapped into 160+ pages. What I have come to realize, however, is that this emotional and personal process was just as much a part of earning my Ph.D. as the courses I took and the papers I wrote. My Ph.D. was a test of my strength, perseverance, and commitment to a goal I had set for myself way back in sophomore year of college, and here I am, at the finish line, incredibly proud of what I have accomplished.

I would like to use the remainder of this acknowledgment section to thank a few people who are standing with me at this finish line. I say *undeniably* that without the individuals listed below I would not have completed my dream of becoming a doctor.

- My Facebook friends – Oh the power of social media! Often when I reached a turning point in my dissertation, I would write a post expressing my accomplishment. Without fail, friends I have known forever and supporters I never knew I had would leave comments or "like" my status as a sign of support

and encouragement to keep going. At times I felt like an entire stadium of people was rooting me on and enjoying my small successes. In addition to their support, many of my friends who are in the counseling field offered to send their colleagues the survey link needed to collect data to complete my dissertation study! I received offers to send my link to hospital staff, Army therapists in Alaska, a substance abuse facility in Maine, social workers, etc. These small acts of kindness did not go unnoticed and provided me with even more motivation to continue pursuing my dream.

- Gloria Jacobs – Gloria is everything a Ph.D. student could want in an editor. Her turn-around time is impeccable, she is detail oriented, her comments make sense, her rates are reasonable, and she is a wiz at APA formatting! Gloria bettered each of the chapters I sent her way, and I was confident upon receiving her results that my papers were polished and precise.

- Jenny Bostaph – My original editor and keeper of my timeline. Jenny spent many hours reviewing my initial computational exams and making APA style revisions. She also wrote me weekly emails checking on my progress and created inflexible due dates to help keep me on task. Jenny's care packages (often inclusive of candy!) were always motivating and a welcome sign of support and her belief in my abilities.

- Ari Elliot – I don't think Ari truly knows how significant a role he played in my dissertation process. I mean this when I say it- I would *not* be completing my Ph.D. if Ari hadn't agreed to help me run and review my statistics. When I first

reached out to Ari I was lost, lacking confidence, confused, and desperate. I did not know how to move forward. Ari committed hours of his time and brainpower to sitting with me as I ran my principal components analysis (and other statistical tests) and constructively helped me understand my results. I am indebted to you, Ari, and more thankful for your time and friendship than I can express in writing. I would also like to thank the weather for cooperating during the times when Ari and I met, as only once did we need to reschedule due to the rain ☺.

- Sherri and Nina Wingender – The first to admit that they had no idea what a dissertation was or what my topic was about, Sherri and Nina were two of my biggest supporters. They asked questions, looked for ways to insert the topic into our conversations, and showed genuine interest in my Ph.D. process. Sherri and Nina are two beautiful examples of women who invest in true friendship and act selflessly at all times. Their interest in me as a person, as well as my course of study, will never be forgotten or go unacknowledged. I am so lucky to have these ladies in my life as close friends.

- Elaine Casquarelli – The connection I have to Elaine does not need explanation. Simply stated, I have found strength, love, compassion, and peace within our friendship, and I am so thankful for her continued support and encouragement. Distance cannot separate the spiritual connection that we share, and I am so thankful for Elaine and her wife Kitty's presence in my life.

- Jay Nittoli – I first met Jay in my Counselor Supervision course. I thought he was smug and assumed our interactions would be strictly classroom based. I was

wrong. Jay has become one of my best friends over the last five years, and his confidence in me has been unparalleled. When I genuinely told him I was going to give up on getting my Ph.D., he said "no," bought me sushi, and threatened to give up if I did. I'm 99% confident if I had walked away from Warner at that time, he would have too—always leaving me with the message that giving up on myself meant giving up on those who looked up to me most. I am so thankful to Jay for his perfectly timed sense of humor and ability to reach me when I felt unreachable.

- Rebecca Herzog – "Here! [Hands me a napkin and a pen], tell me what you're doing your dissertation on." We sat outside at a BBQ joint one sunny afternoon as I explained my dissertation topic through pictures and words scribbled on a hefty white napkin. Rebecca has always made an effort to understand my dissertation topic and to relate what I was studying to her experience working in higher education. She cared enough to want to know and want to understand—a genuine acknowledgement of our sister-like-friendship. Rebecca is there when I need to vent, she commiserates with me even when she's not sure what we're complaining about, and she and her husband Philip playfully question when I'll be done with school so we can have our fun lifestyle back. Rebecca has also supported my personal life while I continued this academic process. She is there for me whenever I need her, is a listening ear at any time of day, and always keeps my life interesting. She will be there with bells on (it's possible I mean this literally) on graduation day, and I couldn't be more excited!

- Renee Bostaph – Yes, the same Renee who started the Ph.D. process with me in our sophomore year of college. Renee has been my best friend and source of strength for the last 12 years. I cannot put into words how much her friendship, confidence, and support of me means. Renee jokes often about not being a very good friend (because she doesn't send cards in the mail), but the truth is she is one of the best friends anyone could ever ask for. Renee flew with me to Hawaii in March of 2014 to support me as I presented a portion of my dissertation at the American Counseling Association conference. She brags about me in my presence: "This is my best friend Erin, she is getting her Ph.D. from the University of Rochester," matches my level of enthusiasm or disdain when I call to talk about something that has affected me, and will be in tears as I walk across the graduation stage this May. I am so thankful for Renee's continued love and friendship throughout the last 12 years and eagerly await what the next 12 years have in store for us.

- Brian and Shannon Halligan – My brother has never failed to let me know how proud he is that I am getting my Ph.D. He supports me by asking questions about my progress and by trying to understand my topic. He brags about how smart his sister is (I'm not entirely sure this is true, but I like to believe it is) and will run home after graduation to proudly update our family tree with my new accomplishment. I love you Bubba and am lucky to call you my brother. Shannon joined our family a little over ten years ago and we have since bonded over challenging clients, mismanaged mental health organizations, art therapy

activities, conference presentations, and client success stories. I am thankful for her listening ear and ability to make me feel better when all seems lost. Our misery loves each other's company!

- Lilly Halligan – My seven-year-old niece- I want you to know what a profound role you have played in me finishing my dissertation. From the first moment I held you, I felt a sense of responsibility to empower you, help you find your strength, and enable you to find your own inner confidence. I knew you were going to be a tenacious and unique little lady from the age of 2, and it has been so enjoyable to watch you grow into the person you are today. At times when I would think about quitting this dissertation, I would inevitably see your face. What message was I sending to you if I quit when things got tough? I want you to know that this was one of the hardest emotional and academic journeys I have ever experienced… but I did it. Set your goals, prepare your mind, and never let anyone tell you that you "can't." I will *always* believe in you.

- My parents – I received no greater strength and support throughout this process than from my parents. They were always there, cheering me on, sending me bouquets of flowers for each accomplishment (e.g. completing my coursework, submitting my proposal), and reminding me of my strength. My mom would often reference the *Little Engine That Could* and would remind me that I come from a "long line of strong Halligan-Helvie women." My dad would engage me in academic-related discussions and would find any way he could to relate with my dissertation topic. He was, and always has been, invested in me. My parents

would brag about me to other parents, they'd share updates with my grandparents so they, too, could remain invested in my experience, and I am confident that they will be the two proudest parents in the Eastman Theatre this May (in case you're wondering who they are, my mom will be the one with a gigantic pin of me playing Little League or bowling when I was 10-years-old). Thank you both for everything you have done to get me where I am today.

- Mark – I married an incredible man. He is a true partner in every sense of the word and has helped me directly (through confidence building and listening to my stories) and indirectly (by picking up the slack at home) obtain this degree. Before Mark even became my boyfriend, I had written 45 characteristics of the man I was going to marry in a notebook during a cruise in the Caribbean. After one month of dating Mark, I reviewed this list and found that he espoused every single item. Unbelievable. More unbelievable, however, was that fact that I had forgotten the most important item—a characteristic that I argue is the only one necessary on the list to begin with—"together we will get through whatever happens in life." This characteristic couldn't be truer of our life together, our ability to persevere, and our commitment to each other. I love you Mark and am so happy to be sharing this huge accomplishment with you by my side.

- Carter – To my unborn son, I can't wait to meet you (and I hope you have your dad's nose)! In the last eight months you have been an incredible motivator for me. If I wasn't in high gear before you were conceived, I certainly was after seeing the positive pregnancy test and knowing that you would be joining our

family in February. You will be three-months old when I graduate with my Ph.D., and your dad and I joke that we are going to put you in a onesie that says, "My mom is smarter than your mom." I wish you could know the excitement we have anticipating your arrival and how eager we are to learn your personality. I also want you to know that part of me getting my Ph.D. is to show you what hard work and dedication can produce. I didn't give up even though, at times, I wanted to. The reward is so sweet. I also hope my Ph.D. helps you conceptualize women on an equal playing field to men. We're just as smart and just as capable no matter what societal messages you grow up with. May you keep this in mind when you find your own partner someday (woman or man)—gender doesn't dictate success. I love you already and look forward to spending the rest of my days getting to know who you are.

So much has changed since I began my Ph.D. journey five years ago, yet many of my personal values and characteristics have remained the same. How do I know? Because writing this acknowledgement section was the most meaningful part of my entire dissertation. I am a woman who appreciates, deeply, when others invest in me. There were quite a few years in my life when I felt unworthy of this investment, but eager for it. Through my own therapy and my own self-reflection I have come to know myself as an empathic, intelligent, emotional, deeply-caring, and relatable woman who wants to be understood and to understand others. The individuals acknowledged in this section have helped me along this journey, and although you won't find letters after my name that

represent this self-discovery, I argue that it is the most important accomplishment I've earned.

To the ten Ph.D. programs that rejected me 12 years ago: My life would have taken such a different course had I received your acceptances. I would not be the woman I am today. You humbled me, you showed me that I'm malleable, and you made me work harder than I ever thought I was capable of and for that I forever thank you!

**Abstract**

Counselor supervision has evolved as a skillset unique from counseling in the last 30 years. Approaches to counselor supervision, often created with counselor developmental models in mind, are examined, and the author claims that a combination of postmodern approaches to counselor supervision (narrative, systemic, reflective, and IPR strategies), referred to as constructivist approaches, are worthy of additional consideration and assessment. However, no instrument currently exists that validates constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. The purpose of this dissertation was to explore constructivist themes and characteristics associated with constructivist supervisors and supervisees' preference for each of the constructivist supervisor characteristics. The author sent a peer-reviewed and pilot-tested *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* to multiple counselor supervises. A principal components analysis was used to determine how many components are representative of constructivist supervision. Three components were revealed during the exploratory process: Warm and non-directive relationship, past and present experiences, and acceptance of various styles. Results also revealed that supervisees preferred constructivist supervisor characteristics. Future supervisors can use the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* to determine whether constructivist methods are being used during supervision. The *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* can also be used to assess supervisees' preference for constructivist supervisor characteristics.

## Contributors and Funding Sources

# Table of Contents

# List of Tables

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

Counselor supervision is an active and skillful process aimed at improving the performance of counselors as they progress through stages of supervisee development. Distinct from counseling, this process has been used to help supervisees understand their role with clients, work through case conceptualizations, identify and consider counselor, supervisor, and client role designations, and grow personally and professionally with the guidance of a fellow counselor. The topic of counselor supervision has become increasingly established within the counseling literature over the last 30 years and the desire of supervisees and counselor educators to identify skills, processes, and procedures associated with effective supervision has become more prevalent.

Within the counseling profession there has been a growing consensus that counselor supervision is important and necessary. According to the 2009 Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards, site supervisors working with master's students must have "relevant [supervision] experience" (CACREP, 2009, p. 15). CACREP approved doctoral programs also are required to prepare counselor supervisors for their work with supervisees by offering courses and instruction on the supervision process. These standards have helped to advance the profession, establish counselor supervision as a meaningful aspect of counselors' experience, and assist in the development of higher-quality professionals.

The practice of counselor supervision has continued to develop in the last 30 years as have the approaches used to guide supervisees. Whereas previous supervision approaches relied on the expertise of the supervisor to inform and lead the supervision

session, emerging constructivist approaches are instead relying on supervisees' ability to self-reflect and intuit from past personal and professional experiences. The role of the supervisor has shifted alongside emerging constructivist theories. The supervisor-as-counselor identity has diminished in response to the belief that supervisees are capable and willing to process their unique client experiences. The supervisor-as-consultant identity, depicted in Bernard's (1979) discrimination model as a process of engaging the supervisee in a discussion about their counseling experiences and facilitating conversations with the supervisee about his or her work with clients, has emerged as a primary role that allows the supervisor to guide the supervisees' personal and professional experiences instead of directing supervisees toward the "right" way to address client concerns.

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of the history of clinical supervision in order to frame the constructivist approaches that I plan to investigate. I also delineate salient aspects of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision based on a review of several supervision approaches broadly categorized as constructivist in nature. As part of this review, I also highlight research that has supported elements of constructivist supervision as well as gaps that remain in understanding the efficacy of constructivist approaches. I conclude by outlining my research questions and providing an overview of the proposed study.

### An Introduction to Constructivist Supervision

Early supervision approaches were born from the psychoanalytic tradition and the distinctions between therapy and supervision were often unrecognizable (Stoltenberg,

1981). The role of the supervisor was to instruct beginning therapists in how to work with patients by providing considerable direction and advice (Hogan, 1964; Hunt 1971). It was also not uncommon for early supervisors to shift their focus from the therapist's work with clients to counseling the therapist themselves, blurring the expectations of the supervisory experience (Davy, 2002; Delaney, 1972). Ekstein and Wallerstein (1972) have been identified as being the first practitioners to portray supervision as a relational instead of directive process, one used to discuss dynamics between the supervisor and therapist for the benefit of the client (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

As post-psychodynamic theories of counseling emerged, new ways of working with supervisees were also identified. Rogers' (1961) person-centered model, for instance, suggested that facilitative conditions (e.g. genuineness, empathy, unconditional positive regard) were necessary for client growth. These characteristics were adopted into the supervision process under the assumption that supervisees would also benefit from a genuine, empathic, and unconditionally supportive relationship with their supervisor. Stoltenberg's (1981) initial integrated developmental model (IDM) also added to the supervision literature by proposing three stages of supervisee development and environmental conditions necessary for supervisee growth. The developmental approach to supervision encouraged counseling and psychology researchers to consider the experiences of supervisees, the role of supervisors, and supervisee development between and within Stoltenberg's identified stages. Other therapeutic approaches, such as cognitive-behavioral, systemic, and those considered process-oriented, have also contributed to counselors' framing and understanding of present day supervision

(Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Carroll & Holloway, 1999; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993, 2003).

**Constructivism**

Broadly stated the terms modern and postmodern have been used to distinguish between supervisory approaches (Gonzalez, 1997). Modernist supervision approaches are guided by the belief that an objective reality exists and can be discovered within the supervisory process. Postmodern supervision approaches, alternatively, are guided by the belief that reality is subjective and unique to each individual. Postmodern theoretical approaches, including constructivism, have altered thinking about counselor supervision and the experience of supervisees. An increasing interest in the application of postmodern approaches to counselor supervision has developed in the past 15 years (Mills & Sprenkle, 1995; Neimeyer & Steward, 2000; Pare & Larner, 2004). Constructivism, one such postmodern theory, provides the foundation for understanding constructivist approaches to counselor supervision.

Constructivism is a theoretical framework based on the belief that "humans actively create and construe their personal realities" (Mahoney & Lyddon, 1988, p. 200). To do this, individuals must combine their past and present knowledge and experiences with insight. This ability to think deeply and meaningfully about one's experiences is what generates new learning and new knowledge. The constructivist belief that the mind is "an active, constructive system, capable of producing not only its output but also, to a large extent, the input it receives." (Guidano, 1984, p. 33) suggested that learning is

ongoing, adaptable, and influenced by one's interactions with others and with the environment.

Constructivists view learning as an active and constructive process as opposed to an act of acquiring knowledge (Callison, 2001). In keeping with postmodern thought, constructivists support the idea of multiple realities, believe that knowledge is created and recreated through experience, and suggest that learners make meaning out of their experiences based on the degree to which they are encouraged to do so. The learners' knowledge is thought to be cumulative and representative of their unique ideas and experiences.

According to Fox (2001), theories of constructivism posit learning as an active process:

- Knowledge is constructed rather than innate or passively absorbed;

- Knowledge is invented not discovered;

- All knowledge is created by each individual through their experiences and interactions with others;

- Learning is essentially a process of making sense of the world;

- Effective learning requires meaningful, open-ended, challenging problems for the learner to solve.

The constructivist-minded teacher and learner work together in ways that help the learner discover new thoughts and conceptualizations. These thoughts and conceptualizations become part of the learner's refined perspective and inform future engagements with others. Learners create new meanings through their interactions with others and explore

these interactions with the assistance of mentors who help facilitate thinking about these experiences.

**Constructivist Counseling and Supervision**

Although the propositions of constructivism have been most widely applied to education, the theory also has been applied to the field of counseling. Neimeyer (2005) viewed constructivist counseling as a process of helping clients discover new ways of being through an acknowledgement and awareness of their past experiences. Neimeyer (2005) stated, "My client is necessarily the expert on his or her experience and all of those subtle historical and contemporary factors that jointly shape his or her current life, to which I will inevitably be a distant observer" (p. 85). By invoking a sense of openness to these experiences, the constructivist therapist encourages the client to search within him or herself for answers regarding how to move forward.

Constructivist counseling expects that humans can and do change throughout the life span. By individualizing the counselor's therapeutic techniques, constructivist counselors aim to initiate some degree of proactive change within the client (Mahoney & Granvold, 2005). Clients become their own agents of change, supported by a therapist who offers hope, interest, and clinical experience. The success of constructivist counseling is derived from the client's strengths, personal experiences, awareness, resiliency, and opportunities for growth (Neimeyer & Mahoney, 1995).

Elements of constructivist counseling can also be applied to supervisees and the process of counselor supervision. In fact, counselor supervision, an aspect of the counselor education process that has direct influence on the experience and education of

nascent professionals, provides an obvious opportunity in which to apply constructivist methods. In constructivist approaches to counselor supervision the perspective of the supervisee becomes the primary lens through which client sessions are viewed. Instead of relying on the supervisor's expertise, the supervisee's knowledge and past personal and professional experiences are used to frame discussions about the effectiveness of counseling sessions. Supervisees learn about counseling by actively engaging their thoughts, experiences, and feelings about counseling sessions, instead of passively relying on their supervisor's knowledge and advice to guide their practice.

Applied to counselor supervision, the theory of constructivism suggests that supervisees come to their supervision sessions with answers, styles, and strategies for working with clients, and better understand their work with clients through interactions with their supervisor. When supervisors approach the supervision process through a constructivist framework, supervisees are encouraged to reflect on their personal experiences, think comprehensively about their work with clients, and view counseling as a discipline that requires constant adaptability and self-actualization. Constructivist ideas have been applied to a few postmodern approaches to counselor supervision: narrative, systemic, reflective, and interpersonal process recall (IPR) strategies. In the next section, I briefly summarize each of these approaches and suggest key similarities that, together, form the foundation of constructivist supervision.

**Constructivist-Type Supervision Approaches**

A review of supervision literature revealed four approaches to supervision that are heavily rooted in constructivist principles of learning, growth, and change. These include

narrative, systemic, reflective, and interpersonal process recall (IPR) strategies. After briefly reviewing each of these approaches, I conclude this section by providing commonalities shared by each approach that can, to some extent, be considered core elements of constructivist supervision.

**Narrative.** Narrative therapy, developed by White and Epstein from 1970 to 1980, provides the basis for a narrative approach to counselor supervision. The narrative approach focuses on ways dominant discourse affects how clients talk about their experiences, particularly by asking clients to discuss the meaning they attach to these experiences (Neal, 1996). The client's personal narrative, and the way they recall this narrative, is the primary focus of therapy sessions. Narrative therapy characteristics have recently been applied to the practice of counselor supervision (Carlson & Erikson, 2001; Neal, 1996; Whiting, 2007). Narrative-led supervisees are encouraged to discuss the ways their own experiences have influenced their work with clients or how they have come to think about the client's story. Through collaboration with the supervisor, the supervisee is asked to think about the client's story from multiple perspectives and to discuss how the client's story has impacted their own personal narrative. In keeping with constructivist ideals, this supervision approach honors and privileges the supervisees' lived experience, knowledge, skills, talents, ideas, morals, personal ethics, values, and beliefs (Carlson & Erikson, 2001). The supervisees' personal narrative is used to engage their thinking about the supervisory process and frame their thinking about clients. Supervision becomes a process of co-visioning (White, 1997) where the supervisor and supervisee work collaboratively to activate the supervisee's growth and awareness.

**Systemic.** A second supervision approach, based on systemic therapy, originated in the 1950s and grew to include constructivist and social constructivist ideals in the late 1980s (Boston, 2000). The systemic paradigm focuses on the importance of understanding psychological difficulties in the context of social relationships. In other words, systemic counselors are encouraged to review the client's problem in relation to the factors that surround it, as opposed to addressing the client's problem as a one-dimensional diagnosis (Gorell Barnes, Down, & McCann, 2000). Systemic techniques have been applied to counselor supervision with the goal of helping supervisees understand their client's multi-layered realities. The systemic supervisor helps the supervisee apply personal accumulated knowledge in a counseling session while remaining aware of the ways the system surrounding the client has uniquely affected the client's own reality. The systemic approach is consistent with constructivist theory because supervisees' are asked to use past experiences, both personally and professionally, to inform new learning and to apply this new knowledge to their work with clients. The systemic supervisor is aware that the supervisees' experiences are created and recreated through social interactions, and that these interactions and experiences will affect how the supervisees conceptualize the client's problems.

**Reflective.** Reflective supervision is a third constructivist-framed approach derived from the paradigm of reflective learning, a process by which individuals are asked to think critically, reflectively, affectively, and skillfully about a particular topic or task (Ward & House, 1998). Applied to counselor development, reflective supervision is a process whereby supervisees meaningfully reconstruct counseling experiences using a

repertoire of personal understandings, images, and actions to reframe a troubling situation so that problem-solving interventions can be generated (Neufeldt, 1999; Ward & House, 1998). Supervisees engaged in reflective supervision are encouraged to think about counseling and supervision sessions meaningfully, recalling emotions related to these experiences whenever possible. Reflective supervisors value the supervisee/supervisor relationship and understand that the strength of this relationship affects how comfortable supervisees feel about taking risks. The role of the reflective supervisor is to support supervisees as they think about their work with clients and examine how their attitudes, experiences, knowledge, and beliefs affect the supervisee's counseling practice (Rivera, 2010). The supervisor also helps supervisees activate their thoughts and feelings in such a way that increased insight is attained.

**Interpersonal process recall (IPR) strategies.** IPR strategies also are related to constructivist approaches. IPR strategies were proposed by Kagan (1984) in an attempt to improve the reliability of training programs for mental health workers. IPR strategies allow trainees to view their interactions with clients in a session (via videotape) and recall their thoughts, feelings, reactions, and responses at the time of the session. Through the use of videotaped sessions, trainees are able to review their work with clients in a safe, self-directed atmosphere. The IPR supervisor, instead of directing the session, takes on the role of inquirer and asks the supervisee to think about the ways they interacted with their client and how the client may have perceived these interactions. The main role of the inquirer is to "allow the supervisee the psychological space to investigate internal processes to some resolution" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009, p. 229). Through non-

judgmental and open-ended questions, the inquirer helps the supervisees discuss the dynamics of the original session and more accurately understand and interpret their behaviors. The strategies associated with IPR are primarily led by the supervisee so as to encourage self-awareness and strengthen self-efficacy. This supervisee-led process allows the supervisees to identify and initiate discussion about the events in their sessions while the supervisor encourages thinking through reflective and thoughtful questions.

Based on this summarization of these four postmodern approaches, the following commonalities are recognizable when viewed through a constructivist lens:

- Need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor.

- Reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning.

- Using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee.

- Reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge.

- Acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling.

A constructivist approach to counselor supervision, then, is one in which supervisees feel responsible for their learning in the context of a supervisory relationship that is facilitative and supportive. Within these commonalities are various details and approaches to the supervision process, often based in the personalized styles of supervisors and supervisees. Based in my review of the literature, I argue these themes are representative of constructivist supervision. Additional support is needed, however, to

validate whether these themes are, in fact, representative of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision.

## Research on Constructivist Supervision Approaches

A few of the constructivist supervision themes identified in the previous section have been discussed in the counseling supervision literature, although often independently of one another and with varying degrees of sophistication. Research related to each of the themes is discussed in this section. For those themes in which research does not exist, I highlight the theme's relevance and relatedness to constructivist supervision as a way of justifying the need for research in that particular area.

### Relationship with Supervisor

The first theme that unites the identified postmodern supervision approaches is the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor. The supervisory working alliance, defined most often in the literature as the combined skills and knowledge of the supervisor and the supervisee, has been extensively studied and linked to various supervisee outcomes (Cheon, Blumer, Shih, Murphy, & Sato, 2009; Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Mandani, Kees, Carlson, & Littrell, 2009). Some of the results of these studies suggested, (a) beginning supervisees' need to establish rapport with their supervisor, (b) supervisees' need to feel supported when they try new skills, (c) supervisees' perceive value in reciprocity, and (d) mutual agreement about the goals and tasks of supervision is important to the success of the supervision sessions. Mandani et al. (2009) concluded, "When supervisees perceived their supervisors as being supportive, present, warm, open,

honest, and strengths-oriented, it really increased [their] comfort to be honest" (p. 4).

According to the literature, a supervisory relationship based in honesty encourages the

supervisee to discuss their concerns, fears, desires, and hopes with their supervisor, and

this type of disclosure is likely to lead to increased supervisee self-awareness,

understanding, and growth (Mandani et al., 2009). Extensive research on the topic of

supervisory relationships has suggested that a supervisory relationship that encourages

supervisee growth, allows the supervisee to learn from their counseling experiences, and

provides agreed upon goals and objectives is paramount to effective counselor

supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Haynes, Corey, & Moulton, 2003; Magnuson,

Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000).

**Reliance on Supervisee Self-Awareness**

A second theme of constructivist supervision supported by the literature is the

reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge in

order to advance supervisee learning. In Norem, Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Arbel's

(2006) qualitative review of supervisees who achieved outstanding growth in supervision

(according to their supervisors), supervisees who used personal life experiences as

opportunities to grow as therapists and enhance insight were found to be most successful.

In Norem et al.'s study, three counselor educators conducted interviews with 12

experienced supervisors. Researchers asked these supervisors about their experiences

with highly successful supervisees as well as supervisees whose performances were

unsatisfactory and unsuccessful. Results indicated that supervisee autonomy, self-

efficacy, and intuition were characteristics most often associated with successful

supervisees. Supervisees who trust their intuitiveness, know about themselves and their clients, and are able to suspend their own values were found to be the most successful in supervision (Norem et al., 2006).

**Acceptance of Various Counseling Approaches**

A third theme of constructivist supervision, also supported by the literature, is the supervisor's acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro and Wolgast (1999) examined supervisees' perspective of the supervisors' ethical behaviors, including the supervisor's ability to work with alternative therapeutic perspectives. According to supervisees, supervisors' inability to work with alternative counseling perspectives was the second most offended ethical category (the first was 'confidentiality issues'). Approximately 18% of the supervisees sampled felt that supervisors were not receptive to supervisees trying any theoretical orientations other than the one to which the supervisor subscribed (Ladany et al., 1999). This finding was consistent with Moskowitz and Rupert's (1983) report that 20% of supervisor-supervisee conflicts revolved around differences in theoretical orientation and approaches. In both of these studies the supervisor's strong preference for their own counseling approach negatively impacted the supervisor-supervisee relationship. This research suggested that supervisees prefer supervisors who are open to and accepting of counseling approaches different from their own. The supervisees in the Ladany et al. study felt their growth and knowledge were impeded by supervisors who were unsupportive and unwilling to consider alternate counseling perspectives. Conversely, other researchers found that supervisors who value and attempt to engage supervisees'

own theoretical perspectives have improved supervisory relationships (Fernando &

Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Galassi & Trent, 1987).

**Supervisee Use of Past Experiences to Guide New Learning**

Empirical support surrounding the supervisee's ability to use personal and

professional experiences to guide new learning is seemingly nonexistent. I was unable to

find published studies that evaluated supervisees' use of past and present personal

experiences to effect new learning or articles that supported counselor supervisees'

reliance on such experiences to inform their practice. Supervisees' use of past and present

experiences to guide new learning in supervision is important because these experiences

are the foundation upon which constructivist supervision approaches are built.

Supervisors use supervisees' experiences to facilitate a discussion about how the

supervisees' lived experiences relate with their client's story. The discussion of these past

and present experiences, when facilitated effectively by supervisors in constructivist

ways, provides some of the main elements associated with supervisee learning and

growth. Ascertaining the extent to which supervisees draw from previous experiences and

the degree to which these experiences inform supervisees' practice requires additional

research, particularly as related to constructivist approaches to supervision.

**Facilitation of New Learning by the Supervisor**

A second area consistent with constructivist supervision, but lacking empirical

support, is the importance of a supervisor who guides the supervisee through the process

of case conceptualization rather than one who provides direct advice. The IPR research

has suggested that supervisors should facilitate learning by becoming an inquirer (Kagan,

1980). The inquirer asks open-ended and non-judgmental questions aimed at helping supervisees understand their thoughts, feelings, and reactions during client sessions. This inquirer role is said to help supervisees develop case conceptualization skills and increase their effectiveness with clients (Kagan, 1984).

I was unable, however, to locate specific research supporting the effectiveness of supervisors who facilitate learning. This may be because a majority of the IPR literature has focused on the overall interpersonal recall process rather than investigating and validating the impact of the inquirer on supervisee outcomes. Nonetheless, research regarding the characteristics associated with supervisors who facilitate learning, and the effect these characteristics have on supervisee learning, is necessary and important to constructivist supervision because constructivist supervisors are tasked with the facilitation of growth producing supervisory sessions instead of directing their outcome and objective.

**Summary of Constructivist Supervision Approaches**

The preceding review of the literature revealed five themes for constructivist supervision approaches: (a) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor; (b) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning; (c) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee; (d) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge; and (e) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. The review of the literature also indicated that some of the themes have received empirical support in the field of counselor supervision, while others

have not. Despite several themes being unsupported with empirical evidence, strong claims have been made about their importance in counselor supervision and their relevance to constructivist supervision approaches. As such, there is a need for additional research in these areas.

**Research Approach**

The purpose of the dissertation study was to design and validate an instrument to assess the extent to which supervisors adhere to constructivist approaches from the perspectives of their supervisees, with respect to their current or most recent experience in supervision. Additionally, supervisee preference for each of the constructivist supervisor characteristics was obtained by asking the supervisee to rate the degree to which they "prefer" or "do not prefer" each supervisor characteristic.

For the first phase of the study, I generated statements that reflect each of the main constructivist themes identified in this chapter. These statements were reviewed and revised by experienced outside reviewers who utilize postmodern approaches to counselor supervision and are familiar with constructivist approaches. After review by these experienced professionals, the initial version of the newly-constructed *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was sent electronically to counselor supervisees registered on various listservs (i.e. COUNSGRADS, CESNET, NARACES).

To assess the validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* counseling supervisees rated the extent to which each statement was true of their current or most recent supervisor in their most recent supervision experience on a Likert-type scale where 1 indicated "not true", 2 indicated "sometimes true", 3 indicated "often true" and 4

indicated, "almost always true". Supervisees also identified the degree to which they "prefer" or "do not prefer" each of the constructivist supervisor characteristics on the following Likert-type scale: 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = very much, by selecting the number that best corresponded with their answer. Supervisees provided demographic information (i.e. age, gender, counseling specialization, ethnicity, current year in their educational/training program, student status [doctoral student, master's student, intern, or practicum student], site of supervision, years of supervision, and years of clinical experience) in a final section of the assessment.

In order to provide a test of the new scale's construct validity, other measures were administered. After completing the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* supervisees completed the supervisee version of the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984). On the SSI, supervisees rated how well each descriptor described their current (or most recent) supervisor's style on a Likert scale from 1 (not very) to 7 (very). The SSI can be divided into subscales (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented), and these scales were used to test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent and discriminant validity. The convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the attractive subscale scores (7 items) and interpersonally sensitive subscale scores (8 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* while the discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the task-oriented subscale scores (10 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.*

In addition to the SSI, a short 6-item "autonomy supportive relationships" scale was also used to test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent validity. This scale was adapted by Lynch (2004) from William and Deci's (2001) *Health Care Climate Questionnaire* to test how autonomy supportive versus controlling a person perceives his or her partner to be. The items in Lynch's autonomy supportive relationships scale were adapted to reflect the relationship between supervisors and supervisees in counseling. This 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree) asked supervisees to rate the degree to which supervisees' perceive their supervisor to be autonomy supportive.

To test the reliability of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* counselor supervisees from the University of Rochester were given the scale in person and asked to re-take the assessment two weeks after the initial completion in order to provide a measure of reliability. All supervisees who completed the scale (the online and the hard copy versions), had the opportunity to enter into a raffle to win a 16GB Apple iPad 2, one of two 16GB Kindle Fire HDs, or one of four $25 Amazon gift cards. University of Rochester supervisees who participated in the test-retest process had an additional opportunity to enter a raffle for a $25 Amazon gift card.

At least 200 participants were needed for this research. The principle components analysis (PCA) was run without applying any rotation initially, but a promax rotation was later added in order to obtain a clean solution. Items that did not contribute to the solution were removed and the appropriate number of factors were identified and appropriately labeled.

The remaining chapters of the dissertation provide the information necessary to better understand the traits of constructivist supervisors and the need for a constructivist-trait assessment. More specifically, Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive review of developmental models of counselor supervision and how these models have been used to frame a discussion of constructivist supervision approaches. Proposed benefits and limitations of constructivist supervision approaches are also be offered. The study methodology is presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 contains a description of the results, and Chapter 5 includes a discussion and implications of the results.

**Chapter 2: Literature Review**

Many counselor education programs have adopted and adhered to standards of excellence (e.g. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs-CACREP) in an effort to promote diverse leadership and professional preparation among counseling students. CACREP accredited counselor education programs include defined practicum and internship requirements to ensure counseling students participate in hundreds of client hours and receive many hours of counselor supervision. In addition to these standards, the field of counseling seeks and supports professionals with a strong respect for human dignity; professionals who possess willingness to engage in self-reflection, acknowledge bias, reserve judgment, and commit to a career of personal growth and self-assessment (American Counseling Association, n.d.). As such, becoming a counselor is more than simply securing a future occupation; it is a process of personal and professional growth, awakening, and commitment to change.

Because of the field's purposeful investment in its professionals, a great deal of energy has been focused on understanding how counselors develop. Developmental models and stage theories characterizing counselors' experiences were created starting in the early 1960s (Hogan, 1964; Littrell, Lee-Borden, & Lorenz, 1979; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985; Sansbury, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981). These models have identified characteristics most noticeable in counselors from neophyte to advanced professionals, as recognized by seasoned counseling professionals who observed the trainee process. While minimal new research has been added to this developmental literature since the early 1980s, the contributions made embrace and

highlight the practice of counselor supervision in understanding how supervisees develop (Goodyear & Guzzardo, 2000; Holloway, 1992; Ladany & Inman, 2008).

Developmental models are primarily used to conceptualize growth as a continual set of staged processes in which supervisees' garner a better sense of professional identity (Aten, Strain, & Gillespie, 2008). Compared to other types of models, developmental models have focused primarily on the levels (or phases or stages) of supervisee development, characteristics associated with each level of development, and environmental conditions necessary for supervisee growth to occur (Carlson & Lambie, 2012). Because of these characterizations, developmental models provide a meaningful framework upon which to review counselor supervision.

Counselor supervision was established as a skill set separate from that of counseling in the 1980s (Bernard, 2005). This distinction allowed the field of supervision to be independently researched, validated, discussed, valued, and criticized. While the establishment of counselor supervision as a unique skill set has only existed for about 30 years, many areas of counselor supervision were extensively reviewed between the years 1992 and 2004, and research has remained vigorous (Bernard, 2005). These areas include, but are not limited to, the exploration of the supervisory relationship (Efstation et al., 1990; Schwing, LaFollette, Steinfeldt, & Wong, 2011), the role of evaluation in counselor supervision (Giblin, 1994; Trepal, Bailie, & Leeth, 2010), and creative approaches to counselor supervision (Guiffrida, Jordan, Saiz, & Barnes, 2007; Neswald-McCalip, Sather, Strati, & Dineen, 2003).

This literature review briefly explores the advantages and limitations associated with using developmental models. Four models of counselor development are then reviewed in terms of their contribution to the field of to counselor supervision. Salient developmental characteristics associated with supervisees are discussed along with ways the characteristics have been used to inform the practice of counselor supervision. Next, this chapter contains a generic review of modern and postmodern approaches to counselor supervision and discusses how these approaches correspond with supervisees at various stages of development. A focus is placed on a postmodern approach to supervision, referred to as constructivist supervision, in an attempt to highlight its effectiveness in developing reflective counseling practitioners.

**Advantages of Using Developmental Models for Counselor Supervision**

Previous models of counselor supervision primarily focused on skill acquisition (Brammer, 1973; Hackney & Nye, 1973; Ivey, Normington, Miller, Morril, & Haase, 1968) and counseling the supervisee (Lister, 1967), but not on developmental cornerstones of supervisee growth. The focus of this literature review is on supervisee developmental models because those models offer distinct, stage-specific, overt and covert characteristics that educators and supervisors can use as a marker of supervisee growth. Stage developmental models have provided a useful paradigm for conceptualizing the supervision process, what to expect of supervisees at different levels of development, and gives supervisors a basis upon which to review supervisee behaviors. Knowledge of supervisee developmental models is also useful for implementing constructivist approaches to counselor supervision (Guiffrida, 2015).

The term, "developmental model" has been used to describe multiple models of counselor development, all of which vary in detail, incorporate development to differing degrees, and depict counselor development in broad ways (Worthington, 1987). Bernard and Goodyear (2009) suggested that developmental models are not all of the same type and that it is possible to discern model types that differ substantially: stage developmental models, process developmental models, and life-span developmental models. All developmental models, however, have shared the same basic premises. Specifically, supervisees move through levels of development based on their interaction with their environment (e.g. educational and supervisory experiences) and present similar characteristics and behaviors based on their current level of development. The developmental framework, then, implies that becoming a counselor is a developmental process that can be facilitated by counselor supervision. Within the developmental framework, supervisors promote supervisee growth by identifying and responding to the supervisee's level of development (Carlson & Lambie, 2012; Lambie & Sias, 2009). The identified strengths of using developmental models for counselor supervision were derived from these basic premises.

Characterizing the experiences of supervisees gives supervisors a baseline understanding of their supervisees' expressions. For example, a supervisor may notice a supervisee expressing resistance to supervision (i.e. lack of insight, limited risk taking, seeming annoyed, defensive). Each of these expressions can be interpreted by the supervisor in many ways depending on a host of reasons: supervisor bias, perceived age of the supervisee, supervisor's knowledge of the supervisee's past experiences, and so on.

When these expressions are viewed through a developmental lens, however, the supervisor is given an additional piece of information that may help the supervisor frame the supervisee's experience. With knowledge of the developmental aspects of being a counselor, a supervisor may be better prepared to respond to the supervisee's experience in a way that normalizes the supervisee's experience, acknowledges the presenting emotion, and helps the supervisor attend to the supervisee at the supervisee's current level of development.

The creation of developmental models of supervision has led researchers to expand basic stage characteristics into other aspects of the supervision process. For example, the transtheoretical model of clinical supervision, described later in this chapter, takes one specific component of supervisee development (e.g. the supervisee's relationship with change) and reviews this aspect in relation to supervisee development. With each addition to the developmental literature, the field of supervision has expanded, and counselor educators have been offered a more refined understanding of the experience of supervisees. Researchers have been thinking about supervision from new, innovative perspectives and have been able to create new or revised theories of counselor supervision to best support the needs of supervisees at multiple stages of development (Behan, 2003; Carroll & Tholstrup, 2001; Shepard & Freado, 2002). Developmental models of counselor supervision have provided the field of supervision with a foundation upon which to conceptualize the experience of novice counselors, the supervisory relationship, and the responsibility to co-create reflective practitioners.

**Limitations of Using Developmental Models for Counselor Supervision**

Although in wide practice within the counseling field, the use of the developmental paradigm to understand supervision and counselor perception and behavior has been questioned and criticized (Holloway, 1987). Critics of developmental approaches have identified the lack of empirical support, weakness in research methodologies, lack of attention to individual supervisee characteristics, and failure to eliminate rival hypotheses as primary contentions (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Holloway, 1987). Most of the existing developmental perspectives were also generated within practicum or internship settings, making it difficult to sort out early-level supervision issues from issues of academic training or preparation (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). Each of these concerns has posed challenges, both in theory and in practice, for supervisees and their supervisors.

Supervisee stage categorization and the establishment of characteristics most commonly associated with supervisees at certain levels of development, has necessitated empirical support. Holloway (1987) and Stoltenberg (1981) debated whether support for developmental models of counselor supervision exist but agreed that improving research methodology in this area was a necessity. Holloway contended that serious shortcomings have existed concerning the methodology, methods of measurement, and sources of data for developmental levels of supervisees. The focus on developmental levels, Holloway claimed, was more on how supervisees changed, not on studying actual supervisee behaviors. While the existence of stage developmental levels for supervisees have received some empirical support (McNeil, et al., 1985; Wiley & Ray, 1986), research in

this area has been limited. The developmental research has continued to focus on perceptions of supervisors and supervisees as opposed to supervision outcomes (Carlson & Lambie, 2012).

Another potential limitation of developmental models has been the tendency to generalize supervisee characteristics into specified stages—a tough sell for many individuals in the field of counseling who appreciate the unique traits, stories, and experiences of others. Originators of supervision modalities that focus on humanistic qualities of beginning counselors (e.g. narrative approaches to counselor supervision, integrative approaches, systemic supervision, and solution-focused supervision) have drawn from supervisees' personal experiences and unique strengths to establish a strong supervisor/supervisee relationship. Developmental models do not necessarily account for unique attributes of supervisees, supervisees' past experiences, or varied responses to developmental stages. Instead, developmental models tend to group the experiences of supervisees together at the cost of supervisee individuality. This shortfall has led researchers to question the validity of developmental models and instead focus on supervisory models that individualize rather than categorize supervisee experiences.

While considerable attention has been given to characteristics associated with supervisee development, less is known about how supervisees actually move between stages. The literature has not made clear when and how supervisees move from one level to another, nor has the literature indicated how the competencies at each level are evaluated (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003). Some research has indicted that developmental movement is associated with the supervisory relationship (Efstation et al., 1990; Patton &

Kivlighan, 1997), and most researchers have argued that development happens with time and experience.

However, without an understanding of how supervisees move from one developmental stage to the next, it becomes challenging to assess how and when a supervisee moves to a new level of development. It is also challenging to determine whether the supervisee is moving at a slower or faster developmental pace than peers. Although developing competency and professionalism is not a race, peer-based comparisons provide insight into other areas of the supervisory process (e.g. poor supervisor/supervisee fit, the need for an altered curriculum, questions about the supervisees' readiness to see clients, etc.). These areas of the supervision process could be further explored to build a better understanding of how and when supervisees move through developmental stages.

A lack of understanding about how supervisees progress developmentally also poses challenges for supervisors tasked with identifying developmentally appropriate interventions and helping supervisees achieve more advanced levels. According to Spruill and Benshoff (2000), "developmental changes take time, and efforts to affect development must be sustained and intentional" (p. 78). Choosing an intentional supervision intervention, however, necessitates an understanding of how supervisees move into higher levels of development, awareness, and skill acquisition. If a supervisor chooses to use more than one type of intervention, is attending to characteristics in more than one developmental level, or chooses to focus on more than one model's conceptualization of supervisee development, it may become difficult to choose an

appropriate supervisory approach. The nuances of counselor development models can make appropriate, effective supervisory responses a challenge. More research is therefore needed to validate interventions, responses, and strategies used by supervisors to help supervisees move to advanced levels of development.

Although developmental models associated with counselor development have limitations, those models still provide counselor educators and supervisors with meaningful information about the common experiences of supervisees and allow counseling professionals a baseline for determining how best to support counselors as they progress in their professional and personal journey. Instead of reviewing developmental models as the only way to conceptualize counselor development, it is more advantageous to use the framework provided by developmental models (that learning is a developmental process, that certain behaviors and characteristics tend to manifest similarly in supervisees at similar stages of development, and that environmental conditions effect supervisee growth) as a guide for learning how to support supervises as they develop as professional counselors.

**Review of Counselor Development Models Related to Counselor Supervision**

Developmental models specifically related to the practice of supervision are a relatively new area of scholarly interest. Thorough reviews of early developmental models of supervision have been presented (Russell, Crimmings, & Lent, 1984; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Worthington, 1987) and researchers have compared and contrasted many of the existing developmental models of supervision (Holloway, 1992; Littrell et al., 1979; Loganbill et al., 1982; Worthington, 1987). Because considerable

work already has been given to these reviews, this chapter, instead, focuses on more recent developmental models of supervision (post 1990). Understandably, each of these models has been, in some way, an extension of the earlier developmental work.

The developmental models of supervision discussed in this review were chosen based on their relatedness to the understanding of supervisee development, contribution to the field of counselor supervision, and novelty. The models chosen were (a) the integrated developmental model (Stoltenberg, McNeil, & Delworth, 1998), (b) lifespan developmental model (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003), (c) systemic counselor supervision model (Carlson & Lambie, 2012), and (d) the transtheoretical model of clinical supervision (Aten et al., 2008). Appendix A contains a chart of the main components of each model. The chosen models highlight many of the developmental components found throughout the literature and serve as a broad overview of how counselors develop.

**Model Similarities**

Each of the developmental models chosen for this review share ontological roots. All four models presume that change is an ongoing process and that "…change is both temporal and dynamic, meaning people are able to move boundlessly from stage to stage and often do so in a cyclical manner" (Aten et al., 2008, p. 1). Supervisees can be in more than one stage at a time, functioning at different developmental levels in different domains and requiring different supervision conditions for each level (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Westfeld, 2009). Movement between and within stages is a necessary part of the developmental framework. All four models reviewed have addressed the claim

that supervisees move between stages by distinguishing stage-specific supervisee characteristics and associating supervisee growth with higher stages of development.

The originators of the four models also agreed that supervisees move through levels of development based on their interaction with their environment. The term environment, in these supervision models, was used to describe the "felt" components of supervision, such as supervisees' feelings about their relationship with their supervisors or how comfortable the supervisees are taking risks with their supervisors. These models have suggested that supervisees need safe and emotionally supportive supervision environments in order to elicit supervisee growth and improvement. Each of the four models have suggested that a successful supervisor is one who notices characteristics associated with a particular developmental level, works toward creating an environment that supports the supervisee's level of development, and appropriately matches interventions to the supervisee's developmental needs.

**Model Differences**

Although ontologically similar, each of the reviewed developmental models offers unique contributions to the understanding of counselor supervision. Three main differences emerged through the review of the literature: (a) the model's area of focus regarding supervisee development, (b) the role of the supervisor in supervisee development, and (c) the model's contribution to the field of counselor education's understanding of supervisee development. Each model is discussed in terms of these three areas of distinction and within the context of counselor supervision.

**Focus of supervisee development.** Stoltenberg et al.'s (1998) integrated developmental model (IDM) focuses primarily on supervisees' motivation, confidence, and level of dependence on the supervisor. According to Stoltenberg et al., the supervisee demonstrates these three characteristics during a supervision session overtly (e.g. asking fewer questions of the supervisor) and covertly (e.g. looking less tense during supervision sessions). A supervisor familiar with the stages of supervisee development recognizes these and other developmental characteristics as the supervisee moves through the training program, specifically during the time when first working with clients. Supervisee movement between and within each of the developmental stages may be evidenced, for example, by a decrease in the supervisees' anxiety level, a decreased reliance on the supervisor for advice, and an increase in confidence as the supervisee takes more risks during a session. According to Stoltenberg et al., these changes are expected to occur within a relatively short period of time and during a very specific stage of the supervisee's training.

Ronnestad and Skovholt's (2003) lifespan developmental model conceptualized counselor development on a longer continuum—throughout the course of a counselor's career. Counselor/supervisee characteristics associated with the lifespan developmental model are those related with a slower, more gradual change in the supervisee's level of professional maturation, clinical experience, and degree of insight. As the counselor/supervisee advances professionally, the individual will become more mature and sophisticated when working with clients (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003). Ronnestad and Skovholt (2003) suggested that counselors continuously grow and adapt and that they

become less dependent, more confident, and more professionally mature with increased experience and exposure to clients. As counselors progress along the lifespan developmental continuum, they better understand their role as a counselor and how this role relates with who they are as a helping professional. The focus of the lifespan developmental model has been neither on stage-specific characteristics, nor overt or covert expressions of development, but on changes in professional identity and insight as a counselor advances through the profession (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003).

The final two models, the transtheoretical model of clinical supervision (Aten et al., 2008) and the systemic counselor supervision model (Carlson & Lambie, 2012) conceptualized development in relation to more concrete areas of supervisee growth. The transtheoretical model, for example, focused on supervisees' growth and development as they notice their relationship with change. According to the transtheoretical model, the more confident, accepting, and open to change the supervisee becomes, the more advanced the supervisee is said to be. Similar to the IDM, the transtheoretical model conceptualized supervisee development in terms of overt and covert supervisee expressions. The nuanced difference, however, is that a transtheoretical supervisor watches to see how a supervisee reacts to suggestions for improvement (overt) and how motivated the supervisee is to implement change (covert). In the transtheoretical model, supervisees' ability to internalize change and commit to a professional identity becomes more apparent and purposeful as they develop.

The systemic counselor supervision model (Carlson & Lambie, 2012), based on Ronnestad and Skovholt's (2003) premise that development occurs across the

professional lifespan, framed development in terms of the supervisees' level of differentiation and ability to acknowledge one's self. Supervisees at more advanced levels of development should be able to address transference and countertransference issues with clients and supervisors, exude professional confidence, and desire opportunities for self-reflection and growth (Carlson & Lambie, 2012). Comparatively, supervisees at earlier stages of development may be unable to recognize how their experiences and sense of self affect the ability to counsel, as well as the ability to conceptualize client's concerns. The systemic counselor supervisor frames supervisee development around the supervisees' ability to self-actualize. Within the systemic counselor supervision model, it is assumed that supervisees have the most differentiated version of themselves later in their professional careers, after they have been given opportunities to acknowledge and understand the ways in which their experiences have informed who they are as counselors.

  **Role of the supervisor.** Each of the models identified in the previous section acknowledges that the supervision environment is important to supervisee growth, as is the relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee. The expectations and role of the supervisor, however, are not identical across models. Since each developmental model conceptualizes growth of the supervisee through different criteria, it is not surprising that supervisors are expected to react, select interventions, and choose an appropriate level of supervisor involvement in unique ways. Appendix B contains a review of the supervisee stage/phase characteristics for each developmental level, and Appendix C contains the suggested supervisor responses and levels of involvement for a

level one (beginning) counselor. Although Appendix C contains sample responses for supervisees at level one (beginning stages) of development, which is a time when supervisee characteristics are most similar across the models, it is important to note that the supervisor role varies as supervisees move into new stages of development.

Many counselor development models, even those outside of the scope of this literature review, suggested similar characteristics associated with beginning/stage one supervisees. The terms "dependency and uninsightfulness" (Hogan, 1964), narrow rigidity, stagnation, in search of the right answers, insecurity, and lack of confidence are just a few phrases that have been used to represent supervisees in early stages of their professional development. Yogev (1982) suggested beginning supervisees are anxious because of their concern that they will do something wrong or harm a client because of something they said or did. Although their knowledge of and familiarity with counseling is quite limited, motivation is usually high for beginning supervisees. Beginning supervisees often are anxious about their counseling performance and request (both directly and indirectly) considerable direction and guidance from their supervisors concerning the fundamentals of the counseling process (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1995).

Because of the gap between supervisees' inexperience and their perceived accountability, the extent to which supervisor advice and guidance can be critically evaluated and integrated becomes limited. Instead, beginning supervisees accept much of what the supervisor has to say which, in turn, can limit the supervisee's growth and reliance on their personal insight (Stoltenberg et al., 1995). According to Spruill and

Benshoff (2000), "students in early stages typically require higher levels of support and encouragement than do advanced students who can absorb more abstract concepts that require them to think and process information in more integrative ways." (p. 70). Even though beginning level supervisees present similarly throughout each of the proposed models, the response from the supervisor differs from one developmental model to the next.

While each of the models offers supervisory approaches specific to their theoretical base, they are consistent in the stance that supervisee development must be supported, and that supervisors play an important role in creating an environment for this development to occur. Additionally, unique supervisee characteristics and behaviors create unique supervision environments and supervisory approaches, even within the same model. As such, the supervision environment and supervisory relationship must change to augment development and elicit growth within each supervisee (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997).

*The IDM supervisor.* The IDM positions the supervisor as a mentor who provides a mix of autonomy, encouragement, and structure to help create an environment conducive to trial and error but supportive enough to keep anxiety at a manageable level. IDM supervisors working with beginning supervisees may suggest techniques the supervisee can use with clients, or model appropriate responses, as long as the supervision environment allows the supervisee to "try on" new counseling approaches with support and guidance from the supervisor. The goal is to move supervisees toward independent functioning. It is essential for the supervisor to encourage the supervisee to

take risks, even when the supervisee resists the push toward responsibility and autonomy (Stoltenberg et al., 1995). As the supervisee transitions to new levels of development, the supervisor skillfully redirects the supervisee's attention away from adequate performance and onto awareness of the client's experience (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997).

*The lifespan development model supervisor.* Supervisors aligned with Ronnestad and Skovholt's (2003) lifespan developmental model share similar characteristics to the IDM supervisor, although the supervisor operating from the lifespan developmental model focuses primarily on providing the supervisee with high levels of encouragement, feedback, and support in addition to marked structure (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). Supervisors adhering to the lifespan developmental model consider the supervisory relationship to be fundamental to the supervisee's professional development and focus less on established models of practice and more on the individualized work of the supervisor (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). The supervisory environment, from a lifespan developmental framework, is comforting, inviting, supportive, and welcoming of supervisee curiosity (Ronnestad & Skobholt, 1993). A supervisor adhering to the lifespan developmental framework will help the beginning supervisee discover their strengths and limitations while further advancing their skills in a way that encourages insight over concrete thinking.

Ronnestad and Skovholt (2003) also identified themes of counselor development that have varying implications for the supervisory relationship. The supervisor is not given direct instructions nor asked to identify in which developmental level their supervisee currently resides; instead, the supervisor is encouraged to offer a continuous,

consistent level of support and encouragement to supervisees working toward self-reflection and self-supervision. The idea is for supervisors to collaborate with supervisees in a way that bolsters supervisee confidence and trust in the supervisee's innate therapeutic skills. Like the IDM supervisor, the goal of this type of supervision is to move supervisees toward independent functioning.

    ***The transtheoretical model supervisor.*** Supervisor processes of change (SPC) are described in the transtheoretical model of clinical supervision as a series of interventions that may be used to facilitate supervisee development (Aten et al., 2008). As the name describes, transtheoretical supervisors play an active role in supervisees' development and respond in experientially-based or behaviorally-based ways depending on the developmental level of the supervisee. For supervisees at beginning stages of development, experiential processes are most effective because they target supervisee emotion and insight (Freyer et al., 2006). Supervisors can choose from a range of experiential or behavioral activities aimed at helping beginning supervisees gain awareness into their clinical practice, recapitulate supervisee/client interactions, assess their self-image, evaluate how their behaviors affect their clients, and gain greater self-awareness (Aten et al., 2008). These activities may include Socratic questioning, dramatic relief, and self-reevaluations (Aten et al., 2008). The transtheoretical model supervisor actively gauges the supervisee's response to change and intervenes in a purposeful way, hoping to help the supervisee feel more comfortable with their strengths or limitations and remain open to trying new ways of being, both inside and outside their client sessions. Unlike supervisors following the IDM or lifespan development model, the

role of the transtheoretical supervisor is to be intentional, direct, and focused on the supervisee's "openness to change" (Aten et al., 2008, p. 6).

*The systemic developmental supervisor.* The systemic developmental supervisor is tasked with evaluating the supervisee's level of self-awareness and responding with an appropriate intervention when one is needed. Beginning supervisees, most often low in self-awareness and not typically ready to explore "self" in supervision, receive validation of their feelings related to anxiety, live observation of their work with clients, modeling of suggested techniques, and opportunities to engage in role-plays from their supervisor (Carlson & Lambie, 2012). The systemic developmental model, like the transtheoretical model, suggests direct interventions for supervisors and holds the supervisor accountable for best identifying the supervisees' levels of awareness and development, then providing developmentally appropriate feedback. Systemic supervisors working with beginning counselors encourage supervisee independence while providing adequate support and structure (Carlson & Lambie, 2012). Within the systemic developmental model, the supervisor should be supportive, discuss the supervisee's understanding of theories and skills, and create an environment where the supervisee can practice what they are learning through coursework and in sessions with their clients (Carlson & Lambie, 2012). Similar to the IDM, lifespan developmental, and transtheoretical models, systemic developmental supervisors are educators, role models, and share a goal of increasing professional self-awareness and case-conceptualization skills with their supervisees.

**Contribution to the field of supervision.** Each of the four models offers at least one distinct contribution to the understanding of supervisee development. The IDM, one

of the most well-known and researched developmental models for supervisees, has provided the field of supervision with a conceptual and empirical approach to supervisee development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender & Shafransky, 2004; Haynes et al., 2003). More current developmental models of supervision often credit the IDM for the creation of its own stage characteristics, and supervisees are often conceptualized with Stoltenberg, McNeil, and Delworth's (1998) developmental levels in mind. The IDM has provided the field of supervision with basic supervisee characteristics that have allowed supervisors and counselor educators to better conceptualize the supervision process and the needs of supervisees' at various levels of development.

Ronnestad and Skovholt's (2003) lifespan developmental model added the notion that counselor development occurs throughout one's professional career, not simply during the course of training. Ronnestad and Skovholt have helped theorists and researchers view supervisees as career-long learners and budding professionals who can offer substantial contributions to the field of counseling at each stage of their development. Ronnestad and Skovholt's qualitative interviews, conducted with 100 counselors ranging from novice to expert, provided the field of supervision with themes of counselor development and a framework for helping supervisors and supervisees conceptualize the common experiences of counseling professionals.

The transtheoretical model added insight into supervisees' openness to change—a specific component of the supervisory process. The framework of the transtheoretical model helps supervisors conceptualize the readiness of supervisees to grow and adapt as they continue to work with clients. The transtheoretical model emphasized the

development of the supervisee's professional maturity; as a supervisee matures professionally, his or her openness to change will also develop. The creators of the transtheoretical model (Aten et al., 2008) also purported that the model would help supervisors address supervisees' maladaptive behaviors, more so than other developmental models, because it targets supervisees' openness to changing specific thoughts, feelings, and actions that may affect developmental progress.

The systemic developmental supervision model added another refined component of the supervisee's development: supervisees' professional self-awareness. Uniquely, the systemic developmental model suggests connections between the supervisee's professional self-awareness and skills acquisition and offered specific supervisor techniques to assist supervisees into reaching greater awareness and acceptance of who they are as clinicians. The model acknowledges many aspects of the supervisory process (both inside and outside of the supervisory relationship) and asks supervisees to conceptualize their work from a perspective that includes all of the factors that may be affecting their work with clients. These systemic factors may include (a) tension that exists between the supervisor and supervisee, (b) anything happening in the supervisee's life that may interfere with their ability to counsel, (c) feelings that surface when the supervisee compares him or herself to others in his or her training program, (d) feelings about being evaluated by one's supervisor, and so on. The systemic developmental supervision model emphasizes the holistic nature of supervision and the supervisory relationship by paying particular attention to the importance of cultivating the

supervisor/supervisee dynamic and understanding how this dynamic relates to supervisees' development.

Each of the four developmental models, while ontologically similar, provides unique insight into a specific aspect of supervisee development including motivation and dependence, maturation and clinical insight, relationship with change, and self-actualization. The duration of supervisee development varies as well within each model by focusing either on the counselor training program or over the course of a professional career. The role of the supervisor, along with each model's contribution to the field of counselor development literature, also varies across the different models. However, rather than operating from an either/or perspective, the researcher or practitioner who sees the differences as offering an opportunity to construct a clearer understanding of counselor development may be at an advantage. Specifically, each model provides insight about the growth and changes processes of supervisees and offers increased awareness about unique, specific aspects of supervisee development. Combined, these models help counselor educators acknowledge the many components involved in the development of counseling professionals. In the remainder of this chapter, I briefly review two general categories associated with supervisory styles and support the claim that constructivist approaches to counselor supervision are worthy of attention and consideration for supervisees at various levels of development.

## Supervision Approaches

Two general terms have been used to distinguish differences within the epistemological positions of supervisory styles: modern and postmodern (Gonzalez,

1997). Each position suggests distinct understandings and expectations of human behavior and requires the supervisee to think about a client from a specific point of view. Supervisees who follow a modernist ideology, for instance, operate from the assumption that an objective reality exists and that it is the supervisee's responsibility to help the client realize and relate with this objective reality. Supervisees who prescribe to postmodern thought, however, are inclined to believe that reality is subjective and that the supervisee's role is to help clients facilitate their experience.

The distinction between modern and postmodern approaches to counselor supervision is more complex than suggested by the provided examples. It is not always easy for supervisors or supervisees to distinguish between the two approaches in an actual supervision session nor is that always the goal. According to Philp, Guy, and Lowe (2007), "We are not always able to identify when this distinction happens and consequently can limit discursive options by maintaining an either/or epistemological position" (p. 11). Thus, when researching modern and postmodern approaches to counselor supervision, it is important to recognize that taking an either/or epistemological position is not necessarily helpful. Instead, understanding the mindset and beliefs of the supervisor may be useful for gauging how the supervisor will respond and react during a supervision session. In other words, how the supervisor thinks and feels about the role of counseling, the roles and responsibilities of counselor supervisees, the supervisory relationship, and how people change is more important than identifying with a modern or postmodern generalization. For the purpose of this review, however, the terms "modern" and "postmodern" are used to broadly distinguish the beliefs, thoughts, and opinions of

educators who demonstrate characteristics typical of either the modern or postmodern perspective.

**Modernist Approaches**

Typically, educators who promote modernist ideals believe in an objective reality, in which knowledge is understood to exist independent of attempts to observe it (McAuliffe & Eriksen, 2000; Philp et al., 2007). Modernist-minded individuals tend to believe that universal truths (sometimes referred to as "reality") can be discovered and validated through scientific means. The modernist-minded supervisor is likely to believe that each client has an objective reality and that it is the supervisee's responsibility to help that client address and acknowledge this reality. Modernist approaches to counselor supervision are most often associated with experienced counselors (supervisors) imparting their knowledge and expertise to beginning counselors (supervisees) through direct instruction, education, and skill correction.

The modernist theories most often associated with early approaches to counselor supervision were psychoanalytic and cognitive-behavioral in nature and were rooted in the belief that supervision and personal analysis (Kovacs, 1936) should be combined with skills training (Carroll, 1996). This made distinguishing between therapy, supervision, teaching, and mentoring very difficult (Davy, 2002). Directive supervision approaches were first recognized and suggested as a way to help beginning counselors become more masterful and skillful in their work with clients. The emphasis was not necessarily on helping supervisees grow personally, to uncover systemic challenges, or to think about counseling from a multi-dimensional perspective.

From a counselor development perspective, the initial stages of development showed beginning supervisees to be anxious, self conscious, and uncertain of their potential (Stoltenberg, 1998). Although supervisees' want to perform well, their performance tends to be overshadowed by anxiety and concern for counseling the "right" way so modernist approaches may be comforting to beginning supervisees because the approach is directive and reliant on the knowledge of the supervisor (Aten et al., 2008; Carlson & Lambie, 2012; Stoltenberg, 1998). The modernist-minded supervisor reacts to the supervisee's outward projection of anxiety and fear by offering suggestions, direction, and answers.

As the supervisee advances in working with clients, however, the direct interactions provided by the modernist-minded supervisor may not fully stimulate the supervisee's critical thinking and case conceptualization skills nor allow the supervisee to develop a personal voice (Guiffrida, 2005; Johnson 2007). Guiffrida (2005) stated, "Although the modernist approach is useful for conveying information and reducing student anxiety, some counselor educators have argued that the approach prevents students from developing new ways of conceptualizing their work with clients" (p. 203). Direct approaches to counselor supervision may limit the supervisee's ability to move beyond the supervisor's preferred method of counseling and into a method that feels more akin to the supervisee's personal style. Supervisees' may also be less likely to try on new ways of working with clients if they fear that their approach is not what the supervisor considers appropriate or effective.

An increasing amount of literature has supported the need for supervisors to step out of the expert role and into a mindset that values and engages supervisees' frames of reference (Guiffrida, 2005). This may be challenging for more modernist-minded supervisors, especially when working with anxious and self-conscious supervisees. However, when powerful, unquestioned norms of personal thinking take over the supervisory conversations, those norms impede the development and construction of other ideas (Philp et al., 2007). This can mean that modernist-minded supervisors who present one, objective and universally effective way of counseling may overlook equally effective methods and thereby limit the experiences of supervisees. Examples of some of the power struggles associated with supervisory beliefs and how these beliefs become embedded in the supervision process are shown in Appendix D.

Supervision approaches that are considered more direct or modern may appeal to supervisors in certain supervisory situations, specifically those working with beginning counselors. However, whether this approach is adequate for all stages of supervisee development and in each clinical setting is questionable. Providing supervisees with experiences that enhance learning and elicit thoughtful reflection about clients and the systems of which they are a part requires a refined look into more recent approaches to counselor supervision, specifically postmodern-minded approaches to encouraging supervisee development.

**Postmodern Approaches**

Unlike supervision approaches that are direct, advice-based, and used to move supervisees toward a goal or acceptance of one reality, postmodern approaches to

counselor supervision tend to minimize the role of authority and focus, instead, on collaborative relationships between the client and counselor (supervisee). The most common theoretical approaches operating with a postmodern frame include narrative, reflective, systemic, and collaborative language systems. In each of these postmodern approaches, the supervisor and supervisee co-create a collaborative partnership and "the all-seeing, all-knowing, all-powerful, ever-present clinical supervisor [becomes] mythical" (Stevenson, 2005, p. 523). Whereas the modernist-minded supervisor is seen as knowing the right way to counsel and has the responsibility to deliver that knowledge to the supervisee, the postmodern-minded supervisor comes from a position of not knowing to provide supervisees with opportunities to work through challenges they may face with clients. In general, the goal of postmodern approaches is to help supervisees think through ways of intervening, identify challenges associated with countertransference, and develop case conceptualization skills.

While supervisees' are likely to look to their supervisors for reassurance of the correct way of intervening with clients, the postmodern-led supervisee recognizes that effective interventions are multiple and often rely on instincts. Because postmodern-led supervisees are not concerned with "right" or "wrong" ways to counsel, they may feel more comfortable experimenting with different counseling styles and interventions, as they are less likely to fear criticism for veering from their supervisor's theoretical ontology. As an additional benefit, postmodern-led supervisees may also build their reliance on their natural counseling instincts because these instincts are being utilized and

relied upon in each supervision session. These skills will be necessary long after these supervision sessions have ended.

Postmodern approaches are not without criticism, however. Supervisory styles, guided by postmodern ideas, do not always fit well into with the ideas of more traditional, educative, and developmental models. Postmodern styles are harder to quantify, harder to validate, and rely on the unique experiences and relationships between supervisors and supervisees. It is seemingly impossible to create a standardized version of postmodern supervision approaches because this type of supervision relies on unique personality characteristics, individual relationship factors, and specific supervision session qualities that cannot be easily quantified and shared with others hoping to adopt this approach. Furthermore, the evaluative role of supervisors, in addition to unwavering ethical responsibilities, may make supervisors uncomfortable with allowing beginning counselors to express high degrees of autonomy.

Although ontologically different, both modernist-minded and postmodern-minded supervision approaches include a focus on counselor training, client protection, and supervisor responsibility. These strands are predominantly held by the supervisor and are maneuvered by the approach to the supervision process. When developing an approach to supervision, supervisors must first determine how they think people learn, what they believe the role of counselor supervision is for new professionals, what they want their role to be as a supervisor, and then relate these determinations with their understanding of supervisee development. Adopting a postmodern approach to counselor supervision can be beneficial to supervisees if implemented from a genuine belief that supervisees' are

capable of effectively working with clients and will benefit from taking risks and learning from their experiences.

## Constructivist Approaches to Counselor Supervision

The epistemological positions inherent in postmodern thought are evident in constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. Constructivist supervision was used in this research to categorize various approaches to counselor supervision, such as the narrative, reflective, systemic, and interpersonal process recall (IPR) strategies described in Chapter 1. These four strategies are informed by postmodern thinking and are rooted in constructivist learning. Although postmodern approaches to counselor supervision have received some support in the literature (as discussed in Chapter 1) only a few of these theories have been reviewed through a lens of constructivism. Guiffrida (2015), for instance, reviewed some of the theories and other constructivist-informed postmodern approaches but referred to the approaches as "constructive."

Constructivist supervision approaches have been informed by the belief that supervisees' knowledge is constructed, actively engaged by supervisors, and personalized to the supervisee. When guided and facilitated through a constructive learning process, supervisees gain command over their learning and knowledge and can feel increased confidence as they apply therapeutic interventions with their clients. Constructivist approaches to counselor supervision help supervisees learn about themselves, learn about their style of counseling, and appreciate the uniqueness of their clients.

Constructivist supervisors are tasked with the responsibility to guide counseling professionals through open, supportive, encouraging, inquisitive, curious, flexible, and

transparent, supervision experiences. It is important to note that these characteristics may be displayed in myriad ways within supervision sessions. Being supportive, for instance, may mean that the supervisor sits back and waits for their supervisee to work through their thoughts and feelings about a particular client. Being supportive could also describe the supervisor who encourages the supervisee to think through their opinions of a client, wondering whether there may be something "under the surface" affecting the supervisee's thoughts. Because characteristics such as supervisor support can manifest in many ways, it is helpful to think about constructivist supervision as a mindset rather than a set of skills that the supervisor and supervisee perform.

**Benefits of a Constructivist Approach to Supervision**

Constructivist approaches to counselor supervision may have both immediate and long-term benefits to supervisees. The benefits are derived from the five themes of constructivist supervision approaches identified in Chapter 1: (a) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor; (b) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning; (c) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee; (d) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge; and (e) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. Each of the benefits (encouraging reflective practitioners, facilitating professional growth, decreased reliance on supervisor, longevity of skill accrual, and improved relationship) is an anticipated result of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. Although additional research is needed to validate the themes associated with constructivist

supervision approaches and the potential benefits of constructivist approaches, exploring the anticipated benefits of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision is an important step in recognizing the potential value of constructivist approaches when working with supervisees.

**Encouraging reflective practitioners.** Constructivist supervisees are encouraged to explore the assumptions associated with their beliefs and actions in their work with clients. From the first supervisory session, constructivist-led supervisees begin defining their professional edges and thinking about their counseling interactions from multiple lenses. Supervisees are given the opportunity to talk through solutions, interventions, and options without fear of judgment or rejection from their supervisor. Supervisors, instead, are patient and understanding of the supervisee's process because they believe that the supervisees' speculations are likely to produce reflective practitioners capable of thinking deeply about client conceptualizations in the future.

One area where supervisors tend to be more cautious about giving supervisees' opportunities to be a reflective practitioner is around the topic of ethics. Due to the potential harm associated with making an unethical decision, modernist-minded supervisors tend to provide clear-cut answers regarding what is ethically right and wrong in a counseling session. Constructivist supervisors, instead of providing the supervisee with right or wrong answers, suspend their advice to allow the supervisee to thoroughly work through their thoughts and moral feelings. Constructivist supervisors are of the mindset that supervisees already have the moral grounding needed to make tough ethical decisions, and if they do not have this moral grounding, a discussion about the

supervisee's beliefs in relation to the ethics of the counseling profession becomes a critical topic of discussion.

Rather than providing the supervisee with answers, the constructivist supervisor attempts to understand the supervisee's beliefs about moral constructs and helps the supervisee explore dominant professional, societal, and cultural discourses that might have framed the supervisee's beliefs. The supervisor also works with the supervisee to understand how these ideas might be impacting the supervisee's responses to the client (Philp et al., 2007). This moral discourse provides constructivist supervisors with an opportunity to regard professional ethics as important while intentionally unpacking the power and rationale laden within the supervisee. Ultimately the goal is helping the supervisee to thoroughly review ethical decision-making in a larger context. By engaging supervisees in this process, the constructivist supervisor actively asks the supervisee to participate in a reflective process.

All counselor supervisors are tasked with the challenge of helping supervisees navigate their relationships with clients and transfer what they are learning into future (often non-supervised) sessions. According to West (2003), "If we are going to insist on supervision in counselor and psychotherapist training and beyond, then it needs to be ethical and a safe place where supervisees feel able to explore any matters arising from their therapeutic practice" (p. 126). Constructivist supervisors believe that the most ethical and safe place for supervisees to explore counseling sessions is one where supervisees are encouraged to be reflective, take risks, define their professional boundaries, and continuously assess the work they are doing with clients.

**Facilitating professional growth.** Supervisees learn about human suffering and resiliency, recognize their own biases and judgments, and realize the limits of the counseling profession within the counseling and supervision processes. Supervisees often question these instances during their client sessions and wonder whether anyone else has ever experienced such growing pains. Loganbill et al. (1982) suggested, "Sometimes it is more growth enhancing to let supervisees experience issues fully for a period of time" (p. 5). Constructivist approaches to counselor supervision permit for this growth to occur and complement the supervisee's desire to learn, grow, and understand their clients. Constructivist supervisors play an active role in supervisee growth through the facilitation of questions aimed at helping the supervisee broaden their current personal and professional understandings.

Constructivist supervisors believe that supervisee growth is cyclical and that learning is a result of trial and error. For this reason, constructivist supervisors give their supervisees the chance to review past experiences and process new experiences in a way that informs their current work with clients. Using strategies like those found in IPR (Kagan, 1984), the constructivist supervisor inquires, curiously, about the supervisees' past and present experiences and uses these experiences to facilitate discussions about supervisees' professional growth and awareness. Alternatively, the modernist-minded supervisor may limit opportunities for personal and professional growth when they give advice, disapprove of a particular intervention, or over-identify with the supervisee's experience. Modernist-minded supervisors may also inhibit supervisee growth by discouraging (directly or indirectly) reflective thought by offering suggestions before

giving supervisees time to think through their options or by eagerly relating the supervisee's experience to the supervisor's experiences.

In keeping with developmental models of counselor supervision, the role of any counselor supervisor is to help the supervisee move into a more advanced level of development. Constructivist supervisors do this by framing their role as a facilitator, defined as one that helps the supervisee use their reflections and insight to advance professional development. By facilitating, instead of directing supervisees' growth, the constructivist supervisor helps supervisees identify and integrate their professional identity.

**Decreased reliance on the supervisor.** Supervisees, specifically those in early stages of development, are likely to look to their supervisors for direct advice about how to most successfully counsel clients (Stoltenberg et al., 1998). Modernist-minded supervisors may choose to address beginning level supervisees' anxiety and need for structure by providing advisement, answers, and expertise. An unintentional side effect of this response, however, may be supervisees' steady reliance on their supervisor for continued guidance and approval, even as they move through stages of development. If a supervisor has previously offered the supervisee an effective intervention, it is likely that the supervisee will rely upon the supervisor for suggestions in the future. This reliance may inhibit supervisees' from fully thinking about their response options and taking responsibility for the outcome of their interventions.

In addition to reliance, supervisees led by modernist-minded supervisors may interpret the supervisor's advice as implying that there is one right and wrong way to

counsel. If this is true, and the supervisee administers the "wrong" technique, the supervisee may have fear harming the client or dissatisfying their supervisor. The supervisee may also become discouraged, thinking that it can take years and years of experience to be as good as the supervisor.

Constructivist supervisors, instead, help supervisees think in terms of effectiveness. In lieu of approaching the supervisee with solutions and suggestions, the supervisor enlists the supervisee's previous experiences as a guide for decision-making. The constructivist supervisor facilitates conversations with the supervisee about their thoughts, feelings, and reactions in client sessions, which shifts the reliance away from the supervisor's opinions and onto the supervisee's own knowledge. Constructivist approaches also shift the conversation away from right and wrong ways of counseling and onto the effectiveness of a particular intervention with a particular client. As supervision continues, constructivist-led supervisees are likely to rely on their own knowledge instead of their supervisor, a skill that will benefit supervisees when counselor supervision is not readily available.

**Longevity of skill accrual.** According to Stoltenberg et al. (1998) beginning level supervisees characteristically put a great deal of pressure on themselves to learn the skills and techniques associated with being an effective counselor. These counseling skills can include effectively starting and ending a counseling session, the use of silence, being an active listener, reserving judgment, visibly showing empathic responses, being succinct, reading the client's body language, deciding when to ask questions, etc. With innumerable counseling skills to learn and master, it would be naïve to think that any

supervisor could teach every counseling skill the supervisee will need throughout tenure as a counselor. Instead, constructivist supervisors understand that counseling skills are accrued over time and that improving counseling skills requires the supervisee insight and openness to trying something new.

Constructivist supervisors' focus on helping supervisees' develop the innate skills that they bring to counseling sessions by eliciting the supervisee's thoughts and feelings about their current experiences with clients. Whereas modernist-minded supervisors are more likely to tell the supervisee how to effectively end a counseling session, for instance, "I would suggest telling the client when there are ten minutes remaining so they have an opportunity to conclude their thoughts," a constructivist supervisor will ask the supervisee how they think they would like to end the session. They might ask, "How have you thought about monitoring the time in your session?" By refining the skills and talents the supervisee already brings into the client session, the constructivist supervisor helps the supervisee move away from selecting the "right" intervention and toward a better understanding of how to improve the supervisee's current skill sets. When the insight and thoughtfulness related to the supervisee's counseling skills comes from the supervisee directly, the constructivist supervisor believes that the supervisee has the best opportunity to integrate new learning and transfer this learning into future client sessions.

**Improved relationship.** Research surrounding supervisory relationships has shown that the relationship between a supervisor and a supervisee is important (Efstation et al., 1990; Ekstein & Wallerstein, 1972; Mueller & Kell, 1972; Ward & House, 1998). Research also has shown that power differentials are inherent between the supervisor and

supervisee (Murphy & Wright, 2005), which have the potential to interfere with the process of establishing and improving the supervisory relationship. If the supervisor, for instance, has distinct power and sole evaluative responsibility over the supervisee, it becomes challenging to create an effective and collaborative working relationship. For this reason, the constructivist supervisor is encouraged to take on the role of mentor rather than expert. When supervisors resist the authoritative role, they have an improved opportunity to partner with the supervisee in the developmental process.

A collaborative partnership with a supervisee may derive therapeutically related benefits within the supervision session. Loganbill et al. (1982) highlighted effectual characteristics of supervisors common to therapy and supervision. These characteristics include: genuineness, potency, optimism, courage, sense of humor, capacity for intimacy, openness to fantasy and imagery, respect, and consideration. Loganbill et al.'s (1982) effectual characteristics included adjectives synonymous with supervisors who operate from a constructivist mindset that suggests that supervisors and supervisees who adopt these characteristics may benefit from an improved supervisory relationship. Supervisors who work from a constructivist framework are likely to benefit from positive, effective, and mutually beneficial working relationships with those they supervise, while supervisees benefit from a supportive, co-facilitative supervisor who builds confidence and recognizes potential.

**Limitations of a Constructive Approach to Supervision**

Additional insight into particular situations where constructivist approaches to counselor supervision may not be the most effective for supervisees should be

determined. Some supervisory settings, for example, limit the amount of supervision sessions the supervisee has to reach performance standards (i.e. some practicum and internship settings). Since constructivist supervision approaches are reliant on supervisee's growth and awareness, it is worth determining whether ample time, consideration, and patience can be given to supervisees who have program-related restrictions. Generally, when considering the benefits associated with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, it is important to determine which environmental conditions best support constructivist approaches.

Additional research is also needed to determine whether supervisees at every stage of counselor development can benefit from constructivist approaches. Research should specifically focus on whether supervisees at beginning stages of development (typically characterized as needing structure and high levels of support) benefit from constructivist approaches to counselor supervision or whether the abstract nature of constructivism is overwhelming for supervisees at early stages of development.

Research against using constructivist approaches in specific situations would also warrant attention. Future research should identify supervisory situations that are not well served through constructivist approaches. While I have argued that constructivist supervision can be used to help supervisees think through moral and ethical dilemmas, for instance, it is important to determine whether the potential ambiguity associated with constructivist approaches mistakenly implies to supervisees that ethical standards are debatable as long as the supervisee can justify their reasoning. If this is the case, there may be situations when the use of more direct ways of supervising counselors are

preferred or recommended over constructivist approaches. These potential areas should be recognized and detailed for the ultimate benefit of all who supervise.

Finally research about constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, and the themes most representative of constructivist approaches, is a new area of study. Before researchers and counselor educators can appreciate the benefits, limitations, and nuances of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, there is a need to define constructivist approaches by (a) investigating which themes are most representative of approaches viewed as constructivist and (b) understanding which supervisor characteristics are most representative of these identified themes. Currently, no instrument exists that validates constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. This lack of empirical support for constructivist themes and characteristics associated with constructivist supervisors may mean that the field of counselor supervision is without important supervision techniques that can be used to facilitate the development of counseling professionals.

## Conclusion

Counselor supervision has a purposeful role in counselor education programs and specifically in the growth opportunities for counselors in training. As the counseling field continues to grow and the demand for counselors increases, counselors must rely on supervision sessions to discuss challenging cases, countertransference, breaking down cultural barriers, and to assess the work a supervisee is doing with clients. Counselor supervisors, specifically in this role, have an important opportunity to provide support, guidance, and education to counselors new to the profession.

A review of the developmental models of counselor supervision, educators, supervisors, and counseling professionals provided a clearer understanding of the experiences of supervisees and how this information can inform counseling practices. Cumulatively, these models offer a strong basis upon which to conceptualize the supervisory process. Independently, they offer unique responses to the question: "How do supervisors best support their supervisees?" Although current research has provided a better understanding of the supervision process, supervisory roles, developmental stages, and supervisee expectations, an instrument is needed to determine which themes are representative of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision and which supervisor characteristics are most representative of constructivist approaches. Establishing and researching the most effective ways of engaging supervisees and enhancing their professional growth will provide supervisors and counselor education programs with the tools to better prepare professionals for their continued role in clients' lives.

**Chapter 3: Method**

As counselor supervision has evolved as a skill set unique from counseling, the need for a distinction between supervision and therapy processes, a definition of counselor supervision, and the identification of effective supervision practices has become increasingly important (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Leddick & Bernard, 1980). Early approaches to counselor supervision were dominated by supervisors teaching or directing supervisees toward a specific client outcome, or by psychoanalyzing the supervisee. However, over the last 15 years there has been movement away from directive approaches and, instead, there has been an increased focus on postmodern approaches to counselor supervision (Mills & Sprenkle, 1995; Neimeyer & Steward, 2000; Pare & Larner, 2004). This shift is important because postmodern supervisory approaches, including constructivist approaches, focus less on supervisee skill assessment and more on building and maintaining effective partnerships between supervisors and supervisees, and between supervisees and their clients.

With the shift in supervisory approaches, there is an increased need to understand supervision assessments. Ellis, Ladany, Krengel, and Shult (1996) provided a comprehensive review of supervision assessments. The assessments reviewed by Ellis et al., while helpful in exploring the importance of counselor supervision for improving supervisee growth and development, did not provide counselor educators with information pertinent to specific supervision approaches or their efficacy. Specifically, Ellis et al.'s metaanalysis revealed a lack of empirical support for any specific postmodern approach to counselor supervision. Furthermore, their analysis found that

there is no current supervision instrument that directly focuses on assessing constructivist approaches to counselor supervision.

Constructivists, by and large, appreciate the unique, personalized experiences of others and adapt their work accordingly based on the flow of the relationship and conversation. Constructivists review seemingly objective, singular dimensions of people's experience (e.g. cognition, behavior, attitude) through a complex network of personalized meanings, which understandably makes it hard to operationalize let alone quantify such dimensions. This differs from positivist approaches to assessment which measure and test specific variables and their relationship to one another. Specifically, constructivists and constructivist assessments orient toward assessing the viability of one's worldview as opposed to the validity of one's worldview (Neimeyer, 1993). However, given the complexity of the constructivist worldview, it is difficult to create a scale that adequately accounts for multiple perspectives and approaches to counselor supervision.

Palomo, Beinart and Cooper (2010) suggested that one of the primary challenges for postmodern supervisory assessments is the absence of a universal agreement on what constitutes a positive outcome in supervision. Postmodern supervisors, respectful of multiple supervisee experiences and unique realities, are hesitant to define positive experiences for fear of limiting and diminishing other supervisee experiences. Specifically for constructivist supervisors who believe multiple, effective supervision outcomes exist and who espouse a nonjudgmental view of supervisee work, a singular-

outcome assessment is antithetical. Ironically, then, the all-inclusive nature of postmodern approaches has become one of its largest constraints.

Due to the multi-dimensional nature of constructivist approaches it is likely that supervisors will embody and employ constructivist characteristics in unique ways. By determining the foundational categories associated with constructivism, identifying characteristics related with each category, allowing for personal administration of those characteristics, and assessing the relationship between these characteristics and the proposed categories, researchers will gain insight into constructivist approaches. Furthermore, validation of the foundational aspects of constructivist supervision may provide greater understanding of the potential benefits associated with this style as well as improved methods for assessing constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. It is important to determine the foundational aspects of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, so that these aspects can be better understood, improved upon, and espoused in counselor supervision.

Research related to counselor supervision and attempts to validate various supervision approaches is not a new task. Specifically, in a metaanalysis of supervision literature conducted between 1981 and 1993, Ellis et al. (1996) found methodological flaws in every study examined (Schutt, 2012). According to Ellis et al., some of the studies incorrectly rejected the null, others were not psychometrically sound, and some were conducted with measures that were not developed for clinical supervision (Schutt, 2012). As a result, inferences could not be made from the results and the lack of psychometrically sound supervision measures posed a significant problem for new

supervision research, especially research that attempted to build upon prior findings and conclusions (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Russell et al., 1984; Vonk & Thyer, 1997). Thus, it becomes apparent that additional work is required to better understand the assessment of counselor supervision so that more meaningful tools can be developed.

Currently assessments related to the practice of counselor supervision are evolving and focusing on refined aspects of the counselor supervision process. These assessments have addressed the role that counselor supervision plays in the development of supervisees' professional identity (Choate, Smith, & Spruill, 2005), supervisor and supervisees' multicultural competence (Black, 2011; Toporek, Ortega-Villabos, & Pope-Davis, 2004; Wong & Wong, 1999), and the overall supervisory relationship (Palomo et al., 2010). A general review of some of the current assessments regarding the practice of counselor supervision can be found in Appendix E.

The purpose of the dissertation study was to design an instrument to assess supervisor behaviors from a constructivist perspective. To this end, I reviewed the extant research literature to identify the themes most consistent with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. Next I created an initial pool of items drawn from the literature and asked experienced outsider reviewers to rate the degree of constructivism associated with each statement (0 indicated "not constructivist," 1 indicated "somewhat constructivist," 2 indicated "moderately constructivist," and 3 indicated "thoroughly constructivist") (Appendix F). Third, I administered the instrument to counselor supervisees, analyzed the results, and determined the psychometric properties of the

scale, including factor structure, reliability, and validity. These phases are described in detail in this chapter.

## Method

Consistent with the recommendations by Crocker and Algina (2008), I conducted this study in three broad phases: scale development, administration, and analysis of psychometric properties. Below, I provide details regarding each phase of this process.

### Stage One: Scale Development

Scale development included the identification of categories and development of items that are intended to reflect each category, with subsequent input from experienced postmodern supervisors in the field of counselor supervision.

**Identifying categories.** I began scale development by reviewing the literature describing postmodern approaches to counselor supervision (as described in Chapters 1 and 2), along with assessment instruments related to the practice of counselor supervision, in general. Based on the literature, I identified the following five themes consistent with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision: (a) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor, (b) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning, (c) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee, (d) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge, and (e) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. I used these five themes to develop an initial pool of items that appear on the instrument.

**Developing items.** Consistent with item development theory (Crocker & Algina, 2008), multiple items related to each of the identified themes were generated. This assured that the pool of items would be as representative as possible of key constructivist concepts. Each of the scale items were reviewed and evaluated by counselor supervisors who identify with and possess expertise in postmodern approaches to supervision. Counselor supervisors with at least a master's degree and seven or more years of supervisory experience were chosen as experienced outside reviewers. The names of the experienced outsider reviewers who participated and their qualifications as reviewers can be found in Appendix G.

Each reviewer was given a complete list of statements with a Likert-type scale under each statement asking the reviewer to rate the degree to which each item reflects a constructivist value or principle (0 indicated "not constructivist," 1 indicated "somewhat constructivist," 2 indicated "moderately constructivist," and 3 indicated "thoroughly constructivist"). Reviewers also had the opportunity to write comments or suggestions in a text box under each statement (Appendix F). On the basis of rater comments, suggestions, and interrater agreement, I determined which statements would be included in the initial version of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. All steps in the decision making process were recorded for future reference and consideration after the final analysis.

The instrument was designed to be consistent with scales used to assess supervisor behaviors or characteristics (Efstation et al., 1990; Stenack & Dye, 1982, Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). As such, the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* begins with

the statement, "My supervisor…" followed by sentence stems related to each of the five categories. Examples of the sentence stems used to represent each of the themes include: (a) is non judgmental (the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor), (b) encourages me to use my own past experiences to guide my understanding of a client's experience (reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning), (c) encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision instead of telling me what to do (using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee), (d) wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients (reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge), and (e) is supportive of my counseling style, even if it's different from his or her style (acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling).

Supervisees were asked to rate the extent to which each statement described their most recent supervisor in their most recent supervision experience (1 = not true, 2 = sometimes true, 3 = often true, 4 = almost always true). In addition, supervisees were asked to indicate the degree to which they "prefer" or "do not prefer" each of the constructivist supervisor characteristics on a Likert-type scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = very much (Appendix H). Asking supervisees for their preference regarding constructivist supervisor characteristics allowed me to assess whether supervisee preference moderates the relation between supervisor style and supervisee outcomes.

**Collecting demographic information.** Ellis, D'Iuso, and Ladany (2008) suggested that if a supervision measure is intended to be used broadly in clinical supervision, information about the diversity of supervisees and their supervision contexts must be collected. Asking for demographic information allowed me to assess whether the diversity of supervisees and their supervision contexts had been captured. These demographic questions helped me better understand my participant sample and aided in determining whether any of these demographic factors suggest patterns of association with perceived or preferred constructivist supervisor characteristics. Demographic information was also used when assessing supervisees' degree of preference for constructivist traits to determine whether a connection exists between any of these demographic variables and supervisee's degree of preference for constructivist supervisor characteristics.

Stoutenbourgh (2008) and Babbie (2008) suggested including demographic questions at the end of an assessment to allow the primary survey questions to be answered when participants are most alert and invested in taking the assessment and to reserve the personal, often less-intensive questions, for the end of the measurement. In keeping with this perspective, demographic information related to the supervisee's age, gender, counseling specialization, ethnicity, current year in their educational/training program, student status (doctoral student, master's student, intern, or practicum student), site of supervision, years of supervision, and years of clinical experience were collected at the end of the initial *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. These demographic criteria were

selected based on a review of similar supervision assessments (Chang, Dew & Glinka, 2012; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989; Ladany, Walker & Melincoff, 2001).

**Stage Two: Administration of the Instrument to Counselor Supervisees**

Options for survey administration (both online and by postal mail) were thoroughly considered for this research. Survey research via regular mail typically generates equal or higher response rates compared with Internet delivery; however, more researchers are moving toward online administration of their assessments due to the ease of distribution, data management, and cost effectiveness (Joinson, Woodley, & Reips, 2007; Pan, 2010). Because supervisees from multiple and varied geographic locations were to be surveyed, online survey administration was the primary administration method associated with this study.

**Recruiting participants**. The *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was created via SurveyMonkey, an online survey platform, and sent electronically, as a link, to counseling supervisees registered on the following listservs: COUNSGRADS, CESNET-L and NARACES. These listservs were chosen because their membership is inclusive of counselor supervisees from various geographic regions and members are in various levels of training or practice. The topics discussed on these listservs include counselor supervision, so participants were likely to have an understanding and interest in the practice of counselor supervision prior to completing the survey. The hope was that supervisees who participated in the study would represent multiple supervision environments and varying levels of experience (clinical settings, schools, practicum and

training settings, first year, second year, advanced professionals, etc.) so the results were more likely to be representative of the counselor supervisee population.

COUNSGRADS is a listserv endorsed by the American Counseling Association for graduate students in counselor education. COUNSGRADS has between 1000-1500 members at any given time and between 40-50 messages are sent on a typical day. This listserv is free-of-charge, but membership on the listserv is required to generate a posting. No additional information is gathered about COUNSGRADS members during the membership process, so additional demographic information was unavailable.

The Counselor Education and Supervision Network listserv (CESNET-L) originated in November 1994 as a professional listserv for counselors, counselor educators, and supervisors to provide an open forum for discussion of issues and sharing of resources related to the profession. As of April 2009 there were more than 1300 members on the CESNET-L. This listserv is also free-of-charge and membership on the listserv is required to generate a posting. No additional information is gathered about CESNET-L members during the membership process, so additional demographic information was unavailable.

While the North Atlantic Region Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (NARACES) organization does not have an active listserv, I was granted access to the organization's email distribution list which was comprised of 313 members; 169 of these members were listed as professionals, one member was retired, and 143 members were students. Because a majority of the members identify as supervisors, and the instrument was intended for completion by supervisees, the email sent to this group

asked members who identify as supervisors to forward the survey link to their supervisees. No additional information is gathered about NARACES members during the membership process, so additional demographic information was unavailable.

In addition to online administration, the assessment was given, via hard copy, to masters and doctoral-level counseling students at the University of Rochester who had previously received counselor supervision. According to the Chair of the Counseling and Counselor Education Department, the general demographic characteristics of the current Counselor Education student population are as follows: African American/Black male: 5 (4%), African American/Black female: 16 (13%), Asian American female: 5 (4%), Asian American male: 1 (~1%), Caucasian/White male: 10 (8%), Caucasian/White female: 79 (64%), Hispanic/Latino/Spanish American male: 1 (~1%), Hispanic/Latino/Spanish American female: 5 (4%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander male: 1 (~1%), Multiracial female: 1 (~1%), Undisclosed/Other female: 6 (5%), Nonresident Alien male: 3 (2%), Nonresident Alien female: 4 (3%). It was expected that the participant sample would be representative of the current Counselor Education student population.

All supervisees who completed the scale, both those who completed the assessment online and those who completed the hard copy, had the opportunity to enter a raffle to win a 16GB Apple iPad 2, one of two 16GB Kindle Fire HDs, or one of four $25 Amazon gift cards. University of Rochester supervisees who were willing to participate in the test-retest process had an additional opportunity to enter a raffle for a $25 Amazon gift card.

**Testing for validity.** Supervisees were provided with the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* instrument. The supervisees were asked to rate how accurately the item (a) described their preference for the statement (1 = does not describe, 2 = somewhat describes, 3 = very accurately describes, 4 = completely describes) and (b) how accurately the item described their actual supervisor (same rating scale as above) A 1-4 Likert-type scale was used to remove the middle or neutral option. Supervisees did not have the option to choose "neutral" or "neither true or not true;" instead, they were forced to select a response that was most representative of their last supervision experience even if that option is only slightly more representative of their experience than the alternative.

After the selected supervisees voluntarily completed the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*, they were asked to complete the supervisee version of the *Supervisory Styles Inventory* (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) to test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent and discriminant validity. The SSI is comprised of 33 descriptive, one-word items describing supervisory styles and includes three subscales: attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented (Appendix I). On the supervisee version of the assessment, supervisees are asked to rate how well each descriptor describes their current supervisor's style on a Likert-type scale from 1 (not very) to 7 (very). Twenty-five out of the 33 scale items were used as determinants of the three subscales that make up the SSI. The remaining eight items were not scored and were removed from the scale prior to administration. The convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the attractive subscale scores (7 items) and interpersonally sensitive subscale scores (8 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist*

*Supervisor Scale* while the discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the task-oriented subscale scores (10 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*.

The SSI is an appropriate measure of validity for two main reasons. First, the SSI is a valid and reliable instrument associated with supervisees' reported (a) willingness to work with supervisors whose style is different from their own, and (b) satisfaction with supervision (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Both of these associations are important and related to the goals of constructivist supervisors—the ability to work with a wide variety of supervisees and to provide an effective, satisfactory supervision experience. The SSI also supports the notion that supervisors are different from each other and can in fact adapt to the needs of the supervisee. This, too, is consistent with the tenets of constructivism because there is no right or wrong way of employing constructivist supervisor characteristics and varying degrees and portrayals of constructivist characteristics are accepted and encouraged.

Second, the three SSI subscales have been validated and are included in the same instrument. Evidence for the validity of the SSI was gathered through the assessment's relation to several supervision variables (Efstation et al., 1990; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Ladany et al., 1996; Usher & Borders, 1993). The validity of the three subscales allowed me to test for more than one type of validity by using a single instrument, thus reducing the chances that participants experienced fatigue. Tests that are overly lengthy may lead participants to experience fatigue, which in turn may influence participants'

motivation and negatively affect their responses (Brehman, Burns, Thaler, Rojas, & Barchard, 2009).

Healy, Kole, Buck-Gengler, and Bourne (2004) also concluded that asking participants to complete lengthy tasks and assessments leads to performance deterioration. Adding this short, 25-item scale to the end of my assessment kept the number of additional items to a minimum, thus limiting participant fatigue, without compromising the validity of the current assessment. Additionally, the use of this single, empirically supported instrument that was created for the purposes of assessing counselor supervision, and retaining items in their validated subscales, preserves the psychometric properties of the SSI subscales. In the interest of testing the factorial validity of the new scale, a principal components analysis (PCA) was performed.

In addition to the SSI a 6-item "autonomy supportive relationships" scale was used to test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent validity. This scale was adapted by Lynch (2004) from William and Deci's (2001) *Perceived Autonomy Support Scale* to test how autonomy supportive versus controlling a person perceives his or her partner to be. The items in Lynch's autonomy supportive relationships scale were adapted to reflect the relationship between supervisors and supervisees in counseling (Appendix J). This 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strong Disagree, 7 = Strong Agree) asked supervisees to rate the degree to which supervisees perceive their supervisor to be autonomy supportive.

Including a measure of autonomy support in the current study was important because of the role of autonomy support in constructivist approaches to counselor

supervision. Constructivist-led supervisors support their supervisees' intrinsic motivation and personal autonomy to make decisions on how to work with clients instead of telling the supervisee what to do or how to respond to client concerns. Items in the autonomy supportive relationship scale reflect one of the constructivist themes identified earlier-using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee. The convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the autonomy support subscale scores (6 items) from the adapted autonomy supportive relationships scale with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.*

**Test-retest reliability.** Supervisees from the University of Rochester were given the scale in person and asked whether they are willing to re-take the assessment two weeks after their initial completion. Participation on the initial assessment and re-take assessment was voluntary. The test-retest was used to help determine whether the instrument is reliable over time. A high, positive correlation was expected between the first and second administrations of the assessment. In an attempt to circumvent the memory effect (the risk of supervisees remembering what they indicated on the assessment the first time and simply repeating that answer on the second assessment) two weeks passed between the two administrations. I also chose to retest participants two weeks after their initial assessment to allow supervisees' one or more new supervision experiences prior to the second administration of the assessment.

**Stage Three: Analyses**

At least two hundred participants are recommended for the use of PCA (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2013), so a sample size greater than or equal to 200 was identified as the target number of participants for this study.

I expected five components (related to the themes I identified in my literature review) to emerge as a result of the PCA; however, given that this was an exploratory analysis, the actual data was used to determine the exact number of components that represent constructivist supervision. Appropriate descriptive labels were created for each component. Because I expected, on conceptual grounds, that the factors were related, I added an oblique rotation (promax) to the PCA for the purpose of redistributing the variance across the factors (Meyers et al., 2013). I choose the promax rotation because it forced the factors to correlate strongly or weakly with each of the variables, thus simplifying the solution. Once a satisfactory initial factor structure was obtained using PCA, the items that did not cleanly load onto one factor were removed.

**Chapter 4: Results**

The purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to assess supervisor behaviors from a constructivist perspective. More specifically, this study sought to determine which themes are most representative of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision and to determine the content and discriminant validity of the assessment. Supervisee preference for constructivist supervisor characteristics was also assessed.

**Instrument Development**

Five major methodological phases were employed in this study: (a) initial item development, (b) outside review of items by experienced supervisors, (c) further measure development (i.e. refining the items based on reviewer feedback), (d) administration of the assessment, and (e) data analysis to determine the scale's psychometric properties. An initial pool of items (n = 62) was created to represent the following five themes of constructivist approaches that were identified during a review of the literature: (a) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor; (b) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning; (c) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it more directively, for example, to teach or counsel the supervisee; (d) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge; and (e) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. These items were sent to nine experienced outside reviewers (Appendix G) for their rating and comment.

Experienced reviewers were asked to rate how constructivist each item was on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all constructivist) to 3 (completely constructivist). A comment box was provided under each item so the reviewers could provide additional thoughts about the item if necessary. Experienced reviewers were selected based on their use of constructivist supervision methods, number of years providing constructivist supervision (more than seven years), and variety of supervision settings. Each of the supervisors was known directly or indirectly (through my dissertation committee members). Nine reviewers were asked to participate in the review process and all nine accepted. Reviewers were offered a $25 gift card to Amazon, Target, or Starbucks for their participation. See Appendix G for additional details about the external reviewers.

As a result of this review, 32 out of 61 items received a score of 2 (moderately constructivist) or 3 (completely constructivist) by at least eight out of the nine reviewers (88% rater agreement). Comments written about any of these 32 items did not convey concerns or suggestions. Thus, 29 items were removed from the assessment and the remaining 32 items comprised the initial *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*.

Following the outside review, the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was entered into SurveyMonkey, an online survey platform, and a link to the survey was sent to approximately 15 counselors who had previously received or were currently receiving counselor supervision in order to pilot test the instrument. Once the 15 participants confirmed that the survey was viable, a link to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was sent to members of the following listservs: NARACES, COUNSGRADS, and CESNET-

L. These listservs are described in the data collection section of this dissertation. After verifying that the participant was at least 18-years-old and had received (or was currently receiving) counselor supervision, the participant viewed the following prompt: "Think about your counselor supervisor. If you have more than one counselor supervisor, please pick one and think about your experience with him or her throughout this assessment." The next four pages of the assessment listed each of the 32 constructivist statements, and under each statement the participant was asked to rate, using a 4-point Likert scale (1 = does not describe, 2 = somewhat describes, 3 = very accurately describes, 4 = completely describes) how accurately the item (a) described their preference for the constructivist characteristic, and (b) how accurately the characteristic described their actual supervisor (Appendix H).

In addition to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* participants were asked to complete the supervisee version of the *Supervisor Styles Inventory* (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and the *Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale* (Lynch, 2004). The SSI was used to test the convergent and discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and the *Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale* was used to test the convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* The SSI consists of 33 descriptive, one-word items describing supervisory styles and 25 of these items are subdivided into three subscales: attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented (Appendix I). On the supervisee version of the assessment, supervisees are asked to rate how well each descriptor describes their current supervisor's style on a Likert-type scale from 1 (not very) to 7 (very). The descriptors on this assessment include words such as friendly,

creative, perceptive, task-oriented, and directive. The twenty-five scale items used in the original scale validated by Friedlander and Ward (1984) were used as determinants of the three subscales that make up the SSI. The convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the attractive subscale scores (7 items) and interpersonally sensitive subscale scores (8 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* while the discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the task-oriented subscale scores (10 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*.

The Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale is a 6-item scale that also was given to supervisees to test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent validity. This scale was adapted by Lynch (2004) from William and Deci's (2001) *Perceived Autonomy Support Scale* to test how autonomy supportive versus controlling a person perceives a partner to be. The items in Lynch's autonomy supportive relationships scale were adapted to reflect the relationship between supervisors and supervisees in counseling (Appendix J) and include statements such as, "My counselor supervisor is very understanding of me" and "My counselor supervisor listens to my thoughts and ideas." It is important to note that two of the scale items, "I feel controlled by my counselor supervisor" and "I am not able to be myself with my counselor supervisor," were reverse scored. This 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree) asked supervisees to rate the degree to which supervisees perceive their supervisor to be autonomy supportive.

**Data Collection**

The NARACES, COUNSGRADS, and CESNET-L listservs were chosen because their membership includes counselor supervisees from various geographic regions and members are in various levels of training or practice. The topics discussed on these listservs include counselor supervision, so participants were likely to have an understanding and interest in the practice of counselor supervision prior to completing the survey. Combined membership of these listservs is approximately 4,500 individuals. No demographic information is gathered about members on any of these listservs, so additional demographic information was unavailable.

The link to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was sent twice (two weeks between emails) to the COUNSGRADS and CESNET-L listservs. The link was only sent once to the NARACES email list because some members responded negatively to the use of the email list to solicit research participation. This was the first time the NARACES email list had been used for such a purpose. Incentives to participate in the study included a chance to win an Apple iPad 2, one of two 16GB Kindle Fire HDs, or one of four $25 Amazon gift cards.

A total of 468 participants opened the link and began the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*, and 380 completed a majority of the assessment and were included in the final analysis. A missing values analysis revealed that 76 people opened the link to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* but did not complete any questions after verifying that they were at least 18 years of age. Each of these 76 non-responders was removed from the study. Additionally, 12 participants answered 16 or fewer items (less than 17%

of the assessment) and were also removed from the sample. The final sample used in subsequent analyses consisted of 380 participants. Demographic data (Appendix K) was collected from all participants who completed all or most of the assessment.

The participants who submitted a complete (or almost complete) assessment ranged in age from 21 to 66 years ($M = 36.94$, $SD = 10.34$) with 65.3% of participants indicating that they were between the ages of 24 and 38. Consistent with most counselor education research, a majority of the participants were female ($n = 293$, or 81%). Approximately 78% of the sample self-identified as White (non-Hispanic), 6% identified as Black or African American, 4.7% as Hispanic or Latino/a, and 2.6% as Asian or Pacific Islander.

Demographic data were also collected about the participants' highest degree attained. A majority of the sample had attained a master's degree (57.2%). Approximately 9% of the sample had a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree, and 25.5% had attained their doctorate. When asked, "Where did you receive the supervision you were thinking about as you completed this survey?" 33.6% chose a college setting, 16.8% selected community agency, 15% chose mental health clinic, 10.8% chose K-12 school system, 5.2% selected substance abuse facility, and 1.8% chose hospital. The remaining 16% of the sample chose "other" and specified their supervision location (e.g. eating disorder clinic, hospice, private practice, residential facility.)

Participants also were asked demographic questions about their supervisor. Most participants indicated that they were thinking about their employment site supervisor while completing this assessment (28.6%). Internship site supervisor (21.8%) and

University supervisor (21.3%) were a close second and third. Only 12.1% ($n = 46$) of the participants were thinking about their practicum site supervisor while completing this assessment. Generally speaking, this information reveals that a majority of supervisees were thinking about the supervisors who worked with them during more advanced levels of training, when the stakes are higher and the supervisee is introduced to clients whose problems tend to be more complex. Supervisees were also asked how many years of experience they thought their supervisor had as a supervisor. Results showed that 16.8% said 0-4 years, 26.8% said 5-9 years, 22.8% believed 10-14 years, 12.9% chose 15-19 years, and 15.5% believed their supervisor had more than 20 years of supervision experience.

## Data Analysis

Of the 380 participants who completed the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*, 266 did not have any missing data. Little's MCAR test (Meyers et al., 2013) suggested that data were missing completely at random (MCAR) (Little's MCAR test: $\chi^2$ (7258) = 7414.932, $p = .097$). This result suggested that the missing values could be ignored because they were not likely to bias results (Meyers et al., 2013). Listwise deletion would have resulted in excessive sample size reduction (114 participants); thus I used pairwise deletion.

Utilizing the final sample ($n = 380$), a principal components analysis (PCA) revealed that 61.423% of the variance was accounted for by four factors. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) the final solution should account for at least 50% of the variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .960, above the

recommended value of .70 (Meyers et al., 2013), and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2$ (496) = 7652.91 < .05). The communalities were all above .4, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. The loadings for each item across each component appear in Appendix L.

In the initial unrotated solution, four components with eigenvalues over 1 accounted for 61.423% of the total variance. Items that loaded onto the components were then examined to determine the conceptual and statistical feasibility of each component. Prior to doing so, an oblique rotation was performed to maximize simple structure. An oblique rotation was chosen for this solution because at least two of the factors were moderately correlated (*r* =.439, *r* =-.625). The results showed that component 1 explained approximately 46.4% of the variance (Table 4.1). This component had 13 items that each reflected the supervisee's perception of a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor (*Warm and Non-Directive Relationship*). Component 2 accounted for 7.2% of the variance and had seven items that reflected the supervisee's use of past and present experiences to guide new learning (*Past and Present Experiences*). Component 3 accounted for 4.4% of the variance and had nine items related to the supervisor's acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling (*Acceptance of Various Styles*). Upon reviewing item loadings, the fourth component (3.5% of the variance) was excluded because two of the three items had loadings smaller than .40.

Table 4.1

*Total Variance Explained*

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total |
| 1 | 14.838 | 46.367 | 46.367 | 14.838 | 46.367 | 46.367 | 12.792 |
| 2 | 2.298 | 7.180 | 53.547 | 2.298 | 7.180 | 53.547 | 12.038 |
| 3 | 1.404 | 4.386 | 57.934 | 1.404 | 4.386 | 57.934 | 8.837 |
| 4 | 1.117 | 3.489 | 61.423 | 1.117 | 3.489 | 61.423 | 5.785 |

The three-factor solution was selected because of the insufficient number of primary loadings on factor 4. Meyers et al. (2013) suggested that items with factor loadings below .4 do not load strongly on any one factor and should be removed. Factor loadings for two of the three items that made up the fourth factor were below .40: "My supervisor is helping me develop my self-awareness skills" (.35), "My supervisor encourages me to stop the tape frequently to discuss issues of interest to me" (.72) and "My supervisor is interested in hearing why I chose a specific intervention" (.31). Without the fourth factor, the remaining three factors still accounted for 57.9% of the total variance. The PCA was rerun after having deleted these three items. Results yielded no significant changes to the three components.

A means analysis of supervisee preference for each constructivist supervisor characteristic revealed that supervisees strongly preferred supervisors who adhered to more constructivist traits. Table 4.2 provides a review of the means and standard deviations for each *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* item. As a reminder, supervisees were asked to rate their preference for each constructivist item on the following scale: 1 = not

at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = very much. Twenty of the 32 constructivist supervisor characteristics had a mean score greater than or equal to 3.5 out of 4.0. The least preferred constructivist characteristic was "My supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing," and this characteristic still had a mean score of 2.43.

In addition to reviewing supervisees' preference for each of the constructivist supervisor's characteristics, I also reviewed supervisees' preference for constructivist characteristics within each of the three subscales (warm and non-direct relationship, past and present experience, and acceptance of various styles) by averaging the mean scores across each subscale (Table 4.3). The results indicated that supervisees had a strong preference for supervisor characteristics associated with developing a warm and non-direct relationship. While supervisees showed preference for characteristics associated with a warm and non-direct relationship, it is also important to note that supervisees showed some preference for the other subscale characteristics as well: past and present experiences (1.43 out of 4.0), acceptance of various styles (2.0 out of 4.0).

A bivariate correlation was used to examine the association between supervisees' preference for constructivist supervisor characteristics and what they were actually experiencing in their supervision sessions. In order to examine the association between supervisees' preferences for constructivist supervisor characteristics and whether or not they noticed this characteristic in a recent supervision session, scores for "preference" and "actual experience," respectively, were computed by summing across the relevant items. Bivariate correlations revealed that supervisee's preference for constructivist

supervisor characteristics and what they say they were actually receiving in supervision were strongly correlated, $r = .53, p < .01$. These results suggest that supervisees who experienced more constructivist characteristics when with their supervisor were more likely to prefer a constructivist approach.

Table 4.2

*Preference for Constructivist Supervisor Characteristics*

| Characteristic | M | SD |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supervisor is non-judgmental | 3.62 | .58 |
| Supervisor supports my need to feel competent | 3.55 | .59 |
| Supervisor makes me feel comfortable processing my client sessions | 3.67 | .53 |
| Supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing | 2.43 | .98 |
| Supervisor encourages me to stop the tape frequently to discuss issues of interest to me | 2.67 | 1.04 |
| Supervisor helps me explore my approach by asking thoughtful questions | 3.59 | .54 |
| Supervisor would tell me if concerned I was not being ethical as a counselor | 3.79 | .45 |
| Supervisor has confidence in my abilities to come up with my own answers | 3.59 | .57 |
| Supervisor believes my past and present experiences in life are valuable | 3.50 | .63 |
| Supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor | 3.53 | .63 |
| Supervisor is transparent with me about what he or she is thinking | 3.49 | .64 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting my work with a client | 3.23 | .78 |
| Supervisor values my thoughts regarding my client cases | 3.74 | .44 |
| Supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor | 3.02 | .84 |
| Supervisor asks for my thoughts regarding my client cases | 3.68 | .49 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision | 3.71 | .49 |
| Supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients | 2.68 | .91 |
| Supervisor gives me time necessary to talk through client cases | 3.59 | .55 |
| Supervisor provides me autonomy to talk about issues that concern me | 3.59 | .54 |
| Supervisor helps to build my confidence by asking me facilitative questions | 3.53 | .60 |
| Supervisor encourages me to think for myself instead of looking to him or her for answers | 3.43 | .65 |
| Supervisor is interested in hearing why I chose a specific intervention | 3.30 | .70 |
| Supervisor encourages me to use personal experiences to inform my role as a counselor | 2.86 | .85 |
| Supervisor encourages me to develop my own counseling style | 3.61 | .54 |
| Supervisor is helping me develop my self-awareness skills | 3.58 | .59 |
| Supervisor supports me incorporating different theoretical approaches into my work with clients | 3.38 | .72 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my counseling style, even if it is different than his or her style | 3.63 | .54 |
| Supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling | 3.65 | .51 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my trying a new technique with my client | 3.54 | .58 |
| Supervisor is open to theoretical orientations different than his or her own | 3.63 | .56 |
| Supervisor encourages me to try new counseling techniques with my clients | 3.43 | .66 |
| Supervisor tells me that he or she learns from me | 2.93 | .90 |
| Valid N (listwise) | | |

Table 4.3

*Means Preference across Subscales*

|  | Min. | Max. | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Warm and Non-Direct Relationship (subscale 1) | 2.38 | 4.00 | 3.5879 | .36574 |
| Past and Present Experience (subscale 2) | 1.43 | 4.00 | 3.1056 | .54481 |
| Acceptance of Various Styles (subscale 3) | 2.00 | 4.00 | 3.4521 | .45582 |
| Valid N (listwise) | | | | |

## Reliability

Cronbach's alpha was used to test the internal consistency reliability of each subscale. Meyers et al. (2013) suggested that an alpha of .70 represents acceptable reliability, .80 is very good reliability, and .90 is excellent reliability. In this study, Cronbach's alpha exceeded .80 for each of the three subscales: warm and non-directive relationship ($\alpha$=.93), past and present experiences ($\alpha$=.89), and acceptance of various styles ($\alpha$=.91). These results demonstrated adequate internal consistency.

Composite scores were created for each of the three subscales by summing scores on the individual items. A composite score was also created for the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* as a whole. Correlations between each of the subscales and the overall *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* are presented in Table 4.5.

To minimize missing data while achieving reliable subscale scores, valid responses on 12 of 13 items were required on the warm and non-directive relationship subscale, six out of seven items on the acceptance of various styles subscale, and seven out of nine items on the past and present experiences subscale. If participants had valid responses on fewer than the above number of items, a subscale score was not computed.

The total scale score for the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was computed by summing

scores across the three subscales.

Table 4.5.

*Subscale and Overall Scale Correlations*

| Independent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Warm and Non-Directive Relationship | -- | | | |
| 2. Past and Present Experiences | .64* | -- | | |
| 3. Acceptance of Various Styles | .80** | .62** | -- | |
| 4. Overall Constructivist Supervisor Scale Score | .91** | .85** | .91** | -- |

*Note.* + p < .10 *p <.05 ** p < .01

**Test-retest reliability.** A subsample of University of Rochester students was

asked to participate in the test-retest process. These students were asked to complete a

hard-copy version of the assessment at the beginning of a summer session and asked to

complete a second version of the assessment two weeks later. A small sample of

respondents ($n = 13$) participated in both the test and re-test process. To determine the

test-retest reliability, I correlated the scores from Time 1 and Time 2 for each subscale as

well as the total score on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* The results of the test-retest

reliability for the entire *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* indicated that the Time 1 and

Time 2 administrations of the assessment were highly correlated ($r = .84$, p < .01). This

initial result suggests that the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* is reliable over time;

however, these results should be interpreted with caution because of the small sample

size. Test-retest reliabilities for each of the individual subscales were also acceptable:

warm and non-directive relationship subscale ($r = .70$, p < .01), past and present

experience ($r = .92$, p < .01 ), and acceptance of various styles ($r = .65$, p < .01).

**Validity**

After completing the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* supervisees were asked to

complete the supervisee version of the SSI (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) to test the

convergent and discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. Convergent

validity was determined by examining the correlation between total scores on the

*Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and the attractive subscale (seven items) and

interpersonally sensitive subscale (eight items) from the SSI. The SSI's attractive

subscale uses words such as friendly, flexible, trusting and warm to describe one's

supervisor and the interpersonally sensitive subscale uses adjectives such as intuitive,

invested, perceptive, and creative. Each of these descriptors is similar to traits most

representative of constructivist supervisors. Composite scores on the *Constructivist*

*Supervisor Scale* were highly correlated with both the attractive ($r = .73$, p < .01) and

interpersonally sensitive subscales ($r = .71$, p < .01) of the SSI. In other words, supervisor

characteristics such as friendly, flexible, trusting, warm, intuitive, invested, perceptive,

and creative were consistent with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. In

addition to the SSI, a 6-item *Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale* was also used to

test the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale's* convergent validity. Statements on the

*Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale* included, "I believe my supervisor is very

understanding of me" and "My counselor supervisor listens to my thoughts and ideas."

Based on a review of the literature related to constructivist-type supervision methods,

these statements are consistent with what is expected of a supervisor who identifies with constructivist methods. Comparing the *Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale* with the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* revealed that these statements were highly correlated ($r = .72$, $p < .01$).

The discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* was tested by correlating the task-oriented subscale scores (10 items) from the SSI with scores on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. Adjectives on the task-oriented subscale include structured, goal-oriented, explicit, and concrete, which are characteristics not commonly associated with constructivist supervisors. The result for this test of validity was $r = .30$, $p < .01$ indicating that, as expected, the adjectives associated with a task-oriented supervisor were not highly correlated with items on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* ($r = .30$, $p < .01$).

## Summary

The results of the present study suggest that the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* is a valid and reliable instrument. The final scale is comprised of 29 statements, each representing characteristics of constructivist supervisors and can be subdivided into three subscales: warm and non-directive relationship, past and present experiences, and acceptance of various styles. Results also suggest that supervisees who have been led by supervisors who embody constructivist characteristics prefer constructivist methods. Tests of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and test-retest reliability were all in the anticipated direction.

The final chapter of this dissertation discusses the importance of these results as well as the implications for counselor supervision. Additionally, Chapter 5 explores the limitations of the dissertation study as well as areas for additional research.

**Chapter 5: Discussion**

The purpose of this dissertation was to design and validate an instrument to assess the extent to which supervisors adhere to constructivist approaches from the perspective of their supervisees, with respect to their current or most recent experience in supervision. Additionally, supervisee preference for each of the constructivist supervisor characteristics was obtained by asking the supervisee to rate the degree to which they "preferred" or "did not prefer" each supervisor characteristic.

There were five major methodological phases employed in this study: (a) initial item development, (b) outside review of items by experienced supervisors, (c) further measure development (item refinement based on reviewer feedback), (d) administration of the assessment, and (e) data analysis. The initial measure was created after a thorough review of constructivist literature (e.g. narrative, systemic, reflective, and IPR strategies). The measure was altered after items were reviewed by a group of experienced professionals who utilize constructivist methods in their provision of supervision. The initial measure that resulted after experienced external review was titled the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and was sent to approximately 4,500 participants registered on three counselor education listservs.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of the findings of this study. The limitations of the study and implications for counselor supervision are presented. Recommendations for future research are also addressed.

**Discussion of the Findings**

The discussion section is organized around the methodological decisions employed in the study as well as the results of the principal components analysis, tests of reliability, and tests of validity.

**Methodological Decisions**

Methodological decisions included the process of using experienced external reviewers, administering the survey online or via hardcopy, and the choice of listservs for distributing the survey. This section details what was learned during each methodological decision point.

**Experienced external review process.** Nine external reviewers, each with 7-40 years of experience using constructivist approaches in counselor supervision, were asked to review and comment on the initial pool of items created for each of the five themes of constructivist supervision approaches developed through the literature review process (see Appendix G for additional information about the experienced external reviewers). Reviewers were asked to rate how constructivist they felt each statement was on a scale of 0 – 3 (0 = not at all constructivist, 1 = somewhat constructivist, 2 = moderately constructivist, 3 = completely constructivist).

Thirty-two of the original 61 items were rated as "moderately constructivist" (2) or "completely constructivist" (3) by at least 8 out of the 9 reviewers (88% rater agreement). The 88% rater agreement or above criterion was used to determine whether an item was included or excluded from the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. In cases where one reviewer did not rate the statement as "moderately" (2) or "completely" (3)

constructivist, the reviewer always chose "somewhat constructivist" (1). No reviewer

rated such an item as "not at all constructivist" (0).

Reviewers were also given an opportunity to comment on each item after having

rated it. No comments were left for any of the 32 items that received 100% (9 out of 9)

rater agreement. When an item received a rater agreement of 88% (8 out of 9) and one of

the nine reviewers rated the item as "somewhat constructivist" (1) the comment under

that item read, "I consider this statement to be reflective of good supervision, not

specifically constructivist supervision" or "Not uniquely constructivist."

**Online versus hard-copy survey administration.** The decision to survey

participants using a link sent to three listservs was based in research suggesting that more

investigators are moving toward online administration of scales because of the ease of

distribution, data management, and cost effectiveness (Joinson et al., 2007; Pan, 2010).

Indeed, these three conditions were true of the administration of the *Constructivist*

*Supervisor Scale*. Distribution involved sending a total of five email messages over the

course of two weeks to listserv members. After data collection, data were stored in

SurveyMonkey, an online survey platform, and transferred to SPSS for analysis. There

was no cost to the researcher associated with sending the assessment.

Of the 4,500 possible participants, 468 (10.4%) opened the link, and 380 (8.44%)

completed enough of the assessment to be included in the final participant sample.

Seventy-six participants did not complete any questions on the scale after completing an

initial screening item. It appears that almost every one of the 76 participants who did

chose not to complete the survey after completing the initial screening item verified that

they were at least 18-years-old (a mandatory question), skipped the assessment in its entirety, then went on to complete the raffle information for the possibility of winning a 16GB Apple iPad 2, one of two 16GB Kindle Fire HDs, or one of four $25 Amazon gift cards. Future administrations of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* should seek to find a more appropriate balance between the incentives offered and the time it takes to complete the assessment, which may have accounted for this phenomenon.

**Choice of listservs**. The COUNSGRADS, CESNET-L, and NARACES listservs were chosen as distribution vehicles because their membership is inclusive of counselor supervisees from various geographic regions, and members are in various levels of training or practice. The hope was that supervisees who participated in the study would represent multiple supervision environments and varying levels of experience (clinical settings, schools, practicum and training settings, first year, second year, advanced professionals, etc.) so the results would be more representative of the counselor supervisee population. Demographic information associated with this study did, in fact, reflect supervisees from multiple supervision environments and varying levels of experience. As expected a majority of the participants were female (81%) and self-identified as White (non-Hispanic) (78.2%). Supervisees from other ethnic categories were also represented (6% identified as Black or African American, 4.7% as Hispanic or Latino/a, and 2.6% identified as Asian or Pacific Islander).

**Principal Components Analysis**

A principal components analysis (PCA) was selected because the focus was on exploring the initial factor structure of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and

determining whether this factor structure was consistent with the themes identified during a thorough review of constructivist literature. I selected an oblique rotation because I expected, on conceptual grounds, that the factors were related. The decision to use an oblique rotation was also supported on statistical grounds because at least two of the factors were moderately correlated. Adding the rotation allowed for the redistribution of the variance across the factors and forced the factors to correlate strongly or weakly with each of the variables, thus simplifying the solution (Meyers et al., 2013).

As reflected in Chapter 4, the final PCA revealed three components representative of constructivist supervision approaches (warm and non-directive relationship, past and present experiences, and acceptance of various styles). While reviewing the items that loaded onto these three components, I noticed that items from each of the five themes identified during the literature review process were represented in the overall scale. Table 5.1 depicts each of the items included in the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* alongside the theme the item was originally proposed to represent and the item's final subscale loading. I have chosen to include this table to assist readers in understanding how I initially categorized each of the constructivist items in comparison to which subcategory each item loaded onto as a result of the principal components analysis. The three items identified in the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* that loaded onto the fourth factor (which was later removed) are also included in Table 5.1.

**Three subscales.** The three components accounted for approximately 58% of the scale's total variance. These components, and the items that comprise them, are explained in detail in this section.

***Warm and non-directive relationship.*** Each of the items that comprise this subscale highlights the value that constructivist methods place on establishing an open and nonjudgmental relationship between supervisor and supervisee. As shown by the items that loaded on this factor, the constructivist supervisor partners with the supervisee and facilitates the supervision session as opposed to directing it. Items from two of the original constructivist themes I identified in the literature: "need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor" and "using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee themes" were represented in this subscale. These items suggest that a constructivist supervisor values the supervisee's thoughts regarding their work with clients and provides the time necessary for the supervisee to work through client cases. These items also suggest that the constructivist relationship itself is often non-directive; instead, the supervisee and supervisor relationship takes form organically based on the supervisee's needs, goals, and hopes for the session. The constructivist supervisor is open, honest, helps the supervisee feel comfortable, and supports the supervisee as they work through case conceptualizations.

Table 5.1.

*Constructivist Supervisor Scale Items by Themes Identified in the Literature*

| Item | Original theme | Subscale |
|---|:---:|:---:|
| Supervisor asks for my thoughts regarding my client cases | C | 1 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision | C | 1 |
| Supervisor values my thoughts regarding my client cases | C | 1 |
| Supervisor is non-judgmental | A | 1 |
| Supervisor gives me time necessary to talk through client cases | C | 1 |
| Supervisor supports my need to feel competent | A | 1 |
| Supervisor has confidence in my abilities to come up with my own answers | C | 1 |
| Supervisor makes me feel comfortable processing my client sessions | A | 1 |
| Supervisor provides me autonomy to talk about issues that concern me | C | 1 |
| Supervisor would tell me if concerned I was not being ethical as a counselor | C | 1 |
| Supervisor helps to build my confidence by asking me facilitative questions | C | 1 |
| Supervisor helps me explore my approach by asking thoughtful questions | C | 1 |
| Supervisor is transparent with me about what he or she is thinking | C | 1 |
| Supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients | D | 2 |
| Supervisor encourages me to use personal experiences to inform my role as a counselor | D | 2 |
| Supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor | B | 2 |
| Supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor | B | 2 |
| Supervisor believes my past and present experiences in life are valuable | B | 2 |
| Supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing | B | 2 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting my work with a client | B | 2 |
| Supervisor is open to theoretical orientations different than his or her own | E | 3 |
| Supervisor encourages me to try new counseling techniques with my clients | E | 3 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my counseling style, even if it is different than his or her style | E | 3 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my trying a new technique with my client | E | 3 |
| Supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling | E | 3 |
| Supervisor encourages me to develop my own counseling style | E | 3 |
| Supervisor supports me incorporating different theoretical approaches into my work with clients | E | 3 |
| Supervisor encourages me to think for myself instead of looking to him or her for answers | D | 3 |
| Supervisor tells me that he or she learns from me | E | 3 |
| My supervisor is helping me develop my self-awareness skills | D | 4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to stop the tape frequently to discuss issues of interest to me | C | 4 |
| My supervisor is interested in hearing why I chose a specific intervention | C | 4 |

*Note.* Themes identified in the literature: (A) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor, (B) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning, (C) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel

the supervisee, (D) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge, (E) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling.
Subscale, (1) warm and non-directive relationship, (2) past and present experience, (3) acceptance of various styles. Items in subscale (4) were discarded.

    ***Past and present experiences.*** Another important component of constructivist supervision is the use of past and present experiences to guide new learning. The items that loaded on this factor represent a supervisor who believes that past and present experiences affect who the supervisee is as a counselor. This type of supervisor encourages supervisees to use these experiences to inform their work with clients. This factor is comprised of two themes originally uncovered during the literature review: reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning, and reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer knowledge. Upon reviewing the items that loaded onto this factor, I was not surprised that items from these two themes were combined into one factor. Supervisees must use their self-awareness, insight, and abilities to transfer knowledge when recalling past and present experiences. It is not simply that supervisees have past and present experiences that is important. Instead, it is the supervisees' ability to transfer their learning from these experiences into their current client sessions that defines constructivist supervision.

    ***Acceptance of various styles.*** The third component associated with constructivist supervision relates to the supervisor's acceptance of various counseling styles. This factor includes items that represent supervisors who are open to theoretical orientations different from their own. The items that loaded on this factor suggest that constructivist supervisors allow supervisees to establish their own voice and counseling style; they encourage supervisees to think for themselves instead of providing answers (which are

most often reflective of the supervisor's theoretical mindset instead of the supervisees').

Being a constructivist supervisor often means withholding advice so supervisees can

establish their own way of working with a client. As argued in Chapter 2, when the

supervisor reserves suggestions and refrains from giving advice, the supervisees are

allowed to "try on" new counseling skills that will last long into their counseling careers.

The three components that comprise the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* provide

valuable information about the characteristics most representative of constructivist

supervisors. Unlike more modernist approaches to counselor supervision, the

postmodern, constructivist supervisor has the mindset that multiple realities exist and that

there are no predetermined outcomes, either in counseling or in supervision. This mindset

allows the supervisor to step back, give the supervisee space and freedom to work

through tough client problems, and facilitate rather than direct the supervision session.

The constructivist supervisor believes that the supervisee has valuable knowledge

(often based on reflection upon the supervisee's past experiences) that can be used to

inform work with clients. Instead of ignoring these past experiences, the constructivist

supervisor elicits this information from supervisees with the goal of helping them

conceptualize the client session and better empathize with what the client may be

experiencing. The constructivist supervisor also accepts that regardless of how few years

supervisees have been counseling, the supervisees already have valuable skills and

knowledge that they bring to the supervision session. It is the constructivist supervisor's

role, then, to help supervisees recognize their talents, strengths, and challenges within the

supervisory process.

**Preference for Constructivist Supervisor Characteristics**

A means analysis of supervisee preference for each constructivist supervisor characteristic revealed that supervisees strongly prefer supervisors who adhere to characteristics that are associated with the constructivist approach to supervision. This analysis was conducted on an item-by-item basis. Twenty of the 32 constructivist supervisor characteristics had a mean score greater than or equal to 3.5 out of 4.0. Twenty-seven of the 32 constructivist supervisor characteristics had a mean score greater than 3.0. Interestingly, the most strongly preferred constructivist supervisor characteristic was, "My supervisor would tell me if concerned I was not being ethical as a counselor." This is an interesting finding because most of the other preferred supervisor characteristics associated with constructivist supervision focus on encouraging supervisees to find their own answer rather than be "told" about errors they are making. It appears, therefore, that supervisees prefer to have space to find their own answers within supervision unless the topic is related to ethics. Preference for this characteristic likely reflects the fear of litigation that many counselor trainees are taught during the course of their training. This finding is, therefore, consistent with most developmental literature that suggests supervisees, especially those in early stages of development, are concerned that they will unintentionally harm clients due to lack of experience.

Constructivist supervisors reserve the right to be more directive when ethical issues arise that require more direct intervention, but might also try to help the supervisee become more comfortable exploring ethical dilemmas in a way that prioritizes their own knowledge and moral experiences. By helping the supervisee work through the ethical

dilemma in a supportive and safe environment, the constructivist supervisor encourages supervisees to build their confidence in decision-making and explore their own moral compass- a compass that will remain with the supervisee long after their time in supervision.

The constructivist characteristic least preferred by supervisees (2.43 out of 4.00) was, "My supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing." When reviewed on an individual-item level it appears that supervisees do not have a preference for supervisors who are willing to explore the ways in which their personal experiences relate with their client's experience. However, when reviewed among the other supervisor characteristics that loaded onto the *past and present experience* subcategory the mean score of this item appears more normalized. Here are a few examples of the other characteristics that loaded onto that category along with their mean scores: "My supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients" (2.68 out of 4.0), "My supervisor encourages me to use personal experiences to inform my role as a counselor" (2.86 out of 4.0), "My supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor" (3.53 out of 4.0), "My supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor" (3.02 out of 4.0), "My supervisor believes my past and present experiences in life are valuable" (3.50 out of 4.0), and "My supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting my work with a client" (3.23 out of 4.0). Additional research is needed to determine how much weight should be given to this particular item as opposed to the subscale in its entirety.

In addition to reviewing supervisees' preference for each of the constructivist supervisor's characteristics, I also reviewed supervisee's preference for constructivist characteristics within each of the three subscales (warm and non-direct relationship, past and present experience, and acceptance of various styles) by comparing subscale scores (computed as the mean of the respective items) across each subscale. The results suggest that supervisees had the strongest preference (among each of the subscales) for supervisor characteristics associated with developing a warm and non-direct relationship (3.59 out of 4.0). Characteristics of these supervisors include making the supervisee feel comfortable processing client sessions, helping to build supervisee confidence by asking facilitative questions, and transparency about what the supervisor is thinking. Supervisees also indicated preference for supervisors who are open to theoretical perspectives different from their own (3.45 out of 4.0). This includes preference for supervisors who encourage supervisees to think for themselves rather than looking to the supervisor for answers, and supervisors who encourage the supervisee to try new counseling techniques with clients. Finally, supervisees' also showed preference for supervisors who ask about the supervisee's past and present experiences and help the supervisee use these experiences to inform their work with clients (3.11 out of 4.0). Supervisees prefer supervisors who are willing to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting supervisees' work with clients and who encourages the supervisee to use these experiences to inform work with clients. Overall, supervisees showed a strong preference for each of the three components associated with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, thus indicating strong supervisee preference for skills associated with constructivist methods. The finding that

supervisees prefer supervisor characteristics associated with a warm relationship is consistent with much of the supervision literature (Cheon et al., 2009; Efstation et al., 1990; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Mandani et al., 2009). New, however, is the finding that supervisees also prefer supervisors who are nondirective in their approach to counselor supervision. The fact that warm and non-direct supervisor characteristics loaded onto the same subcategory suggests that supervisees not only appreciate space to find their own answers, but also perceive supervisors who allow them this space to be warm.

A bivariate correlation was used to examine the association between supervisee's preference for constructivist supervisor characteristics and what they indicated they were actually experiencing in their supervision session. Results indicated that supervisees prefer constructivist supervisor characteristics, and what they say they are actually receiving in supervision is moderately associated with this preference ($r = .53, p < .01$). These results suggest that supervisees who experience more constructivist characteristics when with their supervisor are more likely to prefer a constructivist approach. When a supervisor can facilitate a supervision session through constructivist methods, the result tends to be preferred by supervisees in future sessions. Likewise, it may be difficult for supervisees who have experienced more didactic approaches to supervision to conceptualize how a constructivist approach could facilitate their learning. Additional research is needed to disentangle whether supervisor style precipitates supervisee preference or if supervisee preference informs supervisor style and to determine why

supervisees who have experienced constructivist supervision have an interest in maintaining a constructivist-supervision relationship.

**Reliability**

Cronbach's alpha was used to test the internal consistency reliability of each subscale. In this study, Cronbach's alpha exceeded .80 for each of the three subscales: warm and non-directive relationship ($\alpha$=.93), past and present experiences ($\alpha$=.89), and acceptance of various styles ($\alpha$=.91). These results demonstrated adequate internal consistency.

Temporal reliability of the instrument was ascertained using a test–retest model. Time 1 and Time 2 scores for the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* ($r = .84$, p < .01) as well as the three subscales (warm and non-directive relationship subscale ($r = .70$, p < .01), past and present experience ($r = .92$, p < .01), and acceptance of various styles ($r = .65$, p < .01) depict acceptable reliability over time (2 weeks). This implies that the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* is a reliable instrument. Caution, however, should be used when interpreting these results. First, the small test-retest sample size ($n$=13) does not provide enough power to widely generalize results. Additionally, only two weeks passed between the first and second administration of the assessment, which was held during the summer months; thus, it is likely that the supervisees did not have an additional supervision experience between the Time 1 and Time 2 administrations. It is also possible that participants remembered some of the questions from the previous administration and answered the questions based on their previous responses rather than their actual feelings in that moment.

Additional administrations of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* are needed to better support the test-retest reliability of the assessment. Ideally, future administrators of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* would share their results with me so that I can compile findings and determine whether the assessment is, in fact, reliable. Additional test-retest procedures also increase the number of participants who have completed the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and, as such, improve the accuracy of the results. Collecting these results will also allow more than two weeks to pass between administrations, increasing the ability to rely on the test-retest reliability statistic as a more accurate indicator of this assessment's consistency over time.

**Convergent Validity**

The *Supervisor Satisfaction Inventory* (SSI) (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) is a 33-item measure using one-word adjectives to describe supervisory styles (Appendix I). The SSI was chosen as a measure of validity because (a) it has been considered a valid and reliable instrument to test characteristics of counselor supervisors, (b) it is a relatively simple assessment that does not take considerable time to complete or explain, and (c) it includes three relevant subscales: attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented. These three subscales relate to the aspects of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision that I was researching. Using this scale allowed me to explore two types of validity (convergent and discriminant), thus allowing me to minimize participant burden. In particular, tests that are overly lengthy may lead participants to experience fatigue, which in turn may influence participants' motivation and negatively affect responses (Brehman et al., 2009).

In the next paragraphs, I explain the items that comprised each of the subscales and what the correlational results mean in terms of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision.

**Attractive subscale (SSI).** The SSI's attractive subscale uses words such as friendly, flexible, trusting, and warm to describe a supervisor, words that conceptually seem related to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*. When focusing on the seven items that comprised the scale in relation to the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* items, it is apparent that the two are also highly statistically correlated. The high correlation between the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* and the attractive subscale of the SSI supports the convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* These results suggest that there is a strong connection between supervisors utilizing constructivist approaches to counselor supervision and adjectives such *as friendly, flexible, trusting, warm, open, positive, and supportive.* The items included in the attractive subscale of the SSI describe a counselor supervisor interested in building a relationship with supervisees. It is not surprising that this subscale is highly correlated with items on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* because one of the primary roles of a constructivist supervisor is to create a warm, supportive, and trusting relationship with supervisees in order to facilitate growth and support supervisees as they navigate their work with clients.

**Interpersonally sensitive subscale (SSI).** The interpersonally sensitive subscale of the SSI consists of words such as intuitive, invested, perceptive, and creative. The items on this subscale were also highly correlated with items on the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* which suggests that supervisors who adhere to more constructivist

methods are likely to be described with terms such as intuitive, invested, committed, perceptive, resourceful, reflective, and creative. The interpersonally sensitive subscale describes a supervisor who uses intuition to guide supervision sessions instead of maintaining a strict, inflexible idea of how the session must progress. Again, it is not surprising that the constructivist supervisor tends to have traits described by items on the interpersonally sensitive subscale because the constructivist supervisor is someone who improvises within the supervision session, allows supervisees to lead the session in ways most effective to them, and who shows signs of commitment to the supervision process without a preconceived agenda. The constructivist supervisor is constantly thinking about the supervisees' work with clients (invested) and is aware enough to inquire about the supervisee's experience (perceptive) through whatever method (e.g. metaphoric activities, narratives, etc.) is most helpful to the supervisee (creative). These associations provide further support for the validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale*.

**Autonomy supportive relationships scale.** In addition to the attractive and interpersonally sensitive SSI subscales, the autonomy supportive relationships scale, intended to measure the relationship between supervisors and supervisees in counseling, was used to test the convergent validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* The autonomy supportive relationships scale was adapted by Lynch (2004) from William and Deci's (2001) *Health Care Climate Questionnaire* (Appendix J). The 6-item scale asked participants to reflect on the thoughts, emotions, and behaviors they most commonly experience in their relationship with their most recent counselor supervisor, then rate each item on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) – 7 (strongly agree).

Similar to the attractive and interpersonally sensitive SSI subscales, items on the autonomy supportive relationship scale were also positively correlated with the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* This means that supervisees who perceive supervisors as being more constructivist in their approach also find their supervisor to be understanding, accepting, and able to listen to the supervisees' thoughts and ideas. Constructivist supervisors also tend to accept the supervisee as an individual and try to understand how the supervisee conceptualizes client cases.

As hypothesized, the items on the autonomy supportive relationship scale are positively correlated with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. Supervisees who felt their supervisors were more constructivist in their approach to counselor supervision also indicated that their supervisors were flexible and had more personable relationships with their supervisees. The supervisee also felt their supervisor was accepting, open, supportive, and able to provide multiple opportunities for growth.

One thought to consider about these convergent validity results, however, relates to a comment made by one of the experienced outside reviewers during the creation of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale.* When interrater agreement could not be reached for a particular constructivist item, it was often because one of the reviewers deemed the item, "reflective of good supervision, not specifically constructivist supervision." When I examine the items on the attractive and interpersonally sensitive subscales as well as the autonomy supportive relationships subscale I am reminded of this statement. While the items on these scales are positively correlated with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, they are also vague enough that they could be describing "good supervision"

as a whole. A few examples of items reviewers noted as being reflective of overall "good supervision" are as follows: "My supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor," "My supervisor would tell me if he or she was concerned that I was not being ethical as a counselor" and "My supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling." Additional research is needed to determine whether these characteristics are specifically associated with supervisors who adhere to constructivist methods or whether these characteristics are representative of good supervisors regardless of their theoretical framework.

**Discriminant Validity**

To test the discriminant validity of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* I used the task-oriented subscale in the SSI. As stated previously the SSI was chosen as a measure of validity because (a) it has been considered a valid and reliable instrument to test characteristics of counselor supervisors, (b) it is a relatively simple assessment that does not take considerable time to complete or explain, and (c) it allowed me to explore convergent and discriminant validity within one scale, thus allowing me to minimize participant burden. As hypothesized, the items on this subscale and the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* were only weakly related ($r = .30$, $p < .01$). In other words, supervisors whose style is associated with words such as structured, focused, goal-oriented, prescriptive, thorough, explicit, evaluative, didactic, practical, and concrete are not consistent with characteristics of constructivist supervisors. In reviewing these scale items together, it appears that the task-oriented supervisor may be described as inflexible and directive instead of facilitative. These characteristics are contrary to the constructivist

supervisor and would limit the amount of exploration and opportunity for supervisee-led growth within the session. This finding supports the constructivist nature of a less directive approach.

In addition to the findings thus far discussed, it is also important to discuss the pattern of missing responses for these tests of validity. I ran a missing values analysis (prior to and after cleaning the data) to determine the response rate for the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale,* SSI, and the autonomy supportive relationships scale. The results are shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2.

*Missing Values Analysis Results*

| Assessment | % before cleaning | % after cleaning |
|---|---|---|
| Constructivist Supervisor Assessment | 5.1–7.6% | 0.0–4.7% |
| SSI | 8.4–9.9% | 5.5–7.1% |
| Autonomy Supportive Relationships Scale | 7.1–7.4% | 4.2–4.5% |

The SSI was the second instrument presented in the survey, yet its response rate (even after cleaning the data) was lower than the instruments that followed it (autonomy supportive relationships scale and the demographic section). This raises the question of whether there is some aspect of the SSI that led participants to skip more questions on this section. As described previously, results suggest that the data were missing at random, so there is no identifiable pattern of non-response for participants who skipped these items as well as other items on the assessment. It also appears that participants continued with the assessment after the SSI, thus implying that they specifically chose not to answer the SSI questions, as opposed to stopping the survey entirely after the SSI

section. It is possible that the way the SSI was presented in SurveyMonkey, compared to the way the other instruments were presented, led participants to disengage with this section. Appendix M provides a screenshot of how a portion of the SSI looked to participants. It may have been difficult for participants to plot responses on the 7-point Likert scale because of the number of response possibilities on each line (7) and the number of lines on each page (13). I attempted to compensate for this phenomenon by breaking the SSI into two separate pages on SurveyMonkey, but this effort may not have been enough of an adaptation to maintain participant engagement. Regardless, the percentage of missing responses on the SSI does not appear to have affected the overall results of the study.

## Limitations

Although the present study provides evidence that the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* is a psychometrically sound, valid, and reliable instrument for assessing whether a supervisor uses constructivist approaches to counselor supervision, it is not without limitations. Some of the limitations associated with the study have been identified throughout this chapter. Specifically, providing high-valued prizes may have led some participants to answer the first mandatory question, but skip the rest of the assessment while still submitting raffle information is one such example. The low number of participants in the test-rest process is another limitation. A few additional limitations are discussed in this section.

Those individuals selected as experienced outside reviewers represented a range of experience levels and a variety of constructivist methods, but were not a random

sample. Thus, the sample of experienced outsider reviewers may not have reflected the attitudes and experiences of the wide variety of supervisors who identify with constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. Furthermore, four of the nine reviewers graduated from or work at the same University. This adds to the potential for bias because it is likely that these individuals share one particular understanding of constructivism.

The listservs (COUNSGRADS, CESNET-L) that were utilized in the present study appear to have provided an effective means of sampling a wide variety of supervisees at various levels of training. The choice to send an email to members of NARACES, however, did pose a small challenge. After the first email was sent to members, I received a few emails from participants asking for additional information and inquiring as to how I received their contact information. The NARACES board later informed me that this was the first time an email soliciting participation in a research study had been sent to members and that some members were displeased that the email distribution list was being used for such a purpose. For that reason, I was not permitted to resend the link to my scale two weeks after the initial inquiry. This logistical limitation may have negatively affected the number of individuals who participated in the study. Future administrators of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* should be aware of any ongoing conflicts or concerns associated with emailing participants who have not been recruited previously for participation in research so as to prevent a similar situation from occurring.

While a principle components analysis successfully uncovered three components associated with constructivist approaches, the addition of a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a new sample would provide further evidence that these components are, in fact, reflective of constructivist approaches to counselor supervision. I was unable to run the CFA due to the size of the sample and the low case-to-variable ratio. Future administrations of the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* may provide the opportunity to confirm the factor structure uncovered in the present study during the exploratory process.

The study is limited to supervisees' observation of their supervisors' characteristics during a specific (albeit self-identified) supervision session. Although supervisees received the following prompt, "Think about your counselor supervisor. If you have more than one counselor supervisor, please pick one and think about your experience with him or her throughout this assessment," it is still possible that supervisees' reflections of their experiences were weighed toward the totality of their experience with supervision as opposed to one, specific session. This could have led to inconsistency in how participants answered the items. It is impossible to know whether the supervisee thought about their experience with one supervisor throughout the duration of the assessment or whether their responses were reflective of a combination of supervision experiences.

Additionally, asking participants to answer whether they preferred a supervisor characteristic right before answering whether their supervisor displayed this characteristic may have confounded participants' responses or biased the participants to think a certain

way about their supervisor prior to answering the question. To address this concern in the future, researchers may choose to reverse the order in which these statements are presented (i.e. asking supervisees to indicate whether their supervisor displayed the characteristic before asking them to indicate their preference for that characteristic) to determine whether there is a difference in results.

Supervisors should also be cautious about reviewing preference data in isolation. Factors such as the developmental level of the supervisee, the supervisee's previous experiences with supervision, the supervisee's level of anxiety, and the evaluative component of supervision sessions can each affect the supervisee's opinion about what he or she prefers. Supervisee preference should be considered in regard to each of these factors and together the supervisor and supervisee should discuss their intentions for the session.

## Implications for Counselor Supervision

While much has been written about constructivist approaches to supervision, this is the first study to provide empirical evidence about the supervisor characteristics that most align with constructivist supervision. The results, therefore, provide an important step in defining and understanding constructivist approaches to supervision. Furthermore, while several conceptual articles have espoused the benefits of constructivist approaches to supervision, this is the first study to provide empirical support regarding supervisee preference for constructivist supervision. The results, therefore, not only help define constructivist supervision, but also indicate supervisee preference for the approach. Supervisors who are interested in utilizing constructivist approaches are encouraged to

use the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* to determine whether they are, in fact, implementing constructivist methods.

The *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* also can be used to initiate discussion between the supervisor and supervisee about what is and is not working within their supervisory relationship. Asking the supervisee to rate how constructivist a supervisor is on a scale from 1 (not at all constructivist) to 4 (completely constructivist) will provide the opportunity for supervisors and supervisees to determine whether there are any areas within the supervision session that are disagreeable or need attention. Because establishing a warm, trusting, working relationship with a supervisor is a key component to constructivist supervision, it is advantageous to use the scale as a tool to initiate and build the supervisory relationship.

Finally, because the results of the means analysis suggests that supervisees had the strongest preference (among each of the subscales) for supervisor characteristics associated with developing a warm and non-direct relationship (3.59 out of 4.0), there are also possibilities for using the *Constructivist Supervisor Scale* for future research on the supervisor-supervisee relationship.

**References**

American Counseling Association. (n.d.). Mission statement. Retrieved from

    http://www.counseling.org/about-us/about-aca/our-mission

Aten, J. D., Strain, J. D., & Gillespie, R. E. (2008). A transtheoretical model of clinical

    supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 2*(1)*,* 1-9.

Babbie, E. (2008). *The basics of social research* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson

    Wadsworth.

Behan, C. P. (2003). Some ground to stand on: Narrative supervision. *Journal of Systemic

    Therapies, 22*(4), 29-42.

Bernard (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and

    Supervision, 19(1), 60-68.* DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x

Bernard, J. M. (2005). Tracing the development of clinical supervision. *Proceedings from

    The First International and Interdisciplinary Conference on Clinical Supervision.*

    Amherst, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc. doi:10.1300/J001v24n01_02

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.).

    Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision.*

    Columbus, OH: Pearson.

Black, L. L. (2011). The initial development of the multicultural supervision scale.

    *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice Theory, and Research, 38(2),* 18-36

Boston, P. (2000). Systemic family therapy and the influence of post-modern. *Advances

    in Psychiatric Treatment, 6,* 450-457. doi: 10.1192/apt.6.6.450

Brammer, L. (1973). *The helping relationship, process and skills.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ:

> Prentice-Hall.

Brehman, D. K., Burns, S. S., Thaler, N. S., Rojas, S. L., & Barchard, K. A. (2009).

> *Fatigue: A threat to study results.* Poster presented at the Western Psychological

> Association Conference, Portland, OR.

Callison, D. (2001). Constructivism. *School Library Media Activities Monthly, 18*(4), 35.

Carlson, T. D., & Erikson, M. J. (2001). Honoring and privileging personal experience

> and knowledge: Ideas for a narrative therapy approach to the training and

> supervision of new therapists. *International Journal of Family Therapy, 23*(2),

> 199-220.

Carlson, R. G., & Lambie, G. W. (2012). Systemic-developmental supervision: A clinical

> supervisory approach for family counseling student interns. *The Family Journal:*

> *Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 20*(1), 29-36.

Carroll, M. (1996). *Counselling supervision: Theory, skills and practice.* London,

> England: Cassell.

Carroll, M., & Holloway, E. (1999). *Training counselling supervisors: Strategies,*

> *methods, and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Carroll, M., & Tholstrup, M. (2001). *Integrative approaches to counselor supervision*.

> London, England: Jessica Kingsley.

Chang, C. Y., Dew, B. J., & Glinka, P. B. (2012). The relationship between supervisee

> stress, coping resources, the working alliance, and the supervisory working

> alliance. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 90*(1)*,* 63-70.

Cheon, H., Blumer, M., Shih, A., Murphy, M., & Sato, M. (2009). The influence of supervisor and supervisee matching, role conflict, and supervisory relationship on supervisee satisfaction. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 31*(1), 52-67.

Choate, L. H., Smith, S. L., & Spruill, D. A. (2005). Professional development of counselor education students: An exploratory study of professional performance indicators for assessment. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 27(3),* 383-397. doi; 10.1007/s10447=005-8201-0

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) (2009). 2009 Standards. Retrieved from:

http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf

Crocker, L. & Algina, J. (2008). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Davy, J. (2002). Discursive reflections on a research agenda for clinical supervision. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 75,* 221-238.

Delaney, D. (1972). A behavioral model for the practicum supervision of counselor candidates. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 12,* 46-50.

Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*(3), 322-329.

Ekstein, R., & Wallerstein, R. S. (1972). *The teaching and learning of psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: International Universities Press.

Ellis, M. V., D'Iuso, N. & Ladany, N. (2008). State of the art in the assessment, measurement, and evaluation of clinical supervision. In A. K. Hess, K. D. Hess, & T. H. Hess. (Eds.). *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 473-499). Hoboken: New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Ellis, M. V., & Ladany, N. (1997). Inferences concerning supervisees and clients in clinical supervision: An integrative review. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 467-507). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Ellis, M. V., Ladany, N., Krengel, M. & Schult, D. (1996). Clinical supervision research from 1981- 1993: A methodological critique. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43,* 35-50*.* doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.35

Falender, C. A., & Shafransky, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's-level counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*(4), 293-304.

Fox, R. (2001). Constructivism examined. *Oxford Review of Education, 27*(1), 23-35. doi:10.1080/3054980020030583

Freyer, J., Bott, K., Riedel, J., Wedler, B., Meyer, C., Rumpf, H., …Hapke, U. (2006). Psychometric properties of the 'Process of Change' scale for alcohol misuse and its short form (POC-20). *Addictive Behaviors, 31,* 821-832.

Friedlander, M. L. & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the supervisory styles inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4,* 541-557.

Galassi, J. P. & Trent, P. J. (1987). A conceptual framework for evaluating supervision effectiveness. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 26*(4), 260-269.

Giblin, P. (1994). Clinical supervision. *The Family Journal, 2*(2), 138-141.

Goodyear, R. K., & Guzzardo, C. R. (2000). Psychotherapy supervision and training. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 83-108). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Gonzalez, R. C. (1997). Postmodern supervision: A multicultural perspective. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, Education and Training, and Supervision.* (pp. 350-386). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gorell Barnes, Down, & McCann, (2000). *Systemic supervision: A portable guide for supervision training.* London, UK: Jessica Kingsley.

Guidano, V. F. (1984). A constructivist outline of cognitive processes. In M. A. Reda, & M. J. Mahoney (Eds.), *Cognitive psychotherapies: Recent development in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 31-45). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Guiffrida, D.A. (2005). The emergence model: An alternative pedagogy for facilitating self-reflection and theoretical fit in counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44,* 201-213.

Guiffrida, D. A. (2015). *Constructive clinical supervision in counseling and psychotherapy.* London, England: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Guiffrida, D. A., Jordan, R., Siaz, S., & Barnes, K. L. (2007). The use of metaphor in clinical supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 85,* 393-400.

Hackney, H., & Nye, S. (1973). *Counseling strategies and objectives.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: International University Press.

Healy, A. F., Kole, J. A., Buck-Gengler, C. J., & Bourne, L. E. J. (2004). Effects of prolonged work on data entry speed and accuracy. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 10*, 188-199.

Haynes, R., Corey, G., & Moulton, P. (2003). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 223–232.

Hogan, R. (1964). Issues and approaches in supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1,* 1739-1741.

Holloway, E. L. (1987). Developmental models of supervision: Is it supervision? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 209-216.

Holloway, E. L. (1992). Supervision: A way of teaching and learning. In S. D. Brown, & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 177-214). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hunt, D. E. (1971). *Matching models in education: The coordination of teaching methods with student characteristics.* Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Ivey, A., Normington, C. J., Miller, C. D., Morril, W. H., & Haase, R. F. (1968). Microcounseling and attending behavior: An approach to prepracticum counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15,* 1-12.

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Transformational supervision: When supervisors mentor. *Professional Psychology Research and Practice, 38*(3), 259-267.

Joinson, A. N., Woodley, A., & Reips, U. D. (2007). Personalization, authentication, and self-disclosure in self-administered Internet surveys. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23(1),* 275-285.

Kagan, N. (1980). Influencing human interaction – Eighteen years with IPR. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 262-283). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kagan, N. (1984). Interpersonal process recall: Basic methods and recent research. In D. Larson (Ed), *Teaching psychological skills: Models for giving psychology away* (p. 229-244). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Kaufman, J., & Schwartz, T. (2003). Models of supervision: Shaping professional identity. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 143-158.

Kovacs, V. (1936). Training and control-analysis. *International Journal of Psycho Analysis, 18,* 346-354.

Ladany, N., & Inman, A. G. (2008). Developments in counseling skills training and supervision. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D., Molinaro, M., & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *Counseling Psychologist, 27*(3), 443-475.

Ladney, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to the Supervisory Working Alliance and Supervisor Self-Disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*(4), 263-275.

Lambie, G. W., & Sias, S. M. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model of supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 87,* 349-356.

Leddick, G. R. & Bernard, J. M. (1980). The history of supervision: A critical review. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 20,* 186-196.

Lehrman-Waterman, D., & Ladany, N. (2001). Development and validation of the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*, 168-177.

Lister, J. L. (1967). Theory aversion in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 6,* 91-96.

Littrell, J. M., Lee-Borden, N., & Lorenz, J. (1979). A developmental framework for counseling supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19,* 129-136.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(3), 3-42.

Lynch, M. F. (2004). *Variability in self-concept across personal relationships: The role of culture, basic psychological needs, and authenticity in China, Russia, and the United States*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Mahoney M. & Granvold, D. K. (2005). Constructivism and psychotherapy. *World Psychiatry, 4*(2), 74-77.

Mahoney, M., & Lyddon, W. (1988). Recent development in cognitive approaches to counseling and psychotherapy. *The Counseling Psychologist, 16*(2), 190-234.

Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2000). A profile of lousy supervision: Experienced counselors' perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39,* 189-202.

Mandani, Y. Kees, N., Carlson, L. & Littrell, J. (2009). Counseling students' experiences of the supervisory relationship. Retrieved from: http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas10/Article_40.pdf

McAuliffe, G., & Eriksen, K. (2000). *Preparing counselors and therapists: Creating constructivist and developmental programs.* Virginia Beach, VA: Donning.

McNeill, B. W., Stoltenberg, C. D., & Pierce, R. A. (1985). Supervisees' perceptions of their development: A test of the counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32,* 630-633.

Meyers, Lawrence S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2013). *Applied multivariate research: Design & interpretation* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mills, S., & Sprenkle, D. (1995). Family therapy in the postmodern era. *Family Relations, 44*(4), 357-368.

Moskowitz, S. A., & Rupert, P. A. (1983). Conflict resolution within the supervisory relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14,* 632-641.

Mueller, W. J., & Kell, B. L. (1972). *Coping with conflict: Supervising counselors and*

*psychotherapists.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Murphy, M. J., & Wright, D. W. (2005). Supervisees' perspectives of power use in supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 31*(3), 283-295.

Neal, J. H. (1996). Narrative therapy training and supervision. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 15*(1), 63-77.

Neimeyer, G. J., (1993). Constructivist assessment: A casebook. *Counseling psychologist casebook series, Vol. 2.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Neimeyer, R. A. (2005). The construction of change: Personal reflections on the therapeutic process. *Constructivism in the Human Sciences, 10,* 77-98.

Neimeyer, R. A. & Mahoney, M. J. (1995). *Constructivism in the psychotherapy.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Springer.

Neimeyer, R. A., & Steward, A. (2000). Constructivist and narrative psychotherapies. In C. R. Snyder & R. E. Ingram (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological change* (pp. 327-335). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Neswald-McCalip, R., Sather, J., Strati, J., & Dineen, J. (2003). Exploring the process of creative supervision: Initial findings regarding the regenerative model. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 42*(2), 223-237.

Neufeldt, S.A. (1999). *Supervision Strategies for the First Practicum.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Norem, K., Magnusom, S, Wilcoxon, S. A., & Arbel, O. (2006). Supervisees' contributions to stellar supervision outcomes. *Journal of Professional Counseling, Practice, Theory, & Research, 34,* 33-48.

Palomo, M., Beinart, H. & Cooper, M. (2010). Development and validation of the
Supervisory Relationship. Questionnaire (SRQ) in UK trainee clinical
psychologists. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*, 131-149.

Pan, B. (2010). Online travel surveys and response patterns. *Journal of Travel Research, 49*(1), 121-135.

Pare, D., & Larner, G. (2004). *Collaborative practices on psychology and therapy.* New York, NY: Haworth Press.

Patton, M. J., & Kivlighan, D. M. (1997). Relevance of the supervisory alliance to the counseling alliance and to treatment adherence in counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*(1), 108-115.

Philp, K., Guy, G., & Lowe, R. (2007). Social constructionist supervision or supervision as social construction?: Some dilemmas. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 26*(1), 51-62.

Rivera, M. (2010). Reflective practice, supervision, and consultation. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 20*(8), 25-27.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 71,* 396-405.

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*, 5-44.

Russell, R. K., Crimmings, A. M., & Lent, R. W. (1984). Counselor training and supervision: Theory and research. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 635-681). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Sansbury, D. L. (1982). Developmental supervision from a skills perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10,* 53-57.

Schutt, M. A. (2012). *Replication and extension of Ellis, Ladany, Krengel, and Shult (1996); Clinical supervision and research from 1981 to 1993: A methodological critique.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://preserve.lehigh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2297&context=etd

Schwing, A. E., LaFollette, J. R, Steinfeldt, J. A., & Wong, J. Y. (2011). Novice counselors conceptualizations and experiences of therapeutic relationships. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 33*(1), 51- 63.

Shepard, L., & Freado, M. D. (2002). Value-based supervision. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 11*(2), 103-105.

Spruill, D. A., & Benshoff, J. M. (2000). Helping beginning counselors develop a personal theory of counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*(1), 70-80.

Stenack, R. J., & Dye, H. A. (1982). Behavioral descriptions of counseling supervision roles. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 21,* 295-304.

Stevenson, C. (2005). Postmodernising clinical supervision in nursing. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 26,* 519-529.

Stoltenberg, C. D. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*(1), 59-65.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (1997). Clinical supervision from a developmental perspective: Research and practice. In C. E. Watkins Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 184-202). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Crethar, H. C. (1995). Persuasion and development in counselor supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 23*(4), 633-648.

Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (1998). IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists. San Francisco, CA: Jossy-Boss.

Stoutenbourgh, J. W. (2008). Demographic measures. In P. J. Lavra-kas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 185–186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villabos, L., Pope-Davis, D. B. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*(2), 66-83.

Trepal, H. C., Bailie, J., & Leeth, C. (2010). Critical incidents in practicum supervision: Supervisees' perspectives. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research, 38*(1), 28-38.

Usher, C. H., & Borders, L. D. (1993). Practicing counselors preference for supervisory style and supervisory emphasis. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33,* 66-79.

Vonk, M. E., & Thyer, B. A. (1997). Evaluating the quality of supervision: A review of instruments for use in field instruction. *Clinical Supervisor, 15*(1), 103-113.

Ward, C. C., & House, R. M. (1998). Counseling supervision: A reflective model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38,* 23-33.

West, W. (2003). The culture of psychotherapy supervision. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 3*(2), 123-127.

Westfeld, J. S. (2009). Supervision of psychotherapy: Models, issues, and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37,* 296-316.

White, M. (1997). *Narratives of therapists' lives.* Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Whiting, J. B. (2007). Authors, artists, and social constructionism: A case study of narrative supervision. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 35*(2), 139-150.

Wiley, M. O., & Ray, P. B. (1986). Counseling supervision by developmental level. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,* 439-445.

William, G. C., & Deci, E. L. (2001). Activating patients for smoking cessation through physician autonomy support. *Medical Care, 39*, 813–823.

Wong, P. T. P, & Wong, L. C. J. (1999). *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping.* New York, NY: Springer.

Worthington, E. L. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*(3)*,* 189-208.

Worthington, E. L., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors in training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26,* 64-73.

Yogev, S. (1982). An eclectic model of supervision: A developmental sequence for beginning psychotherapy students. *Professional Psychology, 13,* 236-243.

**Appendix A**

**Review of Developmental Models**

| Name of Model | Authors | Date of Establishment | Number of Stages | Brief Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) | Stoltenberg, McNeil & Delworth | Original 1981, revision 1987, recent version 1998 | 4 levels of counselor development | Trainees move through developmental levels as growth occurs. Development occurs within counselor training programs. Supervisors recognize and match the level of supervisee development in order to facilitate a supervisory environment that fosters supervisee growth. |
| Life Span Developmental Model | Ronnestad & Skovholt | Original 1993, recent version 2003 | 6 phases of development | Counselors move along a continuum of development based on their level of experience. Development lasts throughout the life span of the counselor's career. The supervisory relationship is paramount in facilitating supervisee development. |

| Name of Model | Authors | Date of Establishment | Number of Stages | Brief Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transtheoretical Model of Clinical Supervision | Aten, Strain, & Gillespie | 2008 | 6 supervisee stages of change (SSC)<br><br>10 supervisor processes of change (SPC) | Supervisees advance through a series of stages, altering their relationship with "change" at each level. Supervisors can respond to supervisees' movement between stages through experiential or behavioral interventions. |
| Systemic Counselor Supervision | Carlson & Lambie | 2012 | 3 levels of family counselor development | Supervisees' level of differentiation and readiness to address factors contributing to transference and counter-transference increases as the supervisee advances in the profession. The supervisory relationship can be enhanced when supervisors employ systemic techniques in accordance with the supervisees' level of development. |

**Appendix B**

**Developmental Models and Supervisee Characteristics**

| Name of Model | Number of Stages | Supervisee Characteristics Associated with Each Stage |
|---|---|---|
| Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) | 4 | **Level 1:** High anxiety, high motivation, highly dependent on supervisor, insecure, little ability for insight<br><br>**Level 2:** Desires more autonomy, but relies on supervisor for guidance, fluctuating confidence<br><br>**Level 3:** Secure, stable in motivation, empathic, open to client's experiences<br><br>**Level 3i:** Insight and awareness of limitations, professional, confident, aware |

| Name of Model | Number of Stages | Supervisee Characteristics Associated with Each Stage |
|---|---|---|
| Life Span Development Model | 6 | **Lay Helper Phase:** Typically identifies the problem quickly, responds emotionally, and gives advice based on one's past experiences (e.g. friend, colleague)<br><br>**Beginning Student Phase:** Dependent, anxious, vulnerable, low self confidence, highly value supervisors support and encouragement, perceived criticism can significantly effect moral.<br><br>**Advanced Student Phase:** Feel pressure to "do it right", thorough, basic professional skills and performance, comfortable<br><br>**Novice Professional Stage:** First professional experience post-degree, integrate personal style, more ease and comfort with skills and position<br><br>**Experienced Professional Phase:** Authentic, congruent, skillful, emphasis on therapeutic relationship to create change, flixible<br><br>**Senior Professional Phase:** Individualized approach to therapy, competent, congruent, comfortable with the service they provide to clients, |

| Name of Model | Number of Stages | Supervisee Characteristics Associated with Each Stage |
|---|---|---|
| Transtheoretical Model of Clinical Supervision | 6 | **Precontemplation:** Resistant, unaware, defensive<br><br>**Contemplative:** Ambivalence, apprehension, distress, anxiety<br><br>**Preparation:** Eager to achieve growth, aware, recognition of change<br><br>**Action:** Committed to change, independence, autonomous, anxious about implementation and application of change<br><br>**Maintenance:** Strive for change, conscious effort to sustain achieved areas of change<br><br>**Termination:** More solidified personal identity, natural implementation of skills, confident |
| Systemic Counselor Supervision | 3 | **Beginning Family Counselor:** High levels of anxiety, not typically ready to explore self in supervision, desire structure from supervisor<br><br>**Intermediate Family Counselor:** Lower levels of anxiety, desire more freedom, increased readiness to explore self in supervision, still dependent on supervisor for direction<br><br>**Experienced Family Counselor:** Limited anxiety, high self confidence, strong readiness and desire to explore self in supervision, attained high levels of differentiation, understand personal limitations |

**Appendix C**

**Developmental Models and Suggested Supervisor Response**

| Developmental Model | Level One Supervisee Characteristics | Suggested Supervisor Response |
|---|---|---|
| IDM | <ul><li>Motivated</li><li>Dependent</li><li>Limited self-awareness</li><li>Performance anxiety</li></ul> | <ul><li>Support</li><li>Provide structure</li><li>Convey necessary introductory information about counseling</li><li>Use confrontation minimally</li><li>Role model</li><li>Suggest techniques</li></ul> |
| Lifespan Developmental Model | <ul><li>Strong emotional response to client stories</li><li>Give advice</li><li>Dependent on supervisor</li><li>Anxious and vulnerable</li><li>Low self-confidence</li></ul> | <ul><li>High levels of support, encouragement and feedback</li><li>High levels of structure</li><li>Foster self-reflection and self-supervision</li></ul> |

| Developmental Model | Level One Supervisee Characteristics | Suggested Supervisor Response |
|---|---|---|
| Transtheoretical Model of Clinical Supervision | <ul><li>Supervisees are largely unaware of the possibilities for change</li><li>Less aware of how to change and more resistant to the prospect of change</li><li>May react defensively</li></ul> | Focus on experiential processes:<ul><li>Increase familiarity with knowledge of counseling</li><li>Recapitulate supervisee-client interactions</li><li>Help supervisees consider short and long-term affects of change</li><li>Help supervisees evaluate their behaviors</li><li>Encourage supervisees to engage in self-awareness activities</li></ul> |
| Systemic Developmental Supervision | <ul><li>Experiencing high levels of anxiety</li><li>Desire structure</li><li>Not typically ready to explore "self" in supervision</li></ul> | <ul><li>Encourage supervisee to be more autonomous</li><li>Provide support and structure</li><li>Discuss the supervisees level of systemic knowledge</li><li>Use psychoeducation and other interventions to increase professional self-awareness and client case conceptualization skills</li></ul> |

## Appendix D

## Traditional Power Structures and Dominant Beliefs

(adapted from Philp, Guy & Lowe, 2007, p. 7-8).

| Dominant Belief | Possible Supervisee Responses or Requests |
|---|---|
| **Power structures embedded in the supervision process** | |
| The supervisor is the expert and has superior knowledge. (Beliefs about supervisory expert power) | "I'm confused about what to do with this client and I know you've had a lot of experience in this area. What do you think I should do?" |
| Supervision is essentially about case analysis. (Beliefs affected by the history of supervision) | "My first client was a 27 year-old white female who presented with..." |
| **Power structures embedded in the counseling process** | |
| Counsellors should not give advice. (Beliefs about power and influence) | "My client wanted some practical information and I didn't think I should give them advice." |
| The counselor is the expert and will tell the client what to do. (Beliefs about counselor expert power) | "Yes, but my client wants to know exactly how to be a good parent when this happens. What do you think?" |
| **Power structures embedded in the dominant culture** | |
| Medical considerations should be given precedence over context in understanding clients. (Beliefs about the power of the medical model) | "My client told me she had a diagnosis of bi- polar disorder and she seemed a bit manic in the session." |
| The quality of counseling skills can be quantified and evaluated. (Beliefs about the power of the education system) | "Is my clinical work of distinction standard at this point?" |
| **Power structures embedded in professionalism** | |
| Ethical codes or guidelines should be strictly adhered to. (Beliefs about what constitutes ethical conduct) | "Do I have to write detailed case notes? I never seem to use them and I can't see what it is so useful anyway?" |
| There is a best approach to most counseling situations. (Beliefs about evidence-based practice) | "What do you think is the best way to work with someone who is depressed and anxious?" |

**Appendix E**

**Review of Current Counselor Supervision Assessments**

| Article Title | Goal | Type of Assessment | Summary of Findings Related to Supervision | Discussed Limitations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professional Development Survey (Choate, Smith, & Spruill, 2005) | To develop a set of performance indicators for each of the five identified components of professional development. | Survey asking respondents to provide at least two examples of each of the components | Performance indicators related to supervision were grouped into three categories: 1) specific supervision competencies, 2) supervisor evaluations, 3) willingness to seek out non-required supervisory experiences. | Low response rate; lack of a validated instrument |
| Development and Validation of the Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (SRQ) in UK Trainee Clinical Psychologists (Palomo, Beinart, & Cooper, 2010) | To develop a valid and reliable measure of the supervisory relationship from the supervisee perspective. | Cross sectional questionnaire, repeated measures | Six components of the SRQ are identified: Three reflected a facilitative relationship, and three reflected educative and evaluative functions of supervision. | Homogenous sample; need for additional testing to determine reliability related to different counseling populations (first year trainees, staff, etc.) |

| Article Title | Goal | Type of Assessment | Summary of Findings Related to Supervision | Discussed Limitations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Multicultural Supervision Scale (MSS) (Black, 2011) | To assess supervisors' and counselor educators' multicultural competencies in a variety of multicultural dimensions. | Online survey | 39 items covered three factors: supervisory skills, supervisors' attitudes and beliefs, and stereotypes toward diverse populations. | Self-report related to social-desirability effect |
| Supervisory Styles Inventory (Hart & Nance, 2003) | Evaluate preferences of supervisors and supervisees of four styles of counselor supervision and the perceived frequency of these styles after a 10-week supervision session. | Rank order survey, pre and post test | *Prior to supervision sessions:* Supervisors thought they would prefer a supervision style incorporating high support and low direction or high support and high direction. Supervisees thought they would prefer high support and high direction. *After 10 supervision sessions:* The styles supervisors perceived themselves differed somewhat from the styles they anticipated. Supervisees' preferences for styles differed little from the beginning of supervision to the end. | Supervisory dyads may have been affected by the use of supervision styles to match the supervisees' needs; possible recency phenomenon (may have rated the total experience based on their most recent supervision sessions) |

| Article Title | Goal | Type of Assessment | Summary of Findings Related to Supervision | Discussed Limitations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Counselor Self-Advocacy Questionnaire (Clemens, Shipp, & Kimbel, 2011) | Evaluate school counselors self-advocacy skills | Questionnaire | Support for the use of the School Counselor Self-Advocacy Questionnaire as a nine-item measure. | Need for additional construct validity; reliability beyond internal consistency has not yet been tested. |

**Appendix F**

**Constructivist Supervisor Scale Items**

**Sent to Experienced Outside Reviewers**

Dear *supervisor*,

I hope you will consider serving as an expert reviewer of my Constructivist Supervision Scale; the first-ever Constructivist Supervisor Assessment that I am creating as a part of my Ph.D. dissertation in Counseling and Counselor Education at the University of Rochester. The preliminary results of this study will be presented at the 2014 American Counseling Association conference in Honolulu, HI and I plan to submit the final results for publication in a professional journal.

You were selected as an expert reviewer for this research due to your 1) active engagement in the process of counselor supervision and 2) your knowledge and/or utilization of constructive supervision approaches. If you are willing to help, I ask that your review of these items be completed by *date*. Once completed, you can email your responses as an attachment to erin.halligan@rochester.edu. As acknowledgment for your time and close attention to detail you will be given an option between three, $25 gift cards (Amazon, Target, Starbucks). Your review of the Constructivist Supervision Scale should take between 30-45 minutes. I greatly appreciate your consideration and welcome your questions at erin.halligan@rochester.edu or 315-657-7426.

Directions:

Please review the complete list of statements below and rate the degree to which each item reflects a constructivist value or principle (0 implies "not at all constructivist," 1 implies "somewhat constructivist," 2 implies "moderately constructivist," and 3 implies "thoroughly constructivist"). There is a text box under each statement for you to write comments, thoughts, or suggestions about each statement as necessary. Your comments, suggestions, and inter-rater agreement will assist in my determining which statements will be included in the final version of this instrument.

I have generated items that I believe are consistent with constructivist supervision, specifically items that correspond to the following five categories: (a) the need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor, (b) reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning, (c) using supervision to facilitate supervisee learning in a non-directive way, rather than using it to teach or counsel the supervisee (d) reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and ability to transfer of knowledge, and (e) acceptance of various styles and approaches to counseling. These themes emerged after a thorough review of constructivist-oriented approaches to

counselor supervision, namely narrative, systemic, reflective, and Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) strategies. The items that best represent constructive approaches to counselor supervision will be included in the initial Constructivist Supervisor Assessment.

Sincerely,

*Erin M. Halligan*

**Theme 1: The need for a supportive and non-judgmental relationship with one's supervisor**

My supervisor encourages me to ask questions.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor is non-judgmental.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor and I have developed an effective working relationship.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor wants me to succeed as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor supports my need to feel competent.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor supports my need for relatedness.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

I feel that my supervisor cares about me as a person as well as a supervisee.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor is open with me about how he or she feels I am doing as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

I feel comfortable processing my client sessions with my supervisor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```



```

My supervisor helps me to be a more effective counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```



```

I can be honest with my supervisor about how I feel about my clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```



```

I feel comfortable with my supervisor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

|  |
|---|
|  |

I feel successful as a counselor because of my relationship with my

supervisor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

|  |
|---|
|  |

My supervisor and I are a team.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```


```

My supervisor believes in me.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```


```

My supervisor makes me feel confident about my counseling abilities.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

**Theme 2: Reliance on past and present experiences to guide new learning**

My supervisor asks me if I have ever experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor encourages me to use my own past experiences to guide my understanding of a client's experience.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

[ ]

My supervisor believes that my past and present experiences in life are valuable.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

[ ]

My supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```



```

My supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may

be affecting my work with a client.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```



```

My supervisor believes that through my personal experiences, I already have

a majority of knowledge that I need to be an effective counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor values the experiences I had prior to becoming a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

**Theme 3: Presence of a supervisor who facilitates learning rather than teaching or counseling**

My supervisor encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision instead of telling me what to do.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

My supervisor asks for my thoughts regarding my client cases.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor values my thoughts regarding my client cases.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor gives me the time necessary to talk through my client cases.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor has confidence in my abilities to counsel clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

|  |
|---|
|  |

My supervisor is transparent with me about what he or she is thinking.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

|  |
|---|
|  |

My supervisor has confidence in my abilities to come up with my own

answers.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor would tell me if he or she was concerned that I was not being

ethical as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor answers my questions directly.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

My supervisor does not comment on what is "right" and what is "wrong" in my sessions.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

My supervisor helps to build my confidence by asking me questions instead of giving me answers.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```


```

## My supervisor asks me questions about my counseling approach.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```


```

## My supervisor gives me feedback about my performance as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

When reviewing tapes, my supervisor encourages me to stop the tape

frequently to discuss issues of interest to me.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
│                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

**Theme 4: Reliance on supervisees' self-awareness, insight, and transferability of**

**knowledge**

My supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work

with clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

My supervisor wants me to be autonomous.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```

```

My supervisor has asked me to think about a time in my life when I've experienced something similar to what my client is going through.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor is interested in knowing how I became the counselor I am today.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor trusts that I do good work with my clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor encourages me to think for myself instead of looking to him

or her for answers.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor encourages me to use my personal experiences to inform my

role as a counselor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor talks to me about connections and themes that he or she is

seeing in our supervision sessions.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor is helping me develop my self-awareness skills.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor has mentioned that I am insightful about what may be happening in my client sessions.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor tells me what he or she would have done in some client scenarios.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
│                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

**Theme 5: Acceptance of varying styles and approaches to counseling**

My supervisor is supportive of my counseling style, even if it's different than his or her style.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor is open to theoretical orientations different from his or her own.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor tells me that he or she learns from me.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor encourages me to try new counseling techniques with my

clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

I feel comfortable trying a new technique with a client because my supervisor will be supportive.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor supports me incorporating different theoretical perspectives into my work with clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor gives me space enough to develop my own counseling style.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor and I have different approaches to working with clients and

that's okay with my supervisor.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor encourages me to use multiple counseling interventions.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

My supervisor believes there is more than one way to effectively counsel

clients.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor wants me to develop my own counseling style.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
│                                                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

My supervisor is interested in hearing why I chose a specific intervention,

even if he or she would never have used it.

☐ 0 – Not at all constructivist

☐ 1 – Somewhat constructivist

☐ 2 – Moderately constructivist

☐ 3 – Completely constructivist

Comments/thoughts/suggestions:

<br>

**Thank you for your thoughtful feedback! Please conclude your thoughts and comments in the space below. Also provide the address to which you would like your gift card for $25 sent.**

Are there any aspects of constructivism that you do not believe were adequately addressed in the items listed above?

Are there any additional thoughts or comments you have about these items?

Number of years of experience as a supervisor:

Number of years you have utilized constructivist-type strategies in supervision:

Number of years of experience in the field of

counseling or social work:

Name and description of the place where you

currently supervise:

Degrees and licenses:

Name and address:

Anything else you would like me to know about you as a supervisor:

**Appendix G**

**Information about Experienced Outside Reviewers**

| Name | Degrees and licenses | Years of experience in the field of counseling | Years of experience as a counselor supervisor | Years you have utilized constructivist-type strategies in counselor supervision | Setting(s) where you currently supervise |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mike Boucher | MSW, MA, LCSW-R | 20 | 12 | 10 | Community-based agency |
| Doug Guiffrida | Ph.D., NCC, LMHC, ACS | 18 | 15 | 10 | College |
| Alisa Hathaway | Ed.D., LCSW-R | 20 | 11 | 8 | Community based agency |
| Pieter LeRoux | Ph.D., LMFT | 45 | 40 | 40 | College |
| David Pare | Ph.D., registered counseling psychologist | 24 | 18 | 18 | College and private practice |
| Karen Mackie | Ph.D, LMHC, NCC | 35 | 18 | 8 | College |
| Rich Ryan | Ph.D., NYS license | 35 | 30 | 30 | Previously in a college setting |
| Robert Neimeyer | Ph.D., Licensed psychologist | 40 | 35 | 35 | College |
| Jason Duffy | Ph.D, NCC, ACS | 10 | 7 | 7 | College |

Appendix H

# Constructivist Supervisor Scale

Erin M. Halligan Avery (2015)

**Think about your counselor supervisor. If you have more than one counselor supervisor, please pick one and think of your experience with him or her throughout this assessment.**

Please rate how accurately each statement describes your *preference* for that supervisor characteristic where: **1** = does not describe my preference, **2** = somewhat describes my preference, **3** = very accurately describes my preference, and **4** = completely describes my preference.

Also, please rate how *accurately* each statement describes your supervisor on a scale of 1-4 where **1** = does not describe my supervisor, **2** = somewhat describes my supervisor, **3** = very accurately describes my supervisor, and **4** = completely describes my supervisor.

| **Supervisor Characteristic** | **1** = does not describe my preference **2** = somewhat describes my preference **3** = very accurately describes my preference **4** = completely describes my preference | **1** = does not describe my supervisor **2** = somewhat describes my supervisor **3** = very accurately describes my supervisor **4** = completely describes my supervisor |
|---|---|---|
| My supervisor asks for my thoughts regarding my client cases. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor is open to theoretical orientations different than his or her own. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor helps build my confidence by asking me facilitative questions. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to try new counseling techniques with my clients. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor is supportive of my counseling style, even if it is different than his or her style. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to use my personal experiences to inform my role as a counselor. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor supports my need to feel competent. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |
| My supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling. | 1   2   3   4 | 1   2   3   4 |

| Supervisor Characteristic | 1 = does not describe my preference<br>2 = somewhat describes my preference<br>3 = very accurately describes my preference<br>4 = completely describes my preference | | | | 1 = does not describe my supervisor<br>2 = somewhat describes my supervisor<br>3 = very accurately describes my supervisor<br>4 = completely describes my supervisor | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting my work with a client. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to develop my own counseling style. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor provides me autonomy to talk about issues that concern me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor supports me incorporating different theoretical approaches into my work with clients. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor helps me explore my approach by asking thoughtful questions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor values my thoughts regarding my client cases. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor encourages me to think for myself instead of looking to him or her for answers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor tells me that he or she learns from me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor believes my past and present experiences in life are valuable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor is non-judgmental. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor gives me the time necessary to talk through client cases. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor would tell me if he or she was concerned I was not being ethical as a counselor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor is supportive of my trying a new technique with my client. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor makes me feel comfortable processing my client sessions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor is transparent with me about what he or she is thinking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| My supervisor has confidence in my abilities to come up with my own answers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**Appendix I**

**Supervisor Styles Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984)**

Please indicate your perception of your supervisor's style of psychotherapy/counseling on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of your supervisor.

|                    | not very |   |   |   |   |   | very |
|--------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|------|
|                    | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 1. Goal-oriented   | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 2. Perceptive      | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 3. Concrete        | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 4. Explicit        | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 5. Committed       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 6. Affirming       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 7. Practical       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 8. Sensitive       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 9. Collaborative   | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 10. Intuitive      | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 11. Reflective     | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 12. Responsive     | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 13. Structured     | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 14. Evaluative     | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 15. Friendly       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 16. Flexible       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 17. Prescriptive   | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 18. Didactic       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 19. Thorough       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 20. Focused        | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 21. Creative       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 22. Supportive     | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 23. Open           | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 24. Realistic      | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 25. Resourceful    | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 26. Invested       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 27. Facilitative   | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 28. Therapeutic    | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 29. Positive       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 30. Trusting       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 31. Informative    | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 32. Humorous       | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |
| 33. Warm           | 1        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7    |

Attractive subscale: 15, 16, 30, 33, 23, 29, 22 Interpersonally sensitive subscale: 10, 26, 5, 2, 11, 21, 25, 28 Task- oriented subscale: 13, 20, 1, 17, 19, 4, 14, 18, 7, 3 Items not used: 6, 8, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31, 32

**Appendix J**

**Autonomy Supportive Relationships (ASR) Scale**

Reflect on the thoughts, emotions, and behaviors you most commonly experience **in your relationship with your most recent counselor supervisor.** Then, rate each of the following items with respect to your relationship with your **most recent counselor supervisor.**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I believe my counselor supervisor is very understanding of me. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
| 2. I feel that my counselor supervisor accepts me. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
| 3. My counselor supervisor listens to my thoughts and ideas. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
| 4. I feel controlled by my counselor supervisor. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
| 5. My counselor supervisor tries to understand how I see things. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
| 6. I am not able to be myself with my counselor supervisor. | Strongly Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree Nor Disagree 3 | 4 | Somewhat Agree 5 | 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |

- Items (4) and (6) are reverse-scored.
- The scale score is computed by averaging across responses for each item

## Appendix K

## Demographics

**Age**

[Free entry]

**Gender**

Male, Female, Female to male transgender, Male to female transgender,

Not sure, Other [free entry]

**Ethnicity**

White (non-Hispanic), Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino/a,

Asian or Pacific Islander, Other [free entry]

**Current College/University**

[Free entry]

**Program in which you are enrolled**

Mental health counseling, School counseling, College counseling, Music

therapy, Art therapy, Play therapy, Other

**Years in educational/training program**

[Free entry]

**Student status (can choose more than one)**

N/A, Doctoral student, Master's student, Counseling intern, Practicum

student, other [free entry]

**Highest counseling-related degree attained**

BA/BS, Masters, Doctoral, Other [free entry]

**Site where your supervision experience was received**

Mental health clinic, Substance abuse facility, Community agency,

School, College, Hospital, Other [free entry]

**Was the supervisor you referenced when answering the questions in this**

**survey your only counselor supervisor?**

Yes, No, Other [free entry]

**Years receiving counselor supervision**

[Free entry]

**Years of counseling/clinical experience**

[Free entry]

------------------------

**Demographics Related to Your Supervisor –** Please answer these questions to

the best of your knowledge

**Supervisor's Theoretical Orientation**

[Free entry]

**Supervisor's Approximate Age**

[Free entry]

**Supervisors Highest Degree Attained**

Masters, Doctorate, Other

**Supervisors Professional Affiliations/Associations**

[Free entry]

# Appendix L

## Pattern Matrices of Principal Components Analysis – Rotated Solution

| Subscale 1 (Warm and Non-Directive Relationship) | Component | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Supervisor asks for my thoughts regarding my client cases | **.824** | .074 | -.005 | -.073 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through client cases in supervision | **.809** | .115 | .098 | -.021 |
| Supervisor values my thoughts regarding my client cases | **.735** | -.047 | -.207 | -.083 |
| Supervisor is non-judgmental | **.671** | -.010 | -.080 | .039 |
| Supervisor gives me time necessary to talk through client cases | **.611** | .026 | -.159 | .021 |
| Supervisor supports my need to feel competent | **.605** | .037 | -.112 | .094 |
| Supervisor has confidence in my abilities to come up with my own answers | **.601** | -.019 | -.306 | -.089 |
| Supervisor makes me feel comfortable processing my client sessions | **.599** | .007 | -.189 | .055 |
| Supervisor provides me autonomy to talk about issues that concern me | **.589** | .039 | -.285 | -.126 |
| Supervisor would tell me if concerned I was not being ethical as a counselor | **.549** | -.015 | .076 | .297 |
| Supervisor helps to build my confidence by asking me facilitative questions | **.542** | .015 | -.267 | .233 |
| Supervisor helps me explore my approach by asking thoughtful questions | **.522** | .075 | -.111 | .363 |
| Supervisor is transparent with me about what he or she is thinking | **.499** | .245 | -.004 | -.015 |

| Subscale 2 (Past and Present Experience) | Component | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 |
| Supervisor wants me to use my personal experiences to inform my work with clients | -.080 | **.801** | -.075 | .002 |
| Supervisor encourages me to use personal experiences to inform my role as a counselor | -.133 | **.738** | -.254 | .093 |
| Supervisor would agree that my personal experiences affect who I am as a counselor | .266 | **.720** | .042 | -.276 |
| Supervisor and I openly discuss how my past experiences have shaped who I am as a counselor | .039 | **.699** | -.085 | .214 |
| Supervisor believes my past and present experiences in life are valuable | .411 | **.639** | .029 | -.233 |
| Supervisor asks me if I have experienced a situation similar to what my client is experiencing | .012 | **.622** | .052 | .287 |
| Supervisor encourages me to talk through personal experiences that may be affecting my work with a client | .214 | **.539** | -.056 | .180 |

| Subscale 3 (Acceptance of Various Styles) | Component | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 |
| Supervisor is open to theoretical orientations different than his or her own | .117 | -.037 | **-.799** | -.002 |
| Supervisor encourages me to try new counseling techniques with my clients | -.130 | .146 | **-.787** | -.045 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my counseling style, even if it is different than his or her style | .248 | -.119 | **-.757** | -.023 |
| Supervisor is supportive of my trying a new technique with my client | .069 | .060 | **-.747** | -.133 |
| Supervisor helps me feel comfortable developing my own approach to counseling | .338 | -.046 | **-.665** | .011 |
| Supervisor encourages me to develop my own counseling style | .203 | .036 | **-.651** | -.021 |
| Supervisor supports me incorporating different theoretical approaches into my work with clients | .002 | .057 | **-.591** | .249 |
| Supervisor encourages me to think for myself instead of looking to him or her for answers | .209 | .084 | **-.521** | .052 |
| Supervisor tells me that he or she learns from me | -.028 | .357 | **-.443** | -.004 |

*Notes.* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.[a]

a. Rotation converged in 14 iterations.

# Appendix M

# Screen Shot of Portion of SSI

**Select the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best captures the degree to which that adjective or term reflects your view of your supervisor.**

|  | **Not Very (1)** |  |  |  |  |  | **Very (7)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal-oriented | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Perceptive | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Concrete | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Explicit | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Committed | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Practical | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Intuitive | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Reflective | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Structured | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Evaluative | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Friendly | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Flexible | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Prescriptive | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |