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Chapter 1: General Introduction

Overview

Clinical supervision has been recognized as a core component in the field of counseling since the 1920s within the practice and tradition of psychoanalysis (Bernard, 2005). Clinical supervision is important in the training of supervisees in the profession of counseling during their academic training and for licensure requirements. Graduate education in psychology, social work, and counseling require students to participate in supervision as part of their training. Counseling students must have supervision during practicum and internship and supervisors must meet qualifications to supervise (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2009). The development of counseling professionals is facilitated through clinical supervision, with the goal of client care, skills training and competence.

In the simplest terms, supervision is a formal relationship where a more senior member of the profession is matched with a junior member of the profession in the course of an ongoing, evaluative relationship (Bernard, 2009). The supervision relationship is different from counseling and therapy relationships because of the presence of an evaluative component, which is obligatory (Campbell, 2006; Milne 2009). Yet, it is impossible for the supervisor to convey information to the supervisee that has meaning independent of the relational context on which it is conveyed (Safran & Muran, 2000). The complexity of supervision includes the characteristics of collaboration in the tasks of teaching and goal setting, and also includes evaluation; introducing a power dynamic which creates an inevitable tension in the supervisory relationship.
Significant focus has been given to supervisors who provide clinical supervision for counseling students within the confines of counselor education programs, but less so of supervisors of pre-licensure counselors. However, the need for supervision does not end once a student graduates from a training program in counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Supervision has become one of the most consistent requirements in ongoing post-matriculation, continuing education of counselors (Fall & Sutton, 2003). State boards and professional organizations oversee the counseling profession, but the specification of guidelines providing the supervision is beyond the scope and purposes of regulatory boards (Magnuson, Norem, & Wilcoxon, 2000). Licensure supervisors are responsible for teaching supervisees to become knowledgeable and competent professionals, and often assume the sole responsibility for overseeing supervisees work without the clarity of evaluation criteria provided by course syllabi and accreditation standards (Magnuson et al., 2000).

To date, researchers have successfully documented the supervisory relationship, as well as effective supervision models and interventions, but few have utilized a qualitative approach to understanding the overall experience of the supervisory relationship. Further, while much is known about the expectations of supervision within the context of graduate level training programs little is known about the supervisors experience of licensure supervision.

Using the manuscript style format provided by the Graduate School at Oregon State University, this dissertation aimed to provide scholarly work that explored the experience of the supervisory relationship and of the supervisors experience working with licensure supervisees. Following the manuscript style format, chapter 1 relates two journal-
formatted manuscripts, found in chapter 2 and chapter 3, showing their thematic connections and building research conclusions relevant to the supervisory relationship and licensure supervision. Chapter 2 presents a manuscript titled *A Metasynthesis of the Qualitative Research on Individual Supervision and the Supervisory Relationship*. Chapter 3 is a study titled *A Grounded Theory Study on Licensure Supervisors Experience of Supervision*. The manuscript in chapter 2 is a metasynthesis, which analyzes and synthesizes existing qualitative research on individual supervision and determines gaps in qualitative research regarding the supervisory relationship. Their results answer the question “How do supervisors and supervisees experience the individual supervision relationship?” The manuscript in chapter 3 focused on exploring the experience of supervisors working with licensure supervisees, which was determined as a gap in literature based on chapter 2. Finally, chapter 4 provides common conclusions and links the manuscripts thematically.

With supervision having such a significant place in both graduate level counseling programs and licensure preparation, this dissertation focused on understanding the supervisory relationship, one a metasynthesis of supervision across professional stages and the other a grounded theory focused specifically the licensure supervisors experience of the supervisory relationship. The theme of how clinical supervision is experienced connects the two articles presented.

**Importance to the Profession of Counseling**

Both manuscripts provide contributions to the profession of counseling as each offers insight into the supervisory relationship, which is significant to professional development of graduate level students and supervisees who are pre-licensure.
The clinical supervisor is responsible for teaching clinical conceptualization and counseling skills, as well as evaluating the supervisee’s progress and protecting the welfare of the supervisee’s clients. The supervisory relationship is considered to be very important in the training of the supervisee (Bernard, 1979, 1997; Bordin, 1979; Safran & Muran, 2000; Watkins, Jr, 2012). Both manuscripts focus on the supervisory relationship with the second manuscript bringing specific attention to licensure supervision.

In most cases following graduation the student will pursue professional licensure to work in the field of counseling. Professional counselors are licensed in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2010). The licensure criteria and process in each state may vary but always includes supervision as part of professional licensure requirements. Most states mandate between two and three thousand hours of post-graduate, supervised clinical experience (ACA, 2010). The basis of attaining those hours is primarily through individual clinical supervision.

However, the specification of guidelines for providing supervision is beyond the scope and purposes of regulatory boards (Magnuson, Norem, & Wilcoxon, 2000). Supervisors of pre-licensure supervisees often assume the sole responsibility for overseeing supervisees’ work. This is an important area of the supervisees’ development into the profession of counseling and yet there is limited research into the supervisors’ experience of the supervisory relationship with licensure supervisees.

This research should inform supervisor development and training programs. It will also likely contribute to better understanding best practices in the field of counselor education, as well as the role and relationship of university graduate programs and regulatory bodies in regard to supervision.
General State of Knowledge

The supervisory relationship is considered very important and should be understood in depth. Supervision of counseling practice is an essential aspect of ethical and effective therapy and is seen as the cornerstone of continuing professional development (Wheeler & Richards, 2007). However, the supervisory relationship is complex, including the tasks of teaching skills and developing competence in the supervisee as well as that of providing evaluation. The evaluation aspect introduces a power dynamic to the relationship, creating an inevitable tension in the supervisory relationship. Supervision is expected to be objective and impartial (Bogo, Regehr, Power, & Regehr, 2007; Milne, 2009) and yet it occurs within a relational context.

The importance of supervision has resulted in the emergence of training standards for credentialing and regulations of supervisors. The earliest training, credentialing and regulation of supervisors was in 1997 with the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credentialing by the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) which required supervisors of counselors to demonstrate some knowledge and training in order to provide supervision (“Approved Clinical Supervisor,” n.d., para. 1). Further, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors (March, 1993) were established followed by the American Counseling Association (ACA) Standards And Ethical Guidelines For Counseling Supervisors (ACA Code of Ethics, 2005).

Although quantitative research remains prevalent in the social sciences (Sandelowski, 2003) qualitative research is well suited for this inquiry into the supervisory relationship because it allows for an understanding of the inner experience of the participants. This
helps determine how meanings are formed and it allows for thinking in terms of complex relationships (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Hence, qualitative methodology offers the opportunity to discover aspects of the supervisory relationship which quantitative methodology would not.

A good amount of qualitative research has been done on supervision (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Grant, Schofield, & Crawford, 2012; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Henderson, Cawyer-Stringer, & Watkins, 1999; Jernigan, Green, Helms, Perez-Gualdron, & Henze, 2010; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox, Edwards, Hess, & Hill, 2011; Ladany, Constantine, Miller, Erickson, & Muse-Burke, 2000; Magnuson, Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000; Mangione, Mears, Vincent & Hawes, 2011; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006; Townend, 2008; West & Clark, 2004) but it has been diverse in methodology, quality, and focus and no qualitative research has been completed about licensure supervision.

**Manuscript 1**

The first article presents a metasynthesis where the experience of the supervisory relationship is explored. As previously stated, clinical supervision is significant in the training of supervisees in the profession of counseling during their academic training as well as for licensure requirements. Past research recognizes the complexity of the supervisory relationship. Qualitative research plays a distinctive role by reaching facets of the human experience out of the reach of quantitative methods (Sandelowski, 2012).

Qualitative metasynthesis studies are used to assemble findings about a target phenomenon into a coherent whole to serve as a provisional basis for practice or policy (Sandelowski, 2012). The purpose of this study was to make sense of these qualitative
studies in a way that centers on the supervisory relationship as experienced by the supervisors and supervisees. With this knowledge in mind, the central research question addressed in this study was: How do supervisors and supervisees experience the supervisory relationship?

The metasynthesis highlights gaps in existing qualitative literature about the supervisory relationship. Qualitative research on the supervisory relationship was gathered using electronic databases. Studies were reviewed and characterized with respect to study variables such as methods, research question, and sample, then analyzed to provide an overall picture of the study, critiqued for selection into this metasynthesis, and assessed for research quality (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007; Kline, 2008). The final phase, a thematic analysis, is a method that is used to analyze data in primary qualitative research (Thomas & Harden, 2008) and was used to extract themes describing the supervisory relationship. These abstract levels represent new meanings. The systemic review is an important method for the evidence-informed policy and practice movement, which may inform supervision practices at all levels (Thomas & Harden, 2008).

We intend to publish this article in The Clinical Supervisor to add to the body of knowledge and research.

**Manuscript 2**

The second study is a qualitative grounded theory of supervisors’ experience of supervising licensure supervisees. To date there is limited research in this area of supervision. In particular, the supervisors’ perspective on their experience of licensure supervision is absent.
As mentioned previously, clinical supervision remains significant in the training of supervisees in the profession of counseling during their academic training as well as while they pursue licensure requirements. Through clinical supervision the development of counseling professionals is facilitated with the goal of client care, skills training and evaluation (Aasheim, 2012; Lawson, Hein & Stuart, 2009) with the supervisory relationship as the conduit for this activity (Bernard, 1997; Bordin, 1979; Safran & Muran, 2000).

Licensure supervision is important because it is here that continuing education of counselors occurs, for the protection and care of clients and for ongoing development and professional competence of the supervisee. The licensure supervisor determines whether a supervisee meets the qualifications for professional standing outlined by relevant regulatory bodies. With licensure supervision comes significant responsibility but limited support, which has implications for licensure supervisors experience of supervision.

Given the importance of licensure supervision the purpose of this study was to better understand the experiences of licensure supervisors in the process of supervision. The specific research question was: “How do licensure supervisors experience the process of licensure supervision?” This study interviewed (9) expert licensure supervisors. A qualitative grounded theory method was used. The purpose of qualitative research is to step beyond what is known and enter the world of participants, to see from their perspective, and in doing so make discoveries that will contribute to the development of the empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Proponents of qualitative research
emphasize the distinctive role it plays in reaching facets of the human experience out of the reach of quantitative methods (Sandelowski, 2012).

The use of a purposeful sampling to identify licensure supervisors informed us of the unique experience of the supervisory relationship. During the first round of interviews, participants were asked 6 main questions:

1. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the process of licensure supervision?
2. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the supervisory relationship?
3. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in promoting client welfare?
4. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in counselor development?
5. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the gatekeeping role?
6. As a licensure supervisor, how did you experience preparation as a supervisor as part of this process?

All interviews were analyzed and coded for emerging themes. Follow-up interviews were conducted, using thematic sampling, which was concept driven and allowed researchers flexibility (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Multiple strategies and techniques were used throughout the research to reduce influences and enhance the credibility, including: (a) prolonged engagement, (b) persistent observation and (c) triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This study provided a systematic exploration of experiences of expert licensure supervisors. Results indicated that licensure supervisors’ experienced conceptual considerations that informed and supported the licensure supervision process. The licensure supervision process included two interrelated properties of supervisor
actions and supervisor challenges. The licensure supervision process occurred within the context of supervisor professional development, motivation and personal & professional values.

We intend to publish this article in *Counselor Education & Supervision* to add to the body of knowledge, and to inform best practices in order to bring research closer to decision-making and policy.

**Glossary of Terms**

**Supervision**

For purposes of this study we will use an abbreviated version of Milne’s (2009) definition:

Supervision is the formal provision, by approved supervisors, of a relationship-based education and training that is work-focused and which manages, supports, develops and evaluates the work of colleague/s. (pg.15)

**Supervisor**

A counseling professional who holds a license to practice professional counseling independently in her state and is currently providing, or has provided, supervision to a supervisee or counselor-in-training.

**Supervisee**

A supervisee (also counselor-in-training) is defined as an individual who is currently attending a graduate level counseling or psychology program or who has matriculated from a graduate program and is pursuing state based professional licensure.

**Gatekeeping**

Formalized review strategies to assess for supervisee professional competence and
readiness.

Metasynthesis

Qualitative metasynthesis studies are assembled findings about a target phenomenon into a coherent whole to serve as a provisional basis for practice or policy (Sandelowski, 2012).

Organization

The thematic link between the first and second articles is the experience of clinical supervision. Chapter 2 provides a metasynthesis of qualitative research about the supervisory relationship. Chapter 3 presents a qualitative grounded theory examining the supervisors’ experience of licensure supervision.

Appendices A through D show the Tables related to the Chapter 2 metasynthesis. Appendices E through J show the IRB approved recruitment materials for Chapter 3. The two rounds of interviews (the first face-to-face and the second by telephone) for Chapter 3 study were audio recorded and transcribed. Transcripts were analyzed using a grounded theory methodology including open, axial, and selective coding, and constant comparison was utilized throughout the process (see Appendices L through N to view the documentation of the analysis process). Through the data analysis, the following three contextual categories emerged; supervisor professional development, motivation and personal and professional values, connecting the central category of the licensure supervision process. At the conclusion of the data analysis, participants were sent a member check by email (see Appendices O and P). Six of the nine participants responded and affirmed that their experience was represented in the emergent theory.
Results from both manuscripts will add to the body of research examining clinical supervision and the supervisory relationship, particularly related to licensure supervision. These results may also serve to inform best practices and improve supervisor and supervisee training and development.
Chapter 2
A Metasynthesis of the Qualitative Research on
Individual Supervision and the Supervisory Relationship

Susan Sisko
Oregon State University

Deborah Rubel
Oregon State University
Abstract

Clinical supervision is crucial to counselor development and competence. It is important to understand how the supervision relationship is experienced, and a number of qualitative studies have endeavored to do so. However, these studies have not been examined as a whole to make larger sense of their results. A qualitative metasynthesis was conducted to characterize, critique, and synthesize the qualitative research related to individual supervision to answer the broader question of, “How do supervisors and supervisees experience the supervisory relationship?” Through analysis, three separate but interrelated themes were identified: 1) Supervisor Self-Awareness nurturing Supervisee Self-Awareness, 2) Navigating power & collaboration in a hierarchical system, and 3) Supervisor self-disclosure as potentially beneficial or destructive. These complex themes are discussed in the context of the supervisory relationship, offering new insights, and implications for policy and procedure.

*Keywords:* individual supervision, supervisory relationship, qualitative metasynthesis
A Metasynthesis of the Qualitative Research on Individual Supervision and the Supervisor Relationship

Supervision is widely promoted as an essential aspect of ethical and effective counseling and therapy and is seen as the cornerstone of continuing professional development (Wheeler & Richards, 2007). Supervision requires a different relationship than counseling and therapy because of the presence of the evaluative and obligatory components (Campbell, 2006; Milne, 2009). As a result, the supervision process is complex.

Supervision includes aspects of supervisee development, clinical competence, and evaluation all of which can create tensions in the supervisory relationship. Supervisors should attempt to provide standardized, objective and impartial evaluations of supervisees but because it occurs within a relational context this is not easily managed (Bogo, Regehr, Power & Regehr, 2007). It is important to understand this dynamic and the experience of the supervisory relationship to that end.

Quantitative research is still the dominant research modality in the health sciences yet qualitative research plays a distinct role in reaching facets of the human experience that are out of the reach of quantitative methods (Sandelowski, 2003, 2008). Qualitative research is particularly valuable in understanding meaning in relationship, which is central to the issue of understanding clinical supervision. And when a body of qualitative research exists, metasynthesis is a valuable way to draw together the existing evidence into a meaningful whole. The purpose of this systematic review and metasynthesis was to characterize, critique, and synthesize the qualitative research related to individual
supervision to answer the broader question of, “How do supervisors and supervisees experience the supervisory relationship?”

**Individual Supervision and the Supervision Relationship**

Clinical supervision is important for client welfare and the counselor’s professional development. Client welfare is at the core of all clinical supervision; to that end, supervisors help counselors gain and sustain clinical competence (Aasheim, 2012). The clinical supervisor is responsible for protecting the client’s welfare, teaching clinical conceptualization and counseling skills, fostering supervisee self-awareness, and evaluating the supervisee (Lawson, Hein & Stuart, 2009). In many ways, the supervisor is the translator of theory into practice and is responsible for both the professional development of supervisees and the effective treatment of the clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

There are many useful definitions of clinical supervision. Milne’s (2009) comprehensive definition states that “supervision is the formal provision, by approved supervisors, of a relationship-based education and training that is work-focused and which manages, supports, develops and evaluates the work of colleagues. It therefore differs from related activities, such as mentoring and therapy, by incorporating and evaluative component and by being obligatory” (p.15). Milne’s definition continues with methods of supervision, that we have not included. As is common with definitions of supervision, the elements include; education, training, evaluation and the supervisory relationship.

At the onset of a graduate level program for counseling, supervision is a decisive focus. Graduate counseling programs that are accredited by the Council for Accreditation
of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) require students to participate in both practicum and internship. Counseling students must have supervision during practicum and internship, and the supervisor must meet qualifications to provide that supervision (CACREP, 2009 Standards).

The need for supervision does not end once a student graduates from a training program in counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). In most cases, following graduation the student will pursue professional licensure to work in the field of counseling. The licensure process in each state may vary but always includes supervision. Supervision has become one of the most consistent requirements in the ongoing, post-graduation, continuing education of counselors (Fall & Sutton, 2003).

Supervision is complex in that it is mandatory, evaluative, and occurs within a relational context. Despite the relational context, the evaluative actions are expected to be objective and impartial (Bogo, Regehr, Power, & Regehr, 2007; Milne, 2009). Clearly, the supervisory relationship influences the supervision process and outcomes in crucial ways. Ladany (2004) states that a robust supervisory relationship is related to enhanced supervisee competence, effective evaluation, interpersonally sensitive and task oriented styles, increased supervisee self-disclosure and supervisee satisfaction. Conversely, a weak supervisory relationship may yield the opposite.

It is impossible for the supervisor to accomplish all of the functions and processes of supervision independent of the relational context (Safran & Muran, 2000). Most accounts of what matters in clinical supervision place the quality of the supervisory relationship at the heart (Milne, 2009). Therefore, it is important to understand the supervisory relationship because of its impact on the supervisee and ultimately the client.
Summary of Research Related to the Supervisory Relationship

Research about the supervisory relationship has grown in the past 25 years (Bernard, 2005; Wheeler & Richards, 2007). For example, Freitas (2002) conducted a review of 2 decades of research on supervision that included 10 quantitative studies conducted between 1981-1997. The participants in the studies were counselors-in-training and the focus of the studies was on client outcomes. Freitas’ (2002) research question asked “Does clinical supervision improve client outcomes?” (pg. 11). Conclusions drawn from his review of the 10 studies suggested that research on supervision is complex. When one thinks of the complexity involved in studying supervisor– supervisee–client triads, it is little wonder that the studies in this area are susceptible to criticism. Research in this area of supervision is intimately linked with research on therapy outcome with the additional layer of the supervisor– supervisee relationship added.

Further, Wheeler & Richards (2007) conducted a systematic literature review of individual quantitative (15) and qualitative (3) studies on supervision published from 1980 – 2006, in which the majority of the participants were counselor trainees. A summary of the studies provided some evidence of the impact of supervision on the therapist, their practice, and their clients. The quality of evidence was varied, but supervision consistently demonstrated some positive impact on the supervisee. The review indicated that supervision impacts the therapist’s self-awareness, skills, self-efficacy, theoretical orientation, support, and outcomes for clients.

Quantitative research is still the dominant research modality in the health sciences (Sandelowski, 2008), yet qualitative inquiry represents a legitimate mode of social and human science exploration, without apology or comparison to quantitative research.
(Creswell, 2007). Qualitative research is well suited for inquiry into the supervisory relationship because it allows for (a) researchers to get at the inner experience of the participants and to determine how meanings are formed, (b) discovery in fluid, evolving and dynamic ways (c) thinking in terms of complex relationships (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Hence, qualitative methodology offers the opportunity to discover aspects of the supervisory relationship that may be nuanced, complex, and reflective of the supervisor and supervisee experience.

In fact, a substantial number of qualitative studies have attended to the supervisory relationship, directly or indirectly, including the 17 articles used for this metasynthesis. These publication date of these studies ranged from 1999-2012. However, they have done so with disparate methods and many different foci. No reviews have attempted to characterize, critique or make larger sense of the results.

The Need for Metasynthesis

The purpose of this qualitative metasynthesis was to make sense of these qualitative studies in a way that centers on the supervisory relationship as experienced by the supervisors and supervisees. The growing body of qualitative research in the area of the supervisory relationship warrants an analysis of what has been studied in order to recognize gaps in the research. Further, qualitative metasynthesis reviews are directed toward assembling findings about a target phenomenon into a coherent whole to serve as a provisional basis for practice or policy (Sandelowski, 2012). The purpose of this review was to characterize, critique, and synthesize the qualitative research exploring individual supervision and highlight the supervisory relationship as experienced by supervisors and supervisees.
Method

In order to gather qualitative research on the supervisory relationship and conduct a characterization, critique, and qualitative metasynthesis, we established selection criteria for the studies and gathered it using electronic databases. The studies were reviewed and assessed for an array of characteristics (see Appendix B, Table 1). In the characterization of the research, each study was analyzed to provide an overall picture of what had been studied and how. The critique portion of this review (see Appendix C, Table 2) serves both as an assessment of the body of qualitative studies in this area (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007; Kline, 2008) and as a selection tool for use in this metasynthetic analysis. The final phase, a thematic analysis, is a method that is used to analyze data in qualitative research (Thomas & Harden, 2008) to show emerging themes that describe the supervisory relationship (see Appendix D, Table 3). These themes represent new meanings and contribute to the overall knowledge and understanding of the supervisory relationship.

Selection of Articles

The studies were selected following an extensive and purposeful search completed using the electronic databases PsychInfo and EBSCO during the time period of January 2013 through May 2013. An initial group of 264 abstracts were found using the search terms individual counseling supervision, individual clinical supervision, and qualitative. The resulting articles were screened and relevant articles were extracted. Articles were included if they met the following conditions; (a) they were qualitative studies; (b) they primarily investigated individual supervision; (c) they were published in a peer reviewed journal; (d) they were written or translated in English; (e) they had been published within
the last 13 years; (f) they focused on the supervisory relationship as a primary relationship as a primary concern or tangentially through the reporting of the results. Filtering using the inclusion criteria resulted in 17 eligible studies.

**Process of Metasynthesis**

Metasynthesis is similar to the more commonly known meta-analysis, the difference being that metasynthesis is for qualitative papers (Walker & Bryant, 2013). The descriptive validity for this metasynthesis, as suggested by Sandelowski & Barroso (2007), was maintained by; (a) a comprehensive search for literature; (b) author’s discussion and decisions on research terms and inclusion criteria; (c) assessment and appraisal of studies using Hoyt & Bhati (2007) and Kline (2008) and, (d) maintenance of an audit trail of search results and decisions. We discussed findings of the qualitative studies including characteristics, categories, and themes until agreement was reached through consensus.

The studies selected for this metasynthesis were characterized to give an overall picture of the content of the studies, what aspects of the supervision relationship was explored, whose experience was central, and how the exploration was conducted.

The purpose of the critique was to assess the quality of the methods used in the selected studies using a standard set of criteria. To assess the quality of the selected studies, we utilized four criteria outlined by Hoyt & Bhati (2007) and one described by Kline (2008). Hoyt & Bhati (2007) identified four dimensions of qualitative research critical to quality including focus of research, setting, researcher role, and presentation of findings. Further, Kline (2008) identified the concept of coherence as a significant consideration when assessing quality of qualitative research. Coherence of the research includes the
underlying epistemological assumptions, approach, methods, analysis, and presentation of results. For this review, we reviewed for Hoyt and Bhati’s criteria and coherence, including the purpose and research question, interview questions, data collection methods, analysis and results as part of the critique.

Analysis as a Part of Metasynthesis

Qualitative metasynthesis is defined as a form of scientific inquiry in which research findings about a target event, process, experience, or other phenomenon contained in written reports of completed qualitative studies are summed up to more usefully serve as a basis for practice or policy or for future research (Sandelowski, & Barroso, 2007). This metasynthesis of qualitative research followed the procedures outlined by Thomas & Harden (2008). The procedure involves a three stage thematic synthesis after extracting findings “(a) coding of text line-by-line; (b) the development of descriptive themes; (c) the generation of analytic themes. The development of descriptive themes remains close to the primary studies, whereas the analytical themes represent a stage of interpretation whereby the reviewers go beyond the primary studies and generate new interpretive constructs, explanations, or hypothesis (Thomas & Harden, 2008).

Results

This results section contains three sets of results derived from the characterization, methodological critique and metasynthesis of qualitative studies exploring related to the supervision relationship. Seventeen recent qualitative studies met criteria for inclusion in this metasynthesis (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Grant, Schofield, & Crawford, 2012; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Henderson, Cawyer-Stringer, & Watkins, 1999; Jernigan, Green, Helms, Perez-Gualdron, & Henze,
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2010; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox, Edwards, Hess, & Hill, 2011; Ladany, Constantine, Miller, Erickson, & Muse-Burke, 2000; Magnuson, Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000; Mangione, Mears, Vincent & Hawes, 2011; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006; Townend, 2008; Urdang 1999; West & Clark, 2004; Zaslavsky, Nunes, & Eizivik, 2005). Twelve of the studies were conducted in the United States and six were from other countries including; three from the United Kingdom, one from Brazil, one from Korea and one from Australia (see Appendix B, Table 1 & Appendix C, Table 2).

Summary of Study Characteristics

The studies were characterized with respect to participant demographics, researcher and participant professional orientation, supervision perspective (supervisor or supervisee), developmental level of supervisee, supervisor characteristics, model of supervision used if any, and central purpose of the study (see Appendix B, Table 1). Analysis of these characteristics of 17 qualitative studies on individual supervision revealed several trends, including the significance of the supervisory relationship, training and development of supervisors and supervisees, participant and researcher demographics, and supervision models. This section summarizes the major trends and patterns.

Many of the studies stated that the purpose of the research was for supervisee training or development (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Magnuson et al., 2000; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008; Urdang, 1999; West & Clark, 2005; Zaslavsky et al., 2005). All but one of the studies (Magnuson et al., 2000) engaged participants who were attending graduate level programs, with none of the studies focusing on licensee supervision and beyond,
demonstrating a gap in research on licensure supervision.

There was an even distribution of research focusing on both the supervisors’ and supervisees’ perspectives of the supervisory relationship. In general, specific models of supervision were not used in individual supervision; more often the supervisors’ theoretical orientation guided the supervision process.

Finally, the studies that defined expert supervisors’ characteristics were based on years of experience or academic achievement levels and not by the supervisor having specific training in supervision. Supervision is considered a key component in the preparation of counselors and the protection of the welfare of the clients, and yet supervisors typically receive little supervisor training (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). This is particularly significant as the focus and research in supervision has not produced a higher outcome of specifically trained supervisors based on these studies.

**Summary of Critique**

Overall the 17 qualitative studies that were critiqued, at best, partially met criteria for quality research based on Hoyt & Bahti (2007) and Kline’s (2008) principles and practices. In terms of the types of methods used by the studies, twelve of the studies critiqued utilized phenomenological methods, and five studies utilized grounded theory.

Due to the idiographic focus of qualitative research work, investigators in this tradition wish to establish a considerable acquaintance with their research participants (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). In this area the selected studies showed mixed and generally poor results on this criteria dimension. The research settings in which the behaviors of interest might normally be expected to occur only took place in the participant’s setting in three
studies (Bang & Park, 2009; Mangione et al., 2011; West & Clark, 2004) and fourteen studies either did not state the setting or it was not a natural setting.

To explore the extent to which the authors of these studies embrace the role of researcher as instrument, the studies were examined for (a) use of auditors as a check on findings of the main coder; (b) written reflection on the authors’ biases in the published article; and (c) explicit discussion of the desirability of minimizing or eliminating the effects of the researcher bias (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). This metasynthesis revealed issues related to researcher’s acknowledgement of their bias, which weakened the overall set of qualitative research. In eleven of the research studies critiqued, the authors did not adequately state or manage bias (see Appendix C, Table 2).

The characteristic of “presentation of findings” describes a final set of qualities that published qualitative research reports should use to present rich, complex understandings of idiographic research (Hoyt & Bahti, 2007). Studies should (a) present freestanding quotes from participants (one sentence in length); (b) present extended quotes (at least five lines in length); and (c) include identifiers with the quotations. This review revealed that the majority of the studies were relatively strong in demonstrating their presentation of findings in the area of supervision with the exception of two studies (Ladany et al., 2000; Zaslavsky et al., 2005) (see Appendix B, Table 2).

Studies were also assessed for coherence or the degree to which a consistent epistemological stance is clearly adhered throughout the study (Kline, 2008). Sixteen of the included studies met only partial criteria. Only one of the studies, Johnston & Milne, (2012), met full criteria for coherence. Surprisingly, in many cases the actual research question was not stated or if it was, it was not clear. This omission made it difficult to
determine coherence. Studies that did not state a specific qualitative method or stated using phenomenological qualitative method of research tended to show an overall treatment of the approach, methods, analysis and presentation of the results as similarly vague or unclear. Ultimately, despite methodological weaknesses all 17 studied were kept for metasynthetic analysis.

**Metasynthesis Results**

After the studies were characterized and critiqued, all 17 studies were analyzed using metasynthetic techniques. This metasynthesis of qualitative research procedure involves a three stage thematic synthesis after extracting findings. Although the development of descriptive themes remains close to the primary studies, the analytical themes represent a stage of interpretation whereby the reviewers move beyond the primary studies and generate new interpretive constructs, explanations or hypothesis (Thomas & Harden, 2008). From the metasynthesis, three separate but interrelated descriptive themes emerged that describe characteristics of the supervisor and supervisee experience of the supervisory relationship. The themes are: Supervisor Self-Awareness nurturing, Supervisee Self-Awareness, Navigating power & collaboration in a hierarchical system, and Supervisor self-disclosure as potentially beneficial or destructive. These themes will now be outlined and discussed. To review how the studies contributed to the emergent themes see Appendix A.

**Theme 1: Supervisor self-awareness nurturing supervisee self-awareness.** Self-awareness was defined as knowledge and awareness of the supervisors’ or supervisees’ own personality or character and a necessary condition for growth in supervision. The data from study results describe self-awareness as being valuable within the supervisory
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relationship, specifically, that the supervisor functions with a high level of self-awareness. However, the study results did not include direct descriptions of how to develop self-awareness within the supervisor, supervisee or in the supervisory relationship.

Both the supervisor and supervisee described the experience self-awareness in the majority of the studies. The self-awareness in some cases was spurred by a focus on culture and differences within the supervisory relationship. However, in these cases (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Jernigan et al., 2010; Mangione et al.; 2011) the studies had directly addressed self-awareness through the ideologies of feminism, diversity or multicultural perspectives in supervision. To that end, these ideologies emphasize self-awareness as core values in establishing skills and competencies accordingly.

Further, the participants in Urdang’s (1999) study indicated that self-reflection is the cornerstone of clinical skills as it involves the capacity to be self-aware and process what is happening in the clinical encounter. Most participant supervisors indicated that supervising increased their self-awareness and their capacity to reflect and analyze the components of their own work (p 93). Self-awareness was a noted quality of supervision that was concerned with reflection in the supervision process by the supervisor. Nelson et al., (2006) stated that the supervision relationship supports the importance of becoming aware of a person’s worldview and the importance of the supervisor in helping the supervisee identify what is unique about a client.

Another study (Ladany et al., 2000) brought to light the supervisors’ awareness leading to understanding counter-transference in the supervisory relationship to support resolving a number of interpersonal and environmental factors as well as the supervisors’
own unresolved personal issues (p. 109) that might be interfering with the supervisory relationship. Further, counter-transference was described in supervision as “broader than just listening, observing and indentifying … it is hearing, it is accepting, examining what you are thinking and what is happening to you” (Zaslavsky et al., 2005, p. 1108).

It seemed significant that supervisors were described as needing to be aware, have knowledge and support supervisees’ developmental level (Henderson et al., 1999). The significance of supervisees’ experience of self-awareness is also described in the studies but less so than supervisor self-awareness. Self-awareness by the supervisee is promoted through supervision (Townend, 2008). Johnston & Milne (2012) describe self-awareness being enhanced when supervisees allow themselves time and space immediately after the supervision session to think about the process and material more effectively. Grant et al., (2012) state that counterproductive events in supervision increase self-awareness by supervisee toward the client.

**Theme 2: Navigating power and collaboration in a hierarchical system.**

The theme of power and collaboration was defined as a significant tension experienced within the supervisory relationship between the supervisor and supervisee. During the qualitative metasynthesis process a theme of power and collaboration emerged that described how supervisors and supervisees experienced the supervisory relationship. Collectively, these studies reveal a power dynamic where the supervisor is reported to decide what happens in supervision, what is spoken or not spoken, who can say what, and when it is said. Based on that power dynamic, the supervisee is expected or willing to change for the supervisor to maintain the supervisory relationship.
For example, Johnston & Milne (2012) identified that there is an inherent power tension between supervisor and supervisee because of the evaluation aspect of the supervisory relationship. Additionally, Mangione et al., (2011) referred to power from both the supervisor and supervisee perspective described when supervisors considered power, it was in “the spirit of minimizing its significance” (p. 163) or noting their discomfort with it whereas for the supervisees’ “power was an affectively charged issue” (p. 156). This is a significant difference in regard to the experiences of power by the supervisor and supervisee.

Further, Gray et al, (2001) described counterproductive events in supervision that generally resulted in the supervisee changing their approach to the supervisor, suggesting that the supervisee acquiesces to the supervisors’ position to maintain the supervisory relationship. In several studies supervisees’ described being affectively charged by the power differential in the supervisory relationship to the point that they adjust to the supervisors’ expectations to maintain the relationship. Magnuson et al., (2000) described supervisee experiences in which the supervisor was intolerant of difference in the supervisory relationship. Supervisor attributes such as impatience, rigidity, depersonalization, and inflexibility contribute to a poor supervisory relationship.

Further, power tensions occur in the supervisory relationship when racial identity is considered if the supervisee has a stronger sense of racial identity then the supervisor, and brings this up in supervision as opposed to the supervisor bringing it up. Conversely, supervisors whose predominant racial identity status is more developed than their supervisees have the potential of modeling racial and cultural competence in their role as teacher, counselor, supervisor, and advocate in the supervisory context (Jernigan et al.,
2010). The range of conflict responses depended on the disparity in racial identity development between the supervisor and supervisee. A further study (Ancis & Marshall, 2010) reported that with a culturally competent supervisor, power discussions were often initiated by supervisors and centered on different aspects of the supervisor – supervisee – client relationship.

Overall, it seemed clear that collaboration in supervision is a highly rated quality with many positive attributes that enhance the supervisory relationship. However, because supervisors may underplay the characteristic of power in the supervisory role, as it may seem like an undesirable attribute, this very lack of transparency about the issues of power may impact collaboration in the supervisory relationship.

Developing a supervisory alliance of mutual trust (Johnston & Milne, 2012) increases collaboration; it is the joint responsibility of supervisor and supervisee, creating a stronger relationship and team approach. Additional attributes such as empathy, acceptance, teamwork, and mutuality contribute to the collaboration process. (Henderson et al, 1999; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Mangione et al, 2011; and Townend, 2008). When the supervisor establishes a non-hierarchical relationship and mutual dialogue there is openness to a solution being found rather than one that is imposed (Mangione et al., 2011; Townend, 2008). West & Clark, (2004) stated that their research with supervision dyads has shown the value and potential of collaborative work.

Townend, (2008) discussed a tension with power and collaboration when the respondents refer to the relationship with the supervisee as being collaborative and also the need to direct and be assertive with the
Theme 3: Supervisor self-disclosure as potentially beneficial or destructive. The theme of self-disclosure by the supervisor was defined as the supervisor making known information about themselves or their work during supervision. During the qualitative metasynthesis a theme of self-disclosure emerged that described how supervisors and supervisees experienced the supervisory relationship. Self-disclosure was described in the results as important and having both positive and negative results. Several studies described the theme of self-disclosure by the supervisor as positive when the supervisor was in tune with the supervisees’ developmental level and needs, the self-disclosure can normalize supervisees’ experience and be supportive. Inappropriate or unhelpful self-disclosure by the supervisor created difficulty in the supervisory relationship and was perceived as hindering the supervisees’ work with clients.

Positive or useful self-disclosure by the supervisor included self-disclosure that was relevant to and normalized the clinical work and generally strengthened the supervisory relationship (Knox et al., 2011). Supervisor self-disclosure, when considered authentic and genuine, (Mangione et al., 2011) was considered helpful. Supervisors’ self-disclosure specifically related to cultural bias in a multicultural context was considered important (Ancis & Marshall, 2010). Supervisor self-disclosure that was hindering to the supervisory relationship or caused counterproductive events included inappropriate self-disclosure, (Gray et al., 2001 and West & Clark, 2004), which was felt to be too personal, inappropriate or distressing (Knox et al., 2011). Gray et al., (2001) also discussed how a counterproductive event in supervision negatively affects the supervisees’ work with their clients, as well as their motivation to continue disclosing to the supervisor.

Overall, data indicated that supervisor self-disclosure could be helpful and valuable
when it was appropriate and used to normalize and support the supervisee and client work. For most participants, the supervisor’s disclosure was positive and arose from a good relationship (Knox, et al., 2011). Inappropriate self-disclosure by the supervisor negatively impacted the supervisory relationship, including impacting the supervisee to become more guarded in the supervisory relationship.

**Discussion of the Synthesis**

This metasynthesis aimed to make sense of qualitative studies on supervision in terms of the supervision relationship. From the analysis, three separate but interrelated themes emerged that describe how supervisors and supervisees experience the supervisory relationship. The themes include supervisor self-awareness, negotiating power & collaboration in a hierarchical, and supervisor self-disclosure.

Overall, the studies described elements of relationship dynamics between supervisor and supervisee. This makes sense given the history of supervision developing from a psychodynamic process (Bernard, 2005). Throughout the studies the importance of supervisor self-awareness was described as a desirable quality and particularly valued by supervisees in regard to the supervisory relationship. When the supervisor was experienced as being self-aware they were more likely to arrive at an understanding of the supervisory relationship that is unencumbered by their personal or professional issues (Ladany et al., 2000). As a result, the self-aware supervisor seemed less likely to participate in unhealthy power struggles or communication that is unhelpful, and be more authentic and collaborative in the supervisory relationship. Several studies described the theme of supervisor self-disclosure as positive; when the supervisor was in tune with the supervisee and the discloser supported the supervisory relationship. Whereby,
inappropriate self-disclosure by the supervisor had a negative impact on the supervisory relationship and that this was likely to further result in supervisee non-disclosure in supervision, which most often concerns supervision-related issues. Appropriate supervisor self-disclosure appeared linked to supervisor self-awareness in understanding what information was useful to share to support the supervisee growth and development as well and the supervisory relationship. None of the articles in this metasynthesis described how the supervisor might attain self-awareness except in the examples of studies where ideologies such feminism or multiculturalism were explored in supervision (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Jernigan et al., 2010; Mangione et al., 2011). These ideologies bring with them a deeper exploration of relationship qualities and this may suggest a significant gap in current supervisor training and practices.

Navigating power and collaboration in a hierarchical system was presented as a significant struggle in the supervisory relationship. Relational conflict in supervision has not been given much consideration in the research literature despite the fact that it occurs with some degree of frequency (Quarto, 2002). At the core of the issue the duality of the supervisor role includes the need to be directive, to teach, to counsel, to assess, and to evaluate. A power dynamic of some degree is inevitable in the supervisory relationship. Adams, Bell, & Griffith, (2007), address the impact of internalized subordination, which includes such feelings as inferiority and can result in self-concealment, resignation, isolation, and powerlessness. If the power dynamic in the supervisory relationship is such that supervisees may be internalizing acceptance of “the way things are” (Adams et al., 2007, p. 32) this is highly concerning. This suggests a position of privilege by the supervisor with a negative and oppressive impact on the supervisee. Collaboration is a
desirable and helpful quality in the supervisory relationship (Falender & Shafranske, 2012; Spiller, Byrnes, & Ferguson, 2013). However, the practical balance of managing the tension of power and collaboration in the supervisory relationship was not addressed directly. This is an important area for future research for supervisor training and practice.

**Implications for Research, Practice and Policy**

These findings enable the practice of supervision to be considered more fully and offer insight into the supervisory relationship. Metasynthesis reviews allow the findings about a target phenomenon to be looked at as a coherent whole to serve as a provisional basis for practice or policy (Sandelowski, 2012).

First, the findings indicate implications for future research as only one of the 17 studies met criteria to be considered very good qualitative research. This is an indication of the inherent complexity of qualitative research but also suggests a need for better coherence in qualitative research practices. Future qualitative researchers should work toward a standard of qualitative research that reflects defined characteristics of qualitative methodology and coherence.

Second, there is a gap in qualitative research on supervision beyond graduate school, namely licensure supervision, which could yield important information about the supervisory relationship. In particular, there is minimal research about the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision.

Third, the findings describe the experience of the supervisor self-awareness in the supervisory relationship, however, there is no evidence as to how this is developed or included in the training of supervisors. From these findings it would appear that utilizing
other ideologies such as feminism and multiculturalism in supervisor training might begin to bring more focus on reflection and self-awareness competencies for supervisors’ training.

Finally, the supervisory relationship is complex. A central concern is the balance of managing the inherent power dynamic in the relationship. While this tension is described in these studies, none of the research explores ways to resolve this tension in the practice of supervision and this would be valuable information for the field.

Limitations

Studies in this review provide knowledge about ways in which the supervisor and supervisee are impacted by the supervisory relationship. Only one of the 17 studies met criteria to be considered a very good qualitative study, suggesting a complexity in qualitative research and research about the supervisory relationship. In the attempt to account for researcher bias and expectations in the context of analyzing the data it is possible the researchers’ perception influenced aspects of this review. It is important that further research is replicated and there are extended qualitative investigations into the supervisory relationship.
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Abstract

Review of supervision literature suggests that description of licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision could be useful to expand existing supervision training and practices. This study provided a systematic exploration of experiences of expert licensure supervisors. Results indicated that licensure supervisors’ experienced conceptual considerations that informed and supported the supervision process. The supervision process included two interrelated properties of supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. The supervision process occurred within the context of supervisor professional development, motivation and personal & professional values. The article addresses limitations and suggests implications for training of licensure supervisors, supervision and research.
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Introduction

There are few activities within counselor training as important as clinical supervision (Bernard, 2004). Clinical supervision is significant in the training of counseling supervisees both during their graduate training and licensure process. Supervision has become one of the most consistent requirements in the ongoing, post-degree, continuing education of counselors (Fall & Sutton, 2003). However, licensure supervision differs from university supervision. In particular, licensure supervision lacks the clarity of course evaluation or syllabi, and the supervisor has fewer opportunities to observe the supervisee. Further, typically a business relationship has been entered into between licensure supervisor and supervisee, creating a new dynamic. In addition, licensure supervisors often assume the sole responsibility for overseeing supervisees’ work and professional standing for licensure but specific supervision guidelines are beyond the scope and purposes of regulatory boards (Magnuson, Norem, & Wilcoxon, 2000).

The complexity of licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision is an important area of research yet very little is actually known about it (Borders & Cashwell, 1995; Magnuson & Wilcoxon, 1998). Qualitative research is particularly valuable in understanding meaning in relationship. The purpose of this study was to understand the experience of licensure supervisors working with supervisees in the field. This paper explores the importance of supervision and the process of licensure supervision including the difference between university and licensure supervision, regulatory bodies and supervisee concerns.
Supervision and Licensure

Supervision has a long and significant place in the field of psychology and counseling starting as far back as the 1920s in the tradition of psychoanalysis (Bernard, 2005). Clinical supervision is an intervention that is central to the preparation of counselors, psychologists, social workers and psychiatrists (Lichtenberg & Goodyear, 2000).

Evidence of the importance of supervision comes from training program standards and licensing regulations (Fall & Sutton, 2003). Graduate counseling programs typically require counseling practicum or internship type experiences with supervision. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) approved programs further specify ratios of supervision for hours and standards for supervisors (CACREP, 2009 Standards). Significant focus has been given to supervisors who provide clinical supervision for counseling students within the confines of counselor education programs but less so of licensure supervisors. However, the need for supervision does not end once a student graduates from a training program in counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

The importance of supervision has resulted in the emergence of training standards for credentialing and regulations of supervisors. The earliest training, credentialing and regulation of supervisors was in 1997 with the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credentialing by the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) which required supervisors of counselors to demonstrate some knowledge and training to provide supervision (“Approved Clinical Supervisor,” n.d., para. 1). Further, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) Ethical Guidelines (March 1993) for
Counseling Supervisors were established followed by the American Counseling Association (ACA) standards and ethical guidelines for counseling supervisors (ACA Code of Ethics, 2005). However, the lack of dedicated, formal, and standardized training in supervision seems likely to result in variability in how supervisors function (Robiner, Saltzman, Hoberman & Schirvar, 1997).

What research and literature have suggested about supervision, licensure has mandated (Fall & Sutton, 2003). Professional counselors are licensed in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The licensure criteria may vary between states but always includes supervision. Most states mandate between two and three thousand hours of post-graduate, supervised clinical experience as a licensure requirement (ACA, 2010). The basis of attaining those hours is primarily through individual clinical supervision.

Licensure supervision differs from university-based supervision in several ways. Licensure supervisors work without the clarity of evaluation criteria provided by course syllabi and accreditation standards and have less contact with the supervisee so less opportunity to observe clinical work. As a result, licensure supervisors do not have the same structure or exposure in working with the supervisees and have to independently assess for competency. In addition, licensure supervisors often enter into a fee-for-service agreement creating a direct business relationship with the supervisee (Magnuson et al., 2000) Negotiating supervision fees is unique to licensure supervision.

Additionally, while university and licensure supervision are both tasked with gatekeeping functions, licensure supervisors may not have as many resources and tools to assist with that function. Research has found that faculty report being aware of student impairment in counseling and that there is compelling reason for concern that a
substantial number of deficient students may graduate from training programs untouched by gatekeeping or interventions (Forrest, Elman, Gizara, & Vacha-Haase, 1999; Russell, DuPres, Beggs, Peterson & Anderson, 2007). Faculty may assume that the supervisor will address issues and supervisors conversely assume faculty had already addressed them. In the end, licensure supervisors become responsible to oversee supervisees who may be impaired, requiring additional support with fewer structures in place. Evaluative tools for licensure supervision are increasing, attempting to provide standardized, objective and impartial measures but the evaluations occur within a relational context and can undermine their value (Bogo, Regehr, Power & Regehr, 2007). Current writing includes statements about how effective supervisors should conduct supervision, including method, flexibility in supervisory approach, supervisee developmental levels and ongoing feedback and evaluation (Aasheim, 2012; Campbell, 2006; and Milne, 2009). However, the specification of guidelines providing the supervision is beyond the scope and purposes of regulatory boards (Magnuson et al., 2000).

While licensure supervision is important yet distinct from university supervision, very little research has been conducted to better understand the experience. One quantitative study (Borders & Cashwell, 1995) and one qualitative study (Magnuson & Wilcoxson, 1998), however, do provide some insight. The Borders & Cashwell (1995) study aimed to provide a baseline about current supervision practices and the impact of supervision regulation, education and experience requirements, on the conduct of supervision. The participants were supervisors in two states, one state with supervision regulations and the other state without regulations. Supervisors were surveyed using a four-part questionnaire. In the first part the supervisor described their practices (frequency, fees,
number of supervisees, interventions, format, evaluation practices). In the second part, supervisors indicated their reasons for becoming supervisors and also rated their skills and knowledge. The third part included descriptive demographics (age, degrees, work setting, supervision orientation). The fourth part of the questionnaire contained questions about continuing education activities and were included solely for the state board’s use. The results included participants relying on counseling rather than supervision models to guide their work, with self-report being the most frequent intervention and findings showed that “supervision training seemed to have little if any relationship to confidence on one’s supervision knowledge and skills” (Borders & Cashwell, 1995, p. 61). Further, that “supervision regulations may improve the quality of supervision and one example of that was the possible use of more direct supervision methods” (Borders & Cashwell, 1995, p. 61). This was the first attempt at a comprehensive study of licensure supervision, however the supervisors’ experience of the supervisory relationship was not explored.

Magnuson & Wilcoxon (1998) published two articles on licensure supervision using the same qualitative research. The research was conducted to identify perceived needs and existing practices for clinical supervision of pre-licensed counselors in the state of Alabama. Participants included licensure supervisors, pre-licensed counselors and counselor educators. Findings included twelve thematic categories: (a) benefits of licensure supervision for counselors, (b) perceived purposes of licensure supervision, (c) responsibilities attributed to licensure supervisors, (d) perceived professional needs of pre-licensure counselors, (e) practice and approaches for licensure supervision, (f) the process of supervision, (g) successful licensure supervision based on counselor performance, (h) characteristics attributed to licensure supervisors, (i) ineffective
licensure supervision, (j) concerns related to professional ethics, (k) training for licensure supervisors, and (l), recommendations for improving licensure supervision.

Magnuson & Wilcoxon (1998a) identified that there was less consistency for post-graduate training and supervision as compared to that which occurs during graduate school. The study also identified that there was wide latitude of supervisory approaches and requirements and that attention toward effective and efficient training opportunities for licensure supervisors and pre-licensed counselors’ was warranted. Magnuson & Wilcoxon (1998b) addressed what successful supervision of pre-licensure counselors’ consisted of and how that would be recognized. This study identified characteristics and skills such as astuteness in case conceptualization and treatment planning, versatility in application of theoretical models, mastery of facilitation skills, judicious understanding of ethical guidelines, and demonstrations of professional conduct. The participants emphasized the need for guidelines related to expected competence levels for pre-licensed counselors’ at the culmination of the required supervision. The pragmatic question that evolved was “How would the counseling profession operationalize expectations for counselor licensure candidates?” (Magnusson & Wilcoxon, 1998b, p. 41). The Magnuson & Wilcoxon (1998) study emphasized important characteristics of supervision such as the benefits, purposes, responsibilities, needs, approaches, training and recommendations for licensure supervision but did not explore the complex process of the supervisory relationship.

Whilst quite a bit is known about supervision within the confines of counselor education programs, not much is known about what happens in licensure supervision. Licensure supervision is important because it is here that the continuing education of
counselors occurs, most importantly for the protection and care of clients and for ongoing skill development and competence of the supervisee. Licensure supervisors are also charged with determining whether a supervisee meets the qualification for professional standing of relevant regulatory bodies and is able to practice independently. With licensure supervision comes significant responsibility but limited support, which has implications for licensure supervisors experience of supervision.

Given the importance of licensure supervision the purpose of this study is to better understand the experiences of licensure supervisors in the process of supervision. The specific research question that will be addressed is, “How do licensure supervisors experience the process of licensure supervision?” Existing studies provide limited understanding of the supervisors’ experience of the process of licensure supervision. The current study is designed to address these identified gaps in literature. The results of understanding the licensure supervisors’ experience of this complex process may inform training, practice and policy.

Method

This study employed a qualitative methodology to better understand the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. The purpose of qualitative research is to step beyond what is known and enter the world of participants, to see from their perspective, and in doing so make discoveries that will contribute to the development of the empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Proponents of qualitative research emphasize the distinctive role it plays in reaching facets of the human experience out of the reach of quantitative methods (Sandelowski, 2012). This study sought to understand the complexity of the licensure supervisors’ experience of the supervision process.
Within qualitative research there are several approaches available. A grounded theory approach was chosen for this study. Grounded theory is a qualitative research design in which the inquirer generates a general explanation (a theory) of a process, action or interaction shaped by the views of the participants (Creswell, 2007; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). A grounded theory approach was particularly useful in this case because of its ability to move beyond description and to generate or discover theory, an abstract analytical schema of a process (Creswell, 2007). Grounded theory is a systematic collection and analysis of data for the purpose of developing the theory based on the participants’ perceptions and experiences. Using a grounded theory affords a better understanding of the experience of licensure supervisors in the process of supervision.

The epistemology that was most appropriate for this research is a social constructivist approach, because the goal of this research relies on the participants’ view of the situation (Creswell, 2007; Klein, 2008). The social constructivist approach is predicated on the assumption that the terms by which the world is understood are social artifacts, products of historically situated interchanges between people (Gergen, as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). This approach was meaningful to this study because social constructivism challenges some objective basis for knowledge claims and the process of knowledge construction (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) allowing for the exploration and expression of relationships among people - and even embracing - subjectivity (Morrow, 2005).

**Researcher as Instrument**

Qualitative research culture embraces the role of *researcher as instrument*, in a frank acknowledgement that the conclusions and events of a qualitative investigation are
jointly determined by the subjectivities of researchers and participants (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). Qualitative research requires the researcher to invest in the process but remain somewhat objective, and this can be a difficult balance. As part of accounting for researcher bias, the researchers disclosed experiences and assumptions that may affect the study. One of the primary researchers is a licensure supervisor, has taught a 30-hour clinical supervisor training preparing clinicians to meet state based registration criteria, and has generally benefited from positive and supportive supervision. The second primary researcher has taught doctoral level supervision coursework and has provided supervision of supervisors to licensure supervisors as a part of doctoral internships. The primary researchers have both attended CACREP doctoral programs with specific supervisor training and CACREP standards applied to internship work. This training may bring with it an expectation of standards of licensure supervisors.

Both researchers brainstormed and processed assumptions held about licensure supervision. A summary of assumptions include, (a) licensure supervisors generally do not received formal training in supervision; (b) they struggle with gatekeeping, not knowing what to report and to whom; (c) licensure supervision might take a backseat to administrative supervision; (d) licensure supervisors are more mature (10+ years) in the profession and generally enjoy providing supervision; and (e) licensure supervisors are busy people and do not always have the time to process, consult, or research issues they face as part of supervision.

Participants

Research participants were selected based on specific criteria central to this study, utilizing purposeful sampling (Morse, 1994). The researchers selected individuals and
sites for study because they could purposefully inform understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study (Creswell, 2007). The study included five female and four male participants who experienced an average of 13.6 years practicing as supervisors. The participants worked in private practice, agency or hospital settings. The participants primarily identified as white / European with one participant identifying as multiracial. Four participants held doctoral level degrees and five held a master level degree in counseling or psychology. The research participants met the minimum licensure supervisor requirements of the state in which they provide supervision services.

Access to this population was gained by contacting professional colleagues; state counseling list-serves and state licensure supervisory directories for the states of Oregon and Washington were utilized for contact information. Oregon and Washington were chosen for participant recruitment due to their convenient location and the differing licensure supervisor training requirements. Participants who met general criteria contacted the student researcher via telephone or electronic mail, were screened and then enrolled in the study.

**Data Collection**

Data collection occurred through interviews. The initial interviews were held in the naturalistic setting where the behaviors of interest might normally be expected to occur (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). Initial interviews lasted 45-60 minutes each. The participants were asked semi-structured questions and the interview(s) were audio-recorded and then transcribed in full. The initial interview questions were designed based on a current literature review and meant to be specific enough to focus participants on their experience of providing licensure supervision, yet broad enough to allow them freedom
to express their unique experiences. The initial interview questions were:

1. How do you experience the process of licensure supervision?
2. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the supervisory relationship?
3. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in promoting client welfare?
4. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in counselor development?
5. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the gatekeeping role?
6. As a licensure supervisor, how did you experience preparation as a supervisor as part of this process?

One additional round of interviews of similar length was held via telephone, using theoretical sampling to further the analysis. Theoretical sampling is intentional and induces the researcher to focus attention on samples representative of less than optimally developed categories (Sheperis, Young & Daniels, 2010). Concepts were derived from data during analysis, and questions about those concepts drove the next round of data collection until saturation or no new concepts emerged (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The questions developed for additional rounds were designed to clarify and extend the concepts described by participants in the prior round.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis procedures for grounded theory consist of three major phases: Open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Creswell, 2007). Open coding begins with breaking data apart and delineating concepts to stand for blocks of raw data. Next, axial coding moves the data analysis further as this process relates concepts to each other based on emerging themes. Ongoing interviews allow the researcher to both link and elaborate
categories and finally reach the central phenomenon (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Selective coding is the final phase of the coding process. During selective coding a theory is built around the central category or phenomenon. This entails generating propositions or statements about the connectedness of categories in the theory (Creswell, 2007).

Journaling and memoing were used throughout data collection. These notes are a specialized type of written record that contained the product of analysis and described the researcher’s observations and personal feelings through the data collection and analysis process (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The theory will be provided in a narrative form and in a visual format using a diagram. The grounded theory established through this process was then articulated in the results section of this study.

**Trustworthiness**

The inquiry aim of constructivism is the production of reconstructed understandings, wherein the traditional positivist criteria of internal and external validity are replaced by the terms, *trustworthiness* and *authenticity* (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Guba, (1981) proposed four considerations (credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability) that should be addressed in evaluating qualitative research (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007).

In order to manage influences and enhance the credibility of this study multiple strategies and techniques were used throughout the research, including prolonged engagement and triangulation. Prolonged engagement renders the researcher open to multiple influences, multiple shapers and contextual factors and builds trust with participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Prolonged engagement was obtained by doing multiple interviews with participants over an approximately 5-month time span and
follow up was used as necessary to seek clarification on data. Every effort was made to conduct interviews face-to-face so that rapport and a collaborative relationship developed. The use of reflexive journaling to document and enrich the analytic process supported prolonged engagement. The researcher also utilized techniques of triangulation, which involved using multiple sources and different methods of verifying interpretations and findings of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This was done through multiple interviews, researcher reflexivity, and member checking. Member checking is the process through which the researcher will provide the study participants an opportunity to react to the analytic categories identified, interpretations made, and conclusions drawn (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Transferability** refers to the extent to which the reader is able to generalize the findings of the study to his or her own context (Morrow, 2005). Transferability requires the researcher to provide the database that makes transferrable judgments possible, which includes a working hypothesis together with a description of the time and context in which the research was undertaken through the use of thick and rich description (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This was accomplished by providing context to the study using participant quotes to support the findings.

**Dependability** deals with the way in which the study was conducted; it should be consistent over time, researchers and analysis techniques. This was accomplished through carefully tracking the emerging research design through record keeping using an audit trail, which is a detailed chronology of research activities (Morrow, 2005).

**Confirmability** is based on the acknowledgement that the researcher is never objective (Morrow, 2005). Confirmability approaches included engaging an external audit process,
allowing for an objective observer to assess the process of interviewing, as well as data collection, analyses, interpretation and conclusion. As the audits for both of these characteristics are technically different, diligence about maintaining and retaining the necessary documentation and materials for future examination was required. We included an audit trail maintaining raw data, data reduction and analysis products, data reconstruction and synthesis products, process notes, and materials related to dispositions made (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). While using these techniques as a way of promoting trustworthiness and authenticity, we also engaged in the aforementioned reflexive journaling to better understand the biases we may bring to the research topic and how those biases may affect the research process.

**Results**

In alignment with the grounded theory approach, data was distilled into a theory. The process included the researchers evaluating the data for consistency, checking for the validity of concepts against the data and developing lesser categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Through initial open coding, broad categories emerged as participants described their experiences of licensure supervision. Axial coding was then used to examine the structure and process of the categories identified in open coding, and the researchers looked for relationships, properties and dimensions of the categories (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In the subsequent selective coding process the categories were connected into a larger schema according to their relationship with the central category (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Data analysis generated four major categories that described the participants’ experience of licensure supervision: (a) *supervisor professional development*; (b) *motivation*; (c) *personal and professional values*; and (d) *licensure supervision process*.
The participants typically described their experiences of licensure supervision based on the central category of the *licensure supervision process*, which is the act of being in the process of, or simply put, doing supervision. The remaining three categories *supervisor professional development, motivation and personal and professional values* informed and supported the *licensure supervision process*. The diagram (see Figure 1) shows the participants’ experience of the *licensure supervision process* emerging from *supervisor professional development, motivation, and personal and professional values*. The *supervision process* contained two interrelated properties, *supervisor actions and supervisor challenges*.

**Experiencing Supervisor Professional Development**

The contextual category of *professional development* was defined as the participants’ preparation for licensure supervision and included the common experiences of participants who shared backgrounds as professional therapists and counselors and who sought out opportunities to become licensure supervisors. These experiences added to the participants’ knowledge and skills as a licensure supervisor. The participants described a readiness to become supervisors and they all engaged in required *training(s)* for licensure supervision. Participants experienced *supervisor professional development* as the culmination of past and present experiences, specific trainings, and self-reflection (see Figure 1).

Participants described the importance of professional development through their own experiences of being in the field working as professional counselors and therapists. Here participant 5 illustrated the experience of readiness through professional experience:

After many years of work as a therapist I felt I had something to offer as a supervisor.
The experience of readiness lead participants to consider becoming licensure supervisors, which was followed by participants engaging in specific training to become a licensure supervisor. Participant 1 illustrated his experience:

I’ve had to raise my bar a little bit for licensure supervision with formal training. So along with doing the formal training that is required, I also did my own kind of review of the different theories and models that I frankly hadn’t used in a while. So when a supervisee says, well, I’m using this cognitive approach, and then I can kind of help them tailor that a little bit.

These specific supervision trainings added a knowledge base about licensure supervision.

Further, participants also described experiencing self-reflection as part of professional development. Experiencing self-reflection included participants thinking about their experiences in order to arrive at an understanding of that experience. Participants described self-reflection as an important characteristic of their experience of licensure supervision. For example, participants stated:

P 8 My intuition guided me in the midst of supervising.

P 2 And so if I start feeling in my body like something is really not right, I feel tense and uncomfortable, there is no way that I can be authentic and working well with the person if that’s coming out.

Participants stressed the importance of supervisor professional development as a significant contributor to their over-all experience of licensure supervision.

Experiencing Motivation

The second category that served as a context within which participants experience the licensure supervision process was experiencing motivation. Participants described
experiencing challenges during licensure supervision, however, participants also described significant motivation through influences and rewards, such as enjoying supporting the supervisees’ development and an increase in professional status, which brought balance to experiencing licensure supervision challenges (see Figure 1). The category of experiencing motivation contained a property of experiencing influences and incentives that ranged from immediate influences and incentives to long-term influences and incentives. Immediate Influences and incentives were described as motivating because they created active energy during the here-and-now of licensure supervision. For example:

P 8 I think that it is the mutuality between offering the expertise that I have and asking good questions, which stimulates me and hopefully the supervisee. It’s so mutual and I also look forward to learning more. And so when people ask me about different areas that need to be covered or just in general clinical or ethical questions, it’s really so mutual because it makes me think and it hopefully stimulates the other person to be thinking as well so it creates the question (that) might then generate a wonderful dialogue.

Experiencing long-term influences and incentives in licensure supervision was described as being motivated by far reaching factors experienced both during and beyond the immediacy of the licensure supervision process. Participants described experiencing long-term influences and incentives including dimensions of wanting to insure supervisees have a good experience of supervision and a sense of contributing to the profession. For example:

P 2: The positive things about licensure, especially if you think licensure are making sense and are good then licensure supervision will even ensure more that we are creating, hopefully, a generation of people that have better skills and are more ethical and professional.

P 9 Well, I feel an obligation, a sense of responsibility of caring for the profession but particularly the people going into the profession where they are relatively
independently functioning. I still like what I do and I think it is a worthwhile thing to do and I appreciate when some younger people show some passion and aptitude for it. That’s probably the thing that most motivates me.

Participants further described experiencing long-term influences and incentives as motivational because they benefit from the process. Here participant 3 described significant reward:

I cannot lie that it is a prestige bump as well as far as the social construct of what we hold up or adhere to in life. The idea that if we are a boss we have some how arrived in your career. I can’t lie there. There is some internal jolly.

Experiencing motivation in supervision was described as stimulating and generally positive in nature. These positive experiences brought balance to the overall experiences of licensure supervision process for the supervisor.

Experiencing Personal and Professional values

The third category that served as a context within which participants experience the licensure supervision process was experiencing personal and professional values. Participants described their experiences of personal and professional values as being aware of the intrinsic values and principles that guided their knowledge and conduct while providing licensure supervision (see Figure 1). The delineated range of personal and professional values included promoting growth and development of the supervisee and contributing to the greater professional community including generativity.

Participants described how their values directly impacted their work as licensure supervisors through their valuing of promoting growth and development of supervisee. Participant 9 described:
So, I think that is part of my meaning in supervising so they can be as well prepared as I can help them to be. It is also to help people in a way that minimizes harm to people, so protecting the consumer as well. I think working in a medical context I am always reminded about what I don’t know and so I think part of my meaning is in upgrading who mental health practitioners are. So it is not about the model or the moment or the catchy idea that is not as helpful or proven to be effective. So, as much as I can learn that I can pass that on and help them to be much better licensure supervisees.

Participants further described important personal and professional values being realized by contributing to the greater professional community, including generativity. Here participant 3 described the experience:

Again, it provides meaning in my life. Not only do I help supervisees feel confident, competent and safe but, indirectly I am hoping it will help them help their clients and help the world. So that is, you know, provides a lot of meaning in my life. I mean I am not always thinking about this all of the time but I am trying to make the world a better place. I may have mentioned this last time. You know, that is the ultimate goal, the thing that helps me sleep at night. That gets me through my life and makes all of the effort worth it, you know. Meaning that if I can help therapists help clients then in my belief system in a small way making the world a better place.

Licensure supervisors described experiences of personal and professional values as a sense of productivity and accomplishment by contributing to supervisees, professional and broader communities through supervision.

**Experiencing the Licensure Supervision Process**

The central category, licensure supervision process (see Figure 2), was described by participants as the act and experience of doing licensure supervision, which was supported by the contextual categories of supervisor professional development, motivation and personal and professional values (see Figure 1). The participants described the licensure supervision process being at the core of their experience of licensure supervision. The licensure supervision process was
informed by licensure requirements and the participants’ sense of responsibility for developing the supervisees’ competence, ethical decision making behaviors, and collaboration with the supervisee in preparation for licensure. The *licensure supervision process* was described as having two distinct but interrelated properties, *supervisor actions* and *supervisor challenges* as part of the *licensure supervision process*.

Participants described *supervisor actions* as the opening for the *licensure supervision process* and included three main components (a) *screening*; (b) *structure and focus*; and (c) *developing relationship*. *Screening* potential supervisees was described as a selection process wherein participants decided whether they were able or willing to work with a supervisee for licensure supervision. The decision-making process was generally described as a decision made by the licensure supervisor. Participants described making efforts to screen incoming supervisees for best fit and to minimize potential liability concerns. Participant 6 shared her experience on *screening*:

> I will only take a supervisee that I truly feel like I am a good fit for, or feel like I really trust their judgment and trust that we can work well together. And so I’ve told several graduates that I don’t know if I’m a good fit for you and this is why. And sometimes it’s just that I think they’re too comfortable with me and they need a different perspective. I want them to find someone that they are not familiar with.

Once a decision was made following the *screening* process the licensure supervisor established *structure and focus* for the *licensure supervision process*. *Structure and focus* included experiences that were *immediate* and practical considerations such as time, dates, fees and expectations in the working process. *Immediate* characteristics focused on establishing how the *licensure supervision process* worked, participant 1 described this experience:
I have a supervision agreement that I enter into with all of my supervisees that describes the process as two things. One is promoting their growth and development. And the other is to meet the legal requirements of their practice. So there are two things that I need to be paying attention to simultaneously. One is providing them with the hours that they need. That’s kind of the process, you know, they need to go through a certain amount of hours in order to qualify for their licensure. The other is the content. Actually getting into how they perceive counseling, what their struggles are, what they believe their strengths are and what they believe they need to improve on.

In addition, the *licensure supervision process* required the supervisor be aware of all future requirements for the supervisee, including state regulations, required hours, ethical issues, client safety and welfare. Here participant 4 described the experience:

The complication of it is state regulations. I don’t care if they’re getting licensed to be a mental health counselor, a psychologist or a marriage and family therapist or a social worker, all of them, which I’ve supervised toward licensure have just an incredible curvy journey in our state legislature towards licensure. To the point that I’m continually checking with them and saying, did you check with the state on that? Whoever you talk to write down their name. You don’t want to get to the end of this process and have them tell you the hours don’t count.

As participants described *supervisor actions* they emphasized the importance of developing a supervision relationship with the supervisee, which included the development of supervisee and roles of supervisor. Participants described the development of the supervisee within the supervision relationship as creating the opportunity to build supervisee strengths as well as being able to be corrective, as needed. Here participant 3 illustrated the convergence of the development of the supervisee within the supervision relationship and supervisor roles:

And so being more like a mentor to a person is how I see the process. And so I’m thinking about that when we’re looking at things, we’re looking at not just like this specific skill of how to do therapy with a client, but more about what it is like to be a counselor, generally speaking. In life, how you take care of yourself, how you conduct
yourself, how you conduct yourself with clients, with other professionals, so it is all there. So there’s also a give and take and talk about it. So I can sometimes talk about my own experiences with something as a way to provide them with insight and information, or amalgamate some of the things. So that is what I’m hoping is what they will walk away from is not just having a specific skill in doing work with clients, but more that they also have the depth of being in this field in the world and what’s going on with this field. Until you have that relationship everything else goes in one ear and out the other.

Participants emphasized unique characteristics of the licensure supervision process when describing the experiences of supervisor actions. These characteristics included screening, being aware of licensure rules and regulations, and the evaluative and gatekeeping role of licensure supervision. Participants described establishing the supervisor actions as the starting point for beginning the supervision process.

Supervisor challenges are interconnected to supervisor actions within the licensure supervision process (see Figure 2). Participants described supervisor challenges as issues or barriers that arise during the licensure supervision process. Two dimensions that emerged were structural issues and relational issues in the licensure supervision process.

Structural issues were rooted in the participants’ experience of encountering challenges during the licensure supervision process that were related to themselves or systems such as the universities, agencies and professional licensing boards. Supervisors felt the weight of responsibility related to developing the supervisee for licensure, which included concerns of liability for the supervisees’ caseload and being prepared for supervision. Here participant 9 described the experience:

The most challenging thing is that right now I have four supervisees and they have got X number of people in their caseload then that exponentially increases the people that I am in contact with and need to try to understand and assimilate. You know, it is that responsibility thing. You know when supervisee comes and says, ‘You know that guy, (referring to the client) And I say, ‘No…?’ and then I can struggle with feeling ‘oh, man am I, am
I being on top of it enough? ‘Am I working hard enough to keep on top of it?’ With all of the details of the cases, ‘am I asking what I need to know? Participants described feeling vulnerable as licensure supervisors because of the responsibility to know and implement all of the requirements for licensure but doing so without the added support of an institute or agency. Here participant 7 described the experience:

Okay, I think it is challenging, a couple of things; to keep up with all of the rules and encouraging them to do the same thing. Another challenge is the only thing that I really have in being responsible for all of their clients is what they tell me. I don’t have access to their files or anything like I did at an agency and even then it was pretty much somewhat limited so that is always going to be a challenge. You do the best you can but they are only picking a small sampling of their relationship with that client to tell you anything about them. So all of those things and I could probably go on and on.

In addition to the structural challenges that permeate the licensure supervision process, one of the overarching supervision challenges as described by the participants was the experience of relational issues with supervisees. The participants described a general desire to be collaborative during the licensure supervision process. Participants also described being aware that they were in a position of power due to the role of supervising, which included teaching and evaluating. The participants described the experience of managing the tension between the position of power as a licensure supervisor and the desire to act collaboratively in the supervisory relationship with varying levels of discomfort. For example participant 9 directly stated that he was aware of his power in supervision,

Because of my PhD, position in the agency, older or white male or whatever it happens to be, I am aware of my power.

However, the majority of the participants did not like using the term power with respect to their role as a licensure supervisor and stated,
P 6 I don’t like that word.

P 8 I don’t think of supervision in terms of power.

P 3 There may be some areas where I have more knowledge that does not necessarily translate into power.

The preferred stance of participants was one of collaboration. Here participant 5 illustrated the experience:

I think about LPC interns, I really want to collaborate with my supervisee so that they trust me you know I don’t like the word power but I am really clear to them that I am a gatekeeper and I take that to heart. I try to go in just really collaborative, creating that space where at the same time knowing that sometimes I have to say, you know when I am doing the six-month log for the Board. Do I have concerns “yes” and I am doing it right there with my supervisee. I try to say none of us are perfect and that is it all about growing.

Further, participants’ described the experience of being perceived as powerful, which could cause tension in the supervisory relationship:

P 2 Sometime I am perceived if I say something, then people [supervisee] very quickly see it as criticism and become defensive or concerns or afraid. What I have seen more and more, especially with younger supervisees is the ability to sit with some discomfort or some criticism. It is really hard. I struggle with it because sometimes I say things not against the other person but being about the case and they very quickly personalize it and very quickly think they have done something wrong. It’s just something about the case and they think, “Well, I am not doing this well and I am … “ Wow! So they become really careful not to say anything and so sensitive. I see this more with younger supervisees than older and I do not know if older necessarily age or different generation.

At the same time, participants acknowledged that if things were going poorly, such as when a licensure supervisee experiences an ethical issue or a client being at risk, then the participants would be more directive in their approach in the licensure supervision process and participants would use the power that they have in the supervisory relationship. For example:

P 3 I accept power if supervisee is doing something egregiously counterproductive or harmful but that almost never happens. I don’t want to give false impression that we are complete equals.
The challenge would be continuing to find the balance between empowering them and challenging them because they are so fearful at first. They are uncomfortable trying something new.

I do have the capacity for taking on a more authoritative stance but I don’t want to let that power to drown other perspectives or voices.

All participants in the study described experiences in licensure supervision that were challenging and many supervision challenges were described as unique to licensure issues such as gatekeeping, evaluation, and preparation for professional standing.

**Significant Interactions and Processes**

The results of this study described the formation of categories, properties and dimensions and also showed how each of these has influence over, or is influenced in some way by each other. These influences were revealed through the various interactions and processes that occur between the categories, properties and dimensions.

Within the emergent licensure supervisor experience theory there are many interactions and processes that hold significance, but there are a few that are most significant in understanding the overall experience of the participants. These significant processes are directly tied to the context, personal and professional values and the central category of the licensure supervision process.

Within the personal and professional value for licensure supervisors to interact in a collaborative style with the supervisees while recognizing that this value sometimes conflicted with the role of supervisor.

Participants felt varying degrees of discomfort with utilizing a perceived power-
laden role as licensure supervisors. Whilst all of the participants expressed their desire to interact in a collaborative style with supervisees, P 3 shared how being collaborative was important in her experience:

> When you are really kind of getting what the supervisee might be struggling with and why this is a particular problem for them and helping them work through it and helping them find some different paths to work through the issues. That same feeling you get of kind of being connected and being present.

In this quote P 3 specifically talks about the value placed on working beside the supervisee in a collaborative style. However, licensure supervisors also experienced beginning challenged by supervisees’ behaviors or being conflicted when the supervisee was not developing required skills and when collaboration was not an effective style. The following quote illustrates this experience:

> P 2 I don’t want to give false impression that we are complete equals. I will explicitly tell them what power I accept fully which is that I accept the responsibility of their mistakes and they tell me them. If they let me know something, I take it upon myself to tell them what they should do and should not do. I accept that power. I accept the power that if they tell me something that is egregiously counter productive or harmful but that almost never happens. And I will require that supervisee to follow my direction or I will report them or fire them as a supervisee.

Licensure supervisors described the challenge of balancing the desire to be collaborative with the reality that supervision required the licensure supervisor to take responsibility for the support and development of the supervisee in preparation for licensure and that this required being authoritative at times. Ultimately, participants described a reliance on supervisor actions, a property within the licensure supervision process that supported the balance between the value of collaboration and experiences of power in the role of licensure supervisor. Supervisor actions through careful screening, developing the supervisory relationship and establishing structure and focus in the licensure supervision
process created a means for licensure supervisors to contain and structure supervisor challenges. Participants described using supervision contracts, setting details such as time, dates, fees and expectations around supervision to be highly supportive structures in supervision. In fact, it is as if the participants innately created a syllabus for licensure supervision where they felt there was little structure or support otherwise.

Together these articulated experiences showed significant interaction that was pivotal to the licensure supervisors’ experience to all participants. The process began within identified context of this study; licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. Participants tapped into their values to inform them and developed supportive structures to be able to manage all aspects of licensure supervision. While Figure 1 represents the total interactions and processes of the emergent theory of licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision, the significant interactions just detailed can also be traced.
Discussion

This grounded theory study described licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. The major findings of this study were contextual and process experiences of licensure supervision, including readiness to supervise through supervisors’ professional development, motivation, personal and professional values and the licensure supervision process. Participants described their experience of the licensure supervision process as a dynamic process of experiencing challenges and implementing actions based on a broad context of professional development, motivation and personal and professional values.

Supervisor experiences of supervision continues to receive little attention, which is surprising given that the supervisor is integral to counselor development (Inman & Ladany, 2008). It is significant to note that even less focus on supervision research has been about licensure supervision, which is “the most advanced stages in the progression of training activities” (Mueller & Kell, 1972, p. 66). Magnuson, Norem & Wilcoxon (1998, 2000) uniquely explored clinical supervision of licensure supervisees but not specific to the supervisors’ experience. Significant literature on supervision focuses on the supervisee experiences (Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox et al, 2011; Nelson et al, 2006). Supervision topics such as multicultural frameworks (Ancis & Marshall, 2010), racial identity matters (Jernigan et al, 2010), counterproductive events (Gray et al, 2001) or practicum supervision (Elman & Forrest, 2004; Henderson et al, 2008) are also explored in supervision research. Watkins (2012a) stated that “the least is empirically known about
the party who may exert the most substantial impact on the supervisee therapeutic development and actualization” (p. 70). This study uniquely explored the experiences of the licensure supervisor to begin to shed more light on the licensure supervision process.

Bang & Park’s (2009) study on the supervisors’ experience of clinical supervision in Korea showed promise with focus on supervisors’ experience of supervision but categories that emerged were reflective of Korean social norms and the lack of formal training in Korea for clinical supervisors and not specific to licensure supervision. Grant, Schofield & Crawford’s (2012), study of the supervisors’ perspectives of managing difficulties in supervision explored the gaps in literature on challenges in supervision but the study was not specific to licensure supervision.

This study examined the experiences of licensure supervisors during a critical period of training for the supervisee with significant responsibility on the shoulders of the licensure supervisor. For these participants, licensure supervision experiences were guided by readiness, through professional development, motivation and personal and professional values in the licensure supervision process.

Supervisor professional development was significant to the participants’ experiences. Their process was one of readiness through professional experiences, training and self-reflection. The literature and research indicates similar processes. Watkins (2014) suggests that “the supervisors’ developmental process begins when they start reading about and reflecting on supervision theory, ethics, techniques, and research and increasingly envision themselves in the supervisors” role (p 234).

Uniquely described by the participants in this study was the experience of motivation to become and continue as licensure supervisors. They were motivated by incentives and
rewards that were experienced as both intrinsic and extrinsic. McAllister, Happell & Bradshaw (2013), a qualitative study of mental health nurses, stated that leadership is embedded in clinical experiences of what is meaningful in their work. “Intrinsic rewards in the role of leadership included making authentic connections, being in a position of trust and using creative means to problem solve and achieve therapeutic outcomes” (p. 658). The licensure supervisors’ experience of motivation in this study described experiencing rewards in the role of licensure supervisor, which suggests a process of genuine clinical leadership that was meaningful. McAllister et al, (2013) described “a social influence process where leaders employ interpersonal behaviors to motivate followers” (p. 663).

Integral for the participants’ experience of licensure were experiences of personal and professional values. Loganbill, Hardy & Delworth (1982) early work in creating a developmental model of supervision described “a ‘spirit of generativity’ that included an inherent sense of optimism in each stage of development” (p. 67). The comparison of a developmental model of supervision and Erikson’s (Erikson, Erikson & Kivnick, 1989) life-span stages of development was made in that research describing a position of continuing to build personal life, a successful career and contribute to the world. In this study, the participants’ described experiences of supporting the development of the supervisee, contributing to the greater community and a sense of generativity as being meaningful experiences as licensure supervisors.

The central category of licensure supervision process included two interrelated properties; supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. The participants described supervisor actions as the initiating and formalizing activities of the supervision process
including a) screening; b) structure and focus; and c) developing the supervisory relationship and supervisor roles. Magnuson, Norem and Wilcoxon (1999) described formalizing the supervisory relationship through supervision contracts and when supervisees are working toward certification or licensure the contracts should address external requirements. Supervisor actions were initiated by participants’ in a seemingly innate process that served a purpose in the supervision process but was not described as consistent amongst participants as far as their training or experience.

There has been relatively significant research focus on issues and challenges in supervision (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Grant et al, 2012; Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Henderson, Cawyer-Stringer, & Watkins, 1999; Knox, Edwards, Hess, & Hill, 2011; Ladany, Constantine, Miller, Erickson, & Muse-Burke, 2000; and West & Clark, 2004). This study identified two main thematic experiences of supervisor challenges: relational challenges and structural challenges in licensure supervision.

Participants described experiences of relational challenges in the licensure supervision process as issues significant to power and collaboration tensions in the supervision relationship. The participants described experiences of wanting to be collaborative in the supervisory relationship and also recognizing that power and influence are integral components of the supervisory role. The participants demonstrated an awareness of issues around power and collaboration and an eventual reframing of power when needed in cases of correction and evaluation of the supervisee. Several recent articles highlight the role of power in the supervisory relationship. Townend (2008) stated that power within the supervisor and supervisee relationship was an
important facet within the relationship. Watkins (2014) stated that supervision by definition is an evaluative activity and since the exercise of power is involved in any such evaluation, supervisors’ coming to grips with and accepting power and influence as a necessary part of being a supervisor is requisite. Mangione, Mears, Vincent, & Hawes, (2011) study showed that there was little ongoing or regular discussion about the supervision process, with no mention at all of the relationship per se or issues of power or hierarchy.

Participants described experiencing *structural challenges* that were experienced due to *structural issues* ascribed to licensure supervision. The participants described, in some cases, not being able to influence systems or structures to change concerning areas of licensure supervision including gatekeeping issues. Licensure supervision differs from university supervision, in particular, licensure supervision lacks the clarity of course evaluation or syllabi, and the supervisor has fewer opportunities to observe the supervisee. Typically a business relationship has been entered into between licensure supervisor and supervisee, creating a new dynamic (Magnuson, et al, 1999). Licensure supervisors’ often assume the sole responsibility for overseeing supervisees’ work and professional standing for licensure but specific supervision guidelines are beyond the scope and purposes of regulatory boards (Magnuson, et al, 1999).

**Implications**

The results of this study have several implications that may be beneficial to the fields of counseling, counselor education, licensure supervision and supervisor training. These implications may impact future practice, training and research. In beginning to understand the experiences of licensure supervisors, this study gives a clearer picture of
what is happening in licensure supervision.

This study can encourage the development of others studies supporting licensure supervisors. Of particular significance would be developing trainings for licensure supervisors that are relevant and consistent in content particularly related to structuring licensure supervision. This study showed that supervisor actions initiated the structure and focus for supervision and when well executed allowed for successful outcomes in managing supervisor challenges. It would seem that without adequate structure and focus supervisors and supervisees might struggle unnecessarily in the supervision process. This is supported by previous studies (Magnuson, et al, 1999) but there is no consistent and formalized training for licensure supervisors. This is particularly important because licensure supervision is the last formal point in the training process to directly oversee the work of supervisees before they become licensed professionals. In the end, licensure supervisors carry significant responsibility with limited formal supports.

Of significance to supervisor challenges, the experience of licensure supervisors is impacted by the tension of a power dynamic between the supervisor and supervisee. It seems important to develop supervisor training that includes insight into this dynamic and skills to manage and discuss this aspect of the supervisory relationship. Research (Magnuson et al, 1999; Mangione et al, 2011; Townend, 2008; Watkins, 2014) indicates that support for the supervisor and supervisee including ongoing discussions about power, evaluation and collaboration within the supervisory relationship would be valuable.

This study may be informative to develop licensure supervision training and requirements and for those writing supervisor training curriculum for licensure supervisors. Understanding the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision will shed
light on issues and gaps in literature and training. Generally, speaking supervision training varies from state to state and there is no standard curriculum for licensure supervisor training.

Finally, implications for further research include a shift to focus on the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. The insight of the supervisor is critical in understanding, initiating and carry out the licensure supervision process.

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study may include the researcher’s age, gender, race, educational background, and ethnicity as these may have contributed to how participants responded and discussed their answers. Participants were primarily identified as white/Caucasian and not broadly diverse culturally, therefore some elements of the study may not be transferrable to more diverse cultural groups. Participants all had a common demographic of living and working in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States. Thus, some elements of this study may not be transferrable to other areas. The method of participant recruitment was through individual contacts, through peer recommendation, or through professional supervisor registries in two Pacific Northwest states where supervisor contact details are publicly available. Recruiting more broadly for future research might offer more diversity in participants and their setting and experiences.
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Chapter 4
General Conclusions

This dissertation includes two manuscripts that are thematically linked through their exploration of supervision. The first manuscript (Chapter 2) reviewed qualitative literature and provided a metasynthesis of individual supervision and the supervisory relationship. Qualitative metasynthesis studies are used to assemble findings about a target phenomenon into a coherent whole to serve as a provisional basis for practice or policy (Sandelowski, 2012). This manuscript endeavored to make sense of relevant qualitative studies that centered on individual supervision and the supervisory relationship as experienced by the supervisors and supervisees. The central research question addressed in this study was: “How do supervisors and supervisees experience the supervisory relationship?”

Characterization of the findings of 17 studies explored professional orientation of study participants and researchers, supervision perspective, developmental level of supervisee, supervisor characteristics, model of supervision used and central purpose of study. Of the 17 studies that were reviewed in this manuscript for qualitative research quality (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007; Kline, 2008) at best, only partial criteria were met. Qualitative research plays a distinctive role by reaching facets of the human experience out of the reach of quantitative methods (Sandelowski, 2012). This metasynthesis suggests that higher quality qualitative research is an important need in the field of counseling, psychology and the social sciences.
Clinical supervision is significant in the training of supervisees in the profession of counseling during their academic training as well as for licensure requirements and research recognizes the complexity of the supervisory relationship (Bogo, Regehr, Power & Regehr, 2007; Campbell, 2006; Milne, 2009; Wheeler & Richards, 2007). Based on the findings of this research, three separate but interrelated themes were identified: 1) Supervisor self-awareness nurturing supervisee self-awareness, 2) Navigating power & collaboration in a hierarchical system, and; 3) Supervisor self-disclosure as potentially beneficial or destructive.

Overall the studies describe self-awareness as being valuable within the supervisory relationship, specifically, that the supervisor function with high level of reflection and self-awareness. Research indicated that self-awareness is enhanced for the supervisee via the supervisory relationship. The studies did not discuss directly how to develop self-awareness within the supervisor, supervisee or in the supervisory relationship. This seems an important area for further research.

The theme of power and collaboration emerged and described how supervisors and supervisees experienced this dynamic in the supervisory relationship. Collectively, these studies showed a power dynamic where the supervisor is reported to decide what happens in supervision, what is spoken or not spoken, who can say what, and that the supervisor is ultimately evaluating the supervisee. Mangione, L., Mears, G., Vincent, W., & Hawes, S. (2011) referred to power from both the supervisor and supervisee perspective. When supervisors considered power, it was in “the spirit of minimizing its significance” (p. 163) or noting their discomfort with it whereas for the supervisees’ “power was an affectively charged issue” (p. 156). Based on that power dynamic the supervisee is often
expected or willing to change for the supervisor to maintain the supervisory relationship. Townend (2008) suggested that autonomy is developed through an awareness of power in the supervisory relationship, stating that it is easy to tell the supervisee what to do instead of actually getting them to think through and experience what they should be doing.

Further, the qualities of collaboration described in the studies include the supervisory alliance, mutual trust, empathy, acceptance, and team-work. However, the practical balance of working within the tension of power and collaboration in the supervisory relationship was not addressed directly except in studies where other ideologies such as feminism or multiculturalism were present. Collaboration in supervision is a highly rated quality with many positive attributes that enhance the supervisory relationship (Falender & Shafranske, 2012; Spiller, Byrnes, & Ferguson, 2013). However, supervisors may underplay the characteristic of power in the supervisory role, because it may seem like an undesirable attribute, the lack of transparency about power may impact collaboration in the supervisory relationship. Understanding power and collaboration in the supervisory relationship is important and warrants further research.

Finally, the self-disclosure by the supervisor could be very helpful and valuable when it was appropriate and used to normalize and support the supervisee and client work. Inappropriate self-disclosure by the supervisor negatively impacted the supervisory relationship, including impacting the supervisee to become more guarded in the supervision process. The research suggests that self-disclosure might level the play-field, perhaps decrease a power imbalance or hierarchy between supervisors and supervisees through self-disclosure and normalizing the supervisees’ experiences in supervision. The
resulting study in Chapter 3 sought to address some of these issues through examining the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision.

The second manuscript (Chapter 3) is a qualitative grounded theory study where the central question was; “What is the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision?” Within this study nine clinical supervisors who met criteria to be registered within their respective jurisdictions to be licensure supervisors were interviewed. This research is important and specifically, it fills a gap in knowledge about the experiences of licensure supervisors.

Four major categories emerged related to the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. The central category included the supervision process with two distinct but interrelated properties, supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. Contextual categories included supervisors’ professional development, motivation, personal and professional values, these categories informed and supported the supervision process.

This study may be beneficial to the fields of counseling, counselor education, supervision and supervisor training in several ways. This research increases the understanding of the experience of licensure supervisors. This is important because licensure supervisors play a crucial role in the ongoing development of newer professionals in the field of counseling. Licensure supervisors bridge the gap between theory and practice of the profession (Bernard, 2005).

Supervisor professional development included experience, training and self-reflection. The participants all engaged in required training(s) for licensure supervision to become supervisors. Training(s) for licensure supervision were most often described in terms of required hours (30 – hour training) as opposed to describing the training based on content
or facilitation. This study indicates the importance of supervisor training but future research could expand an understanding of the content of supervision training, standardized curriculum or consistent regulations, which seems crucial for developing supervisor training.

The participants described self-reflection as using intuition and trusting themselves as valuable assets they relied on during licensure supervision. When the supervisor is self-reflective they are more likely to be unencumbered by their personal or professional issues (Ladany et al., 2000) and trust themselves to use intuition in supervision, however, the development of becoming self-reflective is unclear and research in this area would benefit a deeper understanding of training needs for supervisors.

The participants described the supervision process being at the core of their experience of licensure supervision with two distinct but interrelated properties, supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. Supervisor actions included setting up the focus and structure of the supervision process. Aspects of focus and structure were developed by the participants’ based on requirements established by licensing bodies while other aspects of focus and structure were not. Participants seemed to naturally develop screening processes, supervision contracts and other tools independently. Whilst successful in these endeavors it seems important to consider where gaps might be in the supervisor actions to develop consistent and supportive measures for the supervision process.

Supervisor challenges included experiences that required the supervisor to be responsible to support supervisee competence in skill development, ethical decision making behaviors and supervisee preparation for licensure. The challenges of power and
collaboration in the supervisory relationship were significant. Fully understanding the significance of this dynamic within the supervision process is extremely important. Participants generally described a discomfort with power in supervision and a desire to act in a collaborative fashion. Research indicates that this is a significant theme in supervision (Mangione, et al 2011; Milne, 2009) but there seems to be limited research indicating how supervisors might manage and resolve issues of power and collaboration in the supervisory relationship.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The results of this dissertation provide various opportunities for continued research. This study employed grounded theory methodology and calls upon participants' experiences in making meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Through the use of prolonged engagement via two interviews and a member checking session, participants shared their experiences and developed trust with the primary researcher, resulting in rich description (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The resulting information filled a gap in literature by giving a voice to licensure supervisors and the unique role they play in the development of supervisees and the counseling profession. Future research might replicate this study to include broader demographics or regions to look for common themes in the experience of licensure supervision.

Future research might beneficial if larger populations were included. Research using broader methodology including quantitative studies by developing a survey based on these findings might create an opportunity for more information about licensure supervision.
Together, both manuscripts have implications on future policy, practice and research. It is clear that supervision is significant in preparing counselors for the field. It is even clearer that licensure supervision plays a unique role in the training and preparation of counselors for the field. Supervisors can become better trained in supervision. From these results, it is clear that the licensure supervisors’ experiences are not being transmitted through high quality qualitative research and that there are strong themes of self-reflection, challenges and issues concerning power and collaboration dynamics that need to be further assessed, addressed and supported. This collaborative information might support the development of consistent and relevant training for licensure supervisors.

Conclusion

The findings of this dissertation reflect current research on supervision. However, the results of this study show the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision and this is not a voice frequently reflected in research. It is the hope of this author that this study inspires further high quality qualitative research to keep opening this door for learning, research and insight into effective and meaningful training for supervisors.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Narrative of Study

Characteristics and Methodological Analysis

(see Appendix B, Table 1)

Professional orientation. The professional orientation of the participants and researchers in each study was assessed, and was found to vary widely, with no single orientation significantly more prevalent. Four of the studies included participants and researchers specifically in the counselor education field (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Gray et al., 2001; Magnuson et al., 2000; and Nelson et al., 2006). Seven of the studies focused on participants and researchers with more broadly stated professional orientations including counselor, psychotherapist, clinical or counseling psychology, and counseling or counselor education (Bang & Parks, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Henderson et al., 2008; Jerrigan et al., 2010; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany et al., 2000; West & Clark, 2005). Three of the studies focused on clinical psychologists only (Grant et al., 2012; Johnston & Milne, 2012; and Mangione et al., 2011). Urdang’s (1999) research included social

**Supervision perspective.** For this characterization, supervision perspective refers to whether the supervisors’ or the supervisees’ experience or perceptions were taken into account. Nearly half of the studies explored characteristics of supervision from the supervisor’s perspective, while the other half explored supervision from the supervisee’s perspective. Two of the studies explored characteristics of supervision from the perspective of both the supervisor and supervisee.

**Developmental level of supervisee.** The characteristic of supervisee developmental level refers to the professional level of the supervisee; whether they are still in training or practicing as a professional counselor. Twelve of the 17 studies reviewed for this metasynthesis used supervisees still in training at the graduate level, with only five of the studies examining the experience of supervisees currently in professional practice pursuing licensure supervision. Several of the studies (Bang & Park, 2009; Grant et al., 2012; Nelson et al., 2006; and Townend, 2008) gave very little description of the supervisees’ developmental level, instead giving significant focus to the characteristics and perspective of the supervisor. The Magnuson et al. study (2000) was particularly unique in that it did not describe the supervisee experience at all, but rather focused on experienced counselors memories of earlier supervision. The absence of research utilizing licensure supervisees is conspicuous.

**Characteristics of supervisor.** Characteristics of the supervisors varied but in most studies general comments were made regarding the supervisors’ experience. This was typically stated in number of years of work or by academic accomplishment, including
PhD or PsyD status (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Gray et al., 2001). None of the studies defined this experience as being specifically trained in individual supervision.

Supervisors were described as having variability in their theoretical preference of supervision including psychoanalytic, gestalt, existential, solution focused, person centered or cognitive behavioral. The diversity of the supervisor, including gender, race, age, and sexual orientation was stated in some studies but not treated with any significance unless diversity was the focus of the study. Several of the studies did not focus on supervisors’ characteristics broadly but more specifically to the purpose of the study being conducted. Magnuson et al., (2000) focused on experienced counselors who reflected on their past experiences of being supervised, while Mangione et al., (2011) focused on “esteemed women supervisors” (p. 147) and Zaslavsky et al., (2005) selected supervisors’ based on accessibility of contact, knowledge and personal experience of the interviewee about the process of psychoanalytic supervision.

**Use of model of supervision.**

The use of mixed theoretical models of supervision, included but was not limited to, psychodynamic, cognitive behavioral, relational, gestalt, existential, person centered and solution-focused (Bang & Park 2009; Knox et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2006;). Grant et al., (2012) and West & Clark (2005) utilized Kagan and Kagan’s Interpersonal Recall Process model of supervision in their qualitative research. Johnston & Milne (2012) and Townend, (2008) utilized Cognitive Behavioral models of supervision in their qualitative research. The Zaslavsky et al., (2005) study engaged participants using a psychoanalytic model of supervision. Six studies did not indicate the use of a particular supervision model in their studies (Elman & Forrest, 2004; Gray et al., 2001; Henderson et al., 2008;
Ladany et al., 2000; Magnuson et al., 2011; and Urdang, 1999). Additionally, the Ancis & Marshall (2010), Jernigan et al., (2011), and Mangione et al., (2011) studies did not indicate the use of a particular supervision model but in each study relied on a framework including feminist and multicultural perspectives to explore characteristics of the supervision relationships.

**Purpose or focus of study.** Within the purpose of the qualitative studies, two main categories emerged: Supervisory Relationship and Training & Development in Supervision. Although all the studies discussed some element of the relationship dynamic between supervisor and supervisee, seven of the studies specifically explored the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee in depth (Gray et al., 2001; Grant et al., 2012; Henderson et al., 1999; Jernigan et al., 2010; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany et al., 2000; and Mangione et al., 2011). Clustering within this category were supervisory relationship characteristics or issues such as power (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Gray et al., 2001; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Mangione et al., 2011; Townend, 2008), collaboration (Henderson et al., 1999; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Mangione et al., 2011; Townend, 2008), counter-transference (Ladany et al., 2000; Zaslavsky et al., 2004), negative use of self-disclosure (Gray et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2011; West & Clark, 2005), and positive use of self-disclosure (Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox et al., 2011; Mangione et al., 2011) emerged. Supervisory relationship studies that focused on self-awareness by both supervisors and supervisees (Urdang, 1999; West & Clark, 2004; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008; Henderson et al., 1999; Grant et al., 2012; Johnston & Milne, 2012) were a dominant theme in the studies reviewed.
The second category, Training and Development, included ten studies (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Magnuson et al., 2000; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008; Urdang, 1999; West & Clark, 2004; Zaslavsky et al., 2005). These studies demonstrated a primary focus on aspects or concerns in supervision around the development of competence and professionalism for both the supervisor and the supervisees. Topics included reviewing supervisors’ and supervisees’ skills (Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Magnuson et al., 2000; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008; West & Clark, 2004), professional competence (Elman & Forrest, 2004; Townend, 2007; Urdang, 1999), experience (Bang & Park, 2009), evaluation (Elman & Forrest, 2004; Johnston & Milne, 2012), teaching and Socratic exchange (Johnston & Milne, 2012; Nelson et al., 2006).

Methodological Critique Narrative

(see Appendix C, Table 2)

Focus of research. The dimension of focus of research refers to the high level of acquaintance between researcher and participant necessary in idiographic inquiry; it is this development of collaborative relationship with the participant that assists the researcher in understanding the participant’s particular subjective experience. (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). The characteristics of contact between coder and participant, nature of contact, proportion of coders who have contact with at least one participant, and average time spent with each participant, (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007) were applied to the 17 qualitative studies on individual supervision to evaluate the focus of research. This assessment
revealed some issues that weakened the overall pool of qualitative research in the area of supervision.

Five studies (Gray et al., 2001; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Nelson et al., 2006; West & Clark, 2004; Zaslavsky, 2005) met none of the criteria of the four characteristics defined by Hoyt & Bhati (2007) in demonstrating the dimension of focus of research. Ten studies (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Grant et al., 2012; Henderson et al., 1999; Jernigan et al., 2010; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany, et al., 2000; Mangione et al, 2011; Townend, 2008; Urdang, 1999) met criteria for describing one of the focus of research characteristics defined by Hoyt & Bhati (2007). The most commonly stated characteristic was the average amount of time spent with each participant, followed by the nature of the contact (face-to-face, telephone or written). Finally, only two of the seventeen studies cited all three of the Hoyt and Bhati characteristics (2007). Bang & Park (2009) and Magnuson, (2000) demonstrated the highest level of focus of research described in the 17 qualitative studies on individual supervision.

**Setting.** It is desirable for qualitative researchers to have a sense of the lived world of their research participants. This type of research utilizes real world settings in which the behaviors of interest might normally be expected to occur. Due to the idiographic focus of qualitative research work, investigators in this tradition wish to establish a considerable acquaintance with their research participants (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). In this area the selected studies showed a mixed and generally poor result on this criteria dimension.

Three studies specifically and clearly stated that they took place in the natural setting of the participant (Bang & Park, 2009; Mangione et al, 2011; West & Clark, 2005).
Seven studies specifically and clearly stated that the participant’s natural setting was not utilized, and information was gathered either in writing, by telephone or in the office of the researcher (Elman & Forrest, 2004; Jernigan et al., 2010; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany, et al., 2000; Urdang, 1999; Zaslavsky et al., 2005). Five of the studies (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Grant et al., 2012; Gray et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008) did not clearly state the setting of the research interview. Finally, Henderson et al., (1999) and Magnuson et al., (2000) describe interviews taking place both face-to-face, by telephone, or through the use of a written questionnaire.

**Researcher role.** Qualitative research culture embraces the role of the researcher as instrument and, acknowledges that the data and conclusions of a qualitative investigation are influenced by the subjectivity of researchers and participants. To explore the extent to which the authors of these studies embrace the role of researcher as instrument, the studies were examined for (a) use of auditors as a check on findings of the main coder; (b) written reflection on the authors’ biases in the published article; and (c) explicit discussion of the desirability of minimizing or eliminating the effects of researcher bias (Hoyt & Bhati, 2007). This metasynthesis revealed issues related to researcher’s acknowledgement of their bias, which weakened the overall set of qualitative research.

In eleven studies the authors did not state a bias in research and as a result did not address explicit discussions in eliminating author bias (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Henderson et al., 1999; Jernigan et al., 2010; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Knox et al., 2011; Magnuson et al, 2000; Townend, 2008; Urdang, 1999; West & Clark, 2004; Zaslavsky et al., 2005). The aforementioned studies did utilize auditors in the researchers role. Author bias and addressing bias elimination by authors was clearly
stated in six studies (Bang & Park 2009; Grant et al., 2012; Gray et al., 2001; Ladany et al., 2000; Mangione et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2006). In each of these studies reference to specifically engaging an auditor (Bang & Park, 2009; Grant et al., 2012; Gray et al., 2001; and Ladany et al., 2000), multiple researchers with multiple methods, member checks (Nelson et al., 2006) and co-researchers and cross analysis (Mangione et al., 2011) were terms used to describe the researchers role.

**Presentation of findings.** The fourth and final dimension, described by Hoyt & Bhati, (2007) in qualitative studies for methodological principles advocated by qualitative theorists is presentation of findings. This dimension is a set of qualities that published qualitative research studies ought to use to present rich, complex understandings of idiographic research. Characteristics include (a) presentation of freestanding quotes from participants (one sentence in length); (b) presentation of extended quotes (at least five lines in length); and (c) inclusion of identifiers with the quotations. This review revealed that the majority of the studies were relatively strong in demonstrating their presentation of findings in the area of individual supervision.

Most studies (Ancis & Marshall, 2010; Bang & Park, 2009; Elman & Forrest, 2004; Grant et al., 2012; Henderson et al., 1999; Jernigan et al., 2010; Johnston & Milne, 2012; Mangione et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2006; Townend, 2008; West & Clark, 2004) included both one sentence and extended quotes from participants, and included identifiers with quotes, making for a rich and complex understanding of the research. The additional body of research included some short quotes by participants and identifiers with no extended quotes or did not include quotes by participants but did include qualitative themes as a result of participant interviews.
**Coherence.** Kline (2008) discussed the concept of coherence as a consideration when assessing the quality of qualitative research. Coherence of the research includes the underlying epistemological assumptions, approach, methods, analysis and presentation of results. Coherence was only partially demonstrated in all of the studies with the exception of Johnston & Milne, (2012) whose study met Kline’s (2008) criteria in that the entire research project utilized a consistent epistemological perspective. Surprisingly, in many cases the actual research question was not stated in the study or if it was, it was so embedded in the study that it was not clear to us, therefore making it difficult to determine coherence. Studies that did not state a specific qualitative method or stated using a phenomenological qualitative method of research tended to show an overall treatment of the approach, methods, analysis and presentation of results as similarly vague or unclear. A common issue in the methods, analysis, and presentation of results when the researchers described using a grounded theory method was that they did not describe the method of coding or did not demonstrate a theoretical model or framework evolving from the research.
# Appendix B

## Table 1. Characteristics of Qualitative Studies on Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/ Article</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Professional Orientation</th>
<th>Supervision Perspective</th>
<th>Development Level of Supervisee</th>
<th>Supervisor characteristics</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Use of Model of supervision or not</th>
<th>Purpose of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bang &amp; Park, Korean Supervisors’ Experiences in Clinical Supervision,</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Counseling psychologists</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>At least 5 years of experience after obtaining supervisors certificate</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Mixed theoretical supervision models</td>
<td>Develop an understanding of the current status of supervision practice in Korea. Reviewing the supervisors’ experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elman &amp; Forrest, Psychotherapy in the Remediation of Psychology Trainees: Exploratory Interviews with Training Directors</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Doctoral level students</td>
<td>Training Directors at university level</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Faculty decisions about doctoral psychology students identified as having personal problems that interfere with their ability to function at an acceptable level. Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant et al, Managing Difficulties in Supervision: Supervisors’ Perspectives.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Clinical psychology</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>16 senior members of the supervision profession from UK and Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Interpersonal recall process (IRP) method used to recall supervision sessions.</td>
<td>Explores how experienced supervisors’ manage difficulties in supervision in the context of the supervisory relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Ladany, Psychotherapy Trainees’ Experience of Counterproductive events in supervision</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Counseling psychology</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Graduate level students</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Mixed theoretical supervision models</td>
<td>Explore what happens in supervision when trainees experience counterproductive events. Examine the influence of counterproductive events on supervisory relationship, process and outcomes and trainee disclosure of counterproductive supervision events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson et al, A comparison of student and supervisor perceptions of effective practicum supervision</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Clinical and counseling psychology</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Doctoral level students</td>
<td>Averaged 12.2 years of supervisory experience (ranging from 6-19 years). All male supervisors, 4 clinical psychology faculty.</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Psychotherapy</td>
<td>Expand the knowledge of practicum supervision by focusing on the experiences of those participating in psychotherapy practicum as supervisors’ and supervisees’. Thoughts of supervisees’ about supervisors’ – supervisees’ relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston / Milne, How do supervisees learn during supervision?</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Clinical psychology</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Doctoral level students</td>
<td>0 - ‘lots of experience’</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>CBT Supervision</td>
<td>Conceptualize supervisees’ understanding of the processes in the receipt of supervision and assess the utility of grounded theory methodology to study the receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox / Edward,</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Clinical or counseling psychology, counseling or counselor education</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Master/Doctoral students</td>
<td>0-20 years experience</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Mixed theoretical methods. Topic: Supervisor self-disclosure</td>
<td>Explore how supervisees experience supervisor self-disclosure to supervisees. How this effects supervision and supervisees’ clinical work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladany et al.,</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Clinical and counseling psychology</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Pre-doctoral interns</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Conduct in-depth qualitative investigation into supervisors’ experience of supervisor counter-transference and its influence on supervisory process and outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson, et al</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Counselor Education</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Experienced counselors reflecting on past supervision</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Identify counterproductive supervisory behaviors and develop a schema for categorizing these behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, et al</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mental health nurses</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Mental health nurses</td>
<td>Cognitive Psychotherapy Course Directors’</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Explore what makes supervision effective and appropriate from supervisors’ perspective. Develop a CBT model of clinical supervision that could be used by nurses and broader psychotherapy communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdang, 1999.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Graduate social work students</td>
<td>19 first year supervising (social work)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Investigates supervisory experience and developmental processes through their own perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; Clark,</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Counselors and</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Post-masters</td>
<td>Expert /</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Explore helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPLORING PERSPECTIVES ON SUPERVISION**
### Appendix C

#### Table 2: Critique of Qualitative Studies on Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/ Article</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Focus of Research*</th>
<th>Setting *</th>
<th>Researcher Role *</th>
<th>Findings Presentation *</th>
<th>Coherence **</th>
<th>Methods used for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancis and Marshall, Using a Multicultural Framework to Assess Supervisees’ Perceptions of Culturally Competent Supervisor</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participants. 45-60 minutes</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>No bias stated. Use of auditor</td>
<td>Yes, minimal use of quotes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bang &amp; Park, Korean Supervisors’ Experiences in Clinical Supervision,</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. 60 minutes</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Yes bias stated. Engaged in self-reflection. Authors recorded expectations about bias prior to collecting data.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elman &amp; Forrest, Psychotherapy in the Remediation of Psychology Trainees: Exploratory Interviews with Training Directors</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. Telephone 45-90 minutes</td>
<td>Not natural</td>
<td>No bias stated. Use of auditor</td>
<td>Yes, minimal and extended use of quotes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant et al, Managing Difficulties in Supervision: Supervisors’ Perspectives.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. 1-2 hours.</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Yes bias stated. Elimination of bias discussed and auditors used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Two Case Studies, Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Ladany, Psychotherapy Trainees’ Experience of Counterproductive events in supervision</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. Time spent not reported</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Yes bias stated. Yes, discussions eliminating bias. Yes, auditor.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No extended quotes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson et al, A comparison of student and supervisor perceptions of effective practicum supervision</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. Face-to-face and written. Two 30-minute interviews.</td>
<td>Both Natural and non-natural (face-to-face and written)</td>
<td>No bias stated. Auditors used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jernigan et al, An Examination of People of Color Supervision Dyads: Racial Identity Matters as much as Race</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No. Written responses sent electronically</td>
<td>Not-Natural</td>
<td>No bias stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston / Milne, How do supervisees learn during supervision?</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant.</td>
<td>Not-Natural</td>
<td>No bias stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Grounded theory, Cross sectional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox / Edward, Supervisor Self-Disclosure: Supervisee’s Experience and Perspective</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. 50 minutes with brief follow-up</td>
<td>Not-natural (by telephone)</td>
<td>No bias stated. Yes. No extended quotes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladany et al., Supervisor Counter-transference: A Qualitative Investigation and Description</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. Telephone 45 – 60 minutes.</td>
<td>Not natural</td>
<td>Bias was stated. Elimination of bias was discussed and auditors were used.</td>
<td>No quotes were used.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson, et al A profile of Lousy Supervision: Experienced Counselors’ Perspective</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant.</td>
<td>Both Natural and Not-Natural (both face-to-face and telephone)</td>
<td>No bias stated. Use of auditor</td>
<td>Yes. No extended quotes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangione, The Supervisory Relationship when women Supervise Women</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8 - dyads</td>
<td>Yes. Proportion of time of coder with contact and average time spent not cited.</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Yes bias stated. Limited discussion about eliminating bias. Cross analysis / co-researchers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson et al.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. Interviews + 90 minute focus group to generate themes.</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Yes, bias stated. Used multiple researchers to manage, multiple methods, member checks and discussion of findings with colleagues and input from interns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townend</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. 50-90 minutes</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>No bias stated. A description of use of auditor, analysis and coder.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdang</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant. 90 minutes.</td>
<td>Not-Natural</td>
<td>No bias stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; Clark</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3 - dyads</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>No bias stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaslavsky</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes, contact between coder and participant and proportion of coders with contact unclear.</td>
<td>Not-natural</td>
<td>No bias stated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Phenomenological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria for critiquing

* Hoyt, W.T., & Bhati, K.S., 2007
** Kline, W.B., 2008
## Appendix D

### Table 3: Initial Coding & Descriptive Themes of Qualitative Studies on Supervisory Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Coding of Study Findings</th>
<th>Descriptive Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Supervisors openly disclose limits of their knowledge  
- Supervisor aware of what you don’t know  
- Supervisor asked questions about multicultural issues  
- Supervisor discloses bias  
- Supervisor acknowledges the impact that oppression and racism have  
- Impact of cultural work. Awareness of work with client  
- Attend blind spots  
- Accepting of cultural difference  
- Being safe  
- Evaluation process | Supervisor-focused personal development: Demonstrate strengths & limits of knowledge. Introduce multicultural issues in supervision. Self discloses bias. Demonstrates awareness  
- Why client is coming to counseling.  
- Few words can capture essence of client issues.  
- Supervisee does not address essential issues  
- Theoretical orientation.  
- Recommendations made to supervisee  
- Supervisors’ modified content based on developmental level of supervisee  
- Method and structure of supervision. Preparation for supervision.  
- Supervisor brings clinical issues  
- Deeper understanding of importance of supervision | Supervision Activities: Teaching and exploration of supervisees’ personal issues  
Supervisor & Supervisee characteristics: Supervisors theoretical orientations and supervisee level of development.  
Systems of supervision: Methods of supervision. Structure of supervision.  
Supervisor Outcomes: Increased level of competence as a clinician.  
Context of supervision: Lack of supervisor training. Lack of formal feedback on supervision performance.  
Engagement in self-development activities: Self-development activities as a counselor and supervisor. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Supervisor training desired.  
- Self-evaluation about effectiveness as supervisor. | Supervision hands off approach: Using personal psychotherapy as remediation as only a suggestion and avoid requiring this.  
Supervision Active Involvement approach: Program required student to attend personal psychotherapy while in graduate program  
Case-by-Case basis: Not setting a national standard for use of personal psychotherapy in case of remediation. |
| Grant, J., Schofield, M.J., & Crawford, S., (2012) | - Interventions used by supervisors  
- Naming the difficulty  
- Validate & normalize  
- Attune to supervisee needs  
- Support  
- Anticipate  
- Explore parallel process  
- Acknowledge mistake  
- Modeling  
- Facilitate reflectivity  
- Remain mindful & monitor  
- Remain patient & transparent  
- Process counter-transference  
- Seek supervision on supervision  
- Case conceptualize  
- Confront tentatively / directly  
- Withdraw, deny, avoid then confront  
- Assess before confronting  
- Refuse to continue  
- Take formal action  
- Refer to personal therapy  
- Become direct | Relational: Interventions based on relational capacities.  
Reflective: Endeavors to think deeply about and understand difficulty supervisee process with clients and supervisor.  
Confrontational: Involve challenging supervisee about aspects of practice or professional behavior.  
Avoidant: Refrain from raising difficult issues |
- Trainee tries to calm down, cries or gets defensive  
- Power differential noted  
- Trainees wish their supervisor would respond differently  
- Supervisory relationship weakened  
- Trainee changes to meet supervisor needs  
- Influence on trainee self-efficacy  
- Disclosure of reaction to counterproductive event  
- Resolution of counterproductive events  
- Foster professional development  
- Parallel process in supervision  
- Influence on client outcome | Initial counterproductive event: Supervisor impacts supervisee  
Ensuing counterproductive interaction: Supervisee adapts to the event.  
Experience of trainee during the counterproductive event: Trainee has negative thoughts and feelings  
Influence of counterproductive event on supervisory relationship, process and outcome: Usually weakens the supervisory relationship and trainee changes approach to supervisor.  
Supervisory relationship in general: Experienced as both positive and negative. |
- Brings knowledge  
- Trainee desires personal growth  
- Provide guidance  
- Respect from supervisor  
- Possesses empathy  
- Techniques are fine but don’t teach how to empathize  
- Supervisor cognizant of trainee vulnerability  
- Evaluation anxiety provoking  
- Negative supervision = uncaring | General Levels of Knowledge: Supervisor as a source of knowledge and resources.  
Facilitation of learning: Integration of theory and practical skills and growth  
Relationship Factors: Facilitate teamwork between student and supervisor, acceptance, mutuality, trust, approachability, respect, attentiveness and empathy  
Effectiveness of Evaluation: Clear communication and consideration of student vulnerability & honesty. Constructive criticism, providing feedback. |
| Jemigan, M.M., Green, C.E., Helms, J.E., Perez-Gualdron, L., & Henze, K., | - How is race introduced  
- Supervisor not broaching the topic of race  
- Isolated and misunderstood  
- Approach supervision wit hesitance and vigilance  
- Challenging, enlightening, responding well  
- I felt confused | Regressive Dyads: Racial identity of the one with less power (supervisee) is more advanced in supervisory relationship  
Progressive Dyads: Racial identity of the one in power (supervisor) is more advanced in supervisory relationship |
# Exploring Perspectives on Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, L. H., &amp; Milne, D.L., (2010)</td>
<td>- I felt like he was mocking me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S.A., &amp; Norem, K., (2000)</td>
<td>- Unbalanced, Hung up on details and does not understand the bigger picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangione, L., Mears, G., Vincent, W., &amp; Hawes, S., (2011)</td>
<td>- I am interested in the constructive use of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race & Organizational Climate:
- Race relevant to dynamics of the training site.

### Supervisory Alliance:
- Supervisory relationship enhanced by awareness of the developmental process and different stages of supervisee.

### The Socratic Approach:
- Practical and informational support. Educational scaffolding.

### The Centrality of the Reflective process:
- Supervisor (Supervisor) is reflective in receiving information.

### Supervisory style:
- Collaborative/supportive/relational/empowering
- Effect of Supervisory Style: Positive / Negative
- Supervisor Self-Disclosure: Positive / Negative

### Source of Supervisor Counter-transference:
- Influences on supervisors' emotional responses
- Experience of Supervisor Counter-transference:
  - Involves affect, cognitions and behaviors
  - Influence of Supervisor Counter-transference on the Supervisory Relationship and Supervision Process and Outcomes: Counter-transference influences the supervisory relationship

### Unbalanced:
- Being able to be focused on the specific with the systemic mind.
- Developmentally Inappropriate: Fails to recognize or respond to dynamic and changing needs of supervisee.
- Intolerant of Differences: Impatient, rigid, inflexible
- Poor Model of Professional and personal attributes: Boundary violations, intrusiveness and exploitation.
- Untrained: Conducts supervision without adequate preparation:
  - Professionally Apathetic: Lazy

### Reflexivity:
- An effort to look at and discuss the supervisory relationship.
- Issues of Power: How is power managed in supervisory relationship
- Collaboration: Supervisory relationship is non-hierarchical.
- Authenticity: Supervisor engages in some type of self-disclosure.

### Learning:
- Academic / Knowledge.
### Supervisee Growth:
- Power differential is always there
- She always asks what id going on
- I did not really feel supported
- I get this sense of being part of the process but not owning it
- She does have personal things around
- Settling into roles
- Feel free to be as creative and you want

### Moderating Inputs:
- Understanding external influences
### Relationships & Roles:
- Complexity of interpersonal
| Townsend, M., (2008) | - Electronics & technology  
- Interpersonal processes  
- Flexibility  
- Dual Roles  
- Stage of development  
- Responsibilities  
- Commitment & respect  
- Acceptance of diversity  
- Reflection & self-awareness  
- Broad experience  
- Deep learning  
- Facilitative role  
- Boundaries  
- Skills development  
- Theory & practice  
- Guided discovery  
- Problem Solving  
- Competency scales  
- Feedback & direct observation  

Values & Beliefs: Of supervisor to be effective in their role  
Cognitive Process: How the supervisor and supervisee make sense of the process of supervision  
Learning Process: How does the supervisee learn  
Mechanisms: Supervisory skill deployed by supervisor including focus, task and goals.  
Monitoring & Assessment: Macro and micro levels of feedback to supervisee  
Outputs from Supervision: Competence practice and support for professional development of supervisee |
|---|---|
| Urdang, E., (1999) | - It really showed me how much I know  
- I know more than I gave myself credit  
- Helps me be more conscious of my own…  
- I had more empathy for myself  
- I think I had anger about one situation and I felt more empathic for both of us  

Development of Professional Self  
The Validation of Professional Competence: Self-esteem and self-identity is the bedrock of professional identity  
Reflective skills: The cornerstone of clinical skills  
Working through Memories of being a student:  
Reviewing past experiences of learning from supervision |
| West, W., & Clark, V., (2004) | - I’ll get out of here and I’ll do this or that  
- At the end of supervision you can’t help but look at something  
- I felt comfortable  
- As a supervisor you are looking for some sort impressive footwork  
- I’d given myself a harder time over it  
- I’m validating him  
- I want to describe this accurately  
- I’ve been in some of those places myself  

Supervisee learned: Looks for outcome from the supervision process  
Supervisor learned: Self-analyses in session of performance and teaching process |
- No understanding of patient  
- Attention to the emotional climate of the relationship  
- Difficulty in remembering, writing, delays, errors, observing the acting-outs  
- Parallel process  
- In supervision one works on top of blind spots  
- Teaching toward the unconscious supervisee  
- Patience, respect, talking kindly  
- Observing limits  

Indicators of Counter-transference: Emotional manifestations, behavioral manifestations and blind spots.  
Working with Counter-transference: The changes, the approach and the functions of the supervisor and the supervisee |
Appendix E

Recruitment Letter of Introduction to Colleagues

Dear Colleague,

My name is Susan Sisko. I am a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at Oregon State University. I am in the process of recruiting participants for a grounded theory study on the experience of licensure supervisors in the counseling profession. This study is being conducted in accordance with the dissertation/thesis qualifications as set forth by Oregon State University. I am under the supervision of Dr. Deborah Rubel, Ph.D., Associate Professor, who serves as my dissertation chair.

Due to your ability to access licensure supervisors through professional contact, I would like to ask for your help in the recruitment of participants for my research study. The criteria for participation are as follows:

- Must be over the age of 18;
- Must be actively supervising licensure supervisees.
EXPLORING PERSPECTIVES ON SUPERVISION

- Must have supervised a minimum of 5 licensure supervisees at the time of research
- Must have a Master’s degree in Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, or Community Counseling;
- Must meet state regulated criterion, in the state in which they provide services, to supervise within the field of counseling
- Must have an interest in and ability to explore their professional experience as a licensure supervisor.

If you know any individuals who meet the above criteria, I would appreciate it if you would give them the information I have attached. This information includes an invitation to participate/letter of introduction and a participant verbal consent form, which further explains the research study. Please indicate to the prospective participant that participation is strictly voluntary, and if interested he or she may contact me directly. By contacting me directly, the risk of breach in confidentiality will be minimized and other individuals will have no knowledge of their participation in the research study. My email address is siskos@onid.orst.edu. Participants may also contact the principle investigator, Deborah Rubel, Ph.D. at deborah.rubel@oregonstate.edu.

The title of the study is “A Grounded Theory Study of Licensure Supervisors’ Experience of Supervision”.

The research design and method for this investigation is a qualitative, grounded theory study. Participating in this research study will involve an initial face-to-face interview that will take 45 - 60 minutes, and up to two follow-up interviews of similar length, which will be telephonic. In the interviews, participants will be asked some questions about their personal and academic backgrounds, but mainly about the experiences as a licensure supervisor. The interviews will be conducted face-to-face and by phone, and in total take approximately three hours of the participants time. The study itself will span no more than five months.

I appreciate your help with this research, which will add to the body of literature related to licensure supervision in the field of counseling.

Thank you in advance for your support and assistance.

Sincerely,

Susan Sisko, M.A. LPC
Oregon State University PhD Candidate
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Email Invitation to Participate in Study

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Susan Sisko. I am a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at Oregon State University. I am in the process of recruiting participants for a grounded theory study on the experience of licensure supervisors in the counseling profession. You may be eligible to participate in this study, if you choose. Participating in this research study is strictly voluntary and, if you qualify, it is up to you to decide if you would like to participate. If you believe that you qualify and desire to be a part of this study, please contact me, the student researcher, directly.

Briefly, to be eligible for this study you:

- Must be over the age of 18;
- Must be actively supervising licensure supervisees.
- Must have supervised a minimum of 5 licensure supervisees at the time of research.
o Must have a Master’s degree in Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, or Community Counseling;

o Must meet state regulated criterion, in the state in which they provide services, to supervise within the field of counseling

o Must have an interest in and ability to explore their professional experience as a licensure supervisor.

As stated previously, participation is strictly voluntary. If you are interested you may contact the student researcher, Susan Sisko, MA, LPC directly via email at siskos@onid.orst.edu or by calling me at my direct phone number, (541) 386-2337. Please include phone contact information so that I might contact you to set up an initial screening conversation. During the initial screening, you will also have the opportunity to ask questions about the research. You may also contact the principle investigator, Deborah Rubel, Ph.D. at deborah.rubel@oregonstate.edu or by direct phone at (541)737-5973.

Thank you,

Susan Sisko, MA, LPC
Oregon State University PhD Candidate

Appendix G

Script: Initial Contact with Potential Participants

Dear Potential Participants:

This initial screening will begin by reviewing the eligibility criteria. In order to be eligible you:

o Must be over the age of 18;

o Must be actively supervising licensure supervisees.

o Must have supervised a minimum of 5 licensure supervisees at the time of research

o Must have a Master’s degree in Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, or Community Counseling;

o Must meet state regulated criterion, in the state in which they provide services, to supervise within the field of counseling

o Must have an interest in and ability to explore their professional experience as a licensure supervisor.
After reading the criteria for participation, are you still interested in being considered for this study?

- If no, thank you for your time and I will destroy what information I have, i.e. name and contact information.
- If yes, I will review the Verbal Consent Guide with you now.

Thank you for consenting to participate in this study, I will now review the criteria again, to establish your eligibility:

- Are you over the age of 18?
- Are you actively supervising licensure supervisees?
- Have you supervised a minimum of 5 licensure supervisees at the time of research?
- Do you have a Master's degree in Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, or Community Counseling?
- Do you meet state regulated criterion, in the state in which they provide services, to supervise within the field of counseling?
- Do you have an interest in and ability to explore their professional experience as a licensure supervisor?

If you answered yes to the above questions, we would like your assistance.

Under the supervision of Dr. Deborah Rubel, I (Susan Sisko) am recruiting licensure supervisors. This study is titled, “A Grounded Theory Study of How Licensure Supervisors Experience Supervision.”

For this study, you will be asked to participate in up to three rounds of interviews. Each interview will be approximately 45 minutes and will take place on dates and times convenient to you. The total expected time commitment if you agree to participate in this study will be approximately three hours.

- What questions can I answer for you?
- So that I am sure that you understand what the study involves, would you please tell me what you think I am asking you to do?
- In your own words, can you tell me what the biggest risk might be if you enroll in this study?

Please do not hesitate to contact either one of us should you have any questions.

Susan Sisko – Student Researcher
Email: siskos@onid.orst.edu
Telephone: (541) 386-2337

Deborah J. Rubel, Ph.D. – Principal Investigator
Email: deborah.rubel@oregonstate.edu
Telephone: (541) 737-5973
Appendix H

Verbal Consent Guide

Purpose. The purpose for this study is to increase the understanding of the experiences of licensure supervisors in the field of counseling.

There is a lack of knowledge in the counseling field about the experience of licensure supervisors. This research aims to address this lack of knowledge by developing a theory and creating an understanding of the experiences of licensure supervisors in the counseling field.

This study is being conducted by a student for the completion of a dissertation and will include interviews with up to twelve participants.

Activities. Participating in this study will involve up to three rounds of interviews that will take approximately 45 minutes each. In the interviews, you will be asked some questions about your personal and academic history, but mostly about your experiences as a licensure supervisor.

The first interview will take place face-to-face with follow-up interviews by phone on a date and time that is convenient for you and your total time commitment to the study will be approximately three hours. The
study will last no more than five months. All interviewing sessions will be audio recorded. Once the interviews are transcribed and checked for accuracy, the recordings will be destroyed.

You are advised to not enroll in this study if you do not want to be recorded. A copy of the interview transcript, with all identifying information removed will be emailed to you. This will be an opportunity for you to make comments, corrections, or remove any information you feel may identify you. You will have four days to let me know by email, any comments you have or changes you would like made. All information gathered in this study will be confidentially stored at OSU for three years.

Risks. The screening interview will cause no physical, economic or psychological risk to you.

Benefits. There are no known direct benefits to you in participating in this study. Your participation will help to contribute to the professions of counseling, and counselor education and supervision. You will also be contributing to the body of knowledge about licensure supervision.

Voluntariness. Participation in this study is up to you. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from this project before it ends, the researchers may keep information collected about you. This information may be included in study reports.

Contact information. If you have any questions about this project, please contact the student researcher, Susan Sisko, at (541) 386-2337. Email: siskos@onid.orst.edu. You may also choose to contact the primary investigator, Deborah J. Rubel, Ph.D. at: (541)737-5973. Email: deborah.rubel@oregonstate.edu. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

Sponsor. There is no sponsor

Office of the Institutional Review Board
Oregon State University
A312 Kerr Administration Bldg, Corvallis, OR 97331-2140
ph. (541) 737-8008  fax (541) 737-3093
IRB@oregonstate.edu
http://oregonstate.edu/irb
Appendix I

Participant Contact Information

Name:_______________________________________
Email:____________________________
Address:_______________________________________________________________________
Phone:_____________________________________
Okay to leave message? Yes _____ No_____

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Integrity | Oregon State University
B308 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, OR 97331-2140
Telephone (541) 737-8008
irb@oregonstate.edu | http://oregonstate.edu/irb/
Appendix J
Participant Information Form

Gender:  Male_____ Female_____ Transgender_____  

Race/Ethnicity:  
African American/Black_____  
Hispanic/Latino/a_____  
Native America/Alaskan Native_____  
Multiracial/Bi-racial_____  
White/Euro-American_____  
Other (please specify)_____  

Education:
Appendix K

Guiding Questions

Main research question: “How do licensure supervisors’ experience the process of licensure supervision?”

7. How do you experience the process of licensure supervision?

8. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the supervisory relationship?

9. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in promoting client welfare?

10. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in counselor development?

11. As a licensure supervisor, have you experienced the gatekeeping role?

12. As a licensure supervisor, how did you experience preparation as a supervisor as part of the process?
Appendix L

First Round Interviews

Introduction

The first round interviews took place March / April 2014. All initial interviews were face-to-face in the participants’ setting with nine master or PhD level expert supervisors. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were analyzed using the grounded theory methodology of open coding procedures to construct conceptual categories. In addition, axial coding procedures were used to explore connections between categories and support complete analysis. The six questions that were asked in the first round interviews were:

1. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the process of licensure supervision?

2. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the supervisory relationship?
3. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in promoting client welfare?

4. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience your role in counselor development?

5. As a licensure supervisor, how do you experience the gatekeeping role?

6. As a licensure supervisor, how did you experience preparation as a supervisor as part of this process?

Six major categorical themes evolved from open and axial coding of the participants’ experience of licensure supervision. These categories were conceptualized as (i) Training & Development of Supervisor (ii) Screening supervisee for supervision (iii) Supervision in Action (iv) Taking on roles as a supervisor (v) Challenging experiences in supervision and (vi) Rewarding experiences in supervision.

**Training and Development of Licensure Supervisor**

The training and development of licensure supervisor emerged as a significant category because the experience of the supervisor feeling prepared to work as a licensure supervisor impacted a willingness and readiness to engage in licensure supervision.

Several properties within the category of training and development of licensure supervisor emerged and included: (a) experience as a counselor or therapist, (b) knowledge through self-reflection and (c) specific trainings to become a licensure supervisor.

**Experience as a counselor or therapist**
Relying on *experience as a counselor or therapist* is a property of *training and development of licensure supervisor* that participants’ defined as a necessary experience of readiness to become a licensure supervisor. Participants’ stated that through their experiences they felt:

- P 9 “*They have something to offer as a supervisor.*”
- P 6 “*Taking time to get there.*”
- P 1 “*Experiencing many years work to become a supervisor.*”
- P 7 “*Feeling ready to become a supervisor took many years.*”
- P 4 “*I’ve been doing it for so long it means I am helping keep our profession ethical and going well.*”
- P 2 “*Well, I think first of all that it took me many years until I felt I was ready to be a supervisor, whether people liked it or not.*”

Participants’ who described having significant past experience as professionals in the field of counseling and therapy felt they were more prepared and competent as licensure supervisors.

**Knowledge through Self-Reflection**

Participants’ defined *knowledge through self-reflection* as their experience of listening to and trusting themselves as a guide during licensure supervision. Participants’ describe this as a part of their development and growth over time. Participants’ stated:

- P 2 “*And so if I start feeling in my body like something is really not right, I feel tense and uncomfortable, there is no way that I can be authentic and working well with the person if that’s coming out*”
- P 4 “*I got a sense.*”
- P 9 “*I trusted myself.*”
“I’ve learned a lot from being supervised myself. I’ve learned that supervision is so different. Every supervisor is different. And I’ve learned what I don’t like about supervision...[chuckles]...about being supervised. And I’ve learned what I’ve liked. So as a supervisor I try to learn from those experiences.”

“My intuition guided me.”

“Yeah, they may be a perfectly fine supervisee for somebody else, but I tend to kind of trust my red flags when I see them.”

“And through that process I learned a lot and became much more cognizant of how I supervised. I became aware of theory, became aware of best practices and became more self-aware of the way I supervise. And so that moved me forward quite a bit in terms of my development as a supervisor. But I still feel like it wasn’t sufficient. I feel like supervisors...I mean, I hope to...What I did was I just did a lot of personal reflection and thinking and writing and reading. And, I hope that other supervisors are doing the same thing. Because the credential is good and the training you have to go through is good, but it’s again, just the beginning of what I think is probably necessary, you know, particularly around ethics and law and stuff.”

Participants’ described a range of experiences that demonstrated a strong awareness of their self-reflection as part of their development as a licensure supervisor.

Training

Participants’ experience of training was similar in that each described a minimum requirement of hours (15-30) of formal supervision training within their professional licensing body. Participants’ expressed the importance of additional and specific training to become a licensure supervisor and also acknowledged that it is a requirement.

“So, here there was the thirty-hour course.”

“I think a lot of it is probably the MFT Association and perspective on supervision. Historically, MFTs have had a strong training, process and standards for supervision, which was one of the reasons I went to get a PhD in the first place.”

“Well, I had done supervision prior to being a licensure supervisor, so I kind of knew the basics of clinical supervision. I had
always done it through agencies, so I had to do the combination of administrative and clinical supervision. I was not working with primarily Master’s level clinicians but more with bachelor’s level, or sometimes even paraprofessional clinicians. So really having to work on a basic level. I’ve had to raise my bar a little bit for licensure supervision with formal training. So along with doing the formal training that is required, I also did my own kind of review of the different theories and models that I frankly hadn’t used in a while. So when a supervisee says, well, I’m using this cognitive approach, and then I can kind of help them tailor that a little bit.”

This category included experiences of both professional skill development and professional identity development for participants’ as licensure supervisors.

**Screening Supervisee for Supervision**

*Screening supervisee for supervision* emerged as a concept from the analysis of data generated by initial interview questions. As participants’ described their experiences as licensure supervisors, they provided insight into their need to screen supervisees as part of the licensure supervision process. Screening the supervisee for licensure supervision was described as important to the structure of licensure supervision and the properties that emerged within the category of *screening supervisee for supervision* include: (a) the best-fit between the licensure supervisor and supervisee and (b) a safeguard to avoid working with highly challenged or challenging supervisees.

**Best-fit between licensure supervisor and supervisee**

*Best-fit between licensure supervisor and supervisee* described how licensure supervisors make a decision about working with a supervisee for licensure. The screening process can be formal or informal and best-fit includes preference for models and working style as well as personality.
P 6 “And I will only take a student that I truly feel like I am a good fit for, or feel like I really trust their judgment and trust that we can work well together. And so I’ve told several graduates that I don’t know if I’m a good fit for you and this is why. And sometimes it’s just that I think they’re too comfortable with me and they need a different perspective. I want them to find someone that they are not familiar with. And I feel like they’ve really gotten a lot from me, and so sometimes that’s the reason. Sometimes because (location) is a small town our circles cross and I don’t feel like I would be objective enough to be their supervisor. So there’s times where I let students know that I can’t—.”

P 1 “No, it’s not necessarily a formal interview. But yes, just hearing a little bit about their experiences and what they’re looking for, especially also the orientation that they’re looking for, for a therapist. And for me to get a feel for the person themselves, but also to tell them a little bit about my style and see if they’re comfortable with it.”

P 5 “Yeah. And typically, if I know pretty immediately that I’m not going to see them, I’ll just have a frank conversation when they call or contact me. But if it sounds like it might be a good one then I have them come in. I talk about my process with them as far as I use discrimination model, and so reminding them what that’s like and what that means and then all of my supervision PDS, informed consent. Yeah, so we just go through that whole process and see if it’s a good fit.”

Safeguard to avoid working with highly challenged or challenging supervisees

Safeguard to avoid working with highly challenged or challenging supervisees describes how the participants develop an ability or screening process to create the best outcomes through setting up structure around who they work with as a licensure supervisee.

P 2 “Using the family genogram specifically to look at their own family origin ... and why that is important to me is that once we start looking at cases, we can look at what sometimes makes it hard for people to move forward, how they get stuck in a case or what triggers them and so we can use the parallel process to work on.”

P 2 “So having that information very quickly sets the stage for working in supervision with the use of self of both the supervisee and the supervisor as well in the process. So the focus, to my mind is very much based on the supervisee and their skills. And then for sure we also definitely look at the
safety, the benefit of the clients that they see, but first and foremost the supervisee and their life.”

**Supervision in Action**

Participants’ described four interconnected properties related to supervisor actions in licensure supervision, which included: (a) **Establishing structure and focus in supervision**, (b) **Building the supervisory relationship**, (c) **Promoting growth and development of supervisee** and (d) **Using supervision tools and interventions**.

**Establishing structure and focus in supervision**

*Establishing structure and focus in supervision* was identified as the participants described the early stages of establishing licensure supervision parameters with two dimensions: *structure of supervision* and *regulations for licensure*.

The *structure of supervision* included establishing how supervision processes work, contracting with the supervisee and focus on client safety and welfare. Participants’ relied on the *structure of supervision* to help manage licensure supervision.

> P 2 “Another thing that I also do is...and I can send it to you...I give them a...I don’t know if it’s exactly like a contract of how I do supervision. Like you will notice that I will be challenging you, and any questions that I ask you don’t necessarily have to answer. I will send you materials about things that we were talking about, and if you have interesting things that come up for you please feel free to send those to me. So there are some things there of how I work.”

> P 8 “You know, I have to practice a lot of skills. Because sometimes when somebody comes in and I would be in disagreement about maybe how they conceptualize the case, or they don’t know how to conceptualize a case, to always stay strength- based. I mean, language is really important. I love words. And so to be able to use them in a way that gets my point across, because I tend to be a pretty direct person. But also shows the empathy and all of those right things that we need to be doing with our clients. I also feel I have to be able to embrace all of those skills with the people I supervise. I want them to stay present with me. And so to do that I clearly have to be very mindful of how any critical feedback comes out of my mouth.”
"I have a supervision agreement that I enter into with all of my supervisees that describes the process as two things. One is promoting their growth and development. And the other is to meet the legal requirements of their practice. So there’s two things that I need to be paying attention to simultaneously. One is providing them with the hours that they need. That’s kind of the process is, you know, they need to go through a certain amount of hours in order to qualify for their licensure. The other is the content. Actually getting into how they perceive counseling, what their struggles are, what they believe their strengths are and what they believe they need to improve on.

Participants’ suggested that creating structure and focus was an important part of managing the licensure supervision process. In addition to structure of supervision focus on regulations for licensure was stated as significant for licensure supervision.

Regulations for licensure

Regulations for licensure includes the licensure supervisor being aware of all requirements for supervisee including required hours, ethical issues, client safety and welfare.

“However, again in the supervisor agreement, and as a practical matter, supervisors are legally responsible for the work of their supervisees.”

“The complication of it is state regulations. I don’t care if they’re getting licensed to be a mental health counselor, a psychologist or a marriage and family therapist or a social worker, all of them, which I’ve supervised toward licensure have just an incredible curvy journey in our state legislature towards licensure. To the point that I’m continually checking with them and saying, did you check with the state on that? Whoever you talk to write down their name. You don’t want to get to the end of this process and have them tell you the hours don’t count.”

“Which includes all the...I think it’s pretty much all the things that are involved with their licensure. So you know, there’s an ethical component. There are principles. There’s all the kind...And so I’ve divided them up and...I mean, I didn’t do the work. This was just something that was part of what I did in the past, which I think is really useful and it helps to structure beyond just that day to day, okay, I’m stuck with my clinician...you know, with my client rather.”
Building the Supervisory Relationship

Building the supervisory relationship was described as a property of the category 
Supervision in Action. As participants’ began to describe their experiences of licensure supervision they described recognizing the importance of establishing a working relationship with the supervisee. Participants’ describe the relationship creating the space and opportunity to build supervisee strengths as well as being able to be corrective, if needed.

P 8 “You know, for me it is one of I like who I supervise a lot right now. I like them as people. So for me, I’m always having to keep in the forefront of my mind good professional boundaries. There’s a piece of me that would love to hang out with them or kind of know some of the things that probably are just not germane to a supervisory role. So I have to keep on top of that, because if I don’t then they’re not going to do that either. Because, again, if I have...I have a good relationship with the people I supervise right now. So they like me as a person as well. So, and how I experienced that with the supervisory the relationship.”

P 6 “Well, actually, my relationship is somebody who’s going to provide them with some positive direction. You know, help them to build on their strengths. Help them to clarify their orientation, to get better at that, if I can. Sometimes I don’t know what they’re talking about though.”

P 3 “And so it being more like a mentor to a person is how I see the process. And so I’m thinking about that when we’re looking at things, we’re looking at not just like this specific skill of how to do therapy with a client, but more about what it is like to be a counselor, generally speaking. In life, how you take care of yourself, how you conduct yourself, how you conduct yourself with clients, with other
professionals, so it is all there. So there’s also a give and take and talk about it. So I can sometimes talk about my own experiences with something as a way to provide them with insight and information, or amalgamate some of the things. So that what I’m hoping is that what they will walk away from is not just having a specific skill in doing work with clients, but more that they also have the depth of being in this field in the world and what’s going on with this field.”

P 1 “This was an opportunity for me to kind of coach that person on, you know what people need is a solution to their problem. And if you can provide that, then that just goes one step further into developing a relationship where the client will really be trusting that you are there to help them in a real practical way. Until you have that relationship everything else goes in one ear and out the other.”

Participants’ describe creating a structure and space for the process of licensure supervision by building the supervisory relationship.

Promoting growth and development of supervisee

Promoting growth and development of supervisee was described as a property of Supervision in Action. Participant interviews suggested that promoting growth and development of the supervisee was particularly unique to licensure supervision. Supporting the supervisee to develop their basic skills as well as confidence and experience during the licensure process was crucial.

P 1 “Yeah. Yeah, so there’s a big difference between being just the kind of informal advisor and actually being a professional counselor. And people come out of graduate school oftentimes with still kind of that informal advisor orientation. What they’ve got to do is kind of fit that theory base and that skill set into that. Because, the informal advisor works for them in a big way. You know, they are approachable. They’re friendly. They’re nonjudgmental. You know, there’s some intuitive things that bring people into this business. And then there’s kind of the more technical, the more skill sets that people develop. So, you know, where I see that role in counselor development is kind of moving that process along.”

P 8 “I’ve been in the field for twenty-five years. I’m out there a long time. And, I can never know enough...And these are people...most of the therapists are very young. Some of them this is their first job out of
grad school. Some of them are young enough that they don’t have a lot of life experience either. You know, there are some people in their mid-twenties. So I have one who’s that young, and then there are some who are in their mid-thirties who have other experiences but are still new to their field.”

P 3 “Well, I find that most counselors, particularly novice counselors, do not have sufficient knowledge because even doctorate programs just skim the essentials. So as an instructor myself, and as someone who really loves theory and history and research, I will often lecture...[chuckles]...my supervisees about certain things that I think are important and that they might think are useful to them .... And so also I’ll loan books out and say, you know, I want you to read this chapter. Or I’ll email articles or videos, or stuff that come up. So in terms of knowledge counselor development I’ll do that. But again, it’s infused in everything I do, because even if we’re just talking about a case, as I’m talking to them I’m hoping that what we’re doing in that supervisory moment they will integrate so that it helps them develop professionally, so that I don’t have to do it again. Do you know what I mean?”

Using supervision tools and interventions

Participants’ described the importance and usefulness of using supervision tools and interventions in licensure supervision. Supervision tools include techniques and models of supervision that supervisors’ used during licensure supervision.

P 2 “And then let’s say when we agree to do the supervision, then the first thing they do in the first meeting is we are doing the family genogram. And the family genogram is used in two ways. It is both used to show them how a genogram can be used in therapy, but also specifically to look at their own family origin as well with the idea that we can look at some of the resiliency and skills that people have learned but also some of the issues that they might have that gets transmitted from one generation to the next.”

P 8 “So my process right now is they are all going to have a clinician development plan. And so they’re at the place right now where they’re identifying their strengths and needs, in maybe six, seven, eight categories. And then I will add to them, based on my observations and experience with them.”

P 4 “I think I take that part of it really, really seriously. I encourage my supervisees to read particular things. I have some standards that I
require them to read. One is called Trauma and The Therapist, which is by Laurie Pearlman, which has to do with mainly beginning therapists and how they’re so enthusiastic to do the work but they take the trauma and they end up burned out. They end up projecting. They end up poor boundaries. They end up all kinds of things. And when I see that, which seems to happen in those couple of years then I’m educating them for their own development.”

Licensure supervisors’ describe using tools and interventions unique to novice or new supervisees working in the field.

Taking on Roles as Licensure Supervisor

Taking on roles as a licensure supervisor was described as having significance in licensure supervision. Some of the roles described are mentor, coach, counselor, teacher, consultant and colleague. These roles were utilized during various stages or experiences by the licensure supervisor.

P 1 “Well, I experience that as a mentor.”

P 3 “I don’t treat my supervisees like clients at all. I consider it to be a very different process. It’s more collegial. It’s more relaxed. It’s more advice giving. Yeah, there’s a lot of different styles of supervision and I’ve tried on a lot of different styles.”

P 6 “So this is just my personal feelings as far as being a supervisor. Well, I enjoy it. For a lot of reasons. I think a role teacher. And a little bit of being a supervisor, I think is doing a little bit of teaching. And I find working with younger therapists, or soon to be therapists refreshing. They teach me stuff. They’re like a sponge, which is kind of fun. They ask good questions.”

P 5 “No. I’ll even say it. I’m putting my counselor hat on now, or I’m putting my teacher hat on. Especially if I want to give them real specific information, like I’m putting this hat on now. Or sometimes they’ll bring something to the table and I’ll say, my consultation hat is coming on because I don’t know. Let’s figure this out together.”

P 3 “And so it’s being more like a mentor to a person is how I see the process. And so I’m thinking about that when we’re looking at things, we’re looking at not just like this specific skill of how to do therapy with a client, but more about what it is like to be a counselor, generally
speaking. In life, how you take care of yourself, how you conduct yourself, how you conduct yourself with clients, with other professionals, so it is all there. So there’s also a give and take and talk about it. So I can sometimes talk about my own experiences with something as a way to provide them with insight and information, or amalgamate some of the things. So that what I’m hoping is that what they will walk away from is not just having a specific skill in doing work with clients, but more that they also have the depth of being in this field in the world and what’s going on with this field.”

Licensure supervisors describe being aware of using different roles in their relationship with the supervisee and the important and value of doing so.

**Supervisor Challenges**

Supervisor challenges are described as the issues or barriers that arise during the course of licensure supervision. The participants’ describe their experiences of challenges during licensure supervision as generally the hardest part about the work of supervision with two dimensions: (a) Challenges from issues with supervisee impairment and (b) supervisor experiences of self concerns.

_Challenges from issues related to supervisee impairment_ is a dimension of supervisor challenges which includes concerns when the supervisee was not able to function at an appropriate standard of client care or respond to supervisor feedback. Participants’ described concerns about liability and responsibility for supervisee. Participants’ described concerns about supervisee having academic and book knowledge but limited practical knowledge so that the supervisees’ perception of their ability did not always match their actual skill set.

_P 4_ “So I wrote her a letter and told her in writing what she couldn’t do, and I copied the state. And I said that I would be unable to sign off on her hours. Very uncomfortable because I don’t think they were well spent. And I wanted her to go under a corrective action for six months and then we could start again. And she did it. But it was very, very painful. A lot of tears. And I know it was costing her money. I knew it
was costing her money. But on the other hand it was so far beyond what she was supposed to be doing.”

P 3 “And it was not comfortable. My experience of it was one of difficulty, pain, guilt, anxiety, but mainly guilt, because she was my supervisee. Oh, you know, she gave me a lot of compliments about my supervision. And I liked her, and I wanted her to succeed. But she made some grave... She made a series of grave errors. And all along the way I kept telling her to stop doing those things. And she kept doing them. And at a certain point I had no other choice but to figure out a way to get her out of the profession. There were just too many problems.”

P 2 “So that’s one difficulty that I’ve seen. And sometimes it became to such a way that they changed supervisor because I put it out there. And the other difficulty that I have as a professional is that my outlook working with people is I look for strength. I look at what people are capable of. And that makes me at times very lousy the other way around of enforcing like the things that you’re not doing well. I will see a light of something that you can do and things like that.”

P 8 “Okay. Yeah, I think that that is probably the most difficult. And I have occasionally... Most of my supervisees have been just great. But there are some that maybe have some challenges, maybe a little immaturity. And I really kind of dissect it to make sure that the issue isn’t necessarily client related. If its client related, then we need to really do something different than if it is just personal related.”

Licensure supervisors also describe challenges in licensure supervision related to the supervisors experiences of self or systems concerns, which has to do with the licensure supervisor feeling anxious, or lacking in skills or confidence or further concerns with systems issues. They also described not having the same level of support working with licensure supervisee (other faculty, audio/video recording, working a university site, practicum site) as one might in a different stage of supervision.

P 7 “And I think that if not, a consulting group. Because quite... Maybe there are supervisors out there that have all the answers and know how to interpret everything. But sometimes the SSR’s are extremely vague. And trying to get someone that will be very concrete with you when you have a question is extremely difficult. So, there are times when I don’t
particularly know the answer to everything. And finding where you go for the answer is always...It can be quite a challenge.”

P 8 “I pretty much said this, but I think that it’s really important. If a clinical supervisor is to do a good job, and good job meaning not only for the clinician that you supervise but also for the families that they work with, I think there needs to be a better balance between clinical administration...or, I mean, supervisory...I don’t even know what I would call that. And the actual clinical supervision. I think when it’s out of bounds it makes me nuts as a person. And I don’t feel like I’m doing as good of a job as I could be. Then there are the awkward and uncomfortable relationships where I don’t feel very secure or confident in what we’re doing, or how they feel about me.”

P 3 “You know, there’s just questions. But I’ve learned to become accustomed to it. It used to really bother me when I was starting out as a supervisor. I used to get really nervous. But as time went on I just learned that it’s just another form of a relationship with the supervisee. It’s not anything to lose sleep over. Well, so supervision is very anxiety provoking. I don’t know if any other people have said this, but that’s something that I have learned to get over.”

P 2 “But on the other hand, the thing that is not so good at, or are always more is like systematically go over every single client that they see and make sure that they do everything. That actually is the direction in the field that I’m really concerned about. It’s now true with the social workers and with psychologists where, actually, they have to sign off on every progress note and things like that. And to me that feels more like protecting your butt legally, but actually it doesn’t necessarily allow for better supervision.”

**Supervisor Rewards**

Supervisor rewards emerged as a concept from the analysis of data generated by the initial interview questions. As participants described their experiences in licensure supervision, they provided insight into rewarding experiences.

Participants describe *supervisor rewards* in licensure supervision as incentives or motivation for engaging in licensure supervision.

P 8 “I find it very exciting. I think it’s wonderful to be able to...I enjoy teaching, so I see it as kind of a co-teaching experience where I am
also learning as much as they are.”

P 6 “So this is just my personal feelings as far as being a supervisor. Well, I enjoy it. For a lot of reasons. I think a role teacher. And a little bit of being a supervisor, I think is doing a little bit of teaching. And I find working with younger therapists, or soon to be therapists refreshing. They teach me stuff. They’re like a sponge, which is kind of fun. They ask good questions.”

P 3 “I enjoy it because it’s personally gratifying to help people help people. That’s why I do it. And, it’s also gratifying to normalize novice therapists’ experience, their anxiety, their worries, their quote/unquote “failures,” their concerns. And so it feels good to support and to normalize and to cheerlead, and all of that sort of stuff.”

Participants’ described events during the supervision process that made licensure supervision rewarding.

Discussion

The first round of interviews provided information that began to explain the experience of licensure supervisor. It involved the ongoing interaction between six categories and eleven properties. The properties identified by the participants relating to supervisors training and development include: a) experience as a counselor or therapist, b) knowledge through self-reflection and c) specific trainings to become a licensure supervisor. Participants suggested that the supervisors training and development was connected to establishing the second category screening for supervision. This category included properties that were described by the participants as a) the best-fit between the licensure supervisor and supervisee and b) a safeguard to avoid working with highly challenged or challenging supervisees.

The fourth category supervision in action evolved as the process of supervision with four properties: a) establishing structure and focus in supervision, b) building the
supervisory relationship, c) promoting growth and development of supervisee and d) using supervision tools and interventions. The fifth category taking on supervisor roles was connected to supervision in action. Finally, both categories of supervisor being challenged with two dimensions: a) Challenges from issues with supervisee impairment and b) supervisor experiences of self concerns and supervisor being rewarded were also connected to supervision in action category.

The information gathered from the participants’ first round interviews suggested that the experience of licensure supervisors is a complex process. The categories and properties are interrelated and form a tentative structure that participants’ describe (See Appendix __, Figure 1). From this tentative structure, the second round of interview questions were developed and formulated with the intention of describing and better understanding the complex experience of licensure supervisors. The second round of interview questions that were developed included:

1) What motivates you during the process of licensure supervision?

2) What does it mean for you to be doing licensure supervision?

3) How does your perception of your responsibilities as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?

4) How does your perception of your power as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?

5) What makes licensure supervision challenging and rewarding?
Figure 1: Emerging Properties and Categories from First Round of Interviews
Appendix M

Second Round Interviews

Introduction

The data gathered through round one interviews and data analysis created a foundation and initial structure reflecting the experience of licensure supervisors.

Round two questions were constructed using the information obtained through previous participant interviews. The second round of participant interviews was gathered telephonically with nine master or PhD level expert clinical supervisors. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and analyzed using the grounded theory methodology of open coding procedures to describe and bring more specific focus on the previously constructed categories. The second round questions were designed with the goal of expanding the previous descriptions of the experiences of licensure supervisors. The second round of interview questions were:

1) What motivates you during the process of licensure supervision?

2) What does it mean for you to be doing licensure supervision

3) How does your perception of your responsibilities as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?
4) How does your perception of your power as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?

5) What makes licensure supervision challenging and rewarding?

During the second round interviews the participants gave further depth and details to their descriptions of the experience of licensure supervision. Through analyzing the second round interview data this confirmed the structure that was developed after the first round of interviews.

After the first round of interviews, the structure that emerged from the data was six categories described by all of the participants as part of their experience as a licensure supervisor. These categories were titled *Training & Development of Supervisor, Screening supervisee for supervision, Supervision in Action, Taking on roles as a supervisor, Challenging experiences in supervision* and *Rewarding experiences in supervision*.

**Continuing and Emerging Major Categories**

**Supervisor Professional Development**

The first round analysis resulted in the emergence of the category, *training and development of supervisor* and the three properties: *experiencing through counselor or therapist role*, *knowing through self-reflection* and *training specific licensure supervisor* remained an important and well-developed contextual category. The participants’ described the importance of gaining the knowledge and experience to supervise licensees. The knowledge and experience were initially categorized as *experiencing professional development*, and a delineated range of knowledge and experiences of growth and
understanding perceived in terms of previous professional experience and self-reflection to specific training(s) to develop skills in supervision. This influenced the participants’ experiences of licensure supervision.

Participants’ described their experience of being in the field as counselors and therapists, which prepared them for working as a licensure supervisor. Participants’ described the importance of professional development through their own experiences of being in the field as working professionals. The participants’ believes that their own working experiences enhanced their capacity as licensure supervisors. Reevaluated in following round two this category is better described as upstream professional development.

*Experiencing through counselor or therapist role* is a property of supervisor professional development that participants’ defined as a necessary experience of readiness to become a licensure supervisor. Participants’ stated that through experiencing counselor or therapist role they established an experience of professional development that contributed to their experience of licensure supervision. For example:

P 9 “They have something to offer as a supervisor”

P 6 “Taking time to get there”,

P 1 “Experiencing many years work to become a supervisor”

P 7 “Feeling ready to become a supervisor took many years”

P 4 “I’ve been doing it for so long it means I am helping keep our profession ethical and going well”.

P 2 “Well, I think first of all that it took me many years until I felt I was ready to be a supervisor, whether people liked it or not”
Participants’ who described having significant past experience as professionals in the field of counseling and therapy felt they were more prepared and competent as licensure supervisors. These experiences describe a process that took time for the participants’ to feel ready to work with licensure supervisees.

Knowing through self-reflection is a property of training and development of supervisor. This property is described by the participants’ as one of listening to and trusting themselves as a guide during licensure supervision. Participants’ describe this as a part of their development and growth over time.

P 2 “And so if I start feeling in my body like something is really not right, I feel tense and uncomfortable, there is no way that I can be authentic and working well with the person if that’s coming out”

P 4 “I got a sense”,

P 9 “I trusted myself”,

P 2 “I’ve learned a lot from being supervised myself. I’ve learned that supervision is so different. Every supervisor is different. And I’ve learned what I don’t like about supervision...[chuckles]...about being supervised. And I’ve learned what I’ve liked. So as a supervisor I try to learn from those experiences.

P 8 “My intuition guided me”

P 1 “Yeah, they may be a perfectly fine supervisee for somebody else, but I tend to kind of trust my red flags when I see them “

P 3 “And through that process I learned a lot and became much more cognizant of how I supervised. I became aware of theory, became aware of best practices and became more self-aware of the way I supervise. And so that moved me forward quite a bit in terms of my development as a supervisor. But I still feel like it wasn’t sufficient. I feel like supervisors...I mean, I hope to...What I did was I just did a lot of personal reflection and thinking and writing and reading. And, I hope that other supervisors are doing the same thing. Because the credential is good and the training you have to go through is good, but it’s again, just the beginning of what I think is probably necessary, you know, particularly around ethics and law and stuff.”
Participants’ described a range of experiences that demonstrate a strong awareness of their self-reflection as part of their development as a licensure supervisor.

*Training specific to licensure supervision* is a property of *training and development of supervisor*. The participants’ describe this property as experiences of engaging in specifically designated courses to become licensure supervisors. Participants’ described similar experiences in that each stated that they engaged in at least a minimum requirement of hours (15-30) of formal supervision training within their professional licensing body. Participants’ expressed the importance of additional and specific training to become a licensure supervisor and also acknowledged that it is a requirement.

- P 1 “So, here there was the thirty-hour course”
- P 9 “I think a lot of it is probably the MFT Association and perspective on supervision. Historically, MFTs have had a strong training, process and standards for supervision, which was one of the reasons I went to get a PhD in the first place”
- P 1 “Well, I had done supervision prior to being a licensure supervisor, so I kind of knew the basics of clinical supervision. I had always done it through agencies, so I had to do the combination of administrative and clinical supervision. I was not working with primarily Master’s level clinicians but more with bachelor’s level, or sometimes even paraprofessional clinicians. So really having to work on a basic level. I’ve had to raise my bar a little bit for licensure supervision with formal training. So along with doing the formal training that is required, I also did my own kind of review of the different theories and models that I frankly hadn’t used in a while. So when a supervisee says, well, I’m using this cognitive approach, and then I can kind of help them tailor that a little bit”.

This category included experiences of both professional skill development and professional identity development for participants’ as licensure supervisors.

**Motivation**

The first round interviews rose the curiosity of the researchers as to what compelled participants’ to become licensure supervisors, especially after their
descriptions of the experiences of the *challenges* in licensure supervision following round one interviews. Licensure supervisor challenges are described as the issues or barriers that arise during the course of licensure supervision. The participants’ describe their experiences related to supervision challenge as generally the hardest part about licensure supervision.

*Experiencing motivation*

The participants’ describe *experiencing motivation* as being aware of the reasons for their actions as well as the *influences and incentives* that impact their initial and ongoing engagement in providing licensure supervision. Participants’ described experiencing motivation in two general ways. These ways are represented in *experiencing motivation* and occur in the context and the practice of licensure supervision as two properties: a) *experiencing mutual and immediate incentives* and b) *experiencing long-term influences and incentives*.

*Experiencing mutual and immediate incentives* are described as motivating and rewarding because this creates an immediate and active energy during the supervision process in the here-and-now of licensure supervision. For example:

P5 “I think when it has to do with the supervisee. I love their questions. I love their excitement. Umm, you know they are just bright eyed and bushy tailed and ready to go and they ask just some great questions, especially, the ethical pieces. We dig into the ethics, the new ethics that just came out. So some of those I know were sprucing up their PDS with the social media things and umm it just feels very dynamic and I really like that”.

P8 “I think that it is the mutuality between offering the tidbits of expertise that I have and asking good question, which stimulates me, which hopefully the supervisee. That makes sense? It’s so mutual and I also look forward to learning more. And so when people ask me about different areas that need to be covered or just in general clinical or ethical questions ummm, it’s, it’s really a mutual, so mutual, ya know, because it makes me think and it umm, hopefully stimulates another person to be
thinking as well so it creates the question might then generate a wonderful dialogue”.

P 1 “Is ummmm, when you just kind of, ya know and this is independent of any particular model you are using but when you feel really present and engaged in what you are doing, both the content and the process. You really kind of getting what the supervisee might be struggling with and why this is a particular problem for them and helping them work through it and helping them find some different paths to work through the issues. That same feeling you get of kind of being connected and being present”.

Experiencing mutual and immediate motivation for participants’ is described as stimulating and generally positive in nature. These positive experiences, although not without some challenges, bring balance to the experiences of licensure supervision. The positive outcomes, growth of the supervisee and pleasure derived in the supervision relationship suggest a counterbalance to the experience of significant challenges. Participants’ describe being impacted as they help the supervisee progress toward licensure.

Experiencing long-term influences and incentives in licensure supervision is described as motivation that has far reaching factors both during and beyond the immediate experience of being in the supervision process. Participants’ describe experiencing long-term influences and incentives including dimensions of wanting to insure supervisees have a good experience of supervision and a sense of contributing to the profession. For example:

P 3 “I know how much support they need, how much they depend on a mentor. And how a safe mentor can be to help serve well. So I guess touches on another meaning for me, which is I have had a number of supervisors throughout my career. Some of which who have been wonderful and I have had abusive, horrific supervisors, one in particular. I don’t use the word abusive lightly. Ummm, and yea, really just want to not have anyone go through that”. P 4 “Relating to being the supervisee in the past and making sure they have a good experience in supervision and sharing what I know as a mature professional to a younger professional”
P 2: “The positive things about licensure, especially if you think licensure are making sense and are good then licensure supervision will even ensure more that we are creating, hopefully, a generation of people that have better skills and are more ethical and professional”.

P 6 “The process of supervision itself, which includes licensure, obviously, is that the Center is going to be doing something good because one of our core values is Excellence. The other thing that motivates me that there will be strong therapists in the future and certainly people are going to get healed. I think there is a generativity about doing supervision.”

P 9 “Well, I feel an obligation, a sense of responsibility of caring for the profession but particularly the people going into the profession where they are relatively independently functioning. I still like what I do and I think it is a worthwhile thing to do and I appreciate when some younger people show some passion and aptitude for it. That’s probably the thing that most motivates me”.

Participants’ further describe experiencing long-term influences and incentives as motivational because they benefit directly themselves from the process:

P 2 “I like being part of the bigger professional community”.

P 5 “Licensure supervision gives more validity to my work”

P 3 “I cannot lie that it is a prestige bump as well as far as the social construct of what we hold up or adhere to in life. The idea that if we are a boss we have some how arrived in your career. I can’t lie there. There is some internal jolly”.

Motivation emerged as a category from round two interviews and supports the re-conceptualization and integration of the supervisor rewards category established from round one interviews (See Appendix __). The supervisor rewards category described experiences of motivation as being aware of the reasons for their actions and the incentives that impact their initial and ongoing engagement in providing licensure supervision. Examples from round one interviews of supervisor rewards category included:
P 8 “I find it very exciting. I think it’s wonderful to be able to...I enjoy teaching, so I see it as kind of a co-teaching experience where I am also learning as much as they are”.

P 6 “So this is just my personal feelings as far as being a supervisor. Well, I enjoy it. For a lot of reasons. I think a role teacher. And a little bit of being a supervisor, I think is doing a little bit of teaching. And I find working with younger therapists, or soon to be therapists refreshing. They teach me stuff. They’re like a sponge, which is kind of fun. They ask good questions.”

P 3 “I enjoy it because it’s personally gratifying to help people help people. That’s why I do it. And, it’s also gratifying to normalize novice therapists’ experience, their anxiety, their worries, their quote/unquote “failures,” their concerns. And, so it feels good to support and to normalize and to cheerlead, and all of that sort of stuff”

**Personal and Professional Values**

This important category emerged in round two interviews as participants’ describe being aware of the intrinsic values and principles that guide their knowledge and conduct in providing licensure supervision

*Experiencing personal and professional values*

*Experiencing personal and professional values* includes characteristics that may or may not be directly shared in the supervision process. The two properties that emerged are: a) *sharing knowledge and supporting the growth and development of the supervisee* and b) *contribute to the greater professional community including generativity; guiding the next generation with a sense of optimism.*

*Sharing knowledge and supporting the growth and development of the supervisee* is a property of *personal and professional values*. Participants’ describe how their values directly impact their work as licensure supervisors. This property includes the experience of *promoting growth and development of supervisee* re-conceptualized from round one interviews (See Appendix ___ Round One Interviews). For example:
P 2 “I think it is especially if I can create this kind of environment of complete rapport and trust and have the possibility to become more a mentor to a person that is the most satisfying thing. So, somebody that comes in, being somewhat green in their skills, and I see them like a flower blossom and get into their own and sometimes surpass me in their work. I find that meaningful. The process is beautiful when I hear myself talk or connect with the supervisee. So actually, I grow a lot during supervision, especially with a supervisee who is very challenging.”

P 9 “So, I think that is part of my meaning in supervising so they can be as well prepared as I can help them to be. It is also to help people in a way that minimizes harm to people, so protecting the consumer as well. I think working in a medical context I am always reminded about what I don’t know and so I think part of my meaning is in upgrading who mental health practitioners are. So it is not about the model or the moment or the catchy idea that is not as helpful or proven to be effective. So, as much as I can learn that I can pass that on and help them to be much better licensure supervisees”.

P 3 “I enjoy it because it’s personally gratifying to help people help people. [Chuckles] That’s why I do it. And, it’s also gratifying to normalize novice therapists’ experience, their anxiety, their worries, their quote/unquote “failures,” their concerns. And so it feels good to support and to normalize and to cheerlead, and all of that sort of stuff”.

The participants’ describe these values as informing to the work as licensure supervisors.

The second property of personal and professional values is contributing to the greater professional community including generativity; guiding the next generation with a sense of optimism. Participants’ further described meaning and value they experience by participating in licensure supervision. For example:

P 5 “I think it is, umm, it is giving back. I think people gave lots of their time to me and ummm, when I was learning and still learning, I have so many colleagues that I reach out to and ummm, just help me with my growth and learning and I feel like it is just part of the process. You know, I just don’t want to be this little silo where I do my work but that we are a bigger community of professionals and it is just giving back to the profession”.

P 4 “I’ve been doing it for so long it means I am helping keep our profession ethical and going well”.

P 3 “Again, it provides meaning in my life. Not only do I help supervisees feel confident, competent and safe but, indirectly I am hoping it will help them help their clients and help the world. So that is, ummm, you know, provides a lot of
meaning in my life. I mean I am not always thinking about this all of the time but I am trying to make the world a better place. I may have mentioned this last time. You know, that is the ultimate goal, the thing that helps me sleep at night. That gets me through my life and makes all of the effort worth it, you know. Meaning that if I can help therapists help clients then in my belief system in a small way making the world a better place”.

P 7 “Well, I think that there is a big element of giving back and uh huh, that’s a great question since I really believe a lot in core values and try to teach, ummm, you know the students that I work with and supervisees and even clients that every decision we make is from our core values, so that’s a good one. I think that there really is that feeling that you are giving back and also personally, I mean I get something out of it. It sometimes validates that I know something more than some other days that I think I might know. I think there is a tendency in the field when you feel like you do not question why you got into the field or question with certain clients if you are really making a difference or if you are getting anywhere. I think with the supervision piece that there is more validity to that, that there is more validity to the work, just personally”.

P 6 “I suppose my first response is it is a duplicate and it is investing in the future. It is always a learning process for me. I am always learning from these interns because they are fresh out of school. They are not jaded and they have learned new things that I pick up at seminars”.

Contributing to the greater professional community, including generativity, reflects a sense of productivity and accomplishment for the licensure supervisor. The experience and these values interconnects with the category of motivation because participants’ describe incentives that are inherent by experiencing their values in the context of licensure supervision

Supervision Process

The supervision process describes the act and experience of doing licensure supervision, which is supported by the contextual categories of supervisor professional development, motivation and personal and professional values categories.

As participants’ relate their experience of licensure supervision in round two interviews two distinct, yet interrelated properties emerged; supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. These properties are interrelated in the supervision process in that
the supervisor actions begin the process of licensure supervision by screening for supervisees, establishing the structure and focus for supervision, including administrative and clinical duties. Through the licensure supervisor actions the supervisor relationship is developed.

**Supervisor Actions**

In round one interviews the participants’ described four interconnected dimensions related to the property of supervisor actions in licensure supervision, which included: a) establishing structure and focus in supervision, b) building the supervisory relationship, c) promoting growth and development of supervisee and d) using supervision tools and interventions (See Appendix ___ Round 1 Interviews). In addition, screening for supervision and experiencing the supervisor roles (See Appendix ___ Round 1 interviews) were re-conceptualized and incorporated into the property supervisor action as part of the category supervision process, that emerged as important in licensure supervision in Round 2 interviews (See Appendix ___,Figure 5).

The interrelationship to supervisor challenges includes those experiences that require the supervisor to be responsible to develop the supervisees’ competence, ethical decision making behaviors and the tensions within the supervision relationship that happen in preparation for licensure in the supervision process.

**Supervisor Challenges**

Participants’ reported that the concern about and experiences of challenges in licensure supervision were significant. Supervisor challenges were described as issues or barriers that arise during the process of licensure supervision. Two dimensions that
emerged are: a) experiencing *structural issues* and b) *experiencing relational issues with supervisee* in the *supervision process*.

Figure 2. Emerging Supervision Process from Second Round Interviews

**Relationship Among Categories**

Through date collection and analysis during the second round of interviews, categorical relationships emerged. Categories that had previously seemed tentative
became more established and relationships within data generated additional layers of depth and understanding the supervisors’ experience of licensure supervision.

The categories of supervisor professional, motivation, personal and professional values development were contextual to understanding the experience of licensure supervisors and central to the experience of the licensure supervision process.

The participants’ described supervisor professional development as having the importance of gaining experience in the field as a counselor or therapist before considering becoming a licensure supervisor. Supervisor professional development brought with it an experience of confidence and knowledge that guided the participant as a licensure supervisor.

In each case, the participant was required by their professional licensing body to participate in a minimal training (typically 30 hours) to be eligible to engage in licensure supervision. The knowledge and experience were categorized as experiencing professional development, and perceived in terms of previous professional experience, self-reflection to specific training(s) to develop skills in supervision.

Supervisor professional development opened the door for participants’ to engage in licensure supervision. However, many professional counselors and therapists are eligible to pursue becoming licensure supervisors relative to the counseling field, few do so. The participants describe their experience of being aware of personal and professional values, influences and incentives that motivate their initial and ongoing engagement to provide licensure supervision. For example:

P 9 “They have something to offer as a supervisor”

P 4 “I’ve been doing it for so long it means I am helping keep our profession ethical and going well”.
P 5 “Feeling ready to participate in licensure supervision seems important because the licensure supervisor is motivated to offer something. I have so many colleagues that I reach out to and ummm, just help me with my growth and learning and I feel like it is just part of the process. You know, I just don’t want to be this little silo where I do my work but that we are a bigger community of professionals and it is just giving back to the profession”

The category of motivation occurs in the context of licensure supervision including experiences related to both immediate and long-term influences. Experiencing motivation includes connection to the profession, to another practitioner and to the participants’ personal and professional values. Long-term motivation incentives, in particular, interrelate strongly with personal and professional values.

For example:

P 3 “I mean I am not always thinking about this all of the time but I am trying to make the world a better place. I may have mentioned this last time. You know, that is the ultimate goal, the thing that helps me sleep at night. That gets me through my life and makes all of the effort worth it, you know. Meaning that if I can help therapists help clients then in my belief system in a small way making the world a better place”.

P 7 “Well, I think that there is a big element of giving back and uhhh, that’s a great question since I really believe a lot in core values and try to teach, ummm, you know the students that I work with and supervisees and even clients that every decision we make is from our core values, so that’s a good one. I think that there really is that feeling that you are giving back and also personally, I mean I get something out of it. It sometimes validates that I know something more than some other days that I think I might know. I think there is a tendency in the field when you feel like you question why you got into the field or question with certain clients if you are really making a difference or if you are getting anywhere. I think with the supervision piece that there is more validity to that, that there is more validity to the work, just personally”.

Participants’ experience of personal and professional values described as their perception of being aware of the intrinsic values and principles that guide the knowledge and conduct of the supervisor providing licensure supervision. Participants’ described how their values directly impact their work as licensure supervisors particularly relating that to a shared experience of having been a supervisee himself or herself and wanting to
create a positive experience for the licensure supervisee, which is also a motivating factor.

For example:

P 3 “I know how much support they need, how much they depend on a mentor. And how a safe mentor can be to help serve well. So I guess touches on another meaning for me, which is I have had a number of supervisors throughout my career. Some of which who have been wonderful and I have had abusive, horrific supervisors, one in particular. I don’t use the word abusive lightly. Umm, and yea, really just want to not have anyone go through that”.

P 4 “Relating to being the supervisee in the past and making sure they have a good experience in supervision and sharing what I know as a mature professional to a younger professional”

P 2: “The positive things about licensure, especially if you think licensure are making sense and are good then licensure supervision will even ensure more that we are creating, hopefully, a generation of people that have better skills and are more ethical and professional”.

P 6 “The process of supervision itself, which includes licensure, obviously, is that the Center is going to be doing something good because one of our core values is Excellence. The other thing that motivates me that there will be strong therapists in the future and certainly people are going to get healed. I think there is a generativity about doing supervision.”

Participants’ stressed not only the values of creating a positive experience for licensure supervisees but that the value of sharing knowledge and the experience of licensure supervision being a common journey for supervisor and supervisee. For example:

P 9 “Well, I feel an obligation, a sense of responsibility of caring for the profession but particularly the people going into the profession where they are relatively independently functioning. I still like what I do and I think it is a worthwhile thing to do and I appreciate when some younger people show some passion and aptitude for it. That’s probably the thing that most motivates me”.

The category of supervision process describes participants’ experience of licensure supervision through two distinct yet interrelated properties emerged; supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. These properties are interrelated in the supervision process in that the supervisor actions begin the process of licensure supervision through supervisee screening. Screening for supervision was a process described that preceded the
establishing a supervision relationship. This property has two dimensions: 1) *formal* or 2) *informal* and occur as part of the decision making process for participants’ to determine whether they would establishing a working relationship with the potential supervisee.

For example:

P 6  “And I will only take a student that I truly feel like I am a good fit for, or feel like I really trust their judgment and trust that we can work well together. And so I’ve told several graduates that I don’t know if I’m a good fit for you and this is why. And sometimes it’s just that I think they’re too comfortable with me and they need a different perspective. I want them to find someone that they are not familiar with. And I feel like they’ve really gotten a lot from me, and so sometimes that’s the reason. Sometimes because (location) is a small town our circles cross and I don’t feel like I would be objective enough to be their supervisor. So there’s times where I let students know that I can’t---“

P 1  “No, it’s not necessarily a formal interview. But yes, just hearing a little bit about their experiences and what they’re looking for, especially also the orientation that they’re looking for, for a therapist. And for me to get a feel for the person themselves, but also to tell them a little bit about my style and see if they’re comfortable with it”.

P 5  “Yeah. And typically, if I know pretty immediately that I’m not going to see them, I’ll just have a frank conversation when they call or contact me. But if it sounds like it might be a good one then I have them come in. I talk about my process with them as far as I use discrimination model, and so reminding them what that’s like and what that means and then all of my supervision PDS, informed consent. Yeah, so we just go through that whole process and see if it’s a good fit”.

Once determined whether a licensure supervisee would be a good-fit the licensure supervisor the properties of 1) *structure and focus* and 2) *developing supervision relationship* in licensure supervision. For example:

The dimensions within the *structure and focus of supervision* included the dimensions *immediate* and *future* characteristics.
Immediate characteristics; include establishing how supervision processes work, contracting with the supervisee and focus on client safety and welfare. Participants’ relied on the structure and focus of supervision to help manage licensure supervision.

P 2 “Another thing that I also do is…and I can send it to you…I give them a...I don’t know if it’s exactly like a contract of how I do supervision. Like you will notice that I will be challenging you, and any questions that I ask you don’t necessarily have to answer. I will send you materials about things that we were talking about, and if you have interesting things that come up for you please feel free to send those to me. So there are some things there of how I work”.

P 8 “You know, I have to practice a lot of skills. Because sometimes when somebody comes in and I would be in disagreement about maybe how they conceptualize the case, or they don’t know how to conceptualize a case, to always stay strength-based. I mean, language is really important. I love words. And so to be able to use them in a way that gets my point across, because I tend to be a pretty direct person. But also shows the empathy and all of those right things that we need to be doing with our clients. I also feel I have to be able to embrace all of those skills with the people I supervise. I want them to stay present with me. And so to do that I clearly have to be very mindful of how any critical feedback comes out of my mouth”.

P 1 “I have a supervision agreement that I enter into with all of my supervisees that describes the process as two things. One is promoting their growth and development. And the other is to meet the legal requirements of their practice. So there’s two things that I need to be paying attention to simultaneously. One is providing them with the hours that they need. That’s kind of the process is, you know, they need to go through a certain amount of hours in order to qualify for their licensure. The other is the content. Actually getting into how they perceive counseling, what their struggles are, what they believe their strengths are and what they believe they need to improve on”.

In addition, licensure supervision requires the licensure supervisor is aware of all future requirements for supervisee, including required hours, ethical issues, client safety and welfare.

P 1 “However, again in the supervisor agreement, and as a practical matter, supervisors are legally responsible for the work of their supervisees”.

P 4 “The complication of it is state regulations. I don’t care if they’re getting licensed to be a mental health counselor, a psychologist or a marriage and family therapist or a social worker, all of them, which
I’ve supervised toward licensure have just an incredible curvy journey in our state legislature towards licensure. To the point that I’m continually checking with them and saying, did you check with the state on that? Whoever you talk to write down their name. You don’t want to get to the end of this process and have them tell you the hours don’t count”.

P 8 “Which includes all the...I think it’s pretty much all the things that are involved with licensure. So you know, there’s an ethical component. There are principles. There’s all the kind...And so I’ve divided them up and...I mean, I didn’t do the work. This was just something that was part of what I did in the past, which I think is really useful and it helps to structure beyond just that day to day, okay, I’m stuck with my clinician...you know, with my client rather”.

As participants’ describe their experiences of licensure supervision they describe recognizing the importance of establishing a working relationship with the supervisee.

The dimensions within this property include the development of supervisee and roles of supervisor.

Participants’ describe the development of the supervisee within the supervision relationship creating the space and opportunity to build supervisee strengths as well as being able to be corrective, if needed. For example:

P 8 “You know, for me it is one of I like who I supervise a lot right now. I like them as people. So for me, I’m always having to keep in the forefront of my mind good professional boundaries. There’s a piece of me that would love to hang out with them or kind of know some of the things that probably are just not germane to a supervisory role. So I have to keep on top of that, because if I don’t then they’re not going to do that either. Because, again, if I have...I have a good relationship with the people I supervise right now. So they like me as a person as well. So, and how I experienced that with the supervisory the relationship”.

P 6 “Well, actually, my relationship is somebody who’s going to provide them with some positive direction. You know, help them to build on their strengths. Help them to clarify their orientation, to get better at that, if I can. Sometimes I don’t know what they’re talking about though”.
To support the development of the supervisee participants’ described the roles of the supervisor to support the supervisor actions in the licensure supervision process. For example:

P 3 “And so it being more like a mentor to a person is how I see the process. And so I’m thinking about that when we’re looking at things, we’re looking at not just like this specific skill of how to do therapy with a client, but more about what it is like to be a counselor, generally speaking. In life, how you take care of yourself, how you conduct yourself, how you conduct yourself with clients, with other professionals, so it is all there. So there’s also a give and take and talk about it. So I can sometimes talk about my own experiences with something as a way to provide them with insight and information, or amalgamate some of the things. So that what I’m hoping is that what they will walk away from is not just having a specific skill in doing work with clients, but more that they also have the depth of being in this field in the world and what’s going on with this field”.

P 1 “This was an opportunity for me to kind of coach that person on, you know what people need is a solution to their problem. And if you can provide that, then that just goes one step further into developing a relationship where the client will really be trusting that you are there to help them in a real practical way. Until you have that relationship everything else goes in one ear and out the other”.

By establishing the supervisor actions in the supervision process theoretically preceded potential challenges or issues in the supervision process. Screening effectively supports the best-fit for the supervisor and supervisee, following screening, establishing structure and focus in supervision and building the supervision relationship.

The interrelationship to supervisor challenges includes those experiences that require the supervisor to be responsible to develop the supervisees competence, ethical decision making behaviors and collaboration with the supervisee in preparation for licensure, which happens in the supervision process by relying on the supervisor actions to have a successful outcome.
Supervisor challenges were described as issues or barriers that arise during the process of licensure supervision. Two dimensions that emerged are: 1) structural issues and b) experiencing relational issues in the supervision process.

Experiencing structural issues

Supervisor challenges in licensure supervision are issues that are described as experiencing structural issues, that are rooted in a sense of the participants’ experience of themselves in respect to responsibility to the supervisee, the professional licensing board, clients and to the broader public, which is described as supervisor challenges in licensure supervisors. For example:

P 2 “The liability in all of that so that makes it challenging. In a perfect world you would like it to be more like consultation where you provide ideas and then the other person takes it in an makes their own decisions but you carry far more weight here as the supervisor. For example, if there was a problem with a certain client and for it to go to court and the supervisor is directly linked to this because you were supervising. It is not so much that I would readily and happily go to court and be there for the supervisee so it is not so much that but just because you were the supervisor, therefore whatever happens becomes your responsibility. It feels a little bit awkward”.

P 9 “The most challenging thing is that right now I have four supervisees and they have got X number of people in their caseload then that exponentially increases the people that I am in contact with and need to try to understand and assimilate. You know, it is that responsibility thing. Uhh and um you know when somebody comes and says, ‘You know that guy I was talking about and ....’ And I say, ‘No...?’ and then I can struggle with feeling ‘oh, man am I, am I being on top of it enough?’ ‘Am I working hard enough to keep on top of it?’ With all of the details of the cases, ‘am I asking what I need to know?’”

P 5 “Challenging umm sometimes schedules, sometimes when someone needs me and it is not a good time but I have told them I will do my best to be there for them so just adjusting life. And ummm, I think some of my supervisees, the ones at __, the students that are really struggling, I truly believe that I have a growth mindset and believe that all people can learn and grow so I really am challenged. I remember saying, “all people can grow...” It feels like everyone is one a bell curve some of those can be way, way outside of the curve and those can be really challenging and also really good for me...Distinct about licensure supervision the
challenging piece is seeing them 2-3 hours per month. Some of them I am doing individual and they are doing group at their agency you know or, so I might only see them for an hour a month and so I just don’t feel as connected. So, I am trying to ask as many questions and understand the case they are bringing. And try to do as much as I can in a small amount of time. Similar to practicum, I have an LPC who is licensed this month and just to see them get so excited. They are done with it. They are ready to be on their own. They are excited about all of their hard work over the past 2–5 years. It’s a long relationship. So, it’s really great when they send me that e-mail from _______ at the Board “It’s official” and you can just see how proud they are.

“Okay, ummm, I think it is challenging, a couple of things: to keep up with all of the rules and encouraging them to do the same thing. Ummm, challenging, of course, in fact, I did a supervision session this morning and since I have graduated and she has graduated there are new theories out there that neither one of us know anything about. It is almost impossible to keep up with it all. Another challenge is ummm, the only thing that I really have in being responsible for all of their clients is what they tell me. I don’t have access to their files or anything like I did at an agency and even then it was pretty much somewhat limited so that is always going to be a challenge. You do the best you can but they are only picking a small sampling of their relationship with that client to tell you anything about them. So all of those things and I could probably go on and on”.

Experiencing supervisor challenges that are structural in nature tend to be complex issues that require complex solutions. Within this property the participants’ describe feeling challenged and rely on themselves to resolve issues through supervision action. In most cases, the solutions are met through supervisor actions that have been established through structure and focus and maintained through the supervision relationship as well as the contextual categories of supervisor professional development, motivation and personal and professional values.

Experiencing relational issues with supervisee

Experiencing relational issues with supervisee is a dimension of the property of supervision challenges within the category of the supervision process.
One of the overarching supervision challenges in the supervision process as described by the participants’ is the experience of relational issues with supervisees. In particular, the dimension between the power dynamic and collaboration in the licensure supervision process emerged during the Round 2 interviews. The participants’ in the supervision process describe this experience of tension between the power dynamic and being collaborative in licensure supervision process with varying levels of discomfort. For example:

One participant directly stated that he was aware of his power in supervision stating,

P 9 “because of my PhD, position in the agency, older or white male or whatever it happens, I aware of my power.”

However, the majority of the participants did not like using the term power in respect to their role as a licensure supervisor stating,

P 6 “I don’t like that word”
P 8 “I don’t think of supervision in terms of power”
P 3 “There may be some areas where I have more knowledge that does not necessarily translate into power. “

The preferred stance of participants was one of collaboration, for example:

P 5 “I think in thinking about ___ and LPC interns, I feel a real humbleness as far as like ummm, I really want to collaborate with my supervisee so that they trust me, and umm, you know I don’t like the word power but I am also really clear to them that I am a gatekeeper and I take that really to heart and I’ll share any concerns I have so I just try to be transparent and when something comes up I’ll say, “Umm, I am needing for us to talk more about this and I need more information”. Umm, so I think it’s, I try to go in just really wanting to collaborate, creating that space where at the same time knowing that sometimes I have to say, you know when I am doing the six-month log for the Board thing do I have concerns “yes” and I’m doing it right there with my supervisee. I try to say, none of us are perfect and it is all about growing so…I don’t know if that helps”.
P 2 “Sometime I am perceived if I say something, which I think is just how I feel then people very quickly see it as criticism and become defensive or concerns, or ummm, afraid. What I have seen more and more, especially with younger supervisees and with this generation is the ability to sit with some discomfort or
some criticism. It is really, really hard. I struggle with is because sometimes I say things not against the other person but being about the case and they very quickly personalize it and very quickly think they have done something wrong. Sometimes people in tears and I had no idea. I did not say anything like, “You need this and this and this ...”. It’s just something about the case and they think, “Well, I am not doing this well and I am ... “ Wow! So they become really careful not to say anything and so sensitive. I see this more with younger supervisees than older and I do not know if older necessarily age or different generation”.

At the same time participants acknowledging that if things are going poorly, if there are problems, that they would be more directive in their approaches in supervision with the supervisee. Participants stated,

P 6 “The challenge would be continuing to find the balance between empowering them and challenging them because they are so fearful at first. They are uncomfortable trying something new”.
P 8 “I think the challenges are ummm, keeping in mind how I communicate so that I am heard so that I speaking to another person who respects how they hear things. Umm, using some diplomacy if the need comes back to giving critical feedback. Just being aware of how I could be perceived in checking things out. So that’s a real challenge so that I am heard in a way that is palatable and is not offensive. Being really present to pick up any cues that I am being heard negatively that someone is being hurt. So that’s a real challenge. Umm, I think another challenge is, I don’t know, I’ll try to explain it. I guess coming across as an expert and at the same time ummm, owning that I don’t know everything and having that be okay as the supervisee. It can be a challenge because somebody is always looking at me to assist in their growth and their professional and person growth in some ways and at the same time as a person who does not know everything so modeling that and at the same time inspiring confidence and that I am the right supervisor for them”.
P 9 “I do have the capacity for taking on a more authoritative stance but I don’t want to let that power to drown other perspectives or voices”
P 3 “I accept power if supervisee is doing something egregiously counterproductive or harmful but that almost never happens. I don’t want to give false impression that we are complete equals”

Discussion

The four categories supervisors professional development, motivation, personal and professional values and the supervision process emerged as significant and established categories following round two interviews and data analysis.
EXPLORING PERSPECTIVES ON SUPERVISION

The supervisors’ professional development, motivation and personal and professional values categories impacted the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision directly and indirectly. In general these categories serve as contextual in nature and give foundation to the supervision process.

The category of supervision process has two properties; supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. Supervisor actions include screening, which is a formal or informal decision-making process about whether the supervisor and supervisee will work together. This decision-making process is generally described as a decision made by the licensure supervisor. Once a decision is made following the screening process the licensure supervisor establishes structure and focus for the supervision process. Structure and focus includes immediate and practical considerations such as time, dates and expectations in the working process and included broader and future oriented structure and focus such as client safety, ethics and client treatment and intervention. Within the property of the supervisor actions the dimension of developing the supervision relationship includes development of supervisee and roles of supervisor. The supervisor actions create the foundational structure of the supervision process and the support for participants’ as licensure supervisors to manage supervisor challenges.

The supervisor challenges includes issues or concerns that are relational between the supervisor and supervisee and issues or concerns that are structural and experienced as issues with self concerns or concerns with systems such as universities, agencies or licensing bodies. When challenges arise participants experience an array or emotions or responses.
The experiences of relational challenges are described by participants’ as some of the most difficult issues to manage. For example:

P 2 “Sometimes I am perceived if I say something, which I think is just how I feel then people very quickly see it as criticism and become defensive or concerns, or ummm, afraid. What I have seen more and more, especially with younger supervisees and with this generation is the ability to sit with some discomfort or some criticism. It is really, really hard. I struggle with is because sometimes I say things not against the other person but being about the case and they very quickly personalize it and very quickly think they have done something wrong. Sometimes people in tears and I had no idea. I did not say anything like, “You need this and this and this …”. It’s just something about the case and they think, “Well, I am not doing this well and I am … “ Wow! So they become really careful not to say anything and so sensitive. I see this more with younger supervisees than older and I do not know if older necessarily age or different generation”.

Participants’ describe a difficult balance challenging and supporting supervisee development. For example:

P 6 “The challenge would be continuing to find the balance between empowering them and challenging them because they are so fearful at first. They are uncomfortable trying something new”.

As a rule, participants’ accept the concept of a power dynamic in the supervision process in terms of power having influence to support the learning, growth and development of the licensure supervisee but they did not as easily accept power in the supervision process in terms of holding power over the supervisee in an authoritative manner. Participants appear to experience this as more negative and possibly counterproductive in licensure supervision.

Participants’ describe supervision challenges generally managed within the supervision process through supervisor actions that had been established to support the supervisor and supervisee in the licensure supervision process including; establishing the screening, structure and focus and developing the supervision relationship
Summary

The second round interviews provided further information to show the licensure supervisors’ experience of supervision. Through the data and analysis process the interaction between four categories emerged. The categories identified by the participants include: supervisor professional development, motivation, personal and professional values and the supervision process.

Supervisors professional development continued as a category with three interrelated properties that include: a) experiencing counselor or therapist role, b) knowing through self-reflection and c) trainings specific to becoming a licensure supervisor.

Motivation emerged as a major category with two properties that include: a) experiencing mutual and immediate incentives and b) experiencing long-term influences and incentives.

Personal and professional values emerged as a category with two properties that include: a) sharing knowledge and supporting the growth and development of the supervisee and b) contributing to the greater professional community including generativity; guiding the next generation with a sense of optimism.

The supervision process emerged as a significant category with two properties that include: a) supervisor actions and b) supervisor challenges. The dimensions within supervision action include: 1) screening, 2) establishing structure and focus in supervision, 3) developing the supervisory relationship. The dimensions with supervisor challenges include: 1) experiencing structural issues and b) experiencing relational issues with supervisee in the supervision process. (See Figures, 3 - 6).
Figure 3. Initial Conceptual Diagram Showing Relationships Between Categories, Properties and Dimensions of Supervisors Experience of Supervision.
Figure 4. Emerging Conceptual Diagram of Categories, Properties, and Dimensions of Supervisors' Experience of Supervision.

Figure 5. Conceptual Diagram Categories, Properties, and Dimensions of Supervisors' Experience of Supervision October 1, 2014.
Figure 6. Final Conceptual Diagram Categories, Properties, and Dimensions of Supervisors Experience of Supervision.

Appendix N

Round Two Interview Questions

The second round of interview questions included:

1) What motivates you during the process of licensure supervision?

2) What does it mean for you to be doing licensure supervision

3) How does your perception of your responsibilities as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?

4) How does your perception of your power as a licensure supervisor affect your experience of doing supervision?

5) What makes licensure supervision challenging and rewarding?
Appendix O

Member Check Letter

Hello ______,

Happy New Year!

I want to express my appreciation to you for participating in this study. Thank you for your time, energy and contributions to our profession.

We have reached the member check stage, which means the data has been collected, analyzed and a theory has emerged. The member check is an opportunity for you to provide added feedback about whether your respective views, feelings and experiences are represented in the theory. I have attached a summary of the theory, a brief overview of the categories, properties and dimensions, as well as conceptual diagrams that provide a pictorial presentation of the theory for your review.

When reviewing the attached documents, please use the following questions as a guide:

· Does the overall structure of the theory fit with your experience as a licensure supervisor?
· Do you agree with the major categories / themes identified in the theory?
· Is there something that you would add to better represent your experience?

You will have several days to review the attached material and then I’d like to set up a brief telephone appointment with you before or during the week of January 12, 2015.

Please, let me know, via e-mail, when you could be available for a telephone appointment.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me directly or you may also contact the primary investigator, Deborah J. Rubel, Ph.D.

Again, thank you for your contributions.

Sincerely,

Susan Sisko – Student Researcher
macedon4me@gmail.com
Telephone (541) 386 2337
Deborah J. Rubel, Ph.D. – Principal Investigator
Email: deborah.rubel@oregonstate.edu
Appendix P

Member Check

CONTEXT
Participants, at minimum, have completed a masters level degree in counseling or psychology. All of the participants are licensed counselors and registered clinical supervisors and have considerable clinical experience.

Participants all describe engaging in formal and specific training in clinical supervision to become licensure supervisors. In addition, participants cite having inprofessional experiences, motivation, personal, and professional values as significant contextual characteristics they draw from that contribute to their experience as licensure supervisors. These characteristics contribute to the licensure supervisors’ experience of the supervision process both in the actions and challenges of the work.

Participants experience licensure supervision in various settings including hospital, agencies and private practice.

LICENSURE SUPERVISORS EXPERIENCE

The professional development of the supervisor was significant to the licensure supervision experience. Participants cited that experiential learning was critical to their interest or readiness to become a licensure supervisor. They described having considerable and varied clinical experience as counselors and therapists, giving them a credible foundation in clinical work. This allowed them to guide younger professionals in the field with a greater level of confidence as licensure supervisors.

All participants engaged in formal training to establish themselves as licensure supervisors. Formal training was typically a 30-hour training taught by more senior professionals in the field of supervision. The participants reported that the content of the supervision training varied in quality and presentation. Once the formal training was completed participants became eligible to register within their professional body to be recognized as a supervisor; additional supervision hours (supervision of supervision) was required in some cases.

Participants described using self-reflection as a means to trust themselves when working with the supervisee. There was a sense that being self-reflective allowed the participant, as a licensure supervisor, to rely on their intuition, experiences and knowledge in the supervision process, which was described as valuable in their professional development.

Along with professional development, participants described their motivation to supervise as being aware of influences and incentives that impact their initial and ongoing engagement in providing licensure supervision. There was a sense that the rewards of licensure supervision were meaningful and inspired the participants. Participants described motivation in supervision as seeing the growth and development in the supervisee and also experiencing status as a licensure supervisor. Participants described experiencing motivation in both immediate and long-term influences and incentives.
Within the context of licensure supervision *personal and professional values* were identified as important for the participants. Participants described that they were aware of the intrinsic values and principles that guide their knowledge and conduct while providing licensure supervision. Personal and professional values included characteristics that may or may not be directly shared in the supervision process. Participants cited sharing knowledge and guiding the next generation with a sense of optimism as being significant personal and professional values. Participants described valuing their contribution to the greater professional community and having an impact on broader changes in a global context, supporting health and healing through the ripple effect that licensure supervision can provide.

Professional development, motivation, and personal and professional values of the licensure supervisor provide the foundation for the *supervision process*. The supervision process is the act of being in and conducting supervision. Participants described two distinct yet interrelated properties of the supervision process: supervisor actions and supervisor challenges. These properties are interrelated in the supervision process in that the supervisors’ actions began the process of licensure supervision by establishing the structure and focus for supervision and by doing so developing the supervisory relationship.

The interrelationship to supervisor challenges included those experiences that require the supervisor to be responsible to develop the supervisees’ skills, ethical decision making behaviors and collaboration with the supervisee in preparation for licensure. Inevitable tensions would arise creating challenges, which happen in the process of supervision. Participants described reliance on the structure, focus and supervision relationship to contain and manage licensure supervision challenges that support the best outcomes.

**OVERVIEW OF PROPERTIES, CATEGORIES AND DIMENSIONS**

**Category: Supervisor Professional Development (contextual)**

The context for the professional development of licensure supervisor was foundational to the supervision process. Recognizing that licensure supervision was inherently different from other types of supervision as such so are the participants. Participants experienced professional development in a number of ways: through gaining the knowledge to supervise licensees from specific trainings, the process of growth and understanding perceived in terms of previous professional experiences and self-reflection, a culmination of past and present experiences, and knowledge and insight, which the licensure supervisor relied on in the process of supervision.

**Property: Acquiring professional experience**

*Dimensions: Experiencing as novice professional – Experiencing as mature professional.* Participants described their own experiences of learning through years of professional work and exposure in the field of counseling or psychology. Participants valued what they have learned from early stages to later stages of their own development and rely on these experiences to inform them as licensure supervisors.

**Property: Acquiring supervision training**
Dimensions: Experiencing required supervisor training – Experiencing additional training and supervision of supervision. Participants described a basic requirement of engaging in a formal training (30-hours) to become registered as a licensure supervisor. Participants describe additional training and supervision of supervision, in some cases, to support their ongoing interest in licensure supervision.

Property: Developing self-reflection
Dimensions: Valuing collective insight in past and present experiences – Trusting self as licensure supervisor. Participants described becoming aware of relying on their own insights to make judgments or decision in supervision and through this process participants described being able to trust themselves as licensure supervisors.

Category: Motivation (contextual)
Experiencing rewards is defined as the participants’ experience of being aware of influences and incentives that impact their initial and ongoing engagement in providing licensure supervision. Experiencing rewards occurs in the context of the practice of licensure supervision including experiences related to both immediate and long-term incentives such as supervisee development and professional status experienced by the supervisor.

Property: Experiencing Rewards
Dimension: Experiencing mutual and immediate incentives – Experiencing long-term incentives. Participants described experiencing mutual and immediate incentives and long-term incentives. Experiencing mutual and immediate incentives are described as motivating and rewarding because this created immediate and active energy during the supervision process in the here-and-now of licensure supervision. Experiencing long-term incentives in licensure supervision is described as motivation that has far reaching factors both during and beyond the immediate experience of being in the supervision process.

Dimension: Experiencing growth and development of supervisee – Experiencing status as supervisor. There was a sense that the rewards of licensure supervision were meaningful in a spectrum of ways. Participants described motivation in supervision as seeing the growth and development in the supervisee as well as experiencing a sense of accomplishment and status as a licensure supervisor.

Category: Personal and Professional Values (contextual)
Experiencing personal and professional values was described as being aware of the intrinsic values and principles that guide the knowledge and conduct of the supervisor providing licensure supervision. Experiencing personal and professional values included characteristics that may or may not be directly shared in the supervision process.

Property: Contributing through licensure supervision
Dimension: Sharing knowledge – Guiding the next generation with optimism. Participants cite sharing knowledge and guiding the next generation with a sense of optimism as significant and guided by their personal and professional values. Through sharing professional and personal knowledge licensure supervisors experience contributions to the supervisee.
**Dimension: Contributing to the greater professional community – Impacting broader community.** Participants described valuing the contribution to the greater professional community and having an impact on broader changes in a global context supporting health and healing through the ripple effect that licensure supervision can bring.

**Category: Supervision Process**

The supervision process is the act of doing supervision. The supervision process included supervisor actions, which begins the process of licensure supervision by establishing the structure and focus for supervision and developing the supervisory relationship. Supervisor actions are interrelated with supervisor challenges in the supervision process. Supervisor challenges included experiences that required the supervisor to be responsible to develop the supervisees’ skills, ethical decision making behaviors, and collaboration with the supervisee in preparation for licensure. During the supervision process inevitable tensions arose creating challenges. Participants described reliance on the structure, focus and supervision relationship to contain and manage licensure supervision challenges that support the best outcomes.

**Property: Supervisor Actions**

**Dimension: Experiencing formal screening – Experiencing informal screening.** Participants described the function of screening licensure supervisees as the first step in the decision making process for participants to determine whether they will establish a working relationship with the potential supervisee. Screening occurred through both formal and informal processes including face-to-face interviews, e-mail or referral.

**Dimension: Immediate structuring and focus of supervision – Future structuring and focus of supervision.** Participants relied on the structure and focus of supervision to help manage licensure supervision. Immediate characteristics included establishing how supervision processes work, dates, times, models, contracting with the supervisee and focus on client safety and welfare. Future characteristics included state requirements for supervisee, such as required hours, ethical issues and developing supervisee competence as a licensed professional.

**Dimension: Developing relationship with supervisee – Supervisor roles.** As participants described their experiences of licensure supervision they recognized the importance of establishing a working relationship with the supervisee. Participants described the development of the supervisee within the supervision relationship creating the space and opportunity to build supervisee strengths as well as being able to be corrective, as needed. The role of the supervisor varied depending on the state of the relationship and developmental level of the supervisee at a given time in licensure supervision.

**Property: Supervisor Challenges**

**Dimension: Experiencing relational issues of power – Experiencing collaboration.** Participants described a general desire to work collaboratively with the licensure supervisee, however, participants recognized that they have a position of power as the
supervisor and relied on this when they needed to be corrective in the supervision process. Participants described tensions in licensure supervision of balancing the relational challenges of power and collaboration.

*Dimension: Experiencing structural issues self – Experiencing systems issues.* Participants described challenges that stemmed from pressures where the supervisor experienced the demands of licensure supervision on themselves (e.g. time and responsibilities to supervisee) to manage the supervision process. Participants described challenges within systems demands (e.g. overseeing large caseloads, responsibilities to others).
Appendix Q

Peer Review

• Do you agree with the major categories / themes identified in the theory?

Yes. Absolutely. I really appreciate the descriptions of the dimensions, too. In my experience of licensure supervision, I agree with your overall theory and love the major categories/themes that emerged! It's so interesting to be conscious of the power that we wield (as well as the responsibility) as licensure supervisors.

• Does the overall structure of the theory fit with your experience as a licensure supervisor?

Yes...I think the description of what leads one to supervisor is fairly accurate. I'm having a difficult time with the graphics though. This graphic seems to suggest that the challenges and corresponding actions are some how cyclical (linear, in a sense) and I'm not sure that I always feel that in my own experience. Not being familiar with your research, I find that I want to take the 'Supervisor Actions' circle and the 'Supervisor Challenges' circle and put an arrow between them going one way and an arrow directly below that going another way to demonstrate that they affect one another, but are not necessarily cyclical. ------ Interesting as I typed that, I tried to consider how my idea for a graphic and yours would be qualitatively different and the answer is that I'm not sure. I think your graphic, to me, suggests that when a challenge arises, the supervisor takes an action, which in turn leads to another challenge based on that action, which requires another action, etc. I don't always have that experience. Sometimes, I experience a challenge, have a response (action) and then a new, entirely unrelated challenges comes forth.... Gosh I hope that makes sense.

• The category of Supervision Process includes supervisor challenges. An identified challenge described experiences of tensions with issues related to power and collaboration in licensure supervision. Could you comment to your experience(s) of this?

Sure. Put simply: I try to manage this tension before it even occurs. As supervisors, I think we recognize that we are gatekeepers to the profession. We have an ethical obligation to maintain the integrity of the counseling field and cannot compromise when it comes to ensuring client safety and care. To do this, compromises our own livelihood in a sense. While I understand this point, I am also aware of the vulnerability that accompanies being a supervisee. It is scary to highlight our areas for growth, etc. Given my awareness of supervisees' general experiences, I want to work with them to establish their learning goals, address their needs, etc. (via collaboration). I've been fortunate in that I've had some very solid supervisees with whom I've established a positive rapport. In these relationships, I've created a clear structure for supervision with an
explicit explanation of my expectations for them as both a supervisee and a clinician. I also take time towards the beginning of the relationship to clarify what types of things I WILL address (at my discretion rather at the supervisee's). With a solid structure in place, I feel less stressed by the tension of collaboration vs. correction/power, as my supervisees should expect the same. In the instances I have felt the tension you described, I address it head on by being transparent with my struggle. I tend to acknowledge my struggle (using those words -- "I'm struggling with...."), address my area of concern, collaborate with the supervisee regarding that issue, and then address the relational dynamics secondary to the struggle addressed.

- Is there something that you would add to better represent your experience?

I would expand motivations a bit. At the risk of sounding incredibly shallow, my experience of motivation is not entirely captured in these documents. While 'Experiencing Rewards' is accurate, all of the reasons presented here are pretty darn noble. While it is true that I'm invested in personal development, affecting change within the field, etc. as a supervisor, there are some less idealistic motivations for doing this as well. First, I don't mind being reimbursed for acting as a supervisor. It is financially lucrative. It seems that the 'immediate' rewards described here only refer to the dynamics within the supervisory relationship. I'm motivated by other external factors, too (Cash, etc.). I'm also pretty motivated by the idea of improving the quality of life of the client of the supervisee (albeit indirectly). I like to think, "Because I helped Susie better understand x, y, and Z, Johnny's care and life is likely to improve in this way, that way, and this way". I'm not sure that really fits into a more global 'affecting the profession' or 'improving the supervisee'. It seems separate from what is laid out here....