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Thèse Cynthia Bilodeau

La supervision est considérée comme un domaine de spécialisation à part entière et perçue comme un élément clé du développement de la compétence en counseling de carrière. Cependant, la plupart des connaissances sur le processus de supervision proviennent de travaux en psychologie. Le but de cette étude est d'accroître les connaissances dans le domaine de la supervision en examinant la relation possible entre l'alliance de travail et l'effet immédiat de la supervision (proposée comme variable prédictive du résultat), tout en tentant de déterminer l'influence de la prédisposition à la honte de la personne supervisée. Les participantes et les participants de cette étude sont 43 étudiantes et étudiants en counseling de carrière et 13 supervisées et supervisors. Le questionnaire Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) a été administré, avant la première et après la dernière séance de supervision, afin de mesurer la prédisposition à la honte. Les versions Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) et Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor (SWAI-S) ont été utilisées pour mesurer l'alliance de travail, alors que le Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) a été utilisé pour mesurer l'effet immédiat de la supervision suite à chacune des supervisions. Les résultats de cette recherche font ressortir l'importance d'avoir un environnement sécuritaire où règne la confiance pour que la supervision soit profitable. Elle suggère aussi que les supervisées ou les superviseurs doivent porter une attention particulière au renforcement de la qualité de l'alliance de travail pour assurer un apprentissage enrichissant et diminuer les effets négatifs possibles de la prédisposition à la honte chez les supervisées ou les supervisés. De plus, cette recherche démontre que l'alliance de travail perçue par les supervisées ou les supervisés pourrait être un facteur prédictif de la réussite d'un processus de supervision, accentuant l'importance pour les supervisées ou les superviseurs de construire et renforcer cette variable du processus.

300 word summary English

Now widely accepted as an independent field of specialization, the practice of supervision is viewed as the most important element in the development of counselor competence in career counseling. The bulk of our knowledge however, concerning the process of supervision has grown out of the psychology literature and this has guided the practice of supervision. The goal of this research is to extend the supervision research by investigating different aspects concerning the nature of the perceived supervisory working alliance and by investigating the possible relationship between the supervisory working alliance and impact (proposed as a variable predictive of outcome), as well as investigating whether supervisee shame-proneness could be found to be significantly related to the supervisory working alliance and impact. The participants in this research included 43 supervisees and 13 supervisors undergoing a 5-session supervisory process. The Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) was administered to the supervisees prior to the start
of the supervision sessions and following the last supervision session as a measure of shame-proneness. The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) and Supervisor (SWAI-S) versions were used to measure the strength of reported supervisory working alliance and the Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) was used as a measure of impact immediately following each of the supervision sessions. Results from this research serve to highlight the importance supervisees place on having a safe and trusting environment for their supervision to be beneficial and suggests supervisors pay particular attention to this aspect of their supervisory alliance building for any meaningful learning to take place as well as to diminish the possible negative impacts of supervisee shame-proneness. Furthermore, this research suggest that the supervisory working alliance perceived by supervisees may be an important predictive factor for the outcome of supervision arguing for the importance supervisors should place on building and strengthening this process variable.

Mots clés:

Supervisions, alliance, honte, développement des compétences, counseling de carrière, formation, effets.

Key words: Supervision, alliance, shame, competency development, career counseling, training, impact, outcome.
SUMMARY

Supervision is viewed as the most important element in the development of competence for counselors. Much emphasis in the literature is placed on the importance of a strong supervisory working alliance in creating optimal conditions for positive outcomes in supervision. As well, the literature suggests that certain counselor characteristics such as shame-proneness may play an important mediating role in this process. The empirical literature in the field of supervision, however, is scattered and many of the inferences made concerning the role of the supervisory working alliance and shame-proneness in the process of supervision rely on extrapolations from the psychology and psychotherapy literature. Since supervisory working alliance is considered to be a key element in the positive outcome of supervision and shame-proneness is seen as a possible factor which may negatively impact this process, it seems of utmost importance to investigate these variables and attempt to provide empirical evidence for these still theoretical assumptions. As well, a further understanding of the role of these variables in the supervisory process will contribute to the enhanced practice of supervision and counselor training. The goal of this research is to extend the supervision research by investigating different aspects concerning the nature of the perceived supervisory working alliance and by investigating the possible relationship between the supervisory working alliance and impact (proposed as a variable predictive of outcome), as well as investigating whether supervisee shame-proneness could be found to be significantly related to the supervisory working alliance and impact.

The participants in this research included 43 counseling supervisees enrolled in a master’s level employment counseling course and 13 supervisors undergoing a 5-session supervisory process. A demographic questionnaire was completed by all participants prior to the start of the supervision sessions. As well, the Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) was administered to the 43 supervisees prior to the start of the
supervision sessions and following the last supervision session as a measure of shame-proneness. The *Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee* (SWAI-T) and *Supervisor* (SWAI-S) versions were used to measure the strength of reported supervisory working alliance and the *Session Evaluation Questionnaire* (SEQ) was used as a measure of impact. Immediately following each of the supervision sessions the SWAI-T and SEQ were completed by the 43 supervisees and the SWAI-S was completed by the 13 supervisors.

The second chapter constitutes the first research article which investigates supervisor and supervisee agreement concerning the supervisory working alliance and the possible influence of shame-proneness. The objectives of this empirical paper are: 1) to investigate whether supervisors and supervisees report similar supervisory working alliance experiences in supervision and 2) to investigate whether supervisee level of shame-proneness could be found to differ significantly in relation to supervisory working alliance ratings. Results indicate that supervisors and supervisees report significantly different supervisory working alliance ratings. As well, no differences in supervisory working alliance ratings were found in relation to supervisee shame-proneness.

The third chapter constitutes a second article investigating the influence of supervisee shame-proneness on the supervisory working alliance and impact. The goals of this empirical paper are: 1) to see whether there was a significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and their rated strength of supervisory working alliance and 2) to investigate whether level of shame-proneness could be found to influence impact. Results indicate a significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and perceived strength of supervisory working alliance. As well, high shame-prone supervisees reported significantly lower levels of impact.

The fourth chapter constitutes a third article investigating the relationship between supervisory working alliance and impact. The goals of this empirical article
are: 1) to investigate the relationship between supervisee perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and impact and 2) to investigate the relationship between supervisor perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived impact. Results indicate that a significant relationship exists between supervisee perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and impact, but that no such relationship exists between supervisor perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived impact.

The results are cause for reflection regarding the practice of supervision. These reflections as well as clinical implications and the strengths and limitations of this study are presented in the discussion and conclusion of this thesis.
RÉSUMÉ

La supervision est considérée comme un domaine de spécialisation à part entière et perçue comme un élément clé du développement des compétences en counseling de carrière. Cependant, la plupart des connaissances sur le processus de supervision proviennent de travaux en psychologie. Si l’on considère les objectifs et les procédés de la supervision comme étant uniques, il apparaît de plus grande importance de comprendre ce processus et les résultats qui en découlent dans d'autres contextes, tel que le counseling de carrière.

La littérature sur le sujet porte surtout sur l'importance de l'alliance de travail dans la création de conditions optimales pour l'obtention de résultats positifs en supervision. La littérature indique également que certaines caractéristiques des personnes supervisées, telles que la prédisposition à la honte, peuvent jouer un rôle considérable dans ce processus. Étant donné que l'alliance de travail en supervision est considérée comme étant un élément clé dans l'obtention de résultats positifs et que la prédisposition à la honte peut avoir un effet négatif sur ce processus, l'étude de ces variables pourrait contribuer à développer des fondements empiriques aux hypothèses formulées. De plus, une meilleure compréhension du rôle de ces variables dans le processus de supervision pourrait améliorer la pratique de la supervision et la formation en counseling de carrière. Le but de cette étude est d'accroître les connaissances dans le domaine de la supervision en examinant la relation possible entre l'alliance de travail et l'effet immédiat de la supervision (proposée comme variable prédictive du résultat), tout en tentant de déterminer l'influence de la prédisposition à la honte de la personne supervisée. À ce jour, aucune étude n'a évalué les liens possibles entre l'alliance de travail, la prédisposition à la honte et l'effet immédiat de la supervision.

Les participants et les participants à cette étude sont 43 étudiantes et étudiants en formation en counseling de carrière inscrits dans un programme de maîtrise en orientation professionnelle et accompagnés par 13 superviseurs et superviseurs. Selon les exigences de l'activité pédagogique, les étudiantes et les étudiants doivent intervenir auprès d'une cliente ou d'un client dans le cadre d'un processus de counseling de carrière d'une durée de 5 à 10 rencontres. Chaque étudiante ou étudiant doit rencontrer une supervisee ou un superviseur à intervalles réguliers durant tout le processus, pour un total de 5 séances de supervision. Un questionnaire sociodémographique a été rempli par les participantes et les participants avant le début de chacune des séances de supervision. De plus, le questionnaire Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) a été administré avant la première et après la dernière séance de supervision, afin de mesurer la prédisposition à la honte. Les versions Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) et Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Supervisor (SWAI-S) ont été utilisées pour mesurer l'alliance de travail, alors que le Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) a été utilisé pour mesurer l'effet immédiat de la supervision. Immédiatement après chacune des supervisions, les questionnaires SWAI-T et SEQ ont été remplis par les
43 étudiantes et étudiants supervisés et le questionnaire SWAI-S, par les 13 superviseurs et superviseurs.

Le deuxième chapitre de cette thèse présente un premier article empirique dans lequel la qualité de l'alliance de travail entre la supervisée ou le supervisé et la superviseur ou le superviseur et l'influence de la prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé sont étudiées. Les objectifs de cet article sont : 1) d'évaluer le niveau de similarité dans la perception de l'alliance de travail des supervisées ou des supervisés et des superviseuses ou des superviseurs et 2) d'évaluer si le niveau de prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé peut différer de manière significative selon la qualité de l'alliance de travail. Les résultats obtenus indiquent que les supervisées ou les supervisés et les superviseuses ou les superviseurs rapportent une qualité d'alliance de travail très différente. De plus, aucune différence dans la qualité de l'alliance de travail n'est enregistrée lorsqu'elle est mise en lien avec des différents niveaux de prédisposition à la honte des supervisées ou des supervisés. Tout comme dans la littérature, ces résultats suggèrent que les supervisées ou les supervisés ainsi que les superviseuses ou les superviseurs mettent probablement l'accent sur des aspects différents de l'alliance de travail et que les besoins émotionnels des supervisées ou des supervisés prennent une importance particulière au cours des séances de supervision. Ainsi, il serait possible de dire que l'établissement d'un climat de confiance et de respect entre la supervisée ou le supervisé et la superviseur ou le superviseur semble être un élément clé d'une supervision réussie, et ce, sans égard au niveau de prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé. L'absence de relation entre la qualité de l'alliance de travail et le niveau de prédisposition à la honte pourrait suggérer que la nature même du processus de supervision pourrait déclencher la honte chez les supervisées ou les supervisés ou chez la plupart d'entre eux. C'est donc dire que les superviseuses ou les superviseurs peuvent interagir avec des supervisées ou des supervisés ayant le même niveau de honte étant donné les exigences du processus de supervision comme tel. En fait, ceci expliquerait l'absence de résultat significatif entre les superviseuses ou les superviseurs ayant des supervisées ou des supervisés qui ont un niveau moyen à élevé de prédisposition à la honte.

Le troisième chapitre présente un deuxième article empirique portant sur l'influence de la prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé sur la qualité de l'alliance de travail et l'effet immédiat de la supervision. Les objectifs de cet article sont : 1) de déterminer s'il existe une relation significative entre la prédisposition à la honte et l'alliance de travail et 2) d'évaluer si le niveau de prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé pourrait avoir une influence sur l'effet immédiat de la supervision. Les résultats obtenus montrent une relation significative entre la prédisposition à la honte de la supervisée ou du supervisé et la perception de la qualité de l'alliance de travail au cours des 5 séances de supervision. De plus, seule la sous-échelle rapport du score général de l'alliance de travail est liée de manière significative à la prédisposition à la honte des supervisées ou des supervisés.
Bien que la relation entre la prédisposition à la honte et l’alliance de travail puisse varier durant les 5 séances du processus de supervision, ces variations entre les séances n'enregistrent pas de différence significative. Cependant on observe une tendance à une relation positive au début du processus de supervision, tandis qu'à la fin, cette tendance est négative. Lorsque l’on compare ces résultats avec ceux que l’on retrouve dans la littérature existante, il en ressort que le soutien perçu par les supervisées ou les supervisés, provenant des superviseurs ou des superviseuses, pourrait servir à diminuer les effets négatifs de la honte et contribuer à créer un climat basé sur la confiance, favorable à l’ouverture et à l’apprentissage.

Sur le plan de la prédisposition à la honte et de l’effet immédiat de la supervision, les supervisées ou les supervisés ayant un niveau élevé de prédisposition à la honte ont rapporté des effets immédiats beaucoup moins élevés. Cette différence importante est détectée aux sous-échelles, douceur (smoothness), positivité (positivity) et éveil (arousal), mais pas à la sous-échelle profondeur (depth). Ces résultats suggèrent que la nature cachée de la honte rend les effets de cette variable difficiles à cerner dans un processus de supervision. En effet, bien que les résultats suggèrent que les supervisées ou les supervisés ayant une prédisposition élevée à la honte perçoivent la supervision comme étant plus difficile émotionnellement, ils ne sont pas moins engagés et ne se perçoivent pas comme ayant moins appris ou comme s’étant moins améliorés que d’autres supervisées ou supervisés ayant une prédisposition à la honte moins élevée. Cependant, avec ce qu’on sait de l’expérience difficile et secrète de la honte, il est probable que les supervisées ou les supervisés ayant une prédisposition à la honte élevée se perçoivent comme étant tout aussi engagés et comme ayant appris autant que leurs collègues ou s’étant améliorés autant qu’eux uniquement pour se protéger de la honte d’avoir à admettre le contraire.

Le quatrième chapitre présente un troisième article empirique examinant la relation entre l’alliance de travail et l’effet immédiat de la supervision. Les objectifs de cet article sont : 1) d’évaluer la relation entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par la supervisée ou le supervisé et l’effet immédiat de la supervision et 2) d’évaluer la relation entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par la superviseur ou le superviseur et l’effet immédiat de la supervision perçu par la supervisée ou le supervisé. Les résultats indiquent qu’une relation significative existe entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par les supervisées ou les supervisés et l’effet immédiat de la supervision, mais qu’aucune relation de ce genre n’existe entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par la superviseur ou le superviseur et l’effet immédiat de la supervision perçu par la supervisée ou le supervisé. De plus, en ce qui concerne la relation entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par la supervisée ou le supervisé et l’effet immédiat de la supervision, les deux sous-échelles soutien (rapport) et le focus-cliente ou client (client-focus) ont joué un rôle prédictif sur l’effet immédiat global à différentes étapes du processus de supervision. À la lumière des résultats provenant de recherches existantes et d’hypothèses théoriques sur l’alliance de travail en supervision, ces résultats suggèrent que différents aspects de l’alliance de travail deviennent importants à des moments particuliers du processus de supervision et contribuent
aux résultats de la supervision. L’absence de relation significative entre la qualité de l’alliance perçue par la superviseure ou le superviseur et l’effet immédiat de la supervision perçue par la supervisee ou le supervisé est aussi en lien avec les résultats présentés au premier chapitre de cette thèse portant sur l’absence de relation significative entre la qualité de l’alliance perçue par la supervisee ou le supervisé et celle perçue par la superviseure ou le superviseur. Ainsi, il semble que les superviseures ou les superviseurs ainsi que les supervisées ou les supervisés ont des conceptions différentes de leur alliance de travail en supervision, et le lien devient moins évident entre la qualité de l’alliance de travail perçue par la supervisee ou le supervisé et l’effet immédiat de la supervision perçue par la supervisee ou le supervisé.

Les résultats de cette recherche mènent à quelques conclusions en ce qui concerne l’alliance de travail, la prédisposition à la honte et l’effet immédiat de la supervision. Globalement, cette recherche fait ressortir l’importance pour les supervisées ou les supervisés d’avoir un environnement sécuritaire où règne la confiance pour que cette supervision leur soit profitable. Elle suggère aussi que les superviseurs ou les superviseuses doivent porter une attention particulière au renforcement de la qualité de l’alliance de travail pour assurer un apprentissage enrichissant et diminuer les effets négatifs possibles de la prédisposition à la honte chez les supervisées ou les supervisés. De plus, cette recherche démontre que l’alliance de travail perçue par la supervisee ou le supervisé pourrait être un facteur prédictif de la réussite d’un processus de supervision, accentuant l’importance pour les superviseures ou les superviseurs de construire et renforcer cette variable du processus.

Cette étude fournit des données empiriques qui enrichissent la compréhension de l’alliance de travail en supervision en montrant le lien entre la prédisposition à la honte et l’effet immédiat de la supervision, à la fois sur l’alliance de travail et sur l’effet immédiat de la supervision. Les implications cliniques découlant de cette recherche sont mises en évidence par les résultats démontrant que les superviseuses ou les superviseurs gagneraient à porter une attention particulière au besoin des supervisées ou des supervisés d’avoir un environnement sécuritaire dans lequel ils peuvent se sentir en confiance pour bénéficier de la supervision et l’importance de la qualité de l’alliance de travail afin d’assurer le développement des compétences en counseling de carrière.
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Counseling supervision has been gaining more attention in the literature in recent years and is now generally accepted as an independent field of specialization (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Different forms or reasons for supervision exist and whether it be in dyads or in groups, live or delayed, as part of training for counselors not yet practicing, or as skill perfection for already practicing counselors, clinical supervision aims the enhancement of competencies and monitors the quality of services using the supervisee's interaction with their clients as the primary means for teaching (Robiner, Saltzman, Hoberman, Scriver, 1997, Blocher, 1983). Counselor supervision is seen as requiring its own set of skills and prior professional experience to ably guide counselors. The bulk of our knowledge however, concerning the process of supervision has grown out of our knowledge of the counselling and psychotherapeutic process, and this has guided the practice of supervision. There exist however, important differences between the two processes with each process aiming distinctly different outcomes (Friedlander, Siegel, & Brenock, 1989). The practice of supervision emphasizes learning of intervention skills and integrates evaluation of these skills as a key part of the learning process. Evaluation and judgment of a client's performance however are typically avoided in a therapeutic relationship. As well, the nature of the interactive relationship differs in the fact that supervisees enter supervision with much more therapeutic knowledge than typically do clients, which guides the interactions between both dyad members. Viewing the practice of supervision as an independent field of specialization recognizes its unique processes and underlines the importance of building its own research base from which to appropriately draw on when developing knowledge and 

1 The spelling of the word counseling using one "I" is adopted throughout this thesis given that it is the accepted spelling in Quebec and in the United States. The spelling of the word counselling with two "l's" however is adopted in the first article of this thesis due to the fact that it was submitted to an Anglophone Canadian journal where the accepted spelling of the word is with two "l's"
guidelines for the practice of supervision. This is of importance for, it is primarily through supervision that counselors and other helping professionals alike build and develop their professional competence (Bordin, 1983, Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990, Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997, Ladany, Ellis, & Frieldander, 1999).

There exists no singular agreed upon way to conduct supervision and many supervision models based on a variety of theories can be found in the literature. Historically, it seems that the context of supervision was tied to counseling theory and supervisees typically were oriented according to their supervisor's approach (Getz, 1999). Examples of early supervision models include among others Ekstein and Wallerstein's (1972) psychotherapy-based approach to supervision from a dynamic theory perspective, and Truax and Carkhuff's (1967) supervision model which was based on Rogersan therapeutic conditions. However, more recent approaches have developed independently from psychotherapy. According to Leddick (1994), three major types of supervision models have emerged from the multitude of models in the literature: Developmental Models, Integrated Models and Orientation-Specific Models. Regardless of approach to supervision, it is clear that little empirical evidence exists to fully support any approach to supervision, and much of the literature used in support of many of the supervisory concepts developed is drawn from the therapeutic literature and knowledge base. It is therefore important that we continue to do research in the field of counseling supervision if we are to continue to build our empirical knowledge base and provide solid foundations to the developing practice of supervision. This study is aimed at contributing to the growing knowledge base in supervision by investigating the process variables, the supervisory working alliance and impact and to see whether shame-proneness could be found to influence either of these variables.
SUPERVISORY WORKING ALLIANCE

It is the supervisory working alliance within the supervisory relationship, which is credited in the literature as being the primary means through which the development of competence is facilitated and supervisee development is enhanced in supervision (Bordin, 1983, Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990, Eckstein & Wallerstein, 1972, Holloway, 1992, 1995) The supervisory working alliance is the process variable of supervision referring to the collaboration between supervisor and supervisee for change in the supervisee based on mutual agreement of the goals and tasks of supervision, as well as a strong emotional bond (Bordin, 1983). The concept of the working alliance has its roots in psychoanalytic theory in which Freud (1940) referred to a collaborative “pact” formed between the psychoanalyst and his or her client in which candor of the sick ego was exchanged for discretion and the experience of interpretation of the psychoanalyst with the goal of giving the ego back his mastery over his mental life. The notion of the working alliance was later redefined pan-theoretically by Bordin (1974) as collaboration for change based on mutual agreement concerning goals and tasks as well as a strong emotional bond between therapist and client. Bordin also likened the therapeutic working alliance to the supervisory working alliance and extended the scope of his working alliance definition to include the supervisory working alliance arguing for the fact that the working alliance is actually a description of the change process itself and that the supervisory relationship is a process of change.

Many different terms are used throughout the literature in reference to the working alliance. Terms including “therapeutic alliance”, “ego alliance”, “helping alliance”, and “working alliance” are used as synonyms according to Bedi, Davis and Arvay (2005) all referring to, “the quality and strength of the reciprocal relationship between a client and a counselor and includes both the affective elements and the collaborative working elements of this reciprocal relationship” (p 71). The mutuality of the relationship is of primary focus in all working
definitions of the alliance. That is, regardless of term used or working definition provided, the contribution and investment from both parties to the relationship is at the heart of alliance building. However, it must be specified that therapeutic working alliances differ from supervisory working alliances in the fact that therapeutic working alliances primarily focus on therapeutic change whereas the supervisory working alliance has primarily a learning and evaluative focus (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997).

Process studies in supervision have served to highlight the importance of strong supervisory working alliances in diminishing the effects of negative supervisory events and contributing to what was perceived as “good” supervisory experiences. In a small qualitative study by Chung, Baskin & Case (1998) investigating positive and negative supervisory experiences, they rated audiotaped interviews conducted with six counseling trainees and found that while most positive supervisory experiences pertained to clinical training, the negative supervisory experiences related to the supervisory relationship itself. Along the same lines, Ladany and Friedlander found in a sample of 123 counselor trainees that stronger supervisory alliances were predictive of less trainee role conflict and ambiguity. This study, however, was based on recall and measured supervisory process at only one point in time. Ramos Sanchez, Esnil, Goodwin, Riggs, Touster, Wright, Ratanaspiripong and Rodolfa, (2002), investigated the effects of negative supervisory effects. In their study, they mailed survey packets to randomly selected APA training programs yielding a sample of 126 counseling trainees. Results indicated among other things that negative supervisory events as reported by trainees were associated with lower alliance strengths and less satisfaction with supervision. This qualitative study also was based on recall and collected data at only one point in time. Although methodologically limited by the validity biases inherent in recall data and the fact that the studies did not control for time in their data collection strategies, these process studies provide important evidence of the importance of a strong supervisory alliance in the process of supervision for buffering against
negative supervisory experiences and maintaining satisfying, quality supervisory relationships

Outcome studies have also provided empirical evidence of the importance of the supervisory alliance in contributing to satisfaction with supervision and to the success of supervision. Nelson and Friedlander (2001) conducted qualitative interviews and self-report measures with a nationwide sample of 13 counseling trainees concerning conflictual relationships. Results from the qualitative interviews surfaced themes of role conflict and power struggles related to negative supervisory experiences. These negative experiences were associated with negative supervisory outcomes in several of the participants in terms of lasting self-doubt with one choosing not to remain in the profession. This study was limited, however by its small sample size, and the fact that although alliance was assumed but not measured, as well as the fact that the time factor was not controlled for creating the possibility for recall bias as participants may well have been referring to different moments in their relationship, knowing that the alliance fluctuates in time suggests that the results are limited by this possible bias. Another study by Ladany, Ellis & Friedlander (1999) found that supervisory alliance was predictive of supervisory outcomes. A national sample of 107 counselor trainees revealed that the emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor predicted supervisee satisfaction with supervision. This study, however also did not control for the factor of time. Worthen and McNeill (1996) conducted a qualitative study looking at “good” supervisory events. Interviews were conducted with 4 doctoral level counseling trainees. Identification of salient themes revealed among other findings that the supervisory relationship was a crucial and pivotal component of the supervision associated with good supervision experiences and positive outcomes of supervision. This qualitative study however was limited by its very small sample size. Worthington and Roehlke (1979) investigated the perceptions of 31 counseling supervisees on the frequency of supervisor behaviors associated with good supervision and satisfaction with supervision. Results revealed that the presence of a positive supervisory relationship
was an important factor associated with supervisee satisfaction with supervision. Results from this study are questionable, however due to the fact that data was based on recall and the authors provided no validity and reliability information on the instruments used. Furthermore, a study by Patton and Kivlighan (1997) investigated the effects of supervisory alliance on counseling alliance and client treatment adherence found that the counselor trainee's supervisory alliance was significantly related to their clients' perceptions of the counseling alliance and clients' treatment adherence. Although these studies make a strong argument for the importance of the supervisory relationship for the outcome of supervision, they suffer from methodological limitations which limit the validity of results. Supervisory alliance research is limited by the fact that it has mainly relied on small qualitative samples, have relied on recall of data, have not controlled for the element of time.

2 SHAME-PRONENESS

Shame is an experience that many prominent authors place at the core of ourselves and our identities and is known to have debilitating effects on the integrity of the self. It is described in the literature as an internal panic-like reaction stemming from the humiliation of personal failure or threat of failure, from feelings of inadequacy and of fear of rejection (Kaufman, 1989, Lewis, 1971, Piers, 1953).

Important distinctions however, must be made between what is described as situational shame and shame-proneness. Since shame has been found to be experienced at some point or another by everyone, situational shame is the triggered emotion at a given moment. Shame-proneness however is the emotional disposition of a person. Shame-proneness is defined as an internal, global and stable propensity to experience shame and high shame-prone individuals have a tendency to experience shame more frequently and more intensely than individuals who are moderately shame-prone (Tangney, 1996).
Research concerning shame-proneness has linked shame-proneness to vulnerability to negative effects of failure in achievement situations (Thompson, Altmann, & Davidson, 2004), problematic relationships (Covert, Tangney, Maddux & Heleno, 2003), and self-derogation, berating and blaming one's own behavior and character (Lutwak, Panish & Ferrari, 2002).

High shame-proneness as a potential variable impacting the process and outcome of supervision has long been theoretized through the theoretical and clinical writings of Hahn (2001), Graff (2008), Farber (2003), and Yourman (2003), yet remains largely uninvestigated empirically. Three existing research studies however do provide some evidence of the possible negative impacts of high shame-proneness on the supervisory process and outcome. A study by Yourman and Farber (1996) investigating supervisee nondisclosure and distortion in a sample of 93 counselor trainees found that 91.3% of supervisees hid aspects of their interactions with clients due to fear of disapproval from their supervisors. Although these results suggest that shame may have played an important role in the trainees’ nondisclosure, the aim of this study was not to investigate shame and there are many methodological limitations to this study which limit the validity of this interpretation. The sample of 93 volunteer trainee respondents is the result of only a 35% response rate, raising the possibility that trainees in this sample may have been more sensitive to supervisor approval and hence more likely than average to distort or not disclose. Furthermore, 72% of the respondents were female which may have also influenced the results. We do not yet have a clear understanding of the differences in shame-proneness rates between men and women, and there remains the possibility that over-representation of women in the sample may well have influenced the results. Another limitation to this study is the fact that data was collected on only one recent supervision session based on supervisee recall and there was no control for where trainees were in terms of their supervisory process, or whether or not they chose the more difficult supervision session to report on. This data collection design limits the internal validity of the study, as we cannot be
certain of the accuracy of recall and level of experience or inexperience in supervision could have very well affected respondent's interpretations.

Another study by Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt (1996) concerning the nature of nondisclosure by supervisees found in a national sample of 108 psychotherapy trainees that "impression management" was one of the typical reasons provided by supervisees explaining their nondisclosures. Again, although these results suggest that shame could be at the core of their non-disclosures, this study was not aimed at measuring shame, but rather focused on non-disclosure. Although we can hypothesize that "impression management" could relate to feelings of shame, this is not addressed in the study. Furthermore, as the study has several limitations which threaten the validity of the results obtained, the convenience sample of mostly women volunteers may have yielded results not generalizable to other counseling trainees. Furthermore, the survey used in this study was created for the study specifically and provides no discussion on the validity or reliability of the data obtained. As well, this study relied on recall and did not control for time variables of when the supervision had occurred, asking participants to complete the questionnaire as it related to a supervisor with whom they had been in individual supervision with for at least two months, creating the possibility that supervisees' responses may not accurately reflect the psychotherapy trainee population.

The only study which has linked supervisee high shame-proneness to impacts on the supervisory process is the study by Doherty (2005). In his sample of 113 volunteer supervisees from several training sites, Doherty looked at shame-proneness in psychotherapy trainees and their reactions to and overall satisfaction with supervision. Although results revealed high shame-prone supervisees to have significantly less satisfactory supervisions and to their perceiving supervision sessions as contributing less to their improvement as therapists, the study is fraught with methodological limitations which severely limit the validity of these results. Firstly, no validity or reliability data was provided for either of the instruments used in his study to measure supervision satisfaction and process, with one of the
instruments developed by himself for the purpose of the study. Secondly, his data collection strategy relied on recall and did not control for time variables, nor for process variables asking respondents to rate one session over the past six months. Another factor seriously limiting the validity of the results relate to his arbitrary division of "low", "moderate" and "high" shame-prone groups, with the "high" group including raw scores ranging from 32 to 85. This range could have lead to misleading results as it is stated by the author the Internalized Shame Scale that a raw scores of 50 or higher is indicative of what is considered "problem shame" (Cook, 2004). Furthermore, Cook reports a mean raw score of 33 for his female norming sample. Doherty's research, therefore includes normal scores in his "high" shame-proneness group rendering valid interpretation of the results impossible.

As clearly outlined by these three studies, research concerning the impacts of shame-proneness on the supervision process and outcome are scarce and the studies suggesting that shame may play a role in the supervisory process and outcome are fraught with methodological limitations. No long-term research has been conducted and the existing research has not controlled for the important variables of time and process. Research concerning the impacts of shame-proneness on the supervisory process and outcome is important in providing an empirical basis for which to rest our theoretical assumptions as well as to continue to contribute to our knowledge base in the field of counselling supervision and important variables influencing process and outcome.

3 IMPACT

Impact refers to the client's internal reaction to sessions. It is the client's immediate subjective evaluation of the session's depth or value, emotional climate, relationship with counselor, assessment of accomplishments and tasks, as well as their post-session mood (Reynolds, Stiles, Barkham, & Shapiro, 1996). According to Stiles (1980), impact can be viewed as a mediator between process and outcome and
therefore measuring and studying session impact can provide indications of change. This is further outlined by Stiles, Reynolds, Hardy, Rees, Barkham & Shapiro (1994) state, “Measures of impact are concerned with clients’ internal reactions to sessions, which, logically, must intervene between in-session events and the long-term, effects of treatment (p 175)” They suggested that looking at the immediate impacts of a therapeutic session and exploring processes which may affect impact provide a feasible unit to predicting outcome. Based on this premise, it seems of importance to investigate possible links between the supervisory working alliance and impact and whether shame-proneness could be found to influence session impact. Linking the supervisory working alliance and shame-proneness to session impact could prove invaluable in providing empirical evidence for the long standing belief of the importance of a strong supervisory working alliance for the outcome of supervision and for the theoretical assumptions of the influence of shame-proneness in the process and outcome of supervision.

Studies concerning impact in a therapeutic setting have found impact to be a predictor of outcome linking it to client improvement, (Stiles, Shapiro, & Firth-Cozens, 1988, 1990) and to client and counselor early termination of working alliance (Mallinckrodt, 1993) Although this has yet to be confirmed in supervisory settings, we could hypothesize that measuring supervision session impact could provide indicative outcome data of possible future change. Studies that have looked at impact in supervisory settings have found impact to vary more significantly for supervisees than supervisors from session to session (Martin, Goodyear, & Newton, 1987), and has found client-rated session smoothness to decrease when the therapist was receiving live as opposed to delayed supervision (Kivlighan, Angelone, & Swafford, 1991)
4 GOALS OF THE STUDY

Supervision is now largely accepted as an independent field of specialization with its own goals and processes. It therefore seems pertinent for this area of practice to base its concepts and knowledge on a solid foundation of its own empirical evidence. The pan-theoretical concept of the supervisory working alliance as an important process variable crucial to the outcome of supervision is discussed theoretically, yet research remains scarce and methodologically limited. Only a handful of studies have looked at the supervisory alliance and there is evidence of the importance of a strong supervisory alliance for both buffering against negative events and for contributing to satisfaction and positive supervisory outcomes. The concept of the supervisory working alliance, having grown out of an extension of our knowledge of this concept in the fields of psychology and psychotherapy, merits its own research, for the goals and processes of supervision and therapy differ on significant aspects. Having a deeper understanding of the supervisory working alliance and how it is experienced by both participants, as well as whether it can be linked to impact predictive of outcome, and whether other extraneous variables such as shame-proneness can be found to influence the supervisory working alliance and impact will take us one step closer to building the empirical knowledge base in the practice of supervision. As stated previously, only one study has looked at the influence of shame-proneness in the supervisory process, and only two others have provided evidence that shame may well influence the supervisory process. These studies, however, are fraught with methodological limitations which include not controlling for important variables of time and process, arbitrary division of groups, and reliance on recall. Furthermore, no studies have looked at the impacts of shame-proneness in a longitudinal study over the course of a supervisory process. As well, no studies to date have looked at session impact in the supervisory context and looking at the effects of shame-proneness and supervisory alliance on session impact could provide valuable predictive outcome data. This will also contribute to our
efforts towards maintaining a high level of quality services in the practice of counseling

The goal of this thesis (consisting of three empirical articles) was to bridge existing methodological limitations in order to gain a greater understanding of these important supervisory factors and to investigate possible relationships between the supervisory working alliance, impact and shame-proneness. We designed a longitudinal study measuring the alliance and impact following each supervision session over the course of a five session process using instruments with evidence of validity and reliability. More specifically, we investigated whether supervisors and supervisees experience similar supervisory working alliance experiences, whether significant relationships exist between the supervisory working alliance and session impact and whether supervisee shame-proneness is significantly related to both of these variables.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Participants

The study was conducted at a Canadian francophone University. The participants were recruited from two campuses where the same course was being offered and included 43 counseling students and 13 supervisors from a possible 64 students and 17 supervisors. The selection process was based on a purposive criterion sample of convenience. The primary criterion for selection in the supervisee sample was that each participant was enrolled in a first year compulsory master’s level employment counseling course.

Supervisors for the course were chosen and hired by the course professor. The selection criterion was based on the supervisors having graduated from the master’s program for which the student supervisees were enrolled. The supervisors having the most years of experience in the field were given priority and were
permitted to supervise more students. Sociodemographic characteristics of supervisor and supervisee participants are detailed in appendix I.

The matching of supervisors and supervisees was made in the following fashion: following a brief presentation of each supervisor by the professor responsible for the course, the students were asked to write down their first three choices for a supervisor in order of preference. Supervisors were then assigned by the professor responsible for the course with an attempt made in respecting everyone’s preferred choices.

5.2 Measures

5.2.1 Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI)

The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) was developed by Efstation, Patton and Kardash (1990) and was designed to measure the relationship in counselor supervision. The measure was based conceptually on the works of Greenson (1967), Pepinsky and Patton (1971), and Bordin (1983) who formulate the relationship in supervision as a working alliance in which social influence occurs. The authors therefore argue that the supervisory working alliance is best measured by assessing both participants’ perceptions of each other. Two forms compose the SWAI, the supervisee or trainee scale (SWAI-T) and the supervisor scale (SWAI-S).

The SWAI-T contains 19 items in two factors, Rapport and Client Focus. Rapport refers to the trainee’s perception of support from the supervisor. Client focus refers to the trainee’s perception of the emphasis the supervisor placed on promoting the trainee’s understanding of the client.

The SWAI-S contains 23 items in three factors, Client focus, Rapport, and Identification. Client focus refers to the emphasis the supervisors placed on...
promoting the trainees' understanding of the client. Rapport refers to the supervisor's effort to build rapport with the trainees by supporting and encouraging them. The identification factor represents the supervisor's perception of the trainees' identification with the supervisor.

The items are rated on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from *almost never* (1) to *almost always* (7). Although there are behaviors that are common to both participants, the authors also took into consideration activities that are specific to each role. It is important to note that due to the French speaking nature of the population being studied in this research, a translated version by Lecomte and Lebourgeois from the Universite de Montreal of the SWAI was used (see Appendices D and E for complete questionnaires). An example of an item from the supervisor's scale is « *J'aide mon/ma stagiaire à travailler à l'intérieur d'un modèle spécifique de traitement avec son/sa client(e)* ». A related question on the supervisee scale is « *Je comprends les comportements des client(e)s et les méthodes de traitement d'une manière semblable à la sienne* ».

The SWAI internal consistency coefficients been reported by Efstation et al. (1990) to have acceptable estimates of reliability. Alpha coefficients were 76 for the Supervisor version and 86 for the Trainee version. Alpha coefficients for the supervisor scales were 71 for Client Focus, 73 for Rapport, and 77 for Identification. Alpha coefficients for the Trainee scales were 90 for Rapport and 77 for Client Focus. Item-scale correlations ranged from 29 to 57 for the supervisor scales and from 37 to 77 for the trainee scales. Convergent and divergent validity evidence was established with intercorrelations with the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI).

Concerning the limitations of the SWAI, it must be noted that the supervisee scale was developed using a sample of advanced practicum and internship level students, and appropriateness of the SWAI with a range of trainee experience levels is not known. As well, supervisor scores have not been examined to determine
whether they vary systematically by theoretical orientation of participants (Efstation, et al., 1990)

5.2.2 Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ)

The Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) developed by Stiles (1980) was initially aimed at measuring dimensions of immediate impacts of a counseling session and later was used to measure immediate impacts of a supervision session (Burke, Goodyear & Guzzard, 1998). Impact refers to a session's immediate effects on the participants' post-session affective state, or mood measured immediately after the session (Stiles, 1980). Stiles and Snow (1984) distinguish impact from process and long-term outcome. They consider impact as a mediator between process and outcome.

The SEQ form 5 is composed of 21 bipolar adjectives rated on a 7 point scale allowing participants to rate how they evaluate their session and how they feel concerning the supervision session. Our version was rated on a 10-point scale. They are grouped into four dimensions, two independent evaluative dimensions of participants' perceptions of their sessions, called Depth and Smoothness, and two dimensions of their post-session mood, called Positivity and Arousal. Depth refers to a session being perceived as powerful, valuable, and deep compared to weak, ordinary, and shallow. Smoothness refers to a session's comfort, relaxation, and pleasantness. Positivity refers to feelings of confidence and clarity, as well as happiness and the absence of fear or anger, whereas Arousal refers to feeling active and excited compared to quiet and calm (Stiles & Snow, 1984). The respondents are instructed to "please circle the appropriate number to show how you feel about this session."

The 21 bipolar adjectives are separated into two sections: 1) evaluation of the supervision, and 2) mood following the supervision. It is important to note that the
version of the SEQ used in this study is a translated version by Lecomte and Tremblay from the Université de Montreal (see Appendix F for complete questionnaire) An example of a question in the SEQ is «Aujourd'hui ma superviseur ou mon superviseur a été » This is followed by three bipolar adjectives habile-maladroit, froid-chaleureux, digne de confiance-peu fiable

According to Mallinckrodt (1993), the Session Evaluation Questionnaire (SEQ) has become one of the most frequently used instruments in counseling process research Extensive factor analysis research conducted by Stiles and his colleagues which included different cultural samples with large groups of persons provide well established proof of the validity and internal consistency reliability of the SEQ Stiles, Reynolds, Hardy, Rees, Barkham and Shapiro (1994) reported coefficients of internal consistency reliability Alpha coefficients for the subscales were 90 for Depth, 92 for Smoothness, 90 for Positivity and 80 for Arousal and Friedlander, Bernardi & Lee (2010) reported a total alpha of 85

Limitations of the instrument have been discussed concerning the bipolarity of the scales (Dill-Standiford, Stiles & Rorer, 1988) and retest reliability (Mallinckrodt, 1993) Concerning the bipolarity of the scales, Dill-Standiford et al (1988) point out that because the scales are bipolar, it cannot indicate that a session could include both positive and negative events They point out that the SEQ measures relatively broad, evaluative session qualities and that it is possible that different agreement results could be obtained with instruments measuring qualities that are more specific or descriptive

Concerning the limitations of retest reliability, Mallinckrodt (1993) points out that “measurements are intended to remain stable over a variety of conditions in which essentially the same results should be obtained” (p 187) He then raises the question over what span of time the impact of a therapy session measured by the SEQ is expected to remain unchanged and suggests that the SEQ’s positivity and arousal ratings are subject to change rapidly, with depth and smoothness being more
stable Rapid change in positivity and arousal would therefore threaten the retest reliability of the SEQ

5.2.3 Internalized Shame Scale (ISS)

The Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) which was designed by Cook (1989) is said to be informed by theoretical conceptions of shame by authors such as G Kaufman, H B Lewis, and S Tompkins The ISS was designed to measure internalized general shame (shame-proneness) The most recent version published in 2001 of the scale consists of 24 items describing feelings or experiences with 6 items from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as fillers Participants respond on a 5 point scale indicating how often they feel this way (Gilbert, 1998) It is important to note that the version being used in this study is a translated version by Savard, Perreault, Bilodeau and Lecomte (see Appendix G for complete questionnaire) An example of an item from the ISS is, «J’ai l’impression de jamais être assez bon(ne) »

According to Gross, Gilbert and Allan (1994), the ISS has been reported to have high internal consistency They quote Cronbach coefficients for the shame scale at .96 and .95 for the self-esteem scale In terms of reliability, test-retest correlations were reported by Cook to be .84 at 7 weeks

Concerning the limitations of the ISS, Cook’s ISS has been criticized in the literature as having potential discriminant validity problems Although Cook (1989) has attempted to provide a theoretical distinction between the two constructs of shame and self-esteem Tangney (1996) criticizes his distinction as one that is blurred and claims that this is reflected in the content of the ISS shame items, many of which tap self-esteem issues Tangney claims that the high correlation found between the ISS and measures of self-esteem threaten the construct validity of the instrument
5.2 Data collection

The supervisee participants attended approximately five 3-hour classes of lecture. The content covered during the class lectures included an overview of career counseling models, the counseling process, the working alliance, theories concerning transition and change, reactions to loss of employment, employability evaluation, and the process of disintegration. As a criterion for the completion of the course, the supervisee counselor participants had to meet with a volunteer client wishing to undergo employment counseling for approximately 6 to 10, 60-minute sessions. Five individual supervision sessions were scheduled throughout the process. In every case, the first supervision session occurred following the first client-counselor session. All other supervision sessions occurred at approximately a 2-session-interval until the end of the counseling process. A formal formative evaluation was conducted by the supervisor and communicated to the supervisee following the second supervision session. Every counseling session was videotaped by the supervisees and they were also required to complete an interview report and analysis of their session following every session and hand in all materials to their supervisors. Data collection was therefore collected over the course of a 10 to 12 week period.

The recruitment and dispersion of clients for the counselor supervisees was done through placing ads in the local papers and through the distribution of flyers on campus offering free counseling services to anyone seeking employment, looking to re-integrate the employment market, experiencing difficulty in employment maintenance, looking for career re-orientation or looking for help in adapting to work-force difficulties. Volunteer clients were pre-screened by a qualified person and preliminary information was gathered such as age, gender, education, experience and general problem for which the person was seeking counseling. Each supervisee obtained a client by contacting the person in charge of the pre-screening and was assigned a client.

The data collection strategy is described and then summarized in Table 1.
Table 1
Data collection strategy

| Time 1  | Prior to starting of classes | - Supervisors completed consent forms and envelopes containing questionnaires and detailed instructions were handed out |
| Time 2  | During second class lecture  | - Introduction of the research to counselor supervisees and consent forms signed. Envelopes containing detailed instructions and questionnaires will be handed out to each participating student.  
- All participating supervisees were asked to complete out the ISS questionnaire found in their envelopes at the end of the second class lecture. |
| Time 3  | After every supervision session (1 to 5) | - Supervisee counselors completed the SEQ and SWAI-T questionnaire  
- Supervisors completed the SWAI-S questionnaire  
- NOTE Following the fifth and final supervision session, supervisees completed the ISS once again |

Time 1 Prior to the start of classes, the project was introduced to the supervisors by the researcher informing them only that the research concerned an investigation into the supervisory process and consent forms were signed. Sealed envelopes identified only by numerical code containing the questionnaires and instructions were handed out to each participating supervisor. None of the questionnaires were identified by name and their exact purpose was not disclosed.

Time 2 Near the end of the second course lecture, the researcher introduced the research to the supervisee counselors informing them only that the research concerned an investigation into the supervisory process and invited all students to participate. Consent forms (appendix B) were signed and sealed envelopes identified by numerical code containing the questionnaires were handed out to participating students and they were asked to fill out the ISS and hand it back to the researcher.
before leaving. None of the questionnaires were identified by name and their exact purpose was not disclosed.

Time 3 Immediately following each supervision session, counselor supervisees were to complete SEQ and the SWAI-T and supervisors were to complete the SWAI-S. Following the fifth and final supervision session, they were also asked to also complete the ISS once again in addition to completing the SWAI-T and the SEQ.

The Biographical questionnaire, the SWAI-T, the SWAI-S, the SEQ and the ISS can be found in appendices C, D, E, F and G respectively.

5.4 Translation of documents

Given the fact that all of the participants for this study were French speaking, each of the instruments used were translated versions from the original English version with permission of authors and in the case of the ISS with permission from the publication house. Translation for the SEQ and SWAI-T and SWAI-S was conducted by qualified persons and followed the commonly recommended translation/back-translation procedure outlined by Brislin (1970). In the case of the ISS as requested by the publication house, a translation/back-to-back-to-back translation was done and given to the publication house. Chronbach’s alpha correlations for all of the translated questionnaires and for the original English versions and their sub-scales are provided in appendix H. All of the translated versions and their subscales yielded acceptable levels of internal consistency and the alpha’s from the different versions differed minimally.
5.5 **Ethical conduct**

Approval from the ethics committee of the university was obtained prior to meeting with participants. The ethical certificate issued by the Education and Social Sciences ethics committee can be found in Appendix A. The research conducted fell within the *low risk* category and posed no risk of physical or moral harm to any of the participants or to their dignity or right to confidentiality. Due to the nature of the shame experience, identifying shame-proneness did require participants to answer some questions which could have been sensitive in nature. The risk of psychological impacts however was minimized by informing students that they could at any time contact a resources person and contact information was provided.

Participants were invited to participate in the research on a volunteer basis and refusal to participate did not bear any impact on their role as students in the class or as student supervisors. All participants were informed of their right to retract themselves from the study at any time and confidentiality was assured for all participants.

Following each supervision session, participants put their completed questionnaires into a previously provided pre-addressed envelope and dropped the envelope into a designated locked bin. Only the researcher handled these envelopes and their contents. The data from the questionnaires were entered by the researcher into an SPSS data base. All participants were identified by code only. The paper questionnaires were kept locked under key in the researcher’s office and the SPSS base was protected by a password.
The second chapter of this thesis constitutes a research article entitled *Examining Supervisor and Supervisee Agreement on Alliance: Is Shame a Factor?* submitted to the *Canadian Journal of Counselling* and presently in press. The goals of this paper were to 1) investigate whether supervisors and supervisees report similar supervisory working alliance experiences and 2) to investigate whether supervisee level of shame-proneness (high shame-prone supervisees vs moderate shame-prone supervisees) could be found to differ significantly in relation to supervisory working alliance ratings in an effort to gain a greater understanding of the working alliance dynamics in supervision and whether shame-proneness can be found to be an important factor in this process. Results indicate that the supervisors and supervisees reported significantly different supervisory working alliance experiences. As well, supervisee level of shame-proneness was not found to significantly influence supervisory working alliance ratings. These findings suggest that supervisors and supervisees may have different needs and experiences concerning the building and maintaining of the supervisory working alliance and that supervisee shame-proneness may have a more global and complicated relationship with the supervisory working alliance than anticipated. Results contribute to an increased understanding of the supervisory working alliance as experienced by both supervisors and supervisees and to increased knowledge concerning the possibly influence of shame-proneness in this process.

The third chapter of this thesis constitutes a research article entitled *Shame in Supervision: The Impacts of Shame-proneness on the Supervisory process* submitted to the *Journal of Counseling & Development*. The goals of this paper were to 1) to see whether there existed a significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and their rated strength of supervisory working alliance and 2) to investigate whether level of supervisee shame-proneness could be found to influence
impact Results indicate that there exists a significant co-relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and supervisee perceived strength of the supervisory working alliance. As well, high shame-prone supervisees reported significantly lower levels of session impact. Results contribute to a growing knowledge base on the impacts of shame-proneness on the process and outcome of supervision by providing tentative data suggesting that supervisee shame-proneness may be an important variable to consider for the well-being and learning of supervisees in training during the supervisory hour.

The fourth chapter of this thesis constitutes a research article entitled *Investigating the Supervisory Alliance Linking Working Alliance to Impact as Outcome* submitted to *Counselor Education and Supervision Journal*. The goals of this article were to 1) investigate the possible relationship that may exist between supervisee perceived strength of the supervisory working alliance and impact and 2) to investigate the possible relationship that may exist between supervisor perceived strength of the supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived impact. Results indicate that a significant relationship exists between supervisee perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and session impact and that both *client focus* and *rapport* were important predictors of perceived impact throughout the supervisory process. No such significant relationship was found between supervisor perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived impact. Results contribute to the knowledge base concerning the process of supervision and the supervisory working alliance and provide important preliminary evidence for the importance of the supervisory working alliance in the outcome of supervision.

In the fifth chapter, the general discussion and conclusion of the thesis attempts to bridge some of the gaps between the counselling supervision theory, supervision research, and the practice of supervision. This discussion highlights the contributions of our research to the existing scientific knowledge base in supervision and how this knowledge may contribute to the practice of supervision and counsellor
training. Strengths and limitations of the study are discussed as well as the implications for future research.

7. POSITION OF THESIS WITHIN THE DOCTORATE THEME
INTERRELATION BETWEEN RESEARCH, TRAINING AND PRACTICE

The essence of this thesis is best described as collaborative. According to Landry and Gagnon (1999), collaborative research can exist in a scientific reference frame, where the researcher obtains the permission of the establishment and the contacts between the two are generally limited to administering tests, questionnaires and interviews. This hierarchical type of collaboration described by Landry and Gagnon most often results in the production of new scientific knowledge in the research field and is disseminated through conferences and peer evaluated scientific publications. Growing out of my academic career aspirations, and my own training experience as a counseling student, this research aims primarily to contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge in the field of supervision. This thesis empirically investigates hypotheses concerning the role of shame-proneness in supervision. These hypotheses are generally accepted as fact in supervision, yet have not to date been empirically supported. This knowledge also contributes to a better understanding of the practice of supervision by highlighting the role of shame-proneness in this process and its relationship with other process variables. This serving to inform the curricula and benefit counselor training programs as well as supervisor training programs leading to enhanced counseling and supervision practices.
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Abstract

This study examined the agreement of 31 supervisee-supervisor pairs on perceived strength of working alliance throughout 5 supervision sessions and looked at whether alliance differed significantly in relation to supervisee shame-proneness. The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (Trainee and Supervisor versions) was used to measure the working alliance and the Internalized Shame Scale was used to measure supervisee shame-proneness. Repeated measures analysis of variance revealed a lack of concordance between perceived alliance strength of supervisors and supervisees $F(1, 29) = 12.70, p = 0.0013$. No differences in alliance ratings were found in relation to shame-proneness. Implications for supervision are discussed.
Examine the supervisor and supervisee agreement on working alliance. Is shame a factor?

The supervisory working alliance is often cited in the literature as the primary means through which competence is enhanced and supervisee development is facilitated in supervision (Bordin, 1983, Eftatson, Patton, & Kardash, 1990, Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997, Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999). The working alliance relationship is seen as collaborative and is based on mutual agreement concerning the goals and tasks of supervision, as well as the development of a strong emotional bond (Bordin, 1994). Research has demonstrated the importance of strong supervisory working alliances which have been linked to increased supervisory satisfaction (Ladany et al., 1999, Worthington & Roehlke, 1979) as well as to increased quality of the supervisory relationship leading to supervisee strengthened confidence, refined professional identity, and increased therapeutic perception (Worthen & McNeill, 1996).

The strength of the supervisory working alliance however is subject to many influences. Shame-proneness in particular has long garnered specific attention from theorists as a possible influential factor (Hahn, 2001, Graff, 2008, Farber, 2003, Yourman, 2003) however, few studies have actually delved further into this variable. It is not clear if supervisees with a tendency to experience shame more frequently and at greater intensities are actually experiencing the supervisory alliance differently than their counterparts.
Proneness to experience shame has been associated with vulnerability to negative effects of failure in achievement situations (Thompson, Altmann, & Davidson, 2004), to problematic relationships (Covert, Tangney, Maddux, & Heleno, 2003), and to self-derogation, berating, and blaming one's own behavior and character (Lutwak, Panish, & Ferrari, 2002). In a supervisory context shame-proneness has been linked to trainee resistance (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996, Yourman & Farber, 1996).

In relation to the supervisory alliance, Quarto (2002) states that "the manner in which supervisees and supervisors interact with one another will affect the quality of their relationships and what they accomplish in supervision" (p. 21). According to Patton and Kivlighan (1997), the working alliance is most directly affected by the dispositional characteristics of the participants. Focusing on dispositional shame (shame-proneness) rather than state shame may hence be of importance in the study of the supervisory alliance.

Moreover, despite the importance of the collaborative relationship in the supervisory working alliance, the approach to supervision as an interactive process has still not received much attention in the research literature. Very little is known about the convergence of supervisor and supervisee judgments concerning their supervisory experiences. The counselling and psychotherapy literature however does provide us with some information on the topic of convergence from which to hypothesize. Convergence is described as a lessening of discrepancy in judgments (Pepinsky & Karst, 1964). Agreement on significant counselling events is seen as an
important mediator of client change and hence an important area for investigation (Kivlighan & Arthur, 2000, Martin & Stelmaczonek, 1988) Previous concordance research in therapeutic settings has found that counsellors and clients have different views of their counselling experiences (Elliott & James, 1989, Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1999) Moreover, therapeutic working alliance research specifically has indicated a stable lack of convergence for counsellor-client alliance ratings or have found only small correlations (Fitzpatrick, Iwakabe, & Stahkas, 2005, Mallinckrodt & Nelson, 1991) with the client tending to rate the strength of the alliance consistently higher than his or her counsellor (Hatcher, Barends, Hansell, & Gutfreund, 1995) Convergence research on counsellor and client recall has been linked to session effectiveness (Cummings, Martin, Hallberg, & Slemon, 1992) as well as to improved client outcomes (Kivlighan & Arthur, 2000) One study by Svensson and Hansson (1999) did report significant correlations between therapist and client working alliance ratings, however their study dealt with a schizophrenic sample, therapists practiced only cognitive therapy, and used different measures of alliance Other research by Kivlighan and Shaughnessy (1995) investigating relations between working alliance and therapeutic outcome of 21 therapist-client dyads found a pattern of increased convergence in alliance ratings over the course of therapy sessions

In a supervisory setting, no studies could be found investigating the agreement of working alliance ratings for counsellor supervisees and their supervisors Several authors have addressed the notion of mutual interaction of dyad members in the supervisory process, yet have not concentrated specifically on
working alliance ratings in any of their studies (Hart, 1982, Holloway, 1982, Lessem, 1995)

It has been suggested that studying multiple perspectives to gain greater insight into the complex nature of the therapeutic relationship would be of valuable importance in the therapeutic field (Svensson & Hanson, 1999) and we propose that this is of equal importance in the field of counselling supervision if we are to proceed in our quest for a better understanding of the complexity of the supervisory relationship. As well, as mentioned by Kennard, Stewart, and Gluck (1987), there are few reports of supervisee characteristics that seem to influence perceived experiences in supervision. Our research objectives for this study therefore were twofold. The first was to examine whether or not supervisees and supervisors would report similar experiences of the supervisory working alliance over the course of the supervisory process. Secondly, we wanted to see whether the strength of the working alliance (as perceived by supervisees and supervisors) would differ significantly in relation to supervisee shame-proneness level.

**Method**

**Design and Participants**

The study was conducted at a Canadian University and included an original sample of 43 student supervisees and 13 supervisors from 64 students enrolled and 17 supervisors which yielded a participation rate of 67% and 76% respectively. Of the 43 supervisee participants, 12 had to be excluded from the sample due to lack of participation from their supervisors. No supervisors were excluded.
supervisor pairs remained. Most supervisors supervised more than one student with one supervisor supervising 9 of the 31 supervisees. Table 1 presents the sociodemographic characteristics of our trainee and supervisor samples.

Table 1

*Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors (N=13)</th>
<th>Supervisees (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69% (9)</td>
<td>84% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31% (4)</td>
<td>16% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of post-secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of counselling experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M</em></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SD</em></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the student supervisees were enrolled in an employment counselling course as master's level counselling students. As part of the course requirements, students met with one client in a counselling process that lasted between five and ten
Each student met with his or her supervisor at regular intervals throughout this process for a total of five supervision sessions. Supervisors for the course were chosen and hired by the course professor. The selection criteria were based on supervisors having graduated from the same Master’s program. The supervisors having the most years of counselling experience were permitted to supervise more students.

Measures

Alliance. The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) developed by Efstation et al. (1990) was designed to measure the relationship in counselor supervision. Two forms compose the SWAI, the supervisee scale (SWAI-T) and the supervisor (SWAI-S) scale.

The supervisee scale contains 19 items across two factors, Rapport and Client Focus. Rapport refers to the supervisee’s perception of support from the supervisor. Client focus refers to the supervisee’s perception of the emphasis the supervisor placed on promoting the trainee’s understanding of the client.

The supervisor scale contains 23 items across three factors, Client focus, Rapport, and Identification. Client focus refers to the emphasis the supervisors placed on promoting the supervisee’s understanding of the client. Rapport refers to the supervisor’s effort to build rapport with his or her trainee by supporting and encouraging them. The identification factor represents the supervisor’s perception of the trainee’s identification with his or her supervisor.

The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from almost never (1) to almost always (7). Although there are behaviors that are common to both
supervisors and supervisees, the authors also took into consideration activities that are specific to each role.

SWAI scale scores have been reported by Efstation et al. (1990) to have acceptable estimates of reliability. Alpha coefficients range from 71 to 77 for the supervisor scales and from 77 to 90 for the trainee scales. Item-scale correlations ranged from 29 to 57 for the supervisor scales and from 37 to 77 for the supervisee scales. Convergent and divergent validity were established through intercorrelations with the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI).

Shame-proneness The Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) developed by Cook (1989) was used as a measure of shame-proneness. The most recent version of the scale published in 2001 consists of 24 items describing feelings or experiences with 6 items from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as fillers. Participants respond on a 5-point scale indicating how often they experience the feelings described in each item. A Reliability coefficient of internal consistency of .95 was reported by Cook (2001). Cook also established convergent validity with several other measures of negative affect and self-esteem measures including the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Brief Symptom Checklist, and the Beck Depression Inventory reporting correlations ranging between -0.41 and 0.62.

The instruments used in this study were selected based on the knowledge that they have all been previously used in alliance and shame research and have demonstrated acceptable levels of validity and reliability by several authors (Rybák & Brown, 1996, Cook, 2001, Del Rosario & White, 2006, Efstation et al., 1990).
Procedures

Prior to the start of the supervision session, supervisees completed the ISS and both supervisors and supervisees completed a demographic questionnaire. Supervisees also completed the ISS after the final supervision session. Immediately after each of the 5 supervision sessions, all supervisors and supervisees were asked to complete the SWAI-T and SWAI-S respectively. All completed forms were returned in sealed envelopes to the researchers and participants were informed that their responses were confidential and that their supervisor would not see the results.

Results

The first research objective, looking at whether or not supervisors and supervisees reported similar experiences of the supervisory working alliance, was investigated using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with treatments supervisees vs supervisors as between-subjects effect and time as within-subjects effect. The items from the SWAI-S relating to identification were removed from the analysis in order to render both alliance measures as comparable as possible and missing data were replaced by the mean. Results indicated a significant main effect for treatment between subjects $F(1,29) = 12.70, p = 0.0013$, with supervisees rating the working alliance ($M = 5.80, SD = 0.74$) as significantly stronger than supervisors ($M = 5.41, SD = 0.53$) throughout the course of the five supervision sessions. We conducted further analysis on the alliance subscales. Repeated measures analysis of variance revealed significant differences for treatment between subjects for the subscale rapport $F(1,29) = 8.52, p = 0.0067$, and the subscale client focus $F(1,29) = 12.41, p = 0.0014$ with supervisees rating both subscales ($M = 5.76, SD = 0.73$ for
rapport and $M = 5.89, SD = 0.83$ for client focus) consistently higher than their supervisors ($M = 5.27, SD = 0.60$ for rapport and $M = 5.39, SD = 0.72$ for client focus).

Our second research objective was to examine whether the strength of the working alliance (as perceived by supervisors and supervisees) would differ significantly in relation to supervisee shame-proneness level. The inclusion criteria for the *high shame-prone* and *moderate shame-prone* groups was based on the information provided in the ISS technical manual which states that scores of 50 or higher are indicative of problematic levels of internalized shame (Cook, 2001). Participants obtaining ISS scores below 50 were included in the moderate shame-prone group and participants obtaining scores of 50 or higher were included into the high shame-prone group. ISS scores of below 50 were obtained by 87% (27) of participants in the study. 13% (4) of participants scored above 50. We conducted repeated measures analysis of variance with 2 levels of repeated measurement (supervisees and supervisors) with treatments “high-shame vs moderate-shame” as between-subjects effect and time as a within-subjects effect. No significant main effects were found in treatment between subjects $F(1,29) = 0.12, p = 0.73$ or within subjects $F(4,86) = 0.41, p = 0.80$. The post-hoc power analyses associated to these tests were 6.4% and 1.3% respectively. That is, the level of supervisee shame-proneness was not found to be a significant factor influencing alliance ratings for either supervisees or supervisors in our sample over the course of the 5 supervision sessions.
Discussion

The research objectives for this study were to gain greater insight into the nature of the supervisory working alliance by investigating whether supervisors and supervisees had similar perceptions of their supervisory working alliances and to examine whether there was a significant difference in alliance ratings in relation to supervisee shame-proneness level. Our results indicated a significant difference between supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the supervisory working alliance throughout the course of the supervisory process. That is, supervisors and supervisees did not perceive the strength of their supervisory working alliances in the same way despite being engaged in the same process. Supervisors consistently ranked the supervisory working alliance as lower than did supervisees. Although there exists to date no supervision studies that could help us to interpret these results, therapeutic working alliance research does provide us with interesting studies from which we can draw tentative conclusions. The lack of concordance in this study between supervisor and supervisee working alliance ratings is similar to previous concordance research in therapeutic settings which has indicated that counsellors and clients have different views of their counselling experiences (Elliott & James, 1989, Heppner et al, 1999). As well, therapeutic working alliance research has found a lack of convergence for counsellor-client alliance ratings or has found only small correlations (Fitzpatrick et al, 2005, Mallinckrodt & Nelson, 1991). These results do however conflict with the study by Svensson and Hansson (1999) which reported significant correlations between therapist and client working alliance.
ratings, however as mentioned before, their study dealt with only schizophrenic
patients, conducted only cognitive therapy and used different measures of alliance.

Fitzpatrick et al. (2005) suggest that the discrepancy between counsellor and
client views of working alliance could be caused by different conceptions or
theoretical ideas counsellors and clients may have of the alliance. They suggest that
therapists may assess the quality of the working alliance based on the setting of
therapeutic goals, tasks, and the development of a strong bond, whereas clients may
concentrate on more familiar ideas such as trust, liking, and respect. Based on this
interpretation, we anticipated that in a supervisory setting, the convergence would
have been close due to the fact that counselling training would have caused both
supervisees and supervisors to have more similar conceptions of the working
alliance than counsellors and their clients. However, this was not the case. It seems
as though the supervisees’ evaluations of the supervisory working alliance may
closely relate to client evaluations of the therapeutic working alliance in their
emphasis and need for a trusting and respectful relationship.

Most of the research concerning supervisee experiences of “good” and “bad”
supervision deals with the effects of the supervisory relationship (mainly the
supervisory working alliance) and facilitative attitudes of the supervisor. Worthen
and McNeill (1996), in their phenomenological investigation into “good”
supervision events found that good supervisors were seen by supervisees as
empathic, nonjudgmental, validating, non-defensive, and willing to examine their
own assumptions. According to Ladany et al. (1999), strong emotional bonds
between supervisor and supervisees create an environment that encourages the
supervisee to engage in professional self-reflection. It seems therefore that establishing a safe, trusting, and respectful climate for supervision is of primary importance for supervisees before they can expose themselves comfortably to their supervisors. The fact that in our research supervisees consistently rated the total supervisory working alliance as well as the rapport subscale of the supervisory working alliance as stronger than their supervisors may well be indicative of the importance they place on these aspects of supervision as well as reflecting the risk involved for supervisees.

Another consideration in attempting to interpret these results is the possible influence of social desirability. A literature review of 63 articles using 9 different measures of working alliance in a therapeutic setting conducted by Tryon, Blackwell, and Hammel (2008), revealed that clients tended to use only the top 20% of rating points and therapists only the top 30% in alliance measures skewing the results positively in that the lower ratings indicating a less strong supervisory alliance were rarely used. The authors suggest that although this could be an accurate reflection of the alliance, these ratings could be influenced by social desirability or dissonance-reducing response sets. In this study, we see similar response set patterns to the ones reported by Tryon et al. It may be that our respondents, especially the supervisees facing evaluation, are more vulnerable in the supervisory setting and may have been influenced by these factors of social desirability and dissonance-reducing response sets.

As a secondary objective, we wanted to see if supervisee shame-proneness level would be related to the strength of perceived supervisory working alliance for
both supervisees and supervisors. Results indicated that high shame-prone supervisee working alliance ratings do not significantly differ from the working alliance ratings of moderately shame-prone supervisees. Although we were interested in finding out whether there was a significant difference between supervisee levels of shame-proneness (high shame-proneness as opposed to moderate shame-proneness) in relation to supervisory working alliance ratings, previous unpublished alliance research by Bilodeau, Savard, and Lecomte (2009) found supervisee shame-proneness to be significantly co-related to supervisee perceptions of alliance. Hence, this could indicate that shame is an important factor in the supervisory setting for every supervisee, not simply the ones considered “high-shame prone.” That is, the relationship between shame and alliance may be more related to situational shame than to shame-proneness. Another explanation is the possibility that higher shame-prone supervisees may not have completely revealed, or may have hidden important aspects of the shame they experience. Previous research has linked supervisee shame to non-disclosure in supervisory settings (Ladany et al., 1996, Yourman & Farber, 1996). It may well be that higher shame-prone supervisees may need more encouragement in revealing their anxieties and difficulties related to supervision.

Limitations of the study

Although there were 27 supervisees in the moderate shame group, only 4 participants fit the criteria for the high shame group. It is possible that the unequal number compromised the comparison between the high and moderate shame groups. Post-hoc power analyses however were quite low (6.4% for and 11.3%) which may
indicate that the difference that exists between the two groups could very well be clinically insignificant.

Another limitation is the possibility of threats to internal validity related to history, selection, and social desirability inherent in post-facto and self-report studies. A third limitation involved the supervisor sample. Several supervisees shared the same supervisor which could have impacted results. As well, due to the fact that all supervisee participants in this study were counsellors in training, generalizability of these results to other supervision interactions may be limited.

**Implications for counsellor supervision and training**

Our research found significant differences between how supervisors and supervisees perceive the strength of their supervisory alliance and found no significant difference in strength of perceived alliance between high and moderate shame-prone supervisees. The results could have important implications for the practice of supervision and the training of counsellors in suggesting that shame may be an important factor for consideration for all supervisees in the supervisory setting. The results highlight the importance of creating a safe, and trusting environment for supervisees, hence placing an emphasis on the bond aspect of the alliance before any meaningful work can be done. In doing so, supervisors can serve as models for supervisees in learning how to address shame and in learning to develop strong working alliances with their own clients, and eventually with their supervisees when they become supervisors themselves.
Implications for future research

Replication and extension of these findings is needed. The supervisory working alliance literature as well as the shame literature in supervision is scarce. Knowing the importance of the supervisory working alliance in fostering counsellor growth and competency development, it is important that we continue to work towards a greater understanding of the working alliance and the supervisory process in order to maintain a high level of quality services in the practice of counselling.
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Abstract

This study investigated the impact of supervisee shame-proneness on supervisee rated supervisory working alliance and session impact for 43 counseling trainees undergoing a 5 session supervision process. Analysis of covariance revealed a significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and supervisory working alliance \( F(4, 126) = 3.38, p = 0.116 \). Independent samples \( t \)-tests revealed high shame-prone supervisees rated significantly lower impact \( t(41) = 2.53, p = 0.02, d = 1.32 \). Implications of findings are discussed.
Shame in supervision  The impacts of shame-proneness on the supervisory process

The experience of shame is described in the literature as an internal panic-like reaction. It includes feelings of helplessness and anxiety and is accompanied by the sudden feeling of being paralyzed and the wish to disappear (Graff, 2008, Morrison, 1994.) Shame is thought to stem from the humiliation of personal failure or even threat of failure, and of fear of rejection (Hahn, 2001, Lewis, 1971, Talbot, 1995, Zupancic & Kreidler, 1999)

In the process of counseling supervision, shame almost inevitably arises as the counseling trainee exposes him or herself in all of their confusion and ignorance as they navigate through the learning process of mastering technique (Buechler, 2008, Hahn, 2001,) Some trainees however are characterologically more shame-prone due to personal history, issues, and development and the experience of shame therefore occurs more frequently and its experience is more intense (Graff, 2008, Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1996) Shame-proneness has been found to be associated with vulnerability to negative effects in achievement situations (Thompson, Altmann, & Davidson, 2004), and to problematic relationships (Covert, Tangney, Maddux, & Heleno, 2003) It could reasonably be argued therefore that high shame-proneness on behalf of counseling supervisees could put them at risk for relationship and other difficulties in their supervisory processes

Shame-proneness as a supervisee characteristic influencing the process and hence outcome of supervision has been discussed through the theoretical and clinical writings of several authors (Farber, 2003, Graff, 2008, Hahn, 2001, Yourman,
2003), yet few empirical studies have actually addressed shame-proneness in the counseling supervision process. It is remains unclear whether higher shame-prone supervisees actually experience their supervisory experiences differently than their counterparts and whether the counseling supervision process is affected by this factor.

Only a handful of empirical studies could be found discussing the impacts of shame and shame-proneness in the process of supervision. These studies have linked shame to therapist supervisee nondisclosure (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996, Yourman & Farber, 1996,) and have linked high shame-proneness among psychotherapy supervisees to less satisfactory supervisions (Doherty, 2005). These studies, however, dealt only with psychology and psychotherapy supervisees, and these issues remain largely unexplored in the field of counseling supervision. Examining the possible influence of supervisee shame-proneness on the counseling supervision relationship could hold valuable implications for the practice of supervision. Exploring these relationships would provide empirical support for the existing theoretical literature which suggests that supervisee high shame-proneness could influence the course of the counseling supervision process. As well, exploring supervisee shame-proneness in the counseling supervision process would expand the existing knowledge of counselor education and supervision by providing counselor educators a critical experiential variable to consider in the effort to enhance the quality of the supervision provided.
Shame-proneness and the Supervisory Working Alliance

The supervisory working alliance is the process variable of supervision referring to the collaboration between supervisor and supervisee for change in the supervisee based on mutual agreement concerning the goals and tasks of supervision, as well as a strong emotional bond (Bordin, 1994). According to Bordin (1983), strong supervisory working alliances are a major feature of the change process in which counselor supervisees experience professional and personal growth. Process studies in supervision have served to highlight the importance of strong supervisory working alliances in diminishing the effects of negative supervisory events and contributing to what is perceived as “good” supervisory experiences (Carifio & Hess, 1987, Chung, Baskin, & Case, 1998, Ladany & Friedlander, 1995, Nelson & Friedlander, 2001, Ramos Sanchez et al., 2002, Worthen & McNeill, 1996).

According to Yerushalmi (1992), it is the strength of the supervisory working alliance which determines the level of active participation from supervisees, who are invited to openly and willingly reveal areas of difficulty within their practice. Yerushalmi explains that continued growth and professional development of supervisees rests largely on the ability of supervisors and supervisees to identify and work through these difficulties. Exploring supervisee shame-proneness as a variable possibly influencing the supervisory alliance therefore becomes important for both our understanding of mediating factors in the process of supervision and our quest for the development of optimal supervisory practice and training.
Shame-proneness and Impact

Impact refers to the client’s internal reactions to sessions. More specifically, impact, measures immediately after the session, refers to a session’s immediate effects reflected in their evaluations of the session and their post-session affective state (Stiles, 1980). Stiles and Snow (1984) have distinguished impact from process and long-term outcome. They consider impact as a mediator between process and outcome. Impact has been linked to client improvement in therapeutic settings (Stiles, Shapiro, & Firth-Cozens, 1988, 1990). In other studies, session impact has been found to be a significant predictor of termination of working alliance for counselors and clients (Mallinckrodt, 1993). Moreover, counselor perceptions of depth in a first session has been found to be related to initial engagement and the client’s return for a subsequent session (Tryon, 1990), whereas ratings of smoothness was found to be related to client dropout (Nash & Garske, 1988). Research in supervisory settings has found that impact varies more for supervisees than for supervisors (Martin, Goodyear, & Newton, 1987). It has also been found that client-rated session smoothness decreased when the client’s therapist was receiving live supervision as opposed to delayed supervision (Kivlighan, Angelone, & Swafford, 1991). In essence, impact research has provided us with tentative evidence of its importance in predicting counseling outcome. The research however is still scattered and very little is known concerning impact in the supervisory context. Moreover, no research could be found concerning shame-proneness and session impact.
Goals of the Study

It is an assumption of this study that supervisee shame-proneness is significantly related to the supervisee’s assessment of impact and strength of the supervisory working alliance. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between shame-proneness and the supervisory process. This will be done by examining the relationship between shame-proneness and the following process variables: supervisory working alliance and impact. Two hypotheses were made:

- There is a significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and supervisee perceived strength of the supervisory working alliance,
- Supervisees scoring high on shame-proneness perceive significantly less supervisory impact than moderate scoring supervisees.

Method

Design and Participants

The participants in this study also included the supervisee participants described in Bilodeau, Savard and Lecomte (2010). This study was part of a larger doctoral dissertation research project aimed at gaining greater insight into the process of supervision which included a supervisor sample. The participants included in the sample were also subject to a formative evaluation following the second supervision session. Previous studies with this sample examined supervisor and supervisee concordance rates and level of shame-proneness. This study, however, examines shame-proneness in relation to process variables in supervision.
The study was conducted at a Canadian university. The participants in this study included an initial sample of 43 student supervisees, from an original 64 students enrolled yielding a participation rate of 67%. The attrition rate for our sample from the first to the fifth supervision session was 37%. All of the participants were enrolled in a career counseling course as master's level counseling students. As part of the course requirements, students met with one client between 5 and 10 counseling sessions and underwent an individual five session supervisory process with a supervisor simultaneously throughout their counseling sessions. The modalities used in supervision were videotapes of each of their supervisees' sessions with their client and student process notes. Students were asked to complete several questionnaires immediately following each of the supervisory sessions. Participating supervisees consisted of 36 females and 7 males. Their average age was 30.1 years with a standard deviation of 8.6. They averaged 6.8 years of post-secondary education with a standard deviation of 1.5.

**Measures**

**Impact** A translated French version of The Session Evaluation Questionnaire Form 5 (SEQ) was used as a measure of session impact. The SEQ developed by Stiles (1980) was initially aimed at measuring dimensions of immediate impacts of a counseling session and later was used to measure immediate impacts of a supervision session (Burke, Goodyear, & Guzzard, 1998, Kivlighan et al., 1991, Lichtenberg & Goodyear, 2000, Martin et al., 1987). The SEQ is composed of 21 bipolar adjectives normally rated on a 7-point scale allowing participants to rate how they evaluate their session and how they feel concerning the
supervision session. Our version was rated on a 10-point scale. Although there is little reliability or response discrimination advantage to increasing possible responses from 7 to 10, there is also little loss of accuracy (Osteras et al., 2008). Increasing the number of possible responses therefore becomes more of a psychological issue than a psychometric one. In a study by Preston and Colman (2000) concerning optimal number of response categories in rating scales, respondents actually preferred 10-point rating scales as opposed to 7, 9 and 5-point scales and rated them as relatively easy to use. Preston and Colman argued that scales must allow respondents to express their feelings adequately in order to prevent frustration and the quality of responses. It was in this spirit that we chose to increase the number of possible responses for this scale.

The items of the SEQ are divided into 2 sections: Session evaluation and post-session mood. The respondents are instructed to circle the appropriate number to show how they feel about the session. Each section yields two dimensions: two independent evaluative dimensions of participants’ perceptions of their sessions, called Depth and Smoothness, and two dimensions of their post-session mood, called Positivity and Arousal. Depth refers to a session being perceived a powerful, valuable and deep as opposed to weak, ordinary and shallow. Smoothness refers to a session’s comfort, relaxation, and pleasantness. Positivity refers to feelings of confidence and clarity as well as happiness and the absence of fear or anger, whereas Arousal refers to feeling active and excited as opposed to quiet and calm (Stiles & Snow, 1984). Friedlander, Bernardi & Lee (2010) reported a total SEQ alpha of .85 and Stiles, Reynolds, Hardy, Rees, Barkham and Shapiro (1994) reported alpha.
coefficients of 90 for Depth, 92 for Smoothness, 90 for Positivity and 80 for Arousal. Alpha coefficients in our study were 93 for total SEQ, 89 for Depth, 89 for Smoothness, 88 for Positivity, and 71 for Arousal. Stiles et al. (1994) also provided evidence for convergent validity with the Session Impact Scale yielding significant correlations ranging between 0.6 and 0.72. The alpha coefficient for the total SEQ in our study was 93.

**Alliance** A translated French version of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee version (SWAI-T) was used as a measure of supervisory working alliance. The SWAI-T was developed by Efstation, Patton, and Kardashian (1990) and was designed to measure the relationship in counselor supervision. The measure was based conceptually on the works of Greenson (1967), Pepinsky and Patton (1971), and Bordin (1983). The supervisee scale contains 19 items in two subscales, Rapport and Client Focus. Rapport refers to the supervisee’s perception of support from the supervisor. Client focus refers to the supervisee’s perception of the emphasis the supervisor placed on promoting the supervisee’s understanding of the client. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*almost never*) to 7 (*almost always*). SWAI scale scores have been reported by Efstation et al. (1990) to have acceptable estimates of reliability. Reliability coefficients of internal consistency ranged from 0.77 to 0.90 for the trainee scales. Alpha coefficients were 0.86 for the total SWAI-T. Subscales alphas were reported as 0.90 for Rapport and 0.77 for Client Focus. Convergent Validity was established with the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI). Modest yet significant correlations ranged between 0.23 and 0.26. Reliability
coefficient for the SWAI-T in our study was 87. In our study, Alpha coefficients were 86 for the total measure, 88 for Rapport and 81 for Client Focus.

**Shame-proneness** A translated French version of The Internalized Shame Scale (ISS) was used as a measure of shame-proneness. Designed by Cook (1989), this scale is informed by the theoretical conceptions of authors such as Kaufman (1989), Lewis (1971) and Tompkins (1987). The most recent version of the scale published in 2001 and the one used in our study consists of 24 items describing feelings or experiences with 6 items from the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as fillers. Participants respond on a 5-point scale indicating how often they feel this way. A Reliability coefficient of internal consistency of 95 was reported by Cook (2001). The alpha coefficient in our study was 91. Cook also established convergent validity with several other shame measures reporting correlations ranging between 31 and 70. Reliability coefficient for the ISS in our study was 91.

**Procedures**

Participants were met during the second class lecture prior to the start of supervision and were invited to participate in the research on a volunteer basis. Refusal to participate did not bear any impact on their role as students in the class. All participants were informed of their right to retract themselves from the study at any time and confidentiality was assured for all participants. Consent forms were signed and sealed envelopes identified by numerical code containing the questionnaires were handed out. Supervisees were instructed to complete the ISS and demographic questionnaire prior to starting their supervision sessions. The ISS was also completed after the final supervision session. All supervisees were asked to
complete the SEQ and the SWAI-T immediately following each of their 5 supervision sessions. All completed forms were returned in sealed envelopes to the researcher and all participants were informed that their responses were confidential and that their supervisor would not see the results.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Prior to the start of analysis, we wanted to verify the stability of reported shame-proneness. A paired samples t-test revealed no significant differences in shame-proneness reported by supervisees prior to the start of supervision sessions and after the last supervision session \( t(26) = 92, p = .36 \). According to Cook (2001), “Scores of 50 or higher are indicative of painful, possibly problematic levels of internalized shame” (p 12). Six of the 43 supervisee participants had scores of 50 or higher on the first administration of the ISS and were thus classified in the “high shame-proneness group.” The other 37 supervisees were classified in the “moderate shame-proneness group.”

Major Analysis (Hypothesis testing)

To test our first hypothesis which predicted a significant relationship between shame-proneness and reported strength of the supervisory working alliance across the five supervision sessions, we conducted repeated measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with shame-proneness as a covariate in the model and time as a within-subjects effects. Data from each subject was used even if it was only partial due to attrition along the way. There were 118 missing observations of the
295 observations included in the analysis resulting in a missing data rate of 40%.

Results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

*Summary of analysis of covariance between supervisee reported supervisory working alliance and supervisee shame-proneness over the course of the 5-session supervisory process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T Rapport</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T Client focus</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*  *Indicates significant result*
Table 2

*Covariance parameter estimates for the total supervisory working alliance strength and the rapport sub-scale over the course of the 5-session supervisory process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total alliance strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapport sub-scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Results indicate that the relationship that exists between supervisee shame-proneness and supervisee’s perceived alliance varies significantly over time. Upon further investigations, however, we found no significant variations between each individual consecutive sessions. Therefore, our conclusions must be cautionary. We can only express a tendency in the beginning (Session 1) for the relationship to be positive and in the end (Session 5) for the relationship to be negative. That is,
after the first supervision session there is a tendency that the higher the reported supervisee shame-proneness, the higher their reported strength of supervisory working alliance. However, in the end, this tendency has changed and following the fifth and final supervision session the tendency was that the higher the reported supervisee shame-proneness, the lower their reported strength of supervisory working alliance.

Results concerning the SWAI-T subscales indicate no significant relationship between supervisee client focus reports and supervisee shame-proneness over the course of the five supervisions, however we do find that the relationship between the subscale rapport and supervisee shame-proneness varies significantly over the course of the five supervision sessions. Upon further investigations we found no significant variations between each individual consecutive session. Therefore, our conclusions must again be cautionary. We can only express a tendency in the beginning (Session 1) for the relationship to be positive and in the end (Session 5) for the relationship to be negative. That is, following the first supervision session, there is a tendency that the higher the reported supervisee shame-proneness, the higher the reported rapport. However, by the end of the fifth supervision session, this tendency has changed and the higher the reported supervisee shame-proneness the lower the reported rapport.

Our first hypothesis therefore was confirmed. There exists a significant relationship between supervisees’ shame-proneness and their perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and this relationship varies over time. However, the
variations from session to session are not significant and the relationship does not always vary in the same direction

To test our second hypothesis which predicted high shame-prone supervisees would perceive significantly less supervisory impact than normal shame-prone supervisees, independent sample t-tests were conducted on the mean scores of all five supervision sessions of each participant. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

T-tests comparing perceived impact of high and moderate shame-prone supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Moderate shame-prone</th>
<th>High shame-prone</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M(SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.71(89)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.77(48)</td>
<td>2.53 02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.14(85)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.19(69)</td>
<td>-0.14 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.56(120)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.03(61)</td>
<td>3.02 004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.93(115)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.93(80)</td>
<td>2.03 05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.22(102)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.92(103)</td>
<td>2.92 006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * indicates significant results

The independent sample t-tests revealed significant differences between perceived impact of high and moderate shame-prone supervisees. More specifically, high
shame-prone supervisees perceived significantly less overall impact than moderate shame-prone supervisees. In the session-evaluation section, high shame-prone supervisees reported significantly lower scores on the smoothness yet there was no significant difference on the depth scale. Both scales positivity and arousal relating to post-session mood revealed significantly lower scores for high shame-prone supervisees than for moderate shame-prone supervisees.

Our second hypothesis therefore was confirmed. Significant differences between high and moderate shame-prone supervisees and perceived impact were found.

Discussion

Results from this repeated measures study over five supervision sessions suggests that shame-proneness does influence the supervisory process. A significant relationship was found between strength of supervisory working alliance and reported supervisee shame-proneness. It is important to note however, that upon further investigation of the subscales, it is solely the rapport subscale which fluctuated, so much so as to influence the total alliance score. Rapport refers to the supervisee’s perception of support from the supervisor. These results may well provide an explanatory factor for previous research by Yourman and Farber (1996) and Ladany et al. (1996), who found that their supervisee participant’s shame was often cited as reasons they kept secrets from their supervisors. That is, the support supervisees perceive from their supervisors may be of particular importance in diminishing the negative effects of shame and promoting a trusting environment.
Also interesting to note is the fact that this relationship is not constant over time. In the beginning there is a positive relationship between rapport and shame-proneness. This relationship changes gradually over time and we find that at the end of the supervisory process, this relationship has inversed. We observed in the first session that the higher the supervisee’s proneness to experience shame, the higher they rated the strength of their supervisory working alliance with their supervisors. However, by the last session, we found the opposite result. The higher the supervisee’s proneness to experience shame, the lower they reported the strength of the supervisory working alliance to be. Although these findings were not significant and only indicated a tendency, it is interesting never-the-less to consider in light of research by Hahn (2001) and Buechler (2008) who address the issue of supervisee shame in the process of supervision. They suggest that shame is seen as an inevitable consequence of the demands of exposure in supervision. There is an element of self-scrutiny that supervisees enter into as they are being evaluated by persons whose opinion deeply matter to them, and according to Buechler, this self-scrutiny only naturally leads to shame. In Hahn’s discussion of shame in supervision, he discusses the idea of supervisee’s idealizing their supervisors as a defence employed to protect themselves from their shame experiences. Hahn also suggests that early on in the supervisory relationship, supervisee’s inhibited sense of emotional awareness can cause supervisees to view their supervisors as “possessing unrealistic insights into relationships” (p 275). Hahn goes on to explain that this situation usually attenuates over time.
The intense shame related to exposure and pressure to be seen in a positive light in the wake of the first session without yet knowing their supervisors, could explain the early positive alliance ratings from the higher shame-prone supervisees. That is, supervisee's higher ratings of the supervisory alliance in the first sessions may have been reflective of their attempt to align themselves positively with their "idealized" supervisors in an attempt to diminish the intensity of their shame experience. As the supervision sessions progressed, the working alliances developed between the supervisees and their supervisors may have contributed to attenuating some of the shame experienced and to diminishing the idealization of the supervisor, hence explaining the inverse relationship observed at the end of the supervisory process.

The fact that shame-proneness level is inversely related to supervisee alliance rapport strength by the final and fifth supervision session may indicate that high shame-proneness could possibly hinder the development of a strong supervisory working alliance. As well, the learning and change process of the supervisee could be hindered through defense maneuvers that Hahn (2001) describes as passive withdrawal. That is, particularly high shame-prone supervisees may avoid emotionally engaging with their supervisors to avoid exposure to the humiliation associated with shame. Supervisor and supervisee dyads unable to address the shame or establish adequate warmth and trust may have more difficulty feeling safe in the supervisory setting as the supervision progresses. The supervision in turn risks developing into a dysfunctional process where an atmosphere conducive to emotional awareness and self-reflection is thwarted (Hahn, 2001). Greater attention
and emphasis on establishing a safe and trusting learning environment may be
necessary for all supervisors conducting supervision

The results concerning impact also shed important light on the influence of
shame-proneness on the supervisory process. Although overall perceived impact was
reported as significantly lower for high shame-prone supervisees, results from each
subscale of the SEQ also provide interesting information. High shame-prone
supervisees reported significantly lower scores on all of the subscales except Depth.
Depth refers to a session being perceived as powerful, valuable and deep. Although
no studies in supervision could be found to interpret these results, studies from the
counseling research provide interesting data as a basis for interpretation. Previous
research by Stiles et al. (1988, 1990) found that therapist-rated depth and
smoothness were related to client improvement. Also in the same line, Tryon (1990)
linked client and counselor perceptions of depth in a first session to initial
engagement and the client’s return for a subsequent session. At face value, we could
hypothesize that although the emotional experience of the supervisory process is
lived as more difficult for high shame-prone supervisees, they are not actually less
engaged in the process and do not perceive themselves as having learned or
improved any less than their counterparts. However, if we consider Hahn’s (2001)
discussion on shame in supervision, the idea that shame is hidden and oftentimes too
painful to process, particularly high shame-prone supervisees may view themselves
as equally engaged and as having learned or improved as much as their peers in an
attempt to protect themselves from the shameful experience of admitting otherwise,
even to themselves. More research investigating shame in supervision would be
necessary to shed light on the actual impacts of shame-proneness on the process and outcomes of supervision.

There are a number of strengths and limitations in this study. One of the obvious strengths of this study is its novelty. No shame studies in the context of counseling supervision have yet been conducted although theoretical literature suggests that shame is an important factor to consider in the counseling supervision process. As well, shame studies have often been limited to descriptive qualitative data based on very small sample sizes. This study attempts an empirical quantitative look at the experience of shame in the supervisory context. The quasi-experimental design of the study did not allow for an equivalent randomly assigned non-experimental group. Without random assignment it is difficult to rule out threats to internal validity. A second limitation involves the supervisor sample; 13 of the 43 supervisees shared the same supervisor, with the remaining supervisors ranging from one to three supervisees which could have impacted results. As well, supervisor experience level varied a lot from approximately 2 to 13 years of experience as counselors. Other limitations of this study include the moderate attrition rate of participants which could have introduced bias in the results and the fact that all participants were counseling trainees enrolled in the same course. As well, limitations of the study also include the presence of unknown mediating factors such as feedback from other people such as peers of professors, and threats to internal validity inherent in post-facto and self-report studies.

This study was aimed at examining the relationship between shame-proneness and the supervisory process. Research in the field of supervision is still
embryonic and the influence of shame-proneness on this process has not been thoroughly investigated. It may well be that shame is particularly important in the process of supervision because of the potentially negative effects it could have on the learning and development of counselor supervisees. There are a number of avenues for future research in counseling supervision and shame. First, and foremost, it would be useful to have a clear understanding of the counseling supervision process in order to better understand the impacts of shame in this process. As well, it would be valuable to measure aspects of the supervisory process and shame without relying on self-report instruments. And finally, an understanding of the impacts of shame on supervisory outcomes would provide invaluable information to the development of optimal supervisory practices and hence optimal counselor development.
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Abstract

This study investigated the link between supervisory working alliance as perceived by supervisors and supervisees and supervisee perceived impact. 43 counselling trainees and 13 supervisors underwent a 5 session supervision process. Results indicate significant correlations between supervisee’s perceived supervisory working alliance and their perceived impact ($r = 0.68, p < 0.001$). No significant correlations were found however between supervisor’s perceived supervisory working alliance and supervisee’s perceived impact. Step-wise regression analysis further revealed that both Client focus and Rapport were important supervisory working alliance predictor variables of impact at different times throughout the supervisory process. Implications for the practice and future research are discussed.
Investigating the supervisory Alliance  Linking working alliance to impact as outcome

The notion of the therapeutic working alliance as an important factor in the outcome of counseling has consistently been supported by research (Horvath & Bedi, 2002) however the same cannot be said for the supervisory working alliance. Although the concept of the working alliance has its roots in psychoanalytic theory referring to the collaboration between client and psychoanalyst in forming a pact (Freud, 1940), it is now widely accepted as an independent phenomenon redefined pantheoretically by Bordin (1983) as an emotional bond between counselor and client and their mutual agreement on goals and tasks. Bordin likened the therapeutic working alliance to the supervisory working alliance and argued for the importance of developing a strong supervisory working alliance for the success of supervision. Furthermore, Patton, and Kivlighan (1997) have reported significant relationships between supervisee perceptions of the supervisory working alliance and their client’s perception of the counseling working alliance, providing a salient argument for the importance of a strong supervisory working alliance not only for the outcome of supervision but for the outcome of counseling as well. Several other authors have also argued for the importance of establishing a strong supervisory working alliance as essential to the outcome of supervision (Ellis & Ladany, 1997, Falendar & Shafranske, 2004, Ramos-Sanchez et al, 2002). Establishing and maintaining a strong supervisory working alliance however, is complicated by the fact that the supervisory working alliance is not static in nature. Indeed, research has demonstrated that the supervisory working alliance fluctuates throughout the process.
of supervision (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997) and theorists have argued that these fluctuations are important for change to occur (Bordin, 1983, Safran & Muran, 2000)

Despite these arguments for the importance of the supervisory working alliance in the outcome of supervision, few studies have actually investigated the working alliance in the context of supervision and its relationship to outcomes. The few studies that have investigated the relationship between supervisory working alliances and supervisory outcomes have found links between strength of the supervisory working alliance and supervisee's development of multicultural competence (Ladany, Brittain-Powell, & Pannu, 1997) increased supervisory satisfaction (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999, Worthington & Roehlke, 1979) as well as increased quality of the supervisory relationship leading to strengthened confidence, refined professional identity and to increased therapeutic perception (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). These studies however are limited in the sense that they provide no theoretical framework for supervision. That is, as opposed to the counseling and psychotherapy literature, the supervision literature does not yet provide us with a clear understanding of the supervisory process which renders the supervision outcome research scattered and difficult to interpret. Litchtenberg and Goodyear (2000) highlight this issue stating that,

Although several theoretical perspectives on the clinical supervision process have been offered (cf. Holloway, 1992; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993, Russel, Crimmings, & Lent, 1984, Stoltenberg, 1981, Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987), research-based knowledge regarding clinical supervision has been
limited-characterized by unrelated fragments of research that generally have been atheoretical (p 2)

It may therefore be relevant at this point rather to attempt to link supervisory working alliance to positive outcome, to take a look at important session processes which may serve as predictors of positive outcome. Impact, which refers to a participant’s post-session mood and evaluation of immediate session effects, has been proposed as a bridge between process and outcome (Mallinckrodt, 1993). Research involving impact in the counseling literature has found that session evaluations significantly predicted client-rated outcome (Mallinckrodt, 1993) and that therapist-rated depth and smoothness were related to client improvement (Stiles, Shapiro, & Firth-Cozens, 1998, 1990).

Few studies investigating impact in supervision settings could be found, however, they do provide us with valuable process information. A study by Martin, Goodyear, and Newton (1987) found that the second supervision session was judged by both supervisees and supervisors as the best overall session and related this to the fact that it focused on relationship issues between the two participants. Another study conducted by Kivlghan, Angelone, and Swafford (1991) found that clients of therapists who received live supervision as opposed to delayed supervision reported significantly stronger working alliances and less smooth sessions suggesting that the increased relationship and support inherent in the live supervision enhanced supervisee’s learning. Therefore, according to the literature, the strength of the relationship or bond between supervisee and supervisor is of utmost importance for the learning process.
**Goals of the study**

Although the link between working alliance and positive outcomes has been demonstrated in the counseling and psychotherapy literature, this link has still to be established in the supervision literature. A major obstacle to this is the fact that the supervisory literature is scattered concerning theory and the process variables of supervision. We propose impact as a process variable predictive of outcome as a viable first step to eventually making the link between supervisory working alliance and positive supervisory outcomes. Due to the fact that the supervisory working alliance is created between both dyad members, our goals for this study were twofold. More specifically, our hypotheses were as follows:

- There exists a significant relationship between supervisor ratings of the supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived impact.
- There exists a significant relationship between supervisee ratings of the supervisory working alliance and supervisee perceived session impact.

**Method**

**Design and Participants**

This study was part of a larger doctoral dissertation research project aimed at gaining greater insight into the process of supervision in which the counselor participants included in this sample were also asked to complete a shame questionnaire and subject to a formative evaluation from their supervisors following their second supervision session. The study was conducted at a Canadian University. The participants included a sample of 43 graduate student trainees and 13
supervisors from an original 64 students enrolled and 17 supervisors which yielded a participation rate of 73% and 76% respectively. Most supervisors supervised several students with one supervisor supervising 13 of the 43 trainees. All of the supervisee participants were master’s level counseling students enrolled in an employment counseling course. As part of the course requirements, students met with one client in a counseling process that lasted between five and ten sessions. Each student met with his or her supervisor at regular intervals throughout this process for a total of five supervision sessions. Supervisors for the course were chosen and hired by the course professor. The selection criteria were based on supervisors having graduated from the same Master’s program. The supervisors having the most years of counseling experience were permitted to supervise more students. The supervisor sample consisted of 13 supervisors of which four were male and 9 were female and 4 were male. The mean age was 37.5 years with a standard deviation of 7.7 years and they averaged 7.5 years of post-secondary education with a standard deviation of 1.6 and had an average of 8.9 years of experience working in the field of counseling with a standard deviation of 5.3. The supervisee sample consisted of 36 females and 7 males. Their mean age was 30.1 years with a standard deviation of 8.6 years. They averaged 6.8 years of post-secondary education with a standard deviation of 1.5 years.
Measures

Alliance  A translated French version of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) developed by Efstation, Patton, and Kardash (1990) was used in our study. The SWAI was designed to measure the alliance in counselor supervision. The measure was based conceptually on the works of Greenson (1967), Pepinsky and Patton (1971), and Bordin (1983). Two forms compose the SWAI, the trainee (supervisee) scale (SWAI-T) and the supervisor (SWAI-S) scale which are designed to measure aspects of the relationship in counselor supervision.

The supervisee scale contains 19 items in two factors: Rapport and Client Focus. Rapport refers to the supervisee’s perception of support from the supervisor. Client focus refers to the supervisee’s perception of the emphasis the supervisor placed on promoting the supervisees’ understanding of the client.

The supervisor scale contains 23 items in three factors: Client focus, Rapport, and Identification. Client focus refers to the emphasis the supervisors placed on promoting the supervisees’ understanding of the client. Rapport refers to the supervisor’s effort to build rapport with the supervisees by supporting and encouraging them. The identification factor represents the supervisor’s perception of the supervisees’ identification with the supervisor. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 7 (almost always). Although there are behaviors that are common to both participants, the authors also took into consideration activities that are specific to each role.

The SWAI internal consistency coefficients been reported by Efstation et al. (1990) to have acceptable estimates of reliability. Alpha coefficients were 0.76 for the...
Supervisor version and 86 for the Trainee version. Alpha coefficients for the supervisor scales were 71 for Client Focus, 73 for Rapport, and 77 for Identification. Alpha coefficients for the Trainee scales were 90 for Rapport and 77 for Client Focus. Item-scale correlations ranged from 29 to 57 for the supervisor scales and from 37 to 77 for the supervisee scales. Convergent and divergent validity were established through intercorrelations with the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI). Reliability coefficients for each scale in our study were 92 for the SWAI-T and 87 for the SWAI-S. In our study, Alpha coefficients were 87 for the supervisor version and 92 for the trainee version. Subscale coefficients for the supervisor version were 69 for rapport, 80 for client focus, and 72 for identification. Coefficients for the trainee version were 88 for rapport and 81 for client focus.

**Impact** A translated French version of the Session Evaluation Questionnaire Form 5 (SEQ) was used as a measure of session impact. The SEQ developed by Stiles (1980) was initially aimed at measuring dimensions of immediate impacts of a counseling session and later was used to measure immediate impacts of a supervision session (Burke, Goodyear, & Guzzard, 1998, Kivlighan et al, 1991, Lichtenberg & Goodyear, 2000, Martin et al, 1987). The SEQ is composed of 21 bipolar adjectives normally rated on a 7-point scale allowing participants to rate how they evaluate their session and how they feel concerning the supervision session. Our version was rated on a 10-point scale. Although there is little reliability or response discrimination advantage to increasing possible responses from 7 to 10, there is also little loss of accuracy (Osteras et al, 2008). Increasing the number of
possible responses therefore becomes more of a psychological issue than a psychometric one. In a study by Preston and Colman (2000) concerning optimal number of response categories in rating scales, respondents actually preferred 10-point rating scales as opposed to 7, 9, and 5-point scales and rated them as relatively easy to use. Preston and Colman argued that scales must allow respondents to express their feelings adequately in order to prevent frustration and the quality of responses. It was in this spirit that we chose to increase the number of possible responses for this scale.

The items of the SEQ are divided into 2 sections: Session evaluation and post-session mood. The respondents are instructed to circle the appropriate number to show how they feel about the session. Each section yields two dimensions: two independent evaluative dimensions of participants' perceptions of their sessions, called Depth and Smoothness, and two dimensions of their post-session mood, called Positivity and Arousal. Depth refers to a session being perceived a powerful, valuable and deep as opposed to weak, ordinary and shallow. Smoothness refers to a session's comfort, relaxation, and pleasantness. Positivity refers to feelings of confidence and clarity as well as happiness and the absence of fear or anger, whereas Arousal refers to feeling active and excited as opposed to quiet and calm (Stiles & Snow, 1984). Friedlander, Bernardi & Lee (2010) reported a total SEQ alpha of 85 and Stiles, Reynolds, Hardy, Rees, Barkham and Shapiro (1994) reported alpha coefficients of 90 for Depth, 92 for Smoothness, 90 for Positivity and 80 for Arousal. Alpha coefficients in our study were 93 for total SEQ, 89 for Depth, 89 for Smoothness, 88 for Positivity, and 71 for Arousal. Stiles et al. (1994) provided
evidence for convergent validity with the Session Impact Scale yielding significant correlations ranging between 0.6 and 0.72. The reliability coefficient for the total SEQ in our study was 0.93.

**Procedures**

Participants were met prior to the start of supervision and were invited to participate in the research on a volunteer basis and refusal to participate did not bear any impact on their role as students or supervisors. All participants were informed of their right to retract themselves from the study at any time and confidentiality was assured for all participants. Consent forms were signed, the demographic questionnaire was completed and sealed envelopes identified by numerical code containing the questionnaires were handed out. Immediately after each of the five supervision sessions, all supervisors and supervisees were asked to complete the SWAI-S and SWAI-T respectively. Supervisees were also asked to complete the SEQ immediately following each supervision session. All completed forms were returned in sealed envelopes to the researcher and all participants were informed that their responses were confidential and that their supervisors or supervisees would not see the results.

**Results**

We wanted to test whether there is a significant relationship between the supervisory working alliance as perceived by supervisors and supervisees and supervisee’s session evaluations. To investigate this, Pearson correlations were conducted on the mean scores of the alliance measure over the course of the five
supervision sessions for supervisees and supervisors and the mean session impact scores of the five supervisions sessions. Results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of intercorrelations between supervisee and supervisor alliance and session impact evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Sub-scales</th>
<th>SEQ Total</th>
<th>SEQ Depth</th>
<th>SEQ Smoothness</th>
<th>SEQ Positivity</th>
<th>SEQ Arousal</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T Total</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T Rapport</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T Client Focus</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliance Sub-scales</th>
<th>SEQ Total</th>
<th>SEQ Depth</th>
<th>SEQ Smoothness</th>
<th>SEQ Positivity</th>
<th>SEQ Arousal</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-S Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-S Rapport</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-S Client Focus</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-S Identification</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note Although the accepted significance level was established at $p<0.01$, all of the correlations were significant at $p<0.0001$.
Of the original 43 participants, 27 participants still remained following the fifth supervision session yielding a mortality rate of 37%. All of the 13 supervisor participants continued to participate until the end of the fifth and final supervision. Results indicate that all of the supervisory working alliance factors rated by supervisees were significantly correlated to all of their session impact factors. Concerning supervisor ratings of the supervisory working alliance, none of the factors were found to be significantly correlated with supervisee impact ratings.

Having established significant correlations between supervisee ratings of the supervisory working alliance and impact, we conducted step-wise regression analysis to identify which of the supervisee working alliance factors could be found to be predictive of supervisee's overall impact evaluations. Ninety-two of the 682 observations for the analysis were missing yielding a 13% missing data rate. The Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method was used to impute missing data and resulted in similar means to the original data confirming the data had not been distorted by the adjustments. Results for 31 supervisees and 13 supervisors are summarized in table 2.
Table 2

Summary of step-wise regression analysis of alliance factors predicting supervisee perceived total impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Partial R-Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 SWAI-T Focus T1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>58.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 SWAI-T Rapport T2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>18.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWAI-T Rapport T1</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>11.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 SWAI-T Focus T3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>72.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWAI-T Rapport T1</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>6.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 SWAI-T Rapport T4</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>13.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 SWAI-T Rapport T5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>27.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWAI-T Rapport T1</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>16.67**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each regression analysis included all alliance variables from previous sessions

***p < .0001, **p < .001, *p < .01

The analysis at T1 showed that only supervisee client focus was uniquely and significantly related to the supervisees' total impact scores following the first supervision session. Specifically, a positive relationship was found between supervisee client focus and supervisee perceived session impact ($R = 0.67, p < 0.0001$), accounting for approximately 67% of the variance for the total session impact variable. Therefore, the greater client Focus supervisees perceived in session 1, the
greater they perceived their session impact to be. However, by session 2, this had changed and Rapport became the most important predictor variable for total session impact ($R = 39, p < 0.001$). Although client focus became the single most important predictor variable at session 3, supervisees’ Rapport was the most important predictive variable for the remaining supervision sessions. Also, interesting to note is the fact that Rapport T1 seems to be consistently negatively related to total session impact for most of the supervision sessions.

Discussion

This study was aimed at examining the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and impact which has been linked to outcome. Results from this study provide us with interesting information concerning the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and perceived impact. In our first set of analyses, correlations revealed that supervisory working alliance rated by supervisees was significantly positively correlated to their perceived impact, and this was true for all of the alliance and session impact sub-scales. The positive correlations between the supervisory working alliance and impact indicate that the strength of the supervisory working alliance may play an important role in the outcome of supervision. However, supervisory working alliance as rated by supervisors revealed no significant correlations to supervisee-rated session impact. It seems therefore that supervisors and supervisees are reporting different experiences concerning the supervisory working alliance and impact. These results go in the same sense as previous supervisory concordance research by the same authors Bilodeau, Lecomte, et Savard (in press) who reported significant differences in supervisory working
alliance ratings between supervisors and supervisees indicating that in the supervisory setting, supervisors and supervisees may have different conceptions of the supervisory working alliance and different needs concerning the relationship. Our results indicate that not only do supervisors report different supervisory working alliance experiences than do their supervisees, but that their reported alliance experiences seem to come from differing perspectives and are not aligned with supervisees' perceived impact. Supervisors in reference to their supervisory working alliance may be placing emphasis on outcome, while supervisees may be focusing on the relationship aspect. Implications of these findings suggest that supervisors and supervisees may benefit from openly negotiating throughout the supervisory process each participant's needs and perspectives regarding the alliance. This could in turn facilitate the establishment and maintenance of the collaborative spirit necessary in the building of strong supervisory working alliances leading to positive supervisory outcomes. Further research concerning the supervisory working alliance and impacts and replication of these findings is important if we are to continue to develop a better understanding of the supervisory process and outcomes.

A second important finding is the fact that although we found a clear correlation between supervisees' perceived supervisory working alliance and impact, we found no clear pattern of prediction. That is, neither rapport nor client focus was found to be more important than the other in predicting session impact. Both seem to play an important role at different times in the supervisory relationship. These results confirm affirmations by supervision researchers and theorists who suggest that the working alliance is dynamic rather than static and that fluctuations in the
supervisory working alliance are to be expected (Bordin, 1983, Patton & Kivlighan, 1997, Safran & Muran, 2000). These results are also consistent with previous research by Martin et al. (1987) who found amongst other things that the second session was identified by both supervisors and supervisees as the best. This was attributed to the fact that the second session was said to have focused more on the relationship between both participants and that this contributed to the progression of supervisor-supervisee interactions from the more formal goal-setting interactions of the first session to a more personal relationship allowing for risk-taking to occur in safety. In our study, although there were no significant differences in alliance fluctuations throughout the supervisory process, our predictor variables did change from rapport to client focus throughout the relationship. This indicates that both variables were important in predicting impact at different times throughout the supervisory relationship. Also, we observed that although client focus was the single most important predictor variable of impact at the first session, rapport was the single most important variable in predicting strength of impact after the second session. This pattern is similar to what was observed in the Martin, Goodyear, and Newton study, indicating that following the more formal interactions inherent in the first supervisory sessions, establishing a strong relationship was of utmost importance for the supervisees during the second session in order for intimacy to be established and learning could safely begin.

Limitations of this study include the possibility of threats to internal validity inherent in post-facto and self-report studies. A second limitation of this study involved the supervisor sample. 13 of the 43 supervisees shared the same supervisor.
which could have impacted results. Another limitation of this study includes the fact that supervisor experience level varied a lot from approximately 2 to 13 years of experience as counselors themselves. Generalizability of these results to other supervision interactions may be limited. As well, repeated administration of the alliance measure may also be susceptible to history effect and the instrument may be affected by social desirability and halo rating bias. Also important to consider in interpreting the high correlations between impact and alliance are threats to internal validity related to the shared methods bias. Also, the fact that both impact and alliance measure process variables, it would be expected that both instruments would be somewhat correlated.

There are a number of avenues for future research in counseling supervision and impact. First, and foremost, it would be useful to have a clear understanding of the counseling supervision process in order to better understand the outcomes of this process. The supervisory alliance and outcome literature is scarce and it is important to work towards a greater understanding of the supervisory process and its contribution to positive supervisory outcomes if we are to continue our work towards maintaining a high level of quality services in the practice of counseling.
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FIFTH CHAPTER
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Growing interest in the field of counseling supervision is evidenced by the increased research being conducted. Over half of the studies we consulted were published within the last decade alone. The process of supervision has been found to be a primary ingredient in counselor training and competency development (Bordin, 1983, Efstation et al., 1990, Ladany, Brittan-Powell et al., 1997, Ladany et al., 1999) and it is now widely viewed as an independent field of expertise (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). The research, however, remains scattered and many of the variables and concepts being investigated have grown out of our knowledge of the psychology and psychotherapy literature and extrapolated to the practice of supervision. Important examples of this are the concept of the supervisory working alliance, and our knowledge concerning the influence of shame in the process and outcome of supervision. There is still little evidence to support much of the already existing theoretical knowledge which warrants research in this field. This research attempted to contribute the empirical knowledge by investigating the possible relationship between the supervisory working alliance and perceived impact and whether supervisee shame-proneness could be found to be significantly related to the supervisory working alliance and impact.

1 NATURE AND PROCESS OF THE SUPERVISORY WORKING ALLIANCE

As mentioned, the concept of the therapeutic working alliance was extended by Bordin (1974) to include the supervisory working alliance. The first article entitled *Examining Supervisor and Supervisee Agreement on Alliance: Is Shame a Factor?* concerning supervisor and supervisee agreement on supervisory working
alliance ratings provides us with some important information concerning the nature of this experience from the perspectives of both supervisors and supervisees. Research in the field of counseling has found that an agreement on significant events was an important mediator of client change (Kivlighan & Arthur, 2000, Martin & Stelmaczonek, 1988), but counselors and clients were found to have a stable lack of convergence concerning their perceptions of the strength of the working alliance or were found to have only small correlations (Fitzpatrick et al., 2005, Mallinkrodt & Nelson, 1991). Our research found similar findings in the supervisory context. That is, the supervisors and supervisees in our sample differed significantly in their reported supervisory working alliance strength. The supervisees in our sample consistently rated higher on the total supervisory working alliance and the rapport subscale than did the supervisors.

These results were somewhat unexpected for Fitzpatrick et al. (2005) suggested that the discrepancies found between counselor and client working alliance ratings could be explained by the fact that counselors and clients have different theoretical conceptions of this concept. Based on this assumption, we anticipated that supervisors and supervisees would report more similar supervisory working alliance experiences due to the fact that both parties entered the supervisory process with very similar conceptions of this concept. These findings suggest that the emotional needs of supervisees in the supervisory hour are of particular importance. That is, regardless of the fact that supervisees enter into the supervisory relationship with a certain degree of technical knowledge and with the goals of building their competence and skill as counselors, the establishment of a trusting, safe and respectful climate remains of the highest importance for the work to be done.
Impact and the Supervisory Working Alliance

Impact is viewed by Stiles (1980) as a bridge between process and outcome and has been found in the counseling literature to be a measurable unit predictive of outcome (Stiles et al, 1988, 1990, Mallinckrodt, 1993). Establishing a significant relationship between supervisory working alliance and impact is an important contribution to the scarce research attempting to link the supervisory working alliance to outcomes of satisfaction and success (Ladany et al, 1997, 1999, Patton & Kivlighan, 1997, Worthen & McNeill, 1996, Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). The third article in this thesis entitled *Investigating the Supervisory Alliance Linking Working Alliance to Impact as Outcome* investigating the supervisory working alliance and its link to impact found that supervisees’ perceived strength of supervisory working alliance was significantly correlated to their total perceived impact. Furthermore, both the rapport and client focus subscales were found to be predictive of impact at different times throughout the supervisory process. These results go in the same sense as previous research and theoretical assumptions by Bordin (1983), Patton and Kivlighan (1997), and Safran and Muran (2000) suggesting that the supervisory working alliance is dynamic rather than static and suggests that different aspects of the supervisory working alliance become of greater importance at particular times throughout the supervisory process. These results indicate that both rapport and client focus are important predictors of impact and also tentatively suggest that both may also be important predictors of supervisory outcome.

Concerning possible links between supervisor perceived strength of supervisory working alliance and supervisee reported impact, no significant relationship was found. This lack of agreement could be explained in much the same way as our findings concerning lack of agreement between supervisors and supervisees concerning strength of supervisory working alliance. That is, supervisors and supervisees may have different conceptions of the supervisory working alliance.
and the links between supervisor alliance ratings to supervisee perceived impact become less evident.

Continued research concerning the links between supervisory working alliance and outcome is of importance if we are to build solid empirical foundations for which to support our theoretical understanding of the concept of the supervisory working alliance.

3 SHAME, IMPACT AND THE SUPERVISORY WORKING ALLIANCE

Also investigated in this thesis are assumptions concerning the possible influence of supervisee shame-proneness in the process of supervision. More specifically, we investigated the possible relationships that may exist between supervisee shame-proneness and the supervisory working alliance as perceived by both supervisors and supervisees as well as between supervisee shame-proneness and impact. Tested was the assumption by several shame authors that supervisee shame-proneness would significantly influence the process and outcome of supervision (Farber, 2003, Graff, 2008, Hahn, 2001, Yourman, 2003). Both articles 1 and article 2 entitled *Shame in Supervision The Impacts of Shame-Proneness on the Supervisory Process* investigated the role of supervisee shame-proneness in relation to the supervisory working alliance and article 2 investigated the links between supervisee shame-proneness and session impact.

Results presented in article 2 found an existing significant relationship between supervisee shame-proneness and their perceived strength of the supervisory working alliance throughout the supervisory process. These results provide some empirical support for the long standing affirmations of shame authors (Farber, 2003, Graff, 2008, Hahn, 2001, Yourman, 2003) who suggest that supervisee shame is an important factor to consider in the process of supervision. This relationship, however, was not found to be stable, but rather varied over time. That is, there was a tendency for the relationship to be positive in the beginning of the supervisory
process and negative at the end. Also important was the finding that only the subscale rapport of the supervisory working alliance was found to be significantly related to supervisee shame-proneness, which impacted the total supervisory working alliance score. Rapport refers to the supervisees' perception of support from their supervisor. These findings could serve to provide an explanatory factor for previous psychology and psychotherapy research who found clients often cited shame as reasons they kept secrets from their therapists (Ladany et al., 1996, Yourman & Farber, 1996.) In a supervisory setting, the support supervisees perceive from their supervisors may be of particular importance in diminishing the negative effects of shame and in creating a trusting environment conducive to openness and learning.

Level of shame-proneness was also investigated. According to Cook (2001), high levels of shame-proneness are indicative of frequent intense negative feelings leading to a variety of defences. Shame research has linked high shame-proneness to vulnerability to negative effects of failure in achievement situations (Thompson et al., 2004), to problematic relationships (Covert et al., 2003), and to self-derogation, berating, and blaming one's own behavior and character (Lutwak et al., 2002). In a supervisory context, shame-proneness has been linked to trainee resistance (Ladany et al., 1996, Yourman & Farber, 1996). Our research attempted to extend this body of research by investigating whether high shame-prone supervisees could be found to differ significantly in relation to strength of working alliance and impact.

Results in relation to level of shame-proneness and supervisory working alliance were presented in article 1. High shame-prone supervisees as opposed to moderately shame-prone supervisees were not found to differ significantly on perceived strength of working alliance. Our inability to find significant results between the two groups could be explained by the possibility that the high shame-prone supervisees may have been successful in hiding important aspects of their shame in their supervisory process, which would support previous research by
Ladany et al (1996) and Yourman and Farber, (1996) who linked supervisee shame to non-disclosure in supervisory settings. However, due to the low number of participants in our “high” shame group, there remains the possibility of type II error as well. Our sample may have lacked the statistical power necessary to detect a difference.

Another possible explanation to the fact that shame-proneness was found to be significantly co-related to strength of perceived alliance in article 2 but that level of shame-proneness was not found to be a significant factor may suggests that shame in the supervisory setting is an important factor for every supervisee and not just the ones who are high shame-prone. That is, the very nature of the supervisory relationship may actually be conducive to experiencing shame in all or most supervisees. This is aligned with theoretical notions brought forth by several authors who suggest that the nature of the demands of the supervisory relationship can easily trigger shame in any supervisee (Graff, 2008, Hahn, 2001, Yourman, 2003).

Another explanation for this seeming contradiction could be linked to the strength of the working alliance. Several process studies in supervision have found that strong working alliances serve to diminish the effects of negative supervisory events (Carfino & Hess, 1987, Chung et al, 1998, Ladany & Friedlander, 1995, Nelson & Friedlander, 2001, Ramos-Sanchez et al, 2002, Worthen & McNeill, 1996). It could be that the strength of the supervisory alliances experienced by the high shame-prone supervisees in our study could have served to diminish the negative impacts of the supervisee shame experienced.

Concerning the supervisory working alliance as perceived by supervisors, supervisee shame-proneness was not found to be significantly related to supervisor perceived strength of working alliance. This lack of significant relationship was somewhat unexpected for it seemingly contradicts previous shame research linking high shame-proneness to problematic relationships (Covert et al., 2003). Based on this previous research, we would have intuitively expected supervisors with high-
shame-prone supervisees to report more difficulties in relation to alliance strength. The previous explanations for the lack of a significant difference between perceived alliance strength for high shame-prone supervisees and moderately shame-prone supervisees could also serve to explain these findings. That is, the very nature of the supervisory relationship may actually be conducive to experiencing shame in all or most supervisees, and therefore supervisors are faced with very similar levels of shame from all supervisees. It may also be that the strength of the supervisory alliances experienced by the high shame-prone supervisees in our study could have served to diminish the negative impacts of the supervisee shame experienced.

These results serve as a strong argument for the fact that the unique nature of the supervisory relationship and its focus on the relationship and on trust and openness as necessary ingredients for change create an environment worthy of its own investigation. These results also highlight the need for further research on the role of shame in supervision and the role of the supervisory working alliance in not only being conducive to change, but as a process capable of remediating shame.

Results concerning level of shame-proneness and impact were presented in article 2. We found significant differences between high and moderate shame-prone supervisees concerning session impact. That is, high shame-prone supervisees perceived significantly less overall impact than moderate shame-prone supervisees. This significant difference was found on all sub-scales (smoothness, positivity, and arousal) of session impact except depth. Supervisees report being less comfortable and less relaxed in their sessions rendering the experience less pleasant than reported by their counterparts. Furthermore, they report feeling less calm post session and report less confidence and clarity following their supervision sessions than their counterparts expressing more fear and anger related to their supervisors. They do not however, report any differences in how powerful they perceive the session, and how valuable and deep they felt the session was. This is surprising considering the
increased fear, anger, and uneasiness they reported as opposed to lower shame-prone supervisees.

When attempting to interpret these results two possible explanations arise. It could be that although the emotional experience of the supervisory process is lived as more difficult for high shame-prone supervisees, they are not actually less engaged in the process and do not perceive themselves as having learned or improved any less than their counterparts. However, in considering Hahn’s (2001) discussion on shame in supervision and the idea that shame is hidden and oftentimes too painful to process, it could also be that particularly high shame-prone supervisees may view themselves as equally engaged and as having learned or improved as much as their peers in an attempt to protect themselves from the shameful experience of admitting otherwise, even to themselves. The fact that impact is a variable predictive of outcome, this interpretation could have important implications for the practice of supervision and the training of counselors. If, in fact, high shame-prone supervisees are learning less from their supervisory sessions and unable to identify the interference of their shame on their learning could seriously impact the quality of their learning and further impact the quality of the services rendered highlighting further the need for finding ways to appropriately address and remediate shame in supervision.

The ambiguity concerning the actual role of shame in perceived session impact underlines the need for further shame research in the field of supervision. There is little shame research in the literature which allows us to comprehend this phenomenon, however, our research provides tentative evidence of the fact that shame plays an important role in the process of supervision.

4 STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The results obtained in this research shed light on important aspects of supervision. A major contribution of this thesis is the investigation of well known
and researched variables in the therapeutic research which are much theoreticized in the supervision literature, being empirically investigated in the specific context of counseling supervision. Investigating notions in supervision contributes to building an empirical foundation to our understanding of these notions in the unique supervisory context. As well, it is the first known study in counselor supervision investigating the links between the three variables shame-proneness, supervisory working alliance and session impact.

Concerning methodology, our research is one of a very few quantitative studies. All of the instruments used provided evidence of validity and reliability providing us with objective measures of our constructs. As well, our choice of investigating supervisory working alliance, shame-proneness and impact using psychometric instruments provides a different angle to the investigating the role of shame in supervision as well as the process of supervisory alliance. This however, is also one of its limitations in that we do not have any qualitative data which could have served to provide insight and explanations to our data. Another strength of this study is its use of repeated measures of data collection, allowing us to investigate the supervisory working alliance and perceived impact over the entire course of the supervisory process, which constitutes a novel approach. However, the fact that these aspects were measured over the course of 5 supervision sessions also involves the loss of subjects across time, which had a limiting effect on the size of the sample and hence the statistical power (Cohen, 1988).

Another limitation is the possibility of threats to internal validity related to history, selection and social desirability inherent in post-facto and self-report studies. The fact that the study was spread over the course of two and three months could have exposed the participants to any number of extraneous factors impacting their reports. Furthermore, although instructions for the participants requested that they complete the questionnaires immediately following their supervision sessions, the study did not control for this and delays in filling out the questionnaire could have
also influenced the results. As well, the simple fact that the respondents were in the process of supervision and that evaluation was an important factor in the process could have introduced the bias of social desirability. Implications of these biases limit the generalisability of the results as well as the possibility of replication.

The sample of our study also constitutes a limitation of our study. There were uneven comparison groups, and all supervisee participants were counseling trainees in enrolled in the same course. As well, there was much variability in our supervisor sample in both number of years experience in counseling and in the number of students they were supervising. These factors also limit the generalisability of the results.

The implications for future research are many. That is, the literature being quite scarce in the field of supervision, our results would need further investigation and replication of findings to fully comprehend and make assertions concerning the supervisory working alliance and shame-proneness in supervision. Qualitative research concerning the supervisory working alliance, shame and perceived impact would also be important in attempting to understand and comprehend the contribution of each of these variables and its functioning in the process of supervision.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING AND PRACTICE

Results from this research have important implications for the practice of supervision. The agreement on alliance research presented in article 1 enhances our understanding of the experience of the alliance through the eyes of both dyad members, highlighting the fact that supervisees have distinct needs concerning the building and maintaining of the supervisory alliance. This has important implications for supervisors in understanding the primary needs of supervisees for a safe and trusting environment leading to optimal conditions for learning and change.
Research concerning the supervisory working alliance and impact provide us with insight concerning the importance of the supervisory working alliance for supervisees in the possible outcome of supervision. That is, our results suggest that supervisors may benefit from paying particular attention to the supervisory alliance and needs of the supervisee throughout the supervisory process when training supervisees in their efforts towards positive outcomes.

The results concerning the significant relationship found between supervisee shame-proneness and their perceived supervisory working alliance, underlines the importance of supervisor support in diminishing the negative effects of shame and in creating a trusting environment conducive to openness and learning.
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Les risques associés à votre participation sont minimes et la chercheuse s'engage à mettre en œuvre les moyens nécessaires pour les réduire ou les pallier. Il est possible que certaines questions vous semblent délicates. Vous pouvez toujours refuser de répondre à une question si elle vous met mal à l'aise. La participation ou non à ce projet n'aura aucun impact sur votre évaluation dans le cours. Le seul inconveniant anticipé est le temps que vous devrez allouer pour participer au projet, soit environ trois heures au total. La contribution à l'avancement des connaissances au sujet de la supervision clinique est le bénéfice direct prévu. Aucune compensation d'ordre monétaire n'est accordée.

Si vous avez des questions concernant ce projet de recherche, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi aux coordonnées indiquées ci-dessous.

Cynthia Bilodeau, étudiante au doctorat en Éducation
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Invitation à participer au projet de recherche
LES EFFETS DE LA SUPERVISION CLINIQUE EN ORIENTATION PROFESSIONNELLE

Recherche menée par Cynthia Bilodeau, Faculté d'éducation, dans le cadre d'une these de doctorat en Education, sous la direction de Reginald Savard (Université de Sherbrooke) et Conrad Lecomte (Université de Montréal)

Madame,
Monsieur,

Nous vous invitons à participer à la recherche en titrant a mieux comprendre les variables qui ont une influence sur la supervision professionnelle et en particulier, sur l'alliance de travail

Votre participation à ce projet de recherche consiste à remplir un questionnaire portant sur le processus et les effets de la supervision immédiatement suivant la fin de chacune des cinq supervisions prévue pour ce cours (OIS 715 Counseling d'emploi) pour chacun de vos supervisees

Les données recueillies dans le cadre de cette étude sont entièrement confidentielles et ne pourront en aucun cas mener à votre identification. La confidentialité sera assurée par le fait que chaque participant sera identifié par un code numérique seulement. De plus, les questionnaires seront mis dans une enveloppe scellée au nom de la chercheuse et déposées dans une boîte prévue à cet effet à la faculté de l'Education. Votre nom ne sera jamais lié à aucune donnée. Les résultats de la recherche ne permettront pas d'identifier les participants. Les résultats seront diffusés par articles (these) et communications dans des congrès.

Les questionnaires seront conservés sous clé dans le bureau de la chercheuse, qui seule y aura accès. La personne ressource pour l'analyse des données et les directeurs de recherche auront seulement accès à la base de données où n'apparaîtra aucun renseignement permettant de vous identifier. Les données seront déttruites au plus tard en décembre 2008 et ne seront pas utilisées à d'autres fins que celles décrites dans le présent document.

La participation à cette étude se fait sur une base volontaire. Vous êtes entièrement libre de participer ou non et de vous retirer en tout temps sans préjudice.
etudiants seront aussi invités à participer et à donner leur point de vue sur l’alliance de travail. Votre participation est possible même si votre supervise refuse de participer.

Les risques associés à votre participation sont minimes et la chercheuse s’engage à mettre en œuvre les moyens nécessaires pour les réduire ou les pallier. Le seul inconvénient est le temps que vous devrez allouer pour participer au projet, soit environ une heure par supervisee au total. La contribution à l’avancement des connaissances au sujet de la supervision clinique est le bénéfice direct prévu. Aucune compensation d’ordre monétaire n’est accordée.

Si vous avez des questions concernant ce projet de recherche, n’hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi aux coordonnées indiquées ci-dessous.
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APPENDIX C
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

RENSEIGNEMENTS GÉNÉRAUX

1 Sexe  F [ ]  M [ ]

2 Âge  ___ ans

3 Nationalité  ________________

4 Votre formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diplômes, certificats, attestations et autres</th>
<th>Année d'obtention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Nombre d'années de scolarité  ______

6 Votre expérience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postes</th>
<th>Lieux</th>
<th>Années</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Nombre d'années d'expérience  __
INVENTAIRE DE SUPERVISION
Questionnaire du/de la stagiaire

Veuillez indiquer la fréquence avec laquelle les comportements décrits dans chacun des items qui suit, reflète le travail avec votre superviseur(e). Après chaque item, encerclez le chiffre correspondant au pointage approprié sur l’échelle de sept points qui suit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jour</th>
<th>Mois</th>
<th>Année</th>
<th>Presque jamais</th>
<th>Presque toujours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire traduit par Lecomte et Lebourgeois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Je me sens à l’aise de mentionner à mon/ma superviseur(e) tout sentiment pouvant me déranger à son sujet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mon/ma superviseur(e) me traite comme un(e) collègue lors de nos sessions de supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>En supervision, je suis plus curieux(se) qu’anxieux(se) lorsque nous discutons de mes difficultés avec le/la client(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>En supervision, mon/ma superviseur(e) met une grande importance à notre compréhension de la perspective du/de la client(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mon/ma superviseur(e) m’encourage à prendre le temps de comprendre ce que le/la client(e) dit et fait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Le style de mon/ma superviseur(e) est d’étudier soigneusement et systématiquement le matériel que j’apporte en supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lorsque mon/ma superviseur(e) corrige mes erreurs avec un/une client(e), il/elle suggère des manières différentes d’intervenir auprès de ce/cette client(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mon/ma superviseur(e) m’aide à travailler à l’intérieur d’un modèle spécifique de traitement avec mon ou ma client(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mon/ma superviseur(e) m’aide à ne pas perdre le fil du sujet pendant nos rencontres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Je travaille avec mon/ma superviseur(e) à des buts précis dans la session de supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INVENTAIRE DE SUPERVISION
### Questionnaire du/de la superviseur(e)

Veuillez indiquer la fréquence avec laquelle les comportements décrits dans chacun des items qui suit, reflète le travail avec votre stagiaire. Après chaque item, encerclez le chiffre correspondant au pointage approprié sur l'échelle de sept points qui suit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presque jamais</th>
<th>Presque toujours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J’aide mon/ma stagiaire à travailler à l’intérieur d’un modèle spécifique de traitement avec son/ sa client(e)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J’aide mon/ma stagiaire à ne pas perdre le fil du sujet pendant nos rencontres</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mon style est d’étudier soigneusement et systématiquement le matériel apporté en supervision par mon/ ma stagiaire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mon/ma stagiaire travaille avec moi à des buts précis dans la session de supervision</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>En supervision, je m’attends à ce que le/la stagiaire pense ou réfléchisse aux commentaires que je lui ai faits</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J’enseigne à mon/ma stagiaire en utilisant des suggestions directes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>En supervision, j’accorde une grande priorité à notre compréhension de la perspective du/de la client(e)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>J’encourage mon/ma stagiaire à prendre le temps de comprendre ce que le/la client(e) dit et fait</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quand je corrige les erreurs de mon/ma stagiaire avec un/une client(e), je suggère des manières différentes d’intervenir</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J’encourage mon/ma stagiaire à formuler ses propres interventions auprès de son/ sa client(e)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>J’encourage mon/ma stagiaire à parler de son travail d’une manière à le/la mettre à l’aise</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Je suis réceptif(ve) aux explications de mon/ma stagiaire sur les comportements de son/ sa client(e)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lors des supervisions, mon/ma stagiaire parle plus que moi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Je fais un effort pour comprendre mon/ma stagiaire</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Je commente avec tact le rendement de mon/ma stagiaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 J'incite mon/ma stagiaire à parler lors de nos sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 En supervision, mon/ma stagiaire est plus curieux(se) qu'anxieux(se) quand il/elle discute avec moi de ses difficultés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mon/ma stagiaire semble être à l'aise à travailler avec moi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mon/ma stagiaire comprend les comportements de mon/ma client(e) et les méthodes de traitement d'une manière semblable à la mienne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Pendant la supervision, mon/ma stagiaire semble capable de prendre du recul et de réfléchir à ce que je suis en train de lui dire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Je reste à l'écoute de mon/ma stagiaire pendant la supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mon/ma stagiaire s'identifie à moi dans la manière qu'il/elle pense et parle de son/sa client(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Mon/ma stagiaire met en pratique d'une manière consistante les suggestions faites en supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire traduit par Lecomte et Lebourgans
### Questionnaire d’évaluation de la supervision

**Tout de suite après la supervision**

**Directives**  Veuillez placer un « * » ou un « ✓ » sur chaque ligne pour indiquer comment vous évaluez cette supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jour</th>
<th>Mois</th>
<th>Année</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 CETTE SUPERVISION FUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Évaluation</th>
<th>Bonne</th>
<th>Risquée</th>
<th>Facile</th>
<th>Sans Valeur</th>
<th>Profonde</th>
<th>Tendue</th>
<th>Vide</th>
<th>Puissante</th>
<th>Ordinaire</th>
<th>Douce</th>
<th>Desagréable</th>
<th>Inconfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mauvaise</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sans Danger</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficile</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Grande Valeur</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficie</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxe</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remplie</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faible</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spéciale</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dur</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agréable</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 PRESENTEMENT, JE ME SENS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Évaluation</th>
<th>Triste</th>
<th>Contente, Content</th>
<th>Immobilisée, Immobilise</th>
<th>Déterminée, Démêl</th>
<th>Détachée, Détache</th>
<th>Excitée, Excite</th>
<th>Effrayée, Effraye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heureuse, Heureux</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fâchée, Fâche</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active, Actif</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incertaine, Incertain</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impliquée, Implique</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calme</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confiant, Confiante</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALERTE</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMICALE, AMICAL</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENTE, LENT</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOYEUSE, JOYEUX</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANQUILLE</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDORMIE, ENDORMI</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROIDE, FROID, (HOSTILE)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITE</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANS JOIE</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIMULÉE, STIMULE</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire traduit par Lecomte et Tremblay
## APPENDIX G

### ISS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Jour</th>
<th>Mois</th>
<th>Année</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Mes sentiments ou mes expériences

La liste d'énonces ci-dessous décrit des sentiments ou des expériences que vous pouvez avoir. Lisez chaque énoncé attentivement et encerclez le numéro à la droite de chaque article qui indique la fréquence à laquelle vous ressentez le sentiment ou vivez l'expérience décrite dans l'énoncé. Utilisez l'échelle suivante. Soyez honnête lorsque vous répondez. Veuillez répondre à tous les numéros.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numéro</th>
<th>Énoncé</th>
<th>Jamais</th>
<th>Rarement</th>
<th>Occasionnellement</th>
<th>Souvent</th>
<th>Toujours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J'ai l'impression de ne jamais être assez bon(ne)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J'ai l'impression d'être mis à part</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Je crois que les gens me regardent de haut</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>En général, je crois que je suis un succès</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Je me reprends et je m'abaisse</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Je crains les opinions que les gens ont de moi</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Comparativement à d'autres gens, je sens que je ne suis pas à la hauteur</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Je me vois comme quelqu'un de petit(e) et d'insignifiant(e)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Je suis fier(e) de moi</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Je sens que je suis inadapté(e) et je doute de moi-même</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Je crois que je suis imparfait(e), qu'il y a quelque chose de pas correct avec moi</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lorsque je me compare à d'autres, je crois que je ne suis pas important(e)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J'ai une peur incroyable que mes défauts soient révélés en présence des autres</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Je crois que j'ai plusieurs qualités</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Je me bats pour atteindre la perfection, mais je ne l'atteins pas</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Je crois que les autres peuvent voir mes défauts</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Je voudrais me battre lorsque je fais des erreurs</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>En général, je suis satisfait(e) de moi-même</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>J'aimerais pouvoir disparaître lorsque je fais une erreur</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Je pense sans cesse à des événements douloureux, jusqu'au point que ça me bouleverse</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Je crois que je suis une personne qui a de la valeur, que je suis sur le même niveau que d’autres</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>À l’occasion, j’ai l’impression que je vais tomber en mille morceaux</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>J’ai l’impression que j’ai perdu le contrôle sur mes émotions et le fonctionnement de mon corps</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parfois j’ai l’impression d’être insignifiant(e)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parfois, je me sens tellement vulnérable que je voudrais que la terre s’ouvre et m’engloutisse</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Il y a un vide à l’intérieur de moi que je ne suis pas capable de remplir</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Je me sens vide et peu comble(e)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>J’ai une attitude positive de moi-même</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ma solitude ressemble plutôt au néant</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J’ai l’impression qu’il me manque quelque chose</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire traduit par Savard, Perrault, Bilodeau et Lecomte
APPENDIX H
RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR TRANSLATED QUESTIONNAIRES

Table 1
Reliability coefficients for translated questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I

### SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors (N=13)</th>
<th>Supervisees (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69% (9)</td>
<td>84% (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31% (4)</td>
<td>16% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of post-secondary education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of counselling experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 3
Means, standard deviations and minimum and maximum values for ISS completed by supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to session 1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following session 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.78</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Means, standard deviations and minimum and maximum average values for alliance measures completed by supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWAI-T</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focu:</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focu:</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focu:</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focu:</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focu:</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Means, standard deviations and minimum and maximum average values for alliance measures completed by supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWAI-S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client focus</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Means, standard deviations and minimum and maximum average values for impact measures completed by supervisees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousal</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K  
TREATMENT OF MISSING DATA

The following approach to dealing with missing data was used in the analyses. The MCMC method was used to impute missing data in the regression analysis of alliance factors predicting supervisee perceived total impact. In other analyses, missing data was not replaced and all data was used even if it was partial. In the case of the ISS, as indicated by the ISS manual, any completed ISS with more than 3 missing values were excluded from the analyses. Not one completed ISS had 3 or more missing values and therefore none were excluded from analysis.
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