Duquesne University
Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Fall 2009

Counselor Trainee Perceived Supervisory Effectiveness: An Investigation of Counselor Trainee Cognitive Style and Supervisor Supervisory Style

Melinda Jean Heher

Follow this and additional works at: https://dsc.duq.edu/etd

Recommended Citation

COUNSELOR TRAINEE PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY EFFECTIVENESS:

AN INVESTIGATION OF COUNSELOR TRAINEE COGNITIVE STYLE AND

SUPERVISOR SUPERVISORY STYLE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Education,

Executive Counselor Education and Supervision Program

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Melinda Jean Heher, M.A., LPC, NCC

December 2008

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Department of Counseling, Psychology and Special Education

Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)

Executive Counselor Education and Supervision Program

Presented by:

Melinda Heher
Kent State University, B.A., 1997
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, M.A., 1999

July 7, 2008

COUNSELOR TRAINEE PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY EFFECTIVENESS:
AN INVESTIGATION OF COUNSELOR TRAINEE COGNITIVE STYLE AND
SUPERVISOR SUPERVISORY STYLE

Approved by:

_____, Chair
Jocelyn Gregoire, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor

_____, Member
Joseph F. Maola, Ph.D.
Professor

_____, Member
Maura Krushinski, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor

ABSTRACT

COUNSELOR TRAINEE PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY EFFECTIVENESS: AN INVESTIGATION OF COUNSELOR TRAINEE COGNITIVE STYLE AND SUPERVISOR SUPERVISORY STYLE

By

Melinda Jean Heher

December 2008

Dissertation supervised by Jocelyn Gregoire, Ed.D.

Supervision during practicum and internship is crucial to the continued professional development and growth of the novice counselor. As counselor trainees are immersed in their field placement sites, they rely on their field site supervisors for guidance and continued training as aspiring counselors. It is imperative that a positive interpersonal supervisory relationship sets the foundation for successful supervision and training. Among the many personality variables that influence the interpersonal relationship and dynamics of supervision, cognitive style has been scarce in the counselor education and supervision literature. In addition to cognitive style, the supervisor's supervisory style influences the interpersonal supervisory relationship. Supervisory style includes the method from which a supervisor approaches the supervision relationship and can include an attractive (e.g. friendly, supportive, open, positive) and interpersonally sensitive (e.g. intuitive, reflective, therapeutic) style. Using a quantitative design, this

research study investigated the influence of field site supervisors' supervisory styles and master's level counselor trainees' cognitive styles on perceived supervisory effectiveness. Specifically, this study attempted to describe perceived supervision effectiveness for an attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory style among counselor trainees who identified with a visualizer cognitive style or verbalizer cognitive style. The Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI), the Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire (VVQ), and the Supervision Questionnaire (SQ) were utilized to describe style differences among supervisors and counselor trainees and overall effectiveness of supervision. A significant finding revealed that visualizers were more satisfied with supervision when they were paired with an attractive supervisory style versus an interpersonally sensitive supervisory style. Conversely, no significant difference was found in supervisory effectiveness among verbalizers who were paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. The results illustrate that matching visualizers with attractive supervisory styles enhances effective supervision. The intention of this study was to add to the limited literature in counselor education and supervision regarding cognitive styles, supervisory styles, and effectiveness of supervision as well as to enlighten supervisors about individualities that influence the professional practice of clinical supervision.

DEDICATION

The completion of this dissertation is dedicated to those students who struggle to learn, but who aspire to accomplish great things. Hold tight to your dreams and believe in yourself. To you I say anything is possible!

"The future belongs to those who believe in the beauty of their dreams."

- Eleanor D. Roosevelt

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of my dissertation is symbolic of yet another chapter of my life that has come to a close. For me, it is bittersweet. I could not have accomplished my long-term goal of earning my doctorate had it not been for my family, friends, teachers, and especially, God.

I am thankful to the outstanding faculty of Duquesne University School of Education for their unwavering support. You make me proud to be a Duquesne alumna. I am especially thankful to my committee: Dr. Jocelyn Gregoire, Dr. Joseph Maola, and Dr. Maura Krushinski. Dr. Gregoire, thank you for inspiring and encouraging me to persevere. The completion of my dissertation would not have been possible without your continued support. Thank you for being a wonderful mentor! Dr. Maola, your expertise in research design and statistical analysis was greatly appreciated. Although I will not miss the "*sunrise*" services, I cherish the opportunity that I had working with you at St. Vincent College. It was a wonderful learning experience! Thank you for being an inspiration to me. Dr. Krushinksi, your expert guidance on counseling and supervision was invaluable. I appreciate our discussions and your words of wisdom, but most of all, your willingness to listen to me. Thank you for your kindness and continued support!

My sincere gratitude goes to my parents. Your untiring support and encouraging words over the years have meant more to me than you will ever know. During times when I doubted myself, you believed in me and encouraged me to pursue my dreams. Because of you, I have accomplished so much in my life. I am proud to have you as my

parents and am blessed to have you in my life. Thank you for all that you have done for me. I love you both very much!

To my family and friends, especially my sisters and Papa, you have been there for me when I needed you the most. You are my cheerleaders, and I love you. I am looking forward to having more time to spend with you!

I am especially grateful to my best friend, my husband. You have supported me through my doctoral program with love, patience, and understanding. Thank you for the times when you were more excited than me for my small accomplishments along the way. I look forward to beginning our life together without school! I love you very much.

Most importantly, I thank God for enabling me to achieve all that I have achieved. I believe in Your words of wisdom, and am grateful for Your unconditional love. Thank You for listening to my prayers and providing me with so many blessings in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) assert that there are pronounced similarities between the processes of counseling and supervision. Most striking is the similarity of the interpersonal relationship. Just as clients find the relationship in counseling to be vital to effective treatment, so do counselor trainees find the relationship in supervision to be fundamental to effective supervision (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). When supervisees were interviewed about a supervision experience that had negative effects on their training, their criticisms centered on the interpersonal relationship (Nelson & Friedlander, 2001). The interpersonal relationship between counselor trainee and supervisor consists of numerous individual characteristics. If not accounted for, individualities could impede the effectiveness of supervision. Individual characteristics consist of style differences such as personality, cognition, learning, and behavior. Although studied in various contexts, including educational and therapeutic settings, style differences have received very little attention in the field of counseling and supervision. Furthermore, the relationship of supervisory style and cognitive style on the efficacy of supervision as perceived by counselor trainees has been overlooked.

The professional practice of clinical supervision has received much attention over the years; as a result, it has become well documented in the literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Bradley & Ladany, 2001; Holloway, 1987; Stoltenberg, 1981; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993; Hess, 1987). Norcross, Farber, and Prochaska (1993) found that clinical supervision was rated the second most frequent professional activity of APA Division 29 psychologists. Psychotherapy was number one. Similar to other

mental health professions, clinical supervision has emerged as one of the most important activities within the field of counseling. In fact, Bernard and Goodyear (2004) assert that the professional practice of supervision is an intervention in and of itself providing its own theories, techniques, and issues.

Clinical supervision is a crucial component of counselor education because it fulfills various training objectives for counselors. Bernard and Goodyear (2004) emphasize that the purpose of supervision is twofold: (1) Supervision is to encourage supervisee professional development, and (2) ensure client welfare. The Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CAPCREP) (2001) defines supervision as "a tutorial and mentoring form of instruction in which a supervisor monitors the student's activities in practicum and internship and facilitates the learning and skill development experiences associated with practicum and internship." In addition, "the supervisor monitors and evaluates the clinical work of the student while monitoring the quality of services offered to clients" (CACREP, 2001).

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) (1993) defines supervisors as counselors who directly oversee the clinical work of a counselor within their organization or agency. Supervisors act as gatekeepers who monitor client welfare vicariously through their supervisees and who promote skills acquisition, knowledge, and professional behaviors for their supervisees. Supervisees can be counselors-in-training who are working with clients in public or private settings as part of their university training program (ACES, 1993). The supervisee may be a student who is in formal training to become a counselor. In order to encourage equitable supervision practice and

adequate training of counselors, accrediting agencies and state regulatory boards have set standards for the training and supervision of counselor trainees.

CACREP (2001) requires counseling students to complete a supervised practicum and internship as part of earning their counselor education degree and considers the practicum and internship "the most critical experience elements in the program." One of the primary goals of providing supervision during practicum and internship is to improve counselor trainees' counseling abilities. In doing so, it is believed that counselor trainees will become more confident, effective, and competent when working with clients. In order to foster these counselor attributes, counselor trainees are supervised during their practicum and internship by a more senior member of the same or similar profession.

The practicum occurs toward the end of the academic coursework and prior to the internship experience. According to CACREP (2001) standards, the practicum is "a distinctly defined, supervised clinical experience in which the student develops basic counseling skills and integrates professional knowledge." Prior to starting the practicum, counselor education students have completed most of their coursework toward degree completion, including basic counseling skills and group work. The practicum affords students the opportunity to put into practice techniques and interventions they have learned during their coursework. It is during this stage of professional development that students begin to hone their clinical skills and rely heavily on their supervisors for support and training. Following the completion of practicum, students are enrolled in internship in order to enhance their counseling abilities and professional identities as counselors.

Internship is a clinical experience in which students refine basic counseling skills and knowledge and incorporate professional skills and knowledge pertaining to the program (CACREP, 2001). The internship experience primarily occurs during the final semester of the student's program and prepares the student for the professional practice of counseling. CACREP (2001) requires students to be supervised by field site supervisors who closely monitor their clinical work with clients and professional activities weekly during practicum and internship for an average of one hour per week of individual supervision. Students also are required to be supervised in their counselor education program for one and a half hours of group supervision.

Both practicum and internship require field experiences that present the student with the opportunity to be mentored and supervised by a professional who has been working in the field for a minimum of two years (CACREP, 2001). Depending on their program of study, students can complete their degree requirements in school settings, community mental health centers, hospitals, or other sites including private practice settings that afford students the opportunity to work with clients in individual counseling and group work. No matter the site, supervision is a marriage of two people each with unique personal qualities that alter the supervisory relationship and perhaps, the effectiveness of supervision.

Supervision is a dynamic process that involves several interpersonal relationship issues. "The supervisory relationship is a product of the uniqueness of two individuals, embedded within the process of supervision and modified by the demands of the various contexts within which supervision occurs" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 101). Within the context of supervision, individual differences can impact the growth and development

of counselor trainees and supervision processes and outcomes. Unlike overt supervisory variables such as ethnicity, gender, and age, interpersonal style variables, including personality traits, are not as noticeable; they may not be obvious to the supervisor and supervisee. Unnoticeable individual characteristics could ultimately compromise the effectiveness of supervision.

Despite its growth in popularity, most research investigating supervisory relationships in counselor education is limited to gender (Granello, Beamish, & Davis, 1997; Granello, 1996), ethnicity, experience or developmental level (Stoltenberg, 1981), and supervision models (Bernard, 1979). It has been noted in the literature that, "there has been little systematic examination of the various factors that influence the actual supervisory relationship, regardless of the theory or model being practiced by the supervisor" (Swanson & O'Saben, 1993, p. 457). Modest attention has been given to personality characteristics such as cognitive style.

Riding and Cheema (1991) define cognitive style "as a person's typical or habitual mode of problem solving, thinking, perceiving, and remembering" (p.194). Other words that have been used to describe this construct are worldviews, cognitive development, and information-processing styles (Rigazio-Digilio, 1998). The terms cognitive and learning style tend to be used interchangeably in the literature. To some authors the terms mean the same; others define them as separate concepts. Riding and Sadler-Smith (1992) distinguish cognitive style as a fixed characteristic and learning style, or strategy, as a dynamic tool that may be used to manage situations and tasks.

Often, supervisors consider the developmental or experience level of the counselor trainee when beginning supervision and neglect cognitive style. "Even though

experience level is an appropriate place to begin in establishing the supervision environment, it is overly simplistic as the sole variable to take into consideration" (Bernard & Goodyear, p. 115, 2004). Individual characteristics, including cognitive style, may trump experience level; therefore, the supervision process must begin by considering prominent personal characteristics in order to be effective (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Because cognitive style is a relatively stable variable (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Rigazio-Digilio, 1998) and developmental and experience levels change over time (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004), supervisors must consider cognitive style as a variable that will inform supervision at any stage of development.

The importance of satisfaction in education and psychotherapy as a function of cognitive style has been documented in the literature. As early as 1975, Follman concluded that students' personality characteristics influence their ratings of overall effectiveness with their teachers. Furthermore, because students have different personality characteristics, teacher ratings of effectiveness are differentially affected (Follman, 1975). Based on their research, Green, Hadjistavropoulos, and Sharpe (2008) assert that patients' satisfaction with therapy was influenced by their personality characteristics. Significant findings on effectiveness and personality characteristics within education and psychotherapy further support the inquiry of cognitive style and the effectiveness of supervision.

In addition to cognitive style, the supervisor's approach of providing supervision influences the supervision process. Supervisors often behave in ways which they believe will contribute to helping supervisees grow into effective counselors (Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). The supervisor's behavior includes the manner from which he or she

engages with the supervisee within the context of the supervision environment. During supervision, "the supervisor creates an atmosphere or an environment as free of threat as possible, which the student can use to grow in understanding and in skills in counseling" (Patterson, 1964, p. 53). In an effort to create a positive supervisory environment that nurtures growth and development, supervisors can employ a variety of supervisory roles. Among the many supervisory functions, the roles of teacher, counselor, and consultant are highlighted throughout the literature.

Hamilton & Borders (1993) conducted a national survey of practicing counselors regarding their supervision preferences and found the following:

> Developmental models indicate that, in general, beginning counselors prefer a supervisory-teacher who focuses on specific counseling skills and techniques. Counselors at intermediate levels desire a supervisor-counselor who emphasizes self-awareness and relationship dynamics (e.g., transference and countertransference). More advanced counselors, including master's counselors, seek out a supervisor-consultant who operates out of a peer-like collegial relationship (p.66).

Thus, developmental theorists suggest that supervisors use the roles in a hierarchal format in order to match the developmental needs of the trainee. This formula suggests that supervisors approach the supervision process based on what they believe trainees need in relation to their experience level. Contrary to developmental models of supervision, research indicates that trainee experience does not predict preference for supervisory style (Ladany, Marotta, & Muse-Burke, 2001). Perhaps trainee interpersonal style variables influence preferred supervisory styles. The roles of teacher, counselor, and

consultant have been likened to the supervisory styles of task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive respectively (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

Friedlander and Ward (1984) operationalized the constructs task-oriented style, interpersonally sensitive style, and attractive style to reflect the various styles that a supervisor could revert to during clinical supervision. These identified styles affect the supervisory relationship, process issues, and outcome variables related to supervisor self-disclosures (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999), supervisee's self-evaluations (Steward, Breland, & Neil, 2001), theoretical orientation (Friedlander & Ward, 1984), and the supervisory working alliance (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). The three supervisory styles were created to identify behaviors that were specific to supervision. Unlike supervisory roles that simply refer to other, more common relationships (lecturer, teacher, consultant, counselor) (Friedlander & Ward, 1984), supervisory styles reflect an accurate representation of supervisory behaviors. The attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles are the preferred methods of providing supervision among trainees and supervisors (Ladany et al., 2001; Usher & Borders, 1993; Ellis, 1991; Steward, Breland, & Neil, 2001. Due to preference in style and sample size, the task-oriented supervisory style was not included in this investigation.

A modest amount of literature has suggested the importance of matching supervisors and counselor trainees based on several key dynamics that, if not accounted for, could preclude the effectiveness of supervision. Pitts and Miller (1990) suggested that clinical supervisors and practicum or internship students be matched on several variables including theoretical orientation, client population, compatibility of schedules, and interpersonal dynamics such as style. Riding and Cheema (1991) purport that once

the style is identified, the method of training can be matched to the individual's cognitive style. Research in education has shown that if the student's cognitive style is similar to his or her teacher, positive learning experiences occur and learning is improved. Similarly, matching styles make students feel more comfortable, consequently affecting learning and outcomes. Conversely, styles that are dissonant may lead to poor performance.

Because most novice counselors will refine their counseling skills during their field placements, supervision is a critical part of the practicum and internship experience. It is essential to promote a positive supervisory relationship that will nurture learning, competence, and professional development. To achieve that aim, interpersonal style differences are important to consider in supervision given their impact on the supervisory relationship. Personality characteristics must be considered a central part of the supervisory relationship. Being cognizant of interpersonal style variables will promote effective clinical supervision within an environment conducive to personal growth and development.

Statement of the Problem

Worthington and Roehlke (1979) assert that "…when counselor-supervisors begin to supervise beginning practicum counselors, they often generalize from their own counseling experiences to the supervisory situation" (p. 71). For this reason, "…supervisors often supervise as they would like to be supervised" (Worthington & Roehlke, 1979, p. 71). In doing so, the supervisor may not consider certain individual differences that could influence supervisee growth and development. Numerous individual differences exist within the supervision environment. Individual differences

9

represent those unique personal qualities that form one's personality (Bernard and

Goodyear, 2004). Style preferences, communication patterns, culture, and developmental

levels are just a few individual differences that contribute to the effectiveness of the

supervision process. There is a lack of empirical work examining the effect of

supervisors preferred style of providing supervision and trainees' cognitive style on the

supervision process. Moreover, there is relatively little research describing the effect of

the two styles on supervision effectiveness. This raises the question, what impact do

supervisory styles have on counselor trainees' perceived supervisory effectiveness when

considering counselor trainees' cognitive styles?

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the effect of supervisors' supervisory style, namely,

attractive or interpersonally sensitive and trainees' cognitive style, defined in this

investigation as either visualizer or verbalizer, on supervisory effectiveness. Specifically,

this study assessed the perceptions of counselor trainees' regarding supervisory

effectiveness. The impact of interpersonal style differences on effective supervision was

examined in order to account for variables that could influence the supervisory

relationship. Because each supervisee is different and each supervision experience is

unique, being knowledgeable of these issues could affect how the supervisee and

supervisor interact with each other and enhance supervision outcomes. Thus, the purpose

of this study was to determine which paired supervisory and cognitive styles are related

to the perception of supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees.

Significance of the Study

This study is intended to contribute to the continued professional development of clinical counseling supervisors and counselor trainees. The findings will enhance the training of clinical supervisors by increasing their awareness about individual characteristics that could impact the supervisory relationship, consequently affecting counselor trainees' work with clients. Furthermore, matching counselor trainees and supervisors based on their cognitive and supervisory styles will result in more positive training outcomes. The results of this study will enrich the counselor education and supervision literature by highlighting interpersonal style differences and their effect on the efficacy of the professional practice of supervision. This study is intended to provide information to supervisors about interpersonal style dynamics that emerge within the context of the clinical supervision experience. This study considered cognitive and supervisory styles as personality characteristics and how they inform the supervisory environment and training effects.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions about the supervisory relationship:

1. How does the relationship between counselor trainees' cognitive style and supervisors' supervisory style affect counselor trainees' perceived supervisory effectiveness?

2. Is there a difference in the perception of effective supervision among practicum and internship counselor trainees who identify themselves as visualizers or verbalizers?

Hypotheses:

The following null hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 2.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 3.

There is no significant interaction between practicum and internship counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant interaction between practicum and internship counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Definitions

Supervision

Supervision is an intervention provided by a more experienced member of a profession to a less experienced member or members of that same profession and the

supervision relationship is evaluative, continues over time, and monitors the welfare of the clients they oversee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Supervisor

"The supervisor monitors and evaluates the clinical work of the student while monitoring the quality of services offered to clients." Supervisors are counselors who directly oversee the clinical work of a counselor within their organization or agency (ACES, 1993).

Counselor Trainee

The counselor trainee is a student who is in formal training to become a professional counselor at the field experience level.

Internship

The internship is a clinical experience in which students refine basic counseling skills and knowledge and incorporate professional skills and knowledge pertaining to the students' program (CACREP, 2001).

Practicum

The practicum is "a distinctly defined, supervised clinical experience in which the student develops basic counseling skills and integrates professional knowledge." (CACREP, 2001).

Supervisory Style

Supervisory style refers to a supervisor's distinct approach to providing supervision and responding to supervisees and includes their overt behaviors that emerge during the supervision experience.

<u>Attractive Supervisory Style</u>

Attractive supervisory style, as measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory, is described as being warm, supportive, friendly, open, and flexible (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

<u>Interpersonally Sensitive Supervisory Style</u>

Interpersonally sensitive supervisory style is defined as being invested, committed, therapeutic, perceptive, and indicates a relationship-oriented approach to supervision, as measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

<u>Cognitive Style</u>

Cognitive style is a person's distinct manner of processing and perceiving information.

<u>Visualizer Cognitive Style</u>

Visualizer cognitive style, as measured by the Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire, is understood as a person's fundamental way of processing information in mental images (Richardson, 1977).

<u>Verbalizer Cognitive Style</u>

Verbalizer cognitive style is a person's fundamental way of processing information using words or verbal associations, as measured by the Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire (Richardson, 1977).

<u>Effectiveness</u>

Effectiveness is the degree to which counselor trainees are satisfied with their practicum or internship supervision experience.

Summary

  This chapter introduced the research topic. Additionally, the statement of the problem and rationale for the study were presented as well as the hypotheses. This study investigated the impact of counselor trainees' cognitive styles and supervisors supervisory styles on the effectiveness of supervision. Specifically, practicum and internship counselor trainees, who identified themselves as verbalizers or visualizers and who were paired with supervisors with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles, rated the effectiveness of supervision they received after one semester. The following chapter reveals that there is a lack of empirical work examining the impact of cognitive style and supervisory style on the effectiveness of supervision. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of supervisee's cognitive style and supervisor's supervisory style on perceived supervisory effectiveness. Relatively little research has been conducted on counselor trainee's cognitive style, the style of supervision employed by the supervisor, and the effect of interpersonal style differences on supervision outcomes. This chapter presents a review of the literature on cognitive styles, supervisory styles, and the effect of personality style variables on effective supervision. The chapter is divided into five sections: (a) historical overview, (b) cognitive style, (c) supervisory style, (d) cognitive diversity, (e) effectiveness of supervision, and (f) summary of the review.

Historical Overview

The concepts of learning or cognitive styles have existed for more than a century. The advent of styles began with a closer examination of human personality. Dating back to the 1920's, psychologist Carl Gustav Jung developed his theory on personality. As a result of his research, he identified eight psychological types that eventually led to the development of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985), a popular multidimensional instrument assessing personality styles. The MBTI has been used widely in empirical works on cognitive style and training, learning, and outcome (Swanson & O'Saben, 1993; Lochner & Melchert, 1997; Handley, 1982; Ronnestad, 1976). Stemming from Jung's personality theory, Allport (1937) formally introduced the term cognitive style to describe a person's typical or habitual mode of problem solving,

16

thinking, perceiving and remembering (Riding & Cheema, 1991). Sternberg and Zhang, (2001) state:

> Since Allport's time, the term has been modified and imbued with different meanings, but the core definition of style—that is, its reference to habitual patterns or preferred ways of doing something (e.g., thinking, learning, teaching) that are consistent over long periods of time and across many areas of activity— remains virtually the same (p.2).

Originating from cognitive psychology, cognitive style is considered to be a personality characteristic that influences values, beliefs, and social interaction. Several theorists have assigned different meanings to the construct cognitive style. Witkin (1954) defines cognitive style as a bipolar construct of field independence and field dependence. Field independent individuals rely on an internal frame of reference and enjoy individualized learning; field dependent persons rely on an external frame of reference and prefer to learn in groups. Based on his research on problem solving tasks, Pask (1972) labeled cognitive style as holist-serialist. People who looked for specific and less information were considered serialists, and those who used large amounts of data searching for patterns and relationships were holists. Gardner (1953) speaks of leveling and sharpening that suggest a cognitive style. Levelers tend to incorporate new events with previously stored ones; sharpeners perceive new events more discretely from those already stored. Research on cognitive style has decreased since the 1970's due to the difficulties in defining and measuring this construct (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1997; Mayer & Massa, 2003).

During the 1970's, the term learning style seemed to trump the construct cognitive style (Riding & Cheema, 1991). In recent years, the concept of learning style became increasingly popular among educators, corporate institutions, and trainings programs. In fact, research on learning style has been intensively subjected to empirical study, consequently, overwhelming the literature.

Because styles have been conceptualized in very different ways, the terms cognitive and learning style have been used interchangeably throughout history. Some theorists postulate the terms mean the same; others argue that they are different concepts each with distinct definitions. For the purpose of this study, cognitive style is distinct from learning style. Learning style includes many elements, whereas cognitive style is an either-or dimension. This attractive quality of cognitive style makes it easier to quantify. Riding and Cheema (1991) note that most who consider learning style as the umbrella from which to work, also consider cognitive style as underlying their training or educational approaches. Therefore, cognitive style has many practical implications and could be used as a predictor of instructional methods to be used in learning. This raises the question, could cognitive style predict the type of supervision style most effective for training counselors?

To date, developmental models have been the driving force on the topic of training counselors and appear to dominate the supervision literature. The assumption that counselors mature in their counseling skills and abilities as they gain experience is grounded in developmental models. "Cognitive style and cognitive complexity have not received the same level of attention in the supervision literature as have developmental differences, including the developmental differences based on level of experience"

(Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 102). In line with what Bernard and Goodyear state, I agree that cognitive style has been treated with less importance in the counselor education and supervision literature compared to developmental level.

Developmental models of supervision have generally viewed the training process of counselors as sequential stages that a trainee progresses through. Accordingly, trainees have been described using categorical descriptors. For example, Stolenberg and Delworth (1987) describe a developmental model that refers to the trainees at three levels: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. A review of developmental models revealed that supervisors change their behavior as supervisees gain experience, consequently affecting the supervisory relationship (Worthington, 1987). Many of these models do not consider cognitive style, a variable that remains constant regardless of experience level. Developmental models stress that trainees move through a progression of skills and abilities over the course of their education; perhaps suggesting that supervisors' expectations of trainees' development of counseling skills are contingent on experience level and not necessarily personality variables.

A few studies have suggested that cognitive style takes precedence over experience level of supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Lochner & Melchert, 1997; Swanson & O'Saben, 1993). Whereas, experience levels are variable and change as supervisees gain knowledge and improve their counseling skills, cognitive styles are static and generally do not alter over time. Based on their results examining the relationships between trainees' cognitive style, program membership, amount of experience, and needs and expectations for supervision, Swanson and O'Saben (1993) concluded that "the expectations and needs that a supervisee brings to the supervisory

experience may be related to his and her cognitive style" (p. 464). Additional scholars

have recommended that cognitive-processing styles be more fundamental to supervision

models, not experience level (Rigazio-DiGilio, 1998; Holloway, 1987). Although

research has shown the significance of cognitive style within the supervisory

environment to some extent, I wonder to what degree cognitive style influences the

effectiveness of supervision.

A closer review of the literature suggests that at least one model of supervision

advocates that supervisors alter their behaviors during supervision to accommodate the

needs of counselor trainees. Bernard's Discrimination Model (Bernard, 1979) combines

three supervisory roles: teacher, counselor, and consultant; and three areas of focus:

conceptualization, process, and personalization. The Discrimination Model considers

supervisory roles to be highly variable and change across sessions and within session in

order to accommodate counselor trainees' learning needs (Bernard, 1979). The

Discrimination Model is perhaps the most pertinent model of supervision that suggests

supervisors need to alter their supervisory roles in order to accommodate supervisees'

needs.

Cognitive Style

Many labels have been used to describe cognitive style. Riding and Cheema

(1991) explored the literature and identified over 30 labels referred to as cognitive or

learning styles. Tennant (1988) defined cognitive style as "an individual's characteristic

and consistent approach to organizing and processing information" (p. 89). Cognitive-

processing styles characterize the different ways individuals receive, interpret, store, and

retrieve information (Rigazio-Digilio, 1998). Cognitive style is highly personalized;

individuals possess a unique manner of processing information. "Although it is generally accepted that all individuals process information, professional counselors and counselor educators have yet to theoretically define or pragmatically operationalize categories of information processing that are universally accepted" (Rigazio-DiGillio, 1998, p.45). The inability to formally agree on a succinct definition of how one processes information has led to confusion in the literature regarding cognitive style, cognitive ability, learning strategy or preferences, and learning ability.

The term style should be distinguished from strategy and ability. A style is generally a fixed characteristic whereas strategies are dynamic and are therefore used to cope with situations and tasks (Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992). Cognitive style could be viewed as a trait, whereas learning strategy denotes a state-like connotation. Ability refers to how well one performs. "Cognitive ability refers to things that people are capable of doing, cognitive style refers to the ways that people process and represent information, and learning preferences refer to the ways that people like information to be presented to them" (Mayer & Massa, 2003, p. 833). Styles are preferences in using abilities (Sternberg & Zhnag, 2001).

Due to the debate and disagreement over the terms meanings, cognitive style and learning style are used interchangeably in the literature. Riding and Cheema (1991) purport that cognitive style is a bipolar dimension, whereas learning style incorporates many elements. Learning styles also are referred to as learning preferences. Learning preferences are the ways that people like to have information presented to them (Mayer & Massa, 2003). For instance, some people prefer to be taught new skills involving pictures or words. Others prefer to hear instructions or new skills. Learning styles have

been identified as important variables to consider on trainees' supervision experiences (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Holloway, 1995). If cognitive style is generally viewed as a fixed personality characteristic, to what extent should perceptual differences be considered in the supervision process?

Lochner and Melchert (1997) explored the relationship of cognitive styles, theoretical orientation, and the supervision process. They surveyed 106 psychology interns to determine their cognitive style based on the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), ideal supervisor, and which theoretical orientation from a list of six that matched their own. Lochner and Melchert hypothesized that supervisees who scored high on the MBTI dimensions of Intuition, Feeling, and Perceptions would prefer an interpersonally sensitive style of supervision, whereas supervisees who scored high on the dimensions of Sensing, Thinking, and Judgment would have stronger preferences for task-oriented supervision. Their results concluded that supervisory preferences, in terms of supervisory styles, were significantly related to cognitive style and theoretical orientation. Interns who scored high on the dimensions of Sensing, Thinking, and Judgment and whose theoretical orientation was identified as behavioral tended to indicate that they preferred a task-oriented supervisor. Those who scored the opposite preferred an interpersonally attractive supervisory style. In sum, Lochner and Melchert found significant results indicating that individual differences in cognitive style and theoretical orientation of psychology interns relate to their preferences of supervisory styles.

Ronnestad (1976) found similar results in her research. Supervisees' cognitive styles had an impact on their perceptions of supervisory styles. Although both studies investigated the cognitive styles of supervisees, neither study considered the actual

22

supervisor's style of supervision. Both studies focused on the supervisees' perceptions of the style they assumed their supervisor employed. Further research exploring both the actual supervisory style used during supervision and the supervisee's cognitive style is warranted.

Cognitive style is an element in research that has been shown to be significant when exploring the relationship between clients and counselors (Handley, 1982). Green, Hadjistavropoulos, and Sharpe (2008) found that satisfaction with cognitive behavior therapy was indicative of clients' personality characteristics. Eugster and Wampold (1996) found similar results among psychotherapy clients. They reported the quality of the therapeutic relationship directly affected how satisfied a patient was with therapy. Griggs (1991) stresses the importance of school counselors being able to diagnose clients' learning styles. In doing so, counselors are better able to use interventions that compliment individual styles and accommodate learning preferences in the classroom. Griggs further states that:

> The starting point in teaching and counseling is to respond to the learning style needs of students, which implies knowledge of our own preferences and a conscious effort to expand our repertoire of counseling interventions and techniques to respond to student diversity (p.2).

Given that research in psychotherapy has shown a significant relationship between personality characteristics and satisfaction with treatment, and the interpersonal relationship between client and counselor parallels that of supervisee and supervisor, I wonder how interpersonal style variables influence the effectiveness of supervision.

Riding and Cheema (1991) investigated the classifications of cognitive style and concluded that cognitive style could be grouped into two primary components: the wholist-analytic and the verbal-imagery dimensions. The wholist-analytic styles process information in wholes or parts. Verbalizers process information using words or verbal associations; visualizers process information in mental images (Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992). For the purpose of this research study, cognitive style was assessed on the dimension of verbalizer-visualizer because of its relevance to training and the ease of quantifying one's preferred cognitive style.

In terms of approach of presentation, imagers learn best from pictorial presentation and verbalizers are better at learning from text (Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992). It has been noted in the literature, that overall verbalizers perform better with verbal tasks and visualizers perform better with concrete, imaginable ones and when there is a mismatch between cognitive style and approach of presentation, performance is reduced (Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992). Riding and Sadler-Smith (1992) investigated the cognitive style and instructional approach on learning performance among adolescents. Their study confirmed that instructional method and cognitive style have grave effects upon learning results (Riding & Sadler-Smith). Furthermore, they assert that teachers and trainers should be cognizant of individual differences in cognitive style and should try to accommodate these differences in their instructional programs (Riding & Sadler-Smith). I suspect that a mismatch of cognitive style and supervisory approach could have detrimental affects on supervision.

"Verbal-imagery cognitive style has been shown to be related to performance on cognitive tasks relevant to training, affecting both the mode of presentation of the

information and the type of content" (Riding & Mathias, 1991, p.2). Riding and

Ashmore (1980) investigated cognitive style and presentation mode among children to

determine a match between style and mode. Similar to the adolescent study, their results

found that imagers learned best from pictorial presentation and verbalizers from written

material (Riding & Ashmore). The importance of being aware of styles is reflected in the

following argument by Riding and Sadler-Smith (1992):

> The identification of cognitive styles is of immediate relevance to teachers and
>
> trainers since it can be used to (a) predict learning difficulties, (b) inform the
>
> discussion of the learning process amongst professional, (c) enlighten
>
> interpretations of learner evaluations of instructional programs, (d) make possible
>
> the design of instructional treatments which may be congruent with an
>
> individual's habitual modes of thinking, and (e) improve the effectiveness and
>
> efficacy of instruction (p. 332).

Sparse attention in research has been given to the importance of matching styles in the

supervision process.

Even though few studies have addressed matching supervisee and supervisor

based on styles, they have nevertheless found notable results. Handley (1982) reported a

significant relationship between cognitive styles and the supervision process. In his study

examining the supervisory relationship and cognitive styles of the supervisor and trainee,

he found that an awareness of supervisor and trainee cognitive style may aid in the

satisfaction with the relationship and supervision process (Handley). Thus, these findings

suggest that matched supervisory dyads perceive a high interpersonal relationship.

Handley recommends:

> It may be helpful for supervisors and trainees to be aware of their cognitive styles
> early in the supervision process…such knowledge might aid them in better
> understanding how they may relate to each other interpersonally and how satisfied
> they might be with supervision (p.514).

In support of Handley's work, Rosenberg (1985) found that supervisors, who were
matched with their trainees based on the cognitive dimension of field-independence-
dependence, rated the effectiveness of their communication higher than unmatched
dyads. Additionally, trainees who were matched with their supervisor accepted feedback
more willingly than those unmatched and student supervisors in unmatched dyads gave
lower ratings of effective communication compared to student supervisors in matched
dyads. Overall, matching cognitive styles among dyads influenced supervisors' view of
their rapport with supervisees (Rosenberg).

Cognitive Diversity

Historically, counseling and supervision multicultural research has focused most
attention on race, ethnicity, gender, age, and sexual orientation. Very little attention has
been given to cognitive diversity. This raises the question, how does culture affect
cognitive style within the supervisory environment? Understanding how culture affects
cognitive style in supervision is perhaps best explained by viewing how students are
affected by culture and learning in the classroom.

In their book on diversity, learning style, and culture, Guild and Garger (1998)
emphasize that a person's early life experiences and cultural values affect the process of
learning. The learner is a product of nature and nurture as well as external influences

particularly within his or her immediate family, extended community, and culture (Guild & Garger, 1998).

Empirical works emphasize individual differences among individuals within cultural groups. Individual differences are distinctive personal qualities that are otherwise known as one's personality (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Dunn (1997) asserts that research on multiculturalism and learning styles shows that there is no such thing as a cultural group style. "There are crosscultural and intracultural similarities and differences among all peoples" (Dunn, 1997, p.77). Each person is unique and each person regardless of ethnicity, race, and gender has different worldviews. Therefore, it is unfair to supervise practicum and internship supervisees in a similar manner simply because of their developmental status.

Personality variables are embedded in a student's unique interpersonal makeup just as ethnicity and race. However, unlike most cultural characteristics, you cannot merely look at a person and know how they learn. Multicultural research on education and learning can help to inform the clinical practice of supervision.

Bernard and Goodyear (2004) state that "…psychological type seems to be a factor in supervision, though it must be viewed as only one factor of many that can affect the supervisory relationship" (p.104). The literature revealed that supervisory style influences the process of supervision as well.

Supervisory Style

Friedlander and Ward (1984) define supervisory style as the supervisors' way of approaching and responding to supervisees. They identified three supervisory styles: attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented. Attractive is described as being

warm, supportive, friendly, open, and flexible. Interpersonally sensitive is defined as being invested, committed, therapeutic, perceptive, and indicates a relationship-oriented approach to supervision. Task-oriented supervisory style includes being goal-oriented, thorough, focused, practical, structured, and focused on content. As stated in chapter 1, the attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles were considered in this investigation. The styles of attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented have been equated to consultant, counselor, and teacher in the Discrimination Model (1979). The Discrimination Model (1979) purports that supervisors alter their roles of consultant, counselor, and teacher during supervision to address counselor trainee needs.

Hart and Nance (2003) explored supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of supervisory styles over the course of nine years. They surveyed supervisors' and supervisees' preferred supervisor styles prior to any supervision sessions and again at the end of 10 supervision sessions. Initially, supervisors preferred to use a style that would provide high support and low direction (i.e. counselor), or both high support and high direction (i.e. supportive teacher). Supervisees preferred being supervised using a style that would provide both high support and high direction (i.e. supportive teacher and counselor style). Hart and Nance reported that at the conclusion of the supervision experience, supervisors and supervisees were able to differentiate the styles that supervisors actually used. Supervisors' styles that were used during supervision were somewhat different from the styles they anticipated using. Supervisees, however, did not vary from their preferred style in the beginning or at the end of supervision. One possible explanation of this finding might be that supervisees' cognitive style determined the type of supervision style they preferred.

Usher and Borders (1993) conducted a survey of counseling practitioners regarding their supervision preferences. In their examination of school versus non-school counselors' supervision preferences, they found that non-school counselors preferred a supervisor who is relationship oriented over one who is task-oriented. School counselors preferred task-oriented supervisors and one who focuses on specific skills and techniques.

Ladany et al. (2001) found a relationship between supervisory style and the supervision process. The supervisor's choice of style and amount of self-disclosure may affect the supervisory relationship.

Similar to what Ladany et al. (2001) found, Steward et al. (2001) investigated the impact of supervisory style on beginning trainees' self-evaluation of counseling competence. Their findings revealed that supervisors who were perceived as consistently attractive may be less apt to challenge trainees beyond their comfort zone and may be supportive to a degree that has negative implications for trainees' development as counselors. As a result, trainees' sense of confidence, self-efficacy, and feelings of accomplishment would remain relatively low (Steward et al.).

Understanding a supervisee's style would enhance the supervisory relationship, reduce some of the defensiveness that characterizes many supervisory relationships, and build on the supervisee's strengths (Ing, 1990). Itzhaky and Eliahou (2001) claim that:

> Identification of the student's learning style is an essential tool for the supervisor, both in selection of the appropriate supervision methods, and as a basis for creating channels of communication between the supervisor and the student that will facilitate the conveyance of knowledge and learning (p.22).

"Cognitive variables are characteristics of participants that guide their behavior during supervision" (Worthington & Stern, 1985, p.252). Due to this reason "…supervisors may need to operate from other than their preferred style of thinking and acting if they intend to be of service to a variety of supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p.107). Ing (1990) supports this view by stating "most supervisors use a single approach to supervision in all situations and do not take into consideration individual differences in learning" (p. 147). When supervisors consider learning styles in supervision, they are able to communicate interpersonally in a way that will encourage growth and development (Ing, 1990). A supervisor's style may "be predictive of not only a trainee's willingness to work with him or her but also the trainee's eventual satisfaction with supervision" (Friedlander & Ward, 1984, p. 556).

Effectiveness of Supervision

Counselor trainees with different cognitive styles could be affected differently when being supervised by the same supervisor. Follman (1975) asserts that "different students have different personality characteristics, and that these influence teacher ratings differentially" (p.164). A few studies have examined the relationship of supervisor behaviors and their relationship to good or effective supervision (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984, Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979).

In their research on identifying specific supervisor behaviors perceived as most effective by supervisees, Worthington and Roehlke (1979) concluded that "…those behaviors that supervisors believed to be important to good supervision were not always the same as those behaviors that correlated significantly with supervisees' ratings of satisfaction with supervision, supervisor competence, and improved counseling skills" (p.

70). Supervisors considered giving accurate feedback and being supportive as constituting good supervision. They did not consider teaching supervisees techniques using role-play, giving literature about interventions, or providing structure in the early sessions as imperative to providing good supervision. Beginning trainees rated supervision better when sessions were structured, they were taught how to counsel, and tried new skills. As a result of their study, Worthington and Roehlke found a strong relationship between satisfaction with supervision and improved counseling skills.

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) surveyed 82 counseling students from master's degree counselor education programs to determine whether their supervisors' supervisory styles were related to satisfaction with supervision. Findings revealed that the attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles influenced satisfaction with supervision. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky caution supervisors to be aware of their supervisory styles because they can influence supervisees' satisfaction with supervision. Additionally, the authors note that although supervisors have their preferred style of supervision, they may need to incorporate elements of other styles into their supervision practice if supervisee needs are not being met. This study lends support to the idea that supervisory style might be predetermined much like cognitive style. If this is true, matching supervisors and supervisees based on styles could benefit the supervision process and outcome.

Research has shown that supervisee decreased defensiveness, brought on by a supervisor's desire to promote learning and development, contributes to supervision effectiveness (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). In their phenomenological study, Worthen and McNeill (1996) interviewed supervisees to find out what supervision events or elements contributed to their meaning of good supervision. A good supervisory

relationship and attention to the task of developing counseling skills emerged as two

factors that aided in identifying positive supervision experiences (Worthen & McNeill).

"Past investigations have focused on the question of satisfaction with supervision,

providing some indications that what constitutes good supervision varies according to the

developmental level of trainees" (Worthen & McNeill, p.25). I wonder if ratings of good

supervision vary as a result of differing styles rather than developmental level. Do styles

determine perceived supervisory effectiveness despite trainee developmental level?

Heppner and Roehlke (1984) examined supervisees' perceptions of supervisors'

behaviors contributing to effective supervision. They found:

> …Supervisory behaviors which correlated with trainees' satisfaction with
>
> supervision progressed along what appears to be a skills acquisition dimension –
>
> that is, from developing intake skills (beginning practica students) to alternative
>
> conceptualization skills (advanced practica students) to examining personal issues
>
> of affecting therapy (interns) (p.87).

The results indicated a relationship between trainee ratings of effective supervision and a

supportive supervisory relationship (Heppner & Roehlke). This research study further

supports the theory that supervisees are satisfied with supervision when their counseling

abilities are strengthened and challenged. This study did not assess the relationship

between supervisory behaviors and supervisee cognitive style however, variables that

may have had an impact on overall satisfaction ratings.

Kennard, Stewart, and Gluck (1987) conducted a pilot study to investigate

relationship variables that influenced the psychotherapy supervision. They collected data

from 68 supervisee-supervisor dyads assessing positive and negative training outcomes

when measuring theoretical orientation of the trainee and supervisor and the behavioral style of the supervisor. Matching supervisee and supervisor based on theoretical orientation and behavioral style have been found to be related to supervisees' positive experiences with supervision. There is a need for more research to be done supporting the idea that matching supervisors and trainees based on style enhances training outcomes. Kennard et al. note that:

"…there is little empirical evidence at present that a "match" is important in determining the quality of supervision relationships (i.e., that a specific trainee and supervisor dyad may report a good supervisor experience, whereas the same individuals in different dyads may not have a positive relationship)" (p. 172).

When considering variables that may contribute to the efficacy of supervision one should not exclude personality attributes and style. In his review of empirical literature on the influence of students' personality characteristics and the ratings they give their instructors, Follman (1975) concluded that college students' characteristics do influence ratings of effectiveness. "In other words, ratings of people in general, and student's ratings of instructors in particular usually reflect to some extent (and sometimes to a large extent) the raters' personality characteristics" (Follman, p. 164). To be effective "…supervisors may need to operate from other than their preferred style of thinking and acting if they intend to be of service to a variety of supervisees" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p.107). Thus, there are many factors that could affect supervision processes and outcomes including cognitive and supervisory styles. Empirical support is limited in this area, however. Therefore, examining the impact of supervisory style and cognitive style on supervisory effectiveness is warranted.

Summary of the Review

A primary goal of supervision is to enhance counselor trainees' skills and professional development. To achieve this goal, supervisors strive to identify situational variables and individual differences that may influence the supervision process. Borders and Brown, (2005) conclude that:

> Each supervisee-and supervisor-brings unique personalities, life experiences, interpersonal histories, professional motivations and goals to the supervisory context. Each supervisory relationship, then, is unique, and what works with one supervisee will not work in exactly the same way with another supervisee- or even that same supervisee at a different point in time (p.68).

"Knowing some of the personal variables that have been considered in the professional literature will arm supervisors with additional tools to assist the supervisee in achieving competence" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 101).

A review of the literature revealed that a supervisor's approach to providing supervision has more often than not been influenced by the experience or developmental level of the supervisee (Stolenberg & Delworth, 1987; Stolenberg, 1981). It has been debated in the literature that cognitive style is more important than experience level during supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Lochner & Melchert, 1997; Swanson & O'Saben, 1993; Rigazio-DiGilio, 1998; Holloway, 1987). Individualities, such as race and gender, have been investigated as factors to be cognizant of when beginning supervision (Granello et al., 1997; Granello, 1996); however, relatively little research has been conducted on cognitive style, a personality variable that affects both educational and counseling settings (Riding & Mathias, 1991; Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992; Handley,

1982; Griggs,1991). Especially noted in the research review, is the lack of current

literature that addresses the influence of cognitive and supervisory style on the

effectiveness of supervision in counselor education and supervision. This study will

attempt to address this matter as well as enhance the counselor education and supervision

literature with current findings.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This study investigated the cognitive styles of supervisees and the supervisory styles of site supervisors and analyzed counselor trainees' perceived effectiveness of supervision. This chapter describes the methodology of the study. Research methodology is the way in which data is collected and analyzed (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The methodology explains the design, the hypotheses, sample, the instrumentation, the data collection, and the data analysis of the study.

There are many types of research questions and designs, as such, it is important to match the question to an appropriate design (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). "Nonexperimental research designs describe things that have occurred and examine relationships between things without manipulation of conditions that are experienced" (McMillan & Schumacher, p.24). This study used a non-experimental study design to answer the research questions:

1. How does the relationship between counselor trainees' cognitive style and supervisors' supervisory style affect counselor trainee perceived supervisory effectiveness?

2. Is there a difference in the perception of effective supervision among practicum and internship counselor trainees who identify themselves as visualizers or verbalizers?

Hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 2.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 3.

There is no significant interaction among practicum and internship counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant interaction among practicum and internship counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Variables:

Independent variables:

The independent variables in this study were the supervisor's supervisory style (attractive and interpersonally sensitive) and the trainee's cognitive style (visualizer-verbalizer). The independent variables were not manipulated in this study.

Dependent variable:

The dependent variable was the trainee's perception of supervisory effectiveness.

Participants

The participants in this study were internship and practicum counseling students in the counselor education master's degree program at Duquesne University. Counseling students were enrolled in either the school counseling, community counseling, or marriage and family therapy program and were completing their practicum or internship course requirements at various field placement sites. Also participating in the study were field site professional counselors who provided individual supervision to the internship and practicum counseling students. Various field sites included elementary and secondary schools, drug and alcohol agencies, community mental health settings, and other sites including a church. The final sample for the study consisted of supervisors and their previously matched counselor trainees who chose to complete all of the questionnaires. The total sample size for the study was 45 supervisor-supervisee dyads.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire is the most widely used technique for gathering information from subjects, is economical, contains the same questions for all subjects, and ensures anonymity (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). This study utilized three questionnaires to assess the supervisory styles of supervisors, the cognitive styles of counselor trainees, and the effectiveness of supervision as rated by counselor trainees.

Supervisory styles were measured using the Supervisory Styles Inventory-Revised (SSI-R; Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The SSI-R is a 33 item self-report inventory that yields scores on three dimensions: attractive (e.g. friendly, supportive, open, warm,

positive); interpersonally sensitive (e.g. intuitive, reflective, creative, therapeutic); and

task-oriented (e.g. goal-oriented; concrete, practical, prescriptive, focused). Supervisors

rated their behaviors on a list of adjectives using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1

(*not very*) to 7 (*very*). "These measures can be completed in regards to your ideal

supervisor, your current supervision work, or how you believe you will behave (or should

behave) in an upcoming supervision experience with a particular supervisee (e.g. a novice

vs. a developmentally advance supervisee" (Borders & Brown, 2005). As stated in

chapter one, only the attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles were used in the

analysis. Several research studies have confirmed that the SSI-R is both reliable and valid

when measuring supervisory styles (Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Holloway, 1995;

Lochner & Melchert, 1997). Reliability estimates reported for the SSI-R include internal

consistency measures of .76 to .93; item scale correlations from .70 to .88 for the

attractive scale; from .51 to .82 for the interpersonally sensitive scale; and from .38 to .76

for the task-oriented scale (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The SSI-R allows both the

supervisor and the supervisee to rate supervisory styles. For the purpose of this study, the

SSI-R was modified to only ask the supervisors to rate their supervisory styles.

The Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire (VVQ), developed by Richardson

(1977), measured cognitive style.   The VVQ is an abbreviated version of Paivio's (1971)

86-item Ways of Thinking Questionnaire. The VVQ is a 15 item true-false questionnaire

which measures a single cognitive style dimension. Subjects with visual tendencies will

obtain high scores and subjects with verbal tendencies will attain low scores. The VVQ

is a common primary measure of the verbalizer-visualizer dimension; however, there is

debate in the literature about its reliability (Mayer & Massa, 2003; Riding & Cheema,

1991). Richardson (1977) reported reliability coefficients of .92, .91, and .91 after one week for male (n=20), female (n=17), and pooled college students (N=37), respectively. Test-retest reliability coefficients of .49, .29, and .48 were reported for male, female, and total (N=53) respectively after three weeks (Warren & Good, 1979). In another study, reliability coefficients of .72 (males), .65 (females), and .68 (all subjects, N=115) were reported after eight weeks (Spoltore & Smock, 1983).

The Supervision Questionnaire (SQ) was used to measure supervisory effectiveness (Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). This instrument rates 42 supervisor behaviors and the trainees' perception of effective supervision. Specifically, the questions address overall satisfaction, supervisor competence, and the degree to which supervision helped improve counseling abilities. The SQ use as a valid and reliable rating scale of supervisory effectiveness has been supported by various researchers (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Worthington (1984) reported that although no reliability or validity data for the SQ were originally reported, it has been used in whole or in part in research studies (Heppner & Handley, 1981; Reising & Daniels, 1983). Herbert and Ward (1995) reported reliability estimates for the SQ-R include internal consistency measures from .51 to .93.

A brief demographic questionnaire was completed by the supervisors and counselor trainees. The demographic questionnaire was used to define subject characteristics that may confound study results and for descriptive purposes only. Counselor trainee respondents were asked to provide the following demographic information: gender, ethnicity, whether they were enrolled in the practicum or internship course, counselor education degree being pursued, and field placement start and

completion dates. Supervisor respondents were asked to provide the following

demographic information: gender, ethnicity, whether they were providing supervision for

an internship or practicum student, type of supervision field site, number of years or

months providing supervision, and current credentials.

Procedure

A list of currently enrolled practicum and internship counselor education students

and their previously matched site supervisors was provided by the department of

counseling at Duquesne University. The investigator received permission from the

department of counseling. Each supervision dyad was assigned a random six-digit study

identification number. In addition, the letter S appeared after the six-digit number on all

supervisor questionnaires and the letter T appeared after the six-digit number on all

trainee questionnaires. The six-digit number allowed the investigator to link the

supervisors with the counselor trainees while maintaining confidentiality. Only the six-

digit study number appeared on all study questionnaires. Subjects' study numbers were

the only identifying information to appear on data and documents used for evaluation or

statistical analysis. To maintain confidentiality, identifiable information was kept in a

locked file cabinet in the investigator's office. The investigator was the only person to

have access to identifiable information. Confidentiality was maintained throughout the

study.

During the fall 2007 semester, supervisors and counselor trainees met for at least

10 individual supervision sessions for one hour once per week. The investigator made

initial contact with the counselor trainees at a large group supervision meeting at the end

of the semester. The trainees were asked to participate in a study to help determine if

individual differences impact the supervision process. They were given an opportunity to have any questions or concerns answered at that time.

Those trainees who expressed interest were given the consent form. The trainees were asked to sign and date the consent form and return it to the investigator. The investigator collected the signed and dated consent forms from participants and placed them in a sealed envelope.

Participating trainees were given an envelope that contained the demographic form, the VVQ, and the SQ questionnaires. The investigator asked each participant to complete the questionnaires and place them in the original envelope and return the envelope to the investigator.

Supervisors were mailed an envelope that contained a cover letter, the consent form, the demographic form, the SSI-R questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The cover letter served as an invitation to participate and provided a description of the research study and investigator contact information should any questions arise. The cover letter instructed supervisors who wanted to participate in the study to read, sign, and date the consent form; and provided instructions for completing the demographic form and the SSI-R questionnaire. Participants were instructed to return the signed consent form, the demographic form, and the SSI-R questionnaire to the investigator in the self-addressed stamped envelope. The investigator gathered the signed and dated consent forms from participants and placed them in a sealed envelope marked consent forms.

In an effort to yield a sufficient sample size, the investigator pursued non-respondents by mailing reminders. Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing, a

reminder letter was mailed to non-respondents. A second packet of the study

questionnaires was mailed to non-respondents two weeks after the first reminder letter.

Attempts to contact non-respondents ceased once the return rate had lessened. A total of

56 questionnaire packets were distributed to each supervision dyad. Of the 55 that were

returned, 45 were completed and useful data.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analyses were conducted in the following ways. Descriptive

statistics showed the variables' mean scores and standard deviations. To assess

hypothesis one, a t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference when

visualizers were paired with each supervisory style. To assess hypothesis two, a t-test

was used to determine if there was a significant difference when verbalizers were paired

with each supervisory style. The F-test, ANOVA, was used to know if there was a

significant difference among practicum and internship visualizers who were paired with

attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. An F-test was used to know if

there was a significant difference among practicum and internship verbalizers who were

paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Summary

The purpose of the methodology section was to help answer the following

research questions:

1. Does the relationship between verbalizer cognitive style and visualizer

cognitive style and attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory style affect

perceived supervisory effectiveness?

2. Is there a difference in the perception of effective supervision among practicum and internship counseling students who identify themselves as visualizers or verbalizers? To shed light on these questions, this study used a quantitative design. The self-report questionnaire was the main tool used to gather information about the supervisees' cognitive styles, the supervisors' supervisory styles, and the perceptions of the supervisees' supervision experiences. Fifty-six supervisory dyads were approached to participate in this inquiry. Chapter 4 details the results of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate how counselor trainees perceived the effectiveness of the supervision that they received from their site supervisors. In particular, it proposed to describe the perceptions among counselor trainees who identified themselves as verbalizers and visualizers when supervised by site supervisors using attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

The following chapter describes the results of the data analyses conducted in order to test various null hypotheses. The presentation of the results will be described for each hypothesis after a section describing the demographic details of the participants.

Demographic data

The initial mailing consisted of 56 supervisory dyads. Of the 55 questionnaires that were returned, 45 were usable data and included in this analysis. The following are the descriptive statistics for the total sample.

The final sample of site supervisors was 45. Of the 45 site supervisors, seven were male and 38 were female. The majority of the sample were Caucasian (42%), while 2% were African American, and only 1% declined to report on ethnicity. None were Asian or Pacific Islander. There were 17 practicum site supervisors and 28 internship site supervisors. In the sample of site supervisors (N=45), 13% supervised in a community mental health agency, 11% supervised in a drug and alcohol agency, 38% supervised in an elementary school, 33% supervised in a secondary school, 4% supervised at other sites that included a church, and none reported supervising at a hospital. Attractive supervisory styles made up 60% of the site supervisors preferred style of providing supervision, 29%

identified themselves as interpersonally sensitive supervisors, and 6.7% of the sample were task-oriented style supervisors. Only 4% of the sample reported no preferred supervision style. Due to the limited number of responses the task-oriented supervisory styles was omitted as a variable to consider in the analysis of this study.

In the total sample of counselor trainees (N=55), 11 were male and 44 were female. There were 24 practicum and 31 internship counselor trainees. Again, like the site supervisors, the majority of the sample were Caucasian (52%), 2% were African American, and 1% were Asian. None were Pacific Islander. Counselor trainees were asked to identify the counselor education degree being pursued. In the total sample (N=54), 65% of trainees were seeking a degree in school counseling, 22% were pursuing a degree community counseling, 7% were in the marriage and family counseling track, and 6% were seeking school certification only. The majority of the sample were visualizers (55%), 31% were verbalizers, and 15% identified themselves as a verbalizer and a visualizer.

Results of hypotheses:

Each hypothesis is restated and the results of the analysis are presented following each restatement.

Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

An independent samples t-test was used because two sample means were being compared from randomly assigned groups. The average rating of supervisory

effectiveness among visualizers who were supervised by attractive supervisory styles

(N=15) was 19.67 with a standard deviation of 1.95. The mean score of supervisory

effectiveness among visualizers who were supervised by an interpersonally sensitive

supervisory style (N=7) was 16.00 (*sd*=3.46). An independent samples t-test comparing

the mean scores of visualizers and attractive supervisory styles group to visualizers and

interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles group found a significant difference between

the means of the two groups ($t(20) = 3.20$, $p < .05$) (see Table One). The mean of the

visualizers and attractive supervisory styles ($m = 19.67$, $sd = 1.95$) was significantly

higher than the mean of the visualizers and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles (*m*

$= 16.00$, $sd = 3.46$).

Table 1.

Supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles

when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory

styles.

Group	N	M	SD	t	p	df
Visualizers paired with attractive styles	15	19.67	1.95	3.200*	.004	20
Visualizers paired with interpersonally sensitive styles	7	16.00	3.46			

* p < .05.

Hypothesis 2.

There is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

The test statistic used for hypothesis two was the t-test. The independent samples t-test compares the means of two randomly assigned groups. The mean rating of supervisory effectiveness among verbalizers who were supervised by attractive supervisory styles (N=8) was 18.75 ($sd = 1.95$). The mean score of supervisory effectiveness among verbalizers who were supervised by interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles (N=5) was 20.00 with a standard deviation of 16.0. An independent samples t-test was calculated comparing the mean score of verbalizers and attractive supervisory styles to the mean score of verbalizers and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. No significant difference was found ($t(11) = -1.10$, $p > .05$) (see Table Two). The mean of the verbalizers and attractive supervisory styles ($m = 18.75$, $sd = 2.12$) was not significantly different from the mean of the verbalizers and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles ($m = 20.00$, $sd = 1.73$).

Table 2.

Supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles
when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory
styles.

Group	N	M	SD	t	p	df
Verbalizers paired with attractive styles	8	18.75	1.95	-1.103	.294	11
Verbalizers paired with interpersonally sensitive styles	5	20.00	16.0			

Hypothesis 3.

There is no significant interaction between practicum and internship counselor
trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have
attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

A two way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test hypothesis three
because the dependent variable was at the interval level and normally distributed and the
independent variables were independent of each other. A 2 x 2 between-subjects factorial
ANOVA was calculated comparing the effectiveness of supervision for visualizers who
were supervised with either attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles and
who were in the practicum or internship course. The main effect for course was not
significant ($F(1,18) = 2.57, p > .05$) (see Table Three). A significant main effect for
visualizers who were supervised by attractive or interpersonally sensitive styles was
found ($F(1,18) = 4.70, p < .05$). The interaction was not significant ($F(1, 18) = .080, p >$

.05). The effect of the course was not influenced by whether or not the visualizers were

supervised with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Table 3.

Interaction between practicum and internship counselor trainees who have visualizer

cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally

sensitive supervisory styles.

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	15.57	1	15.57	2.57
Within Groups	109.25	18	6.07	
Total	124.82	19	6.07	

Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant interaction between practicum and internship counselor

trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have

attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

A 2 x 2 between-subjects factorial ANOVA was calculated comparing the

effectiveness of supervision for verbalizers who were supervised with either attractive or

interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles and who were in the practicum or internship

course. The main effect for course was not significant ($F(1,9) = 3.83, p > .05$) (see Table

Four). The main effect for verbalizers who were supervised with attractive and

interpersonally sensitive styles was also not significant ($F(1,9) = 2.24, p > .05$). Finally,

the interaction was not significant ($F(1,9) = .65, p > .05$). Thus, it appears that neither the

counselor education course nor whether or not verbalizers were paired with attractive or

50

interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles has any significant effect on supervision effectiveness.

Table 4.

Interaction between practicum and internship counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Between Groups	10.32	1	10.32	3.83
Within Groups	24.25	9	2.69	
Total	34.57	10		

Summary

The results of this investigation transpired because of data collected from 45 supervisory dyads. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to describe the sample of supervisors and counselor trainees and provide answers to the research questions. There is a significant difference among visualizers who are paired with attractive supervisory styles compared to visualizers who are paired with interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. By contrast, there is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among verbalizers who are paired with attractive supervisory styles and verbalizers who are paired with interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. Finally, there is no significant interaction in supervisory effectiveness among practicum and internship counselor trainees who identify themselves as visualizers or verbalizers and

who are supervised with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. A

discussion of the results including a rationale for each outcome follows in chapter 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses perceived supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who identify themselves as verbalizers or visualizers and who were supervised by attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the evaluations and interpretations of the findings, recommendations for professional practice, implications for further research, and limitations of this study, Counselor Trainee Perceived Supervisory Effectiveness: An investigation of counselor trainee cognitive style and supervisor supervisory style.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate counselor trainees' perceived supervisory effectiveness. Cognitive style and supervisory style differences among supervisory dyads were explored in order to assess the effect of style differences on clinical supervision outcome. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does the relationship between verbalizer cognitive style and visualizer cognitive style and attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory style affect perceived supervisory effectiveness?

2. Is there a difference in the perception of effective supervision among practicum and internship counseling trainees who identify themselves as visualizers or verbalizers?

In order to answer these questions, a review of the literature and related research was conducted. An overview of cognitive styles and supervisory styles was addressed.

Finally, the effectiveness of clinical supervision as a function of supervisory styles was reviewed.

Participants included master's level counselor trainees from a CACREP counselor education program and their previously matched field site supervisors of various mental health and school field placement sites. Of the 56 questionnaire packets distributed to supervisory dyads, 55 were returned. Forty-five were completed and included in this research study.

The Supervisory Styles Inventory-Revised (SSI-R; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) was used to assess the various supervision styles of field site supervisors employed during supervision. The SSI-R utilizes a 33 item self-report measure that yielded scores on three dimensions: attractive; interpersonally sensitive; and task-oriented. For the purpose of this study, only the attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles were included. The Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire (VVQ; Richardson, 1977) measured a single cognitive style dimension. The VVQ is a 15 item true-false questionnaire that assessed counselor trainees' tendency to perceive information as a verbalizer or visualizer. The Supervision Questionnaire (SQ; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979) was used to measure the effectiveness of supervision. Trainees' provided their perceptions of supervision they received and rated 42 supervisor behaviors. Additionally, the questionnaire addressed overall satisfaction, supervisor competence, and the degree to which supervision helped to improve counseling abilities. Demographic data was also collected from the supervisors and counselor trainees.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics provided the means and standard deviations to describe the sample. A t-test was

used to determine if there was a difference between verbalizers paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles and visualizers paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. An ANOVA was employed to assess the interaction among practicum and internship students who were either verbalizers or visualizers and supervised by an attractive or interpersonally sensitive style.

Findings

Visualizers should be matched with attractive supervisory styles. Hypothesis one stated that there is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. The results indicated a significant difference. It was found that counselor trainees who identified themselves as visualizers and who were paired with an attractive supervisory style were more satisfied with supervision than counselor trainees who identified themselves as visualizers and who were paired with interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. A possible explanation for the finding may be due to the large number of reported visualizers and attractive supervisory styles. Of the 45 supervisors who completed their SSI questionnaire, attractive supervisory style made up 60% of the site supervisors preferred style of providing supervision. Nearly half, 29%, were identified as interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. Similarly, the majority of counselor trainees were visualizers (55%), while only 31% were verbalizers. Another possible explanation of this finding is the tendency for supervisors to identify with an attractive supervisory style. An investigation of learning, teaching, and supervisory styles among field instructors and social work students revealed that the most popular supervisory style for field instructors

was attractive (Short, 2001). Another possible explanation reverts to previous research on styles and self-disclosure during supervision. The literature illustrates that supervisors with attractive supervisory styles were likely to self-disclose counseling experiences that they have had to their trainees (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999). Conversely, the more interpersonally sensitive a supervisor was the less likely he or she was to share counseling experiences (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman). This difference in self-disclosure among supervisory styles suggests that an attractive supervisory style (i.e. supportive and warm) may be more desirable due to their tendency to discuss intrapersonal experiences, therefore, receiving higher ratings of effectiveness of supervision. In order to promote effective supervision, counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles ought to be supervised by supervisors who have attractive supervisory styles.

Hypothesis two stated that there is no significant difference in supervisory effectiveness among counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. There is no difference in satisfaction with supervision among verbalizer counselor trainees who were paired with attractive supervisory styles or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. Evidently, there is no difference in effectiveness when a verbalizer is paired with an attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory style. Although there were no significant findings among verbalizers who were paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles, the outcome of supervision was influenced. Verbalizers who were matched with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles did not rate supervision as effective as visualizers.

Hypothesis three stated that there is no significant interaction between practicum and internship counselor trainees who have visualizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. No significant interaction was found. Counselor trainees in practicum and internship who identified themselves as visualizers reported no difference in satisfaction with supervision when paired with an attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory style. Counselor education course had no consequence as to whether or not visualizers found supervision to be effective. This finding further supports the fact that cognitive styles are fixed personality characteristics and as such do not alter based on developmental or experience level. As stated in the literature, developmental models emphasize that counselor trainees progress through stages of development during their training (Hamilton & Borders, 1993). When supervisors assess counseling students' counseling skills and abilities they rarely consider other individual differences. This study found that counselor trainees preferred mode of processing information does not change and is important to consider during supervision.

Hypothesis four stated that there is no significant interaction in supervisory effectiveness among practicum or internship counselor trainees who have verbalizer cognitive styles when paired with supervisors who have attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles. There was no significant interaction. Counselor trainees in practicum and internship who identified themselves as verbalizers reported no difference in satisfaction with the supervision they received from an attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory style. Again, the counselor education course did not make a

difference in perceived supervision effectiveness among verbalizer counselor trainees when paired with attractive or interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles.

Discussion

The findings illuminated supervision concerns related to styles that were not originally known to this investigator. The descriptors for each supervisory style reflect qualities that would be attributed to personality variables. For example, the attractive supervisory style reflects a collegial dimension of supervision and includes the descriptors warm, supportive, friendly, open, and flexible (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The interpersonally sensitive supervisory style indicates a relationship-oriented approach and includes the descriptors committed, perceptive, and invested (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The descriptors for each style signify aspects of personality variables. Given that personality characteristics are invariable, one might conclude that supervisory styles are unwavering just as cognitive styles. This idea further supports the argument that matching supervisors and counselor trainees based on styles would form a more satisfying supervision experience that would allow for equitable feedback in terms of evaluation, foster a positive interpersonal supervisory relationship (Handley, 1982; Rosenberg, 1985) and strengthen counselor trainees counseling abilities and skills.

Although developmental models of supervision suggest that supervisors change their roles to accommodate the needs of the counselor trainee, these roles may be influenced by the supervisor's personality characteristics and therefore, do not change during supervision. The discrimination model (Bernard, 1979) speaks to three supervisory roles: teacher, counselor, and consultant. These roles have been equated to the attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented supervisory styles (Friedlander

58

& Ward, 1984). The discrimination model purports that supervisory roles change as a function of counselor trainee learning needs. In essence, this model encourages supervisors to alter their supervisory roles within sessions and across sessions. In accordance with previous research (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005), my results revealed that nearly all of the supervisors identified with at least one predominant supervisory style suggesting that supervisory style may be predetermined much like cognitive style. Yet again, the results of my study suggest that matching supervisors and supervisees based on interpersonal style differences is essential for the professional growth and development of the neophyte counselor and to sustain a positive interpersonal relationship that will lend itself to effective training outcomes.

As stated in the results section, 60% of the supervisors reported an attractive supervisory style and only 29% of supervisors reported an interpersonally sensitive supervisory style. Most of the counselor trainees identified themselves as visualizers. The finding that visualizers reported satisfaction with supervision when paired with an attractive supervisory style could be attributed to the higher rates of style differences. Previous research has found that the attractive and interpersonally sensitive supervisory styles were the most acknowledged among supervisors and supervisees (Ladany et al., 2001; Usher & Borders, 1993; Steward, Breland, & Neil, 2001). Given that there is no reported study in the literature that investigated the verbalizer-visualizer cognitive dimension, supervisory style, and effectiveness of supervision, conclusions about this significant finding are limited.

Recommendations for Professional Practice

When supervisors begin supervision they consider individual characteristics of the novice counselor including developmental or experience level, age, gender, theoretical orientation, ethnicity, and the population of clients they will be counseling. Rarely does the supervisor take into consideration the cognitive style of the counselor trainee. As stated in the analyses of the literature, cognitive style is a personality characteristic that does not change over time (Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1992; Tennant, 1988). It is recommended that supervisors inquire about the cognitive style of the counselor trainee so that the supervision style matches the style of the counselor trainee. This is particularly important to consider when considering evaluation of the counselor trainees' counseling abilities and professional development. Evaluation is a key component of the supervision process. Supervisors who are ignorant of the cognitive style of their counselor trainee may provide bias evaluations. Understanding the complexities of the counselor trainee will afford more equitable feedback of their professional development, skills, and abilities.

Few developmental supervision models have considered cognitive style as a variable to contend with during supervision. Based on this study's findings, it is recommended that more developmental models of supervision incorporate cognitive style.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study should be replicated with a larger national sample of counselor trainees and their field site supervisors. Expanding the population pool will

obtain more representative data and increase the opportunity toward generalizability.

2. This study addressed the effectiveness of supervision in a practicum and internship counselor education course. The perceived efficacy of counseling among trainee clients was not addressed. The effectiveness of supervision should ultimately be assessed in terms of client outcome (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984). A study investigating style differences between supervisee and supervisor and client perceived counseling effectiveness would be fruitful.

3. This study assessed trainees' evaluation of effectiveness only and excluded the supervisors rating of effectiveness. There are a limited number of empirical works investigating effectiveness in counselor education. Expanding this study to include the perceptions of site supervisors on effectiveness would add to the counselor education literature.

4. Although this study investigated style differences among supervisory dyads, supervision groups are also a vital part of the preparation of becoming counselors. Typically, one supervisor oversees the group. However, oftentimes one supervision group may include two supervisors. In this instance, the supervisors could have conflicting styles and the supervisees could identify with the same or different cognitive styles; consequently, resulting in a mismatch among styles. This paradigm is inevitable. A study exploring the differences among styles and supervisory effectiveness within supervision groups would be advantageous.

5. The verbalizer-visualizer dichotomy is most popular among a multimedia learning environment. Online training and education courses are becoming increasingly popular among higher education institutions. This phenomenon lends support to the idea that an investigation of cognitive styles as they pertain to counseling supervision and training online would be fruitful. Examining the effects of styles through a multimedia perspective in counselor education and supervision could prove to be an invaluable resource in the training of counselors and their improved counseling abilities.

6. Although this investigator collected data on race and ethnicity differences among counselor trainees and supervisors, the effect of multicultural issues and cognitive style in supervision was not analyzed. Historically, race, ethnicity, and learning style differences among students in the classroom have been researched extensively. These empirical works have shown significant cultural differences among learners and the effect of style on success in education. Addressing these differences in counselor education and supervision would offer new insights into the nuances of providing supervision. As mentioned in chapter 2, the question of how culture and cognitive style affect the supervision process remains.

7. This study assessed the supervisory styles employed by the supervisor. Examining supervision effectiveness and the *cognitive* style of the field site supervisor against the cognitive style of the supervisee could further support the significance of matching dyads based on style.

8. This study examined supervisory dyads made up of previously matched supervisors and counselor trainees. There is some evidence in the literature that matching supervisory dyads informs the supervision process and interpersonal relationship in positive ways (Rosenberg, 1985; Handley, 1982). A study matching supervisors and supervisees based on the visualizer-verbalizer cognitive dimension and supervisory styles to clarify the optimal match as well as the efficacy of supervision would provide further insight into this matter.

Limitations

The following limitations restrict the generalizability of this study's results.

1. Nonprobability sampling is the most common type in educational research (McMillan & Schumacher 2006). This study concentrated data collection from one CACREP accredited counselor education program. Therefore, this increases this studies likelihood of error due to subject selection bias.

2. The use of convenience sampling due to subjects being expedient further limited this studies generalizability. Due to the limitation of sampling, this study yielded a relatively small number of participants. This study thus needs replication with a larger sample size.

3. Due to the small sample size of this study and, consequently, the limited number of style differences, the task-oriented supervisory style was not included in the analyses. A larger representative sample may produce more diversity in supervisory styles and allow for the opportunity to include the task-oriented supervisory style in the analysis.

4. This study's sample was mainly comprised of school counselors and school counseling field sites. A larger sample size would increase the opportunity to have a more representative sample of counselor education field sites and counselor education degrees being pursued.

Conclusion

This study grew out of both personal and professional experiences that I have had as a student and supervisor. Although my style preferences in learning and supervision are modified from time to time based on contextual differences, I continue to identify with one predominant style. I have found that when I am taught or supervised by a mentor whose style matches mine, I am more successful in my endeavors and find the experience of learning more enjoyable and rewarding. I also have found the opposite to be true when there is a mismatch among styles.

Counselor trainee cognitive style is an important variable that should be researched further. This study demonstrated the relevance of cognitive style and supervisory style in relation to the effectiveness of supervision. The significant finding in this study suggests that style differences are a fertile area for future research concerning the training of counselors in counselor education and supervision programs. Furthermore, if more research is conducted in this area and other significant findings are obtained, developmental and training models for counselors may want to consider cognitive style as an element that could impact the efficacy of counselor trainee counseling abilities and supervision processes and outcomes. The results can help supervisors and counselor educators provide effective supervision and training. It was my intention to conduct a study that would contribute to the professional practice of

supervision and the training of counselors. Hopefully, this study offered new insights into

the complexities of providing clinical supervision for supervisors and increased

awareness about individualities that inform the training and supervision of novice

counselors.

References

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: Holt & Company.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision March (1993). Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors. Adopted by ACES Executive counsel and delegate assembly.

Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19, 60-68.

Bernard, J. M. (1997). The Discrimination Model. In C.E. Watkins Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy Supervision* (pp. 310-327). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Borders, D. L., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The New Handbook of Counseling Supervision*. NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bradley, L. J., & Ladany, N. (2001). *Counselor Supervision: Principles, Process, and Practice*. Braun-Brumfield, Ann Arbor, MI.

The Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CAPCREP) (2001).

Dunn, R. (1997). The goals and track record of multicultural education. *Educational Leadership*, 54(7), 74-77.

Ellis, M. V. (1991). Critical incidents in clinical supervision and in supervisor supervision: Assessing supervisory issues. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 342-349.

Eugster, S. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1996). Systematic effects of participant role on

    evaluation of the psychotherapy session. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*

    Psychology, 64, 1020-1028.

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to

    satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's level

    counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44, 293-304.

Follman, J. (1975). Student ratings of faculty teaching effectiveness: rater or rate

    characteristics. *Research in Higher Education*, 3, 155-167.

Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the

    supervisory style inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 541-557.

Gardner, R. W. (1953). Cognitive styles in categorizing behavior. *Journal of*

    Personality, 22(2), 241-233.

Granello, D. H. (1996). Gender and power in the supervisory dyad. *The Clinical*

    Supervisor, 14, 53-67.

Granello, D. H., Beamish, P. M., & Davis, T. E. (1997). Supervisee empowerment:

    Does gender make a difference? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 36,

    305-318.

Green, S. M., Hadjistavropoulos, T., & Sharpe, D. (2008). Client personality

    characteristic predict satisfaction with cognitive behavior therapy. *Journal of*

    Clinical Psychology, 64(1), 40-51.

Griggs, S. A. (1991). *Learning Styles Counseling*. ERIC Counseling and personnel

    services clearinghouse, Ann Arbor: MI.

Guild, P. B., & Garger, S. (1998). *Marching to Different Drummers*. ASCD, 2nd edition.

Hamilton, U. C., & Borders, L. D. (1993). Practicing counselors' preferences for supervisory style and supervisory emphasis. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 33(2): 66.

Handley, P. (1982). Relationship between supervisors' and trainees' cognitive styles and the supervision process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29, 508-515.

Hart, G. M., & Nance, D. (2003). Styles of counselor supervision as perceived by supervisors and supervisees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 146-158.

Heppner, P. P., & Handley, P. G. (1981). A study of the interpersonal influence process in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 437-444.

Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1984). Differences among supervisees at different levels of training: Implications for a developmental model of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 76-90.

Herbert, J. T., & Ward, T. J. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the supervisory style inventory and the revised supervision questionnaire. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 38, 334-349.

Hess, A. K. (1987). Advances in psychotherapy supervision: Introduction. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,* 18(3), 187-188.

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

Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical Supervision: A Systems Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ing, C. (1990). *The Application of Learning Style Research in the Supervisory*

   Process, chapter, from Perspectives in Professional Child and Youth Care.

   The Hawthorn Press, Inc.

Itzhaky, H., & Eliahou, A. (2001). The effect of learning styles and empathy on

   perceived effectiveness of social work student supervision. *The Clinical*

   Supervisor, 20(2), 19-29.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological Types*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Kennard, B. D., Stewart, S. M., & Gluck, M. R. (1987). The supervision relationship:

   Variables contributing to positive versus negative experiences. *Professional*

   Psychology: Research and Practice, 18, 172-175.

Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of

   supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the

   supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 38,

   143-161.

Ladany, N., Marotta, S., & Muse-Burke, J. L. (2001). Counselor experience related to

   complexity of case conceptualization and supervision preference. *Counselor*

   Education and Supervision, 40, 203-219.

Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to

   the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor*

   Education and Supervision, 40, 263-275.

Lochner, B. T., & Melchert, T. P. (1997). Relationship of cognitive style and theoretical

   orientation to psychology interns' preferences for supervision. *Journal of*

   Counseling Psychology, 44, 256-260.

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

Mayer, R. E., & Massa, L. J. (2003). Three facets of visual and verbal learners: Cognitive ability, cognitive style, and learning preference. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 833-846.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in Education Evidence- Based Inquiry*, sixth edition, Pearson Education, Inc.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator.* Palo Alto, VA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nelson, M. L., & Friedlander, M. L. (2001) A close look at conflictual supervisory relationships: The trainee's perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 384-395.

Norcross, J. C., Farber, J. A., & Prochaska, J. O. (1993). Psychologists conducting psychotherapy: New findings and historical comparisons on the psychotherapy division membership. *Psychotherapy*, 30, 692-697.

Pask, G. (1972). A fresh look at cognition and the individual. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 4, 211-216.

Patterson, C.H. (1964). Supervising students in the counseling practicum. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1, 47-53.

Pavio, A. (1971). *Imagery and Verbal Processes.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Pitts, J. A., & Miller, M. (1990). Coordination of clinical supervision in practicum and

    internship programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 29, 291-300.

Reising, G. N., & Daniels, M. H. (1983). A study of hogan's model of counselor

    development and supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 235-244.

Richardson, A. (1977). Verbalizer-visualizer: A cognitive style dimension. *Journal of*

    Mental Imagery, 1, 109-126.

Riding, R. J., & Ashmore, J. (1980) Verbalizer-imager learning style and children's

    recall of information presented in pictorial versus written form. *Education*

    Studies, 6, 141-145.

Riding, R. J., & Cheema, I. (1991). Cognitive styles- an overview and integration.

    Educational Psychology, 11(¾), 193-216.

Riding, R., & Mathias, D. (1991). Cognitive Style and preferred learning mode,

    reading attainment and cognitive ability in 11-year old children. *Educational*

    Psychology, 11, 383-394.

Riding, R., & Sadler-Smith, E. (1992). Type of instructional material, cognitive style and

    learning performance. *Educational Studies*, 18(3), 323-341.

Rigazio-Digilio, S. A. (1998). Toward a reconstructed view of counselor supervision.

    Counselor Education and Supervision, 38, 43-52.

Ronnestad, M. H. (1976). Counselor personality and supervisory styles. *Scandinavian*

    Journal of Psychology, 17, 56-60.

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced

    graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and*

    Development, 71, 396-405.

Rosenberg, B. L. (1985). *Cognitive style as a mediator in the quality of interaction*

    between supervisors and counselor trainees in a practicum setting. Ph.D.

    dissertation, Fordham University, United States –New York. Retrieved

    from dissertations & theses: A & I database. (Publication No. AAT 8508128).

Short, G. F. L. (2001). *Learning, teaching, and supervisory styles in field education:*

    The working alliance investigated. Ph.D. dissertation, University of South

    Carolina, United States- South Carolina. Retrieved from dissertations &

    theses: A & I database. (Publication No. AAT 3020980).

Spoltore, J. D., & Smock, D. J. (1983). The verbalizer-visualizer questionnaire:

    Additional normative data. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 56, 382.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (1997). Are cognitive styles still in style?

    American Psychologist, 52(7), 700-712.

Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, L. (2001). *Perspectives on Thinking, Learning, and Cognitive*

    Styles. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Steward, R. J., Breland, A., & Neil, D. M. (2001). Novice supervisees' self-evaluations

    and their perceptions of supervisor style. *Counselor Education and Supervision*,

    41, 131-141.

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The

    counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 59-65.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising Counselors and Therapist*. San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Swanson, J. L., & O'Saben, C. L. (1993). Differences in supervisory needs and

    expectations by trainee experience, cognitive style, and program membership.

    Journal of Counseling and Development, 71, 457-464.

Tennant, M. (1988). Psychology and Adult Learning. London: Routledge.

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

Warren, R., & Good, G. (1979). The verbalizer-visualizer questionnaire: Further normative data. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 48, 372.

Witkin, H. A. (1954). *Personality Through Perception: An Experimental and Clinical Study.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Worthen, V., & McNeill, B. W. (1996). A phenomenological investigation of "good" supervision events. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 25-34.

Worthington, E. L. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision of counselors as they gain experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 63-75.

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

Worthington, E. L. Jr., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1, 64-73.

Worthington, E. L. Jr., & Stern (1985). Effects of supervisor and supervisee degree level and gender on the supervisory relationship. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 252-262.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Letter to Field Site Supervisor

Dear Supervisor:

My name is Melinda Heher, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education Program in the School of Education at Duquesne University. Presently I am in the process of gathering data for my dissertation, which will investigate supervisors' supervisory styles and counselor trainees' cognitive styles. As a current supervisor for one of our practicum or internship students, I respectively invite you to participate in this study. Your participation will contribute to the continued professional development of clinical counseling supervisors and counselor trainees.

Should you choose to volunteer, you will be asked to complete one questionnaire regarding supervision. The Supervisory Styles Inventory has been shown to be a valid and reliable assessment when measuring supervisory styles. The questionnaire will not take more than ten minutes of your time. ALL ANSWERS AND INFORMATION WILL REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. Initially, your name will be linked with your counselor trainee's name for the purpose of matching subsequent questionnaires that you both complete should you participate in this study. A study number will be assigned to you and your counselor trainee in order to maintain confidentiality. Your name will never appear on any research instrument. No identity will be made in the data analysis. At any time during your involvement you will be free to end your participation in this study. If you need additional information, feel free to contact me at any time.

You may indicate your consent by signing the consent form on the line provided. Please, find also enclosed a demographic form which I will ask you to fill out after you have agreed to participate in the study by signing the consent form. Please return the signed consent form together with the completed demographic form and the Supervisory Styles Inventory to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope within a week of receiving this mail.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and your time completing this questionnaire. Any questions about the study can be addressed to Melinda Heher, (current address was provided). Telephone: (current telephone number was provided). E-mail: heherm@duq.edu.

Sincerely,

_____
Melinda Heher
Doctoral Candidate, Duquesne University

APPENDIX B

Letters to Counselor Trainee

Dear Supervisee:

My name is Melinda Heher, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education Program in the School of Education at Duquesne University. Presently I am in the process of gathering data for my dissertation, which will investigate supervisors' supervisory styles and counselor trainees' cognitive styles. As a current practicum or internship student, I respectively invite you to participate in this study. Your participation will contribute to the continued professional development of clinical counseling supervisors and counselor trainees.

Should you choose to volunteer, you will be asked to complete two questionnaires regarding your learning style and supervision. The Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire has been shown to be a valid and reliable assessment when measuring learning styles. The Supervisor Questionnaire use as a valid and reliable rating scale of effective supervision has been supported by various researchers. The questionnaires will not take more than fifteen minutes of your time. ALL ANSWERS AND INFORMATION WILL REMAIN STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. Initially, your name will be linked with your supervisor's name for the purpose of matching subsequent questionnaires that you both complete should you participate in this study. A study number will be assigned to you and your supervisor in order to maintain confidentiality. Your name will never appear on any research instrument. No identity will be made in the data analysis. At any time during your involvement you will be free to end your participation in this study. If you need additional information, feel free to contact me at any time.

You may indicate your consent by signing the consent form on the line provided. Please, find also enclosed a demographic form which I will ask you to fill out after you have agreed to participate in the study by signing the consent form. Please return the signed consent form together with the completed demographic form and the Verbalizer-Visualizer Questionnaire and the Supervisor Questionnaire to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope within a week of receiving this mail.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and your time completing this questionnaire. Any questions about the study can be addressed to Melinda Heher, (current address was provided here). Telephone: (current telephone number was provided here). E-mail: heherm@duq.edu.

Sincerely,

_____

Melinda Heher
Doctoral Candidate, Duquesne University

APPENDIX C

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

600 FORBES AVENUE ♦ PITTSBURGH, PA 15282

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE:	COUNSELOR TRAINEE PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY EFFECTIVENESS: AN INVESTIGATION OF COUNSELOR TRAINEE COGNITIVE STYLE AND SUPERVISOR SUPERVISORY STYLE
INVESTIGATOR:	Melinda Heher
ADVISOR:	Jocelyn Gregoire, Ed. D., C.S.Sp. Duquesne University School of Education Department of Counseling, Psychology, and Special Education 412-396-4442
SOURCE OF SUPPORT:	This study is being performed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree in Counselor Education and Supervision at Duquesne University.
PURPOSE:	You are being asked to participate in a research project that seeks to investigate the effectiveness of supervision among counseling students with different learning styles when they are paired with supervisors who have different supervisory styles. You are asked to complete two questionnaires and return them to the investigator. It may take approximately 10 minutes to complete both questionnaires.

These are the only requests that will be made of you. |
| **RISKS AND BENEFITS:** | There will be minimal risk to you as a participant. You may experience some degree of discomfort |

when completing the questionnaires; this varies according to the individual (see Right to Withdraw). No identity will be made in the data analysis. All written materials and consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office. You are under no obligation to participate in this study and you are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time. Your participation will help contribute to the professional literature in the field of counseling and supervision.

COMPENSATION: There will be no compensation; and participation in the project will require no monetary cost to you. An envelope is provided for the return of your questionnaires to the investigator.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Any information obtained about you from this research, including answers to questionnaires and your name, will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will only be used to match you with your supervisee. Once you and your supervisee have been identified, you will be assigned a six-digit study number. Your name will never appear on any survey or research instrument. Only the study number will appear on the questionnaires. No identity will be made in the data analysis. All written materials and consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office to protect privacy. The study investigator will be the only person to have the right to access your confidential information. Your responses will only appear in statistical data summaries. All materials will be destroyed six years after the completion of the research.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are under no obligation to participate in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS: A summary of the results of this research will be supplied to you, at no cost, upon request.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason.

On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call Melinda Heher, principal investigator (412-000-0000), Dr. Jocelyn Gregoire, advisor (412-396-4442), and Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).

_____   _____

Participant's Signature   Date

_____   _____

Researcher's Signature   Date

APPENDIX D

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY

600 FORBES AVENUE ♦ PITTSBURGH, PA 15282

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE: COUNSELOR TRAINEE PERCEIVED SUPERVISORY

EFFECTIVENESS: AN INVESTIGATION OF

COUNSELOR TRAINEE COGNITIVE STYLE AND

SUPERVISOR SUPERVISORY STYLE

INVESTIGATOR: Melinda Heher

ADVISOR: Jocelyn Gregoire, Ed. D., C.S.Sp.
Duquesne University
School of Education
Department of Counseling, Psychology, and Special
Education
412-396-4442

SOURCE OF SUPPORT: This study is being performed in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy
(Ph.D.) degree in Counselor Education and
Supervision at Duquesne University.

PURPOSE: You are being asked to participate in a research
project that seeks to investigate the effectiveness of
supervision among counseling students with
different learning styles when they are paired with
supervisors who have different supervisory styles.
You are asked to complete three questionnaires and
return them to the investigator. It may take
approximately 15 minutes to complete all three
questionnaires.

These are the only requests that will be made of
you.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There will be minimal risk to you as a participant.
You may experience some degree of discomfort

when completing the questionnaires; this varies according to the individual (see Right to Withdraw). No identity will be made in the data analysis. All written materials and consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the investigator's office. You are under no obligation to participate in this study and you are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time. Your participation will help contribute to the professional literature in the field of counseling and supervision.

COMPENSATION: There will be no compensation; and participation in the project will require no monetary cost to you. An envelope is provided for the return of your questionnaires to the investigator.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Any information obtained about you from this research, including answers to questionnaires and your name, will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will only be used to match you with your supervisor. Once you and your supervisor have been identified, you will be assigned a six-digit study number. Your name will never appear on any survey or research instrument. Only the study number will appear on the questionnaires. No identity will be made in the data analysis. All written materials and consent forms will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's office to protect privacy. The study investigator will be the only person to have the right to access your confidential information. Your responses will only appear in statistical data summaries. All materials will be destroyed six years after the completion of the research.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are under no obligation to participate in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS: A summary of the results of this research will be supplied to you, at no cost, upon request.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: I have read the above statements and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my consent at any time, for any reason.

On these terms, I certify that I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that should I have any further questions about my participation in this study, I may call Melinda Heher, principal investigator (412-000-0000), Dr. Jocelyn Gregoire, advisor (412-396-4442), and Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).

_____   _____

Participant's Signature   Date

_____   _____

Researcher's Signature   Date

APPENDIX E

Supervisory Styles Inventory

For supervisors' form: Indicate your perceptions of your style as a supervisor of psychotherapy/counseling on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, that best reflects your view of yourself.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not very						Very
1. goal-oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. perceptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. concrete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. explicit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. committed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. affirming	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. practical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. collaborative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. reflective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. responsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. structured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. evaluative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. prescriptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. didactic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. thorough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. focused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. creative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. open	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. realistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. invested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. facilitative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. therapeutic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. trusting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. humorous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX F

VERBALIZER-VISUALIZER QUESTIONNAIRE (VVQ)

1.	I enjoy doing work that requires the use of words.	TRUE	FALSE
2.	My daydreams are sometimes so vivid I feel as though I actually experience the scene.	TRUE	FALSE
3.	I enjoy learning new words.	TRUE	FALSE
4.	I can easily think of synonyms for words.	TRUE	FALSE
5.	My powers of imagination are higher than average.	TRUE	FALSE
6.	I seldom dream.	TRUE	FALSE
7.	I read rather slowly.	TRUE	FALSE
8.	I cannot generate a mental picture of a friend's face when I close my eyes.	TRUE	FALSE
9.	I don't believe that anyone can think in terms of mental pictures.	TRUE	FALSE
10.	I prefer to read instructions about how to do something rather than have someone show me.	TRUE	FALSE
11.	My dreams are extremely vivid.	TRUE	FALSE
12.	I have better than average fluency in using words.	TRUE	FALSE
13.	My daydreams are rather indistinct and hazy.	TRUE	FALSE
14.	I spend very little time attempting to increase my vocabulary.	TRUE	FALSE
15.	My thinking often consists of mental pictures or images.	TRUE	FALSE

Reprinted from the original form by Richardson, A. (1977).

APPENDIX G

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to evaluate the supervision you received during your practicum <u>OR</u> internship site this semester. Please rate the effectiveness of supervision received by circling the most appropriate answer.

1. How satisfied were you with the supervision you received?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Totally Unsatisfied	Mostly Unsatisfied	More Unsatisfied Than Not	Neither Satisfied nor Unsatisfied	More Satisfied Than Not	Mostly Satisfied	Totally Satisfied

2. How satisfied were you with your supervisor's competence at giving good supervision?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Totally Unsatisfied	Mostly Unsatisfied	More Unsatisfied Than Not	Neither Satisfied nor Unsatisfied	More Satisfied Than Not	Mostly Satisfied	Totally Satisfied

3. How satisfied were you with your supervisor's contribution to your professional development/improvement in counseling ability?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Totally Unsatisfied	Mostly Unsatisfied	More Unsatisfied Than Not	Neither Satisfied nor Unsatisfied	More Satisfied Than Not	Mostly Satisfied	Totally Satisfied

Complete Next Page

Please rate (circle the rating) your site supervisor's behavior based on what you believe was typical of the behavior you observed during this semester using the following scale:

1 = Never Descriptive of my supervisor's behavior
2 = Occasionally descriptive of my supervisor's behavior
3 = Descriptive of my supervisor's behavior
4 = Usually descriptive of my supervisor's behavior
5 = Perfectly descriptive of my supervisor's behavior

Your supervisor….

1.	Encouraged you to experiment with different assessment and intervention techniques to discover your own unique style.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Used humor in supervision sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Called you by name at least one time per session.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Provided suggestions for alternative ways of conceptualizing clients.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Provided suggestions for alternative ways of intervening with clients.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Encouraged you to find your own style of counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Shared his or her experiences with clients with you.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Observed you counseling at a minimum of one time this semester.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Provided relevant literature or references on specific treatment techniques or assessment techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Allowed you to observe him or her do co-counseling or listen to audiotapes of his or her counseling sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Made sure that your supervision sessions lasted at least 50 minutes.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Made sure that at least 45 minutes of each supervision session were spent discussing counseling and/or clients.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Focused most supervision sessions on content of counseling sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Was sensitive to the differences between how you talk about your actions and how you really behave with clients.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Used your supervision relationship to demonstrate ethics of counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Listened to at least three audiotapes of your counseling this semester.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Gave appropriate feedback to you about positive counseling behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5

18.	Gave appropriate feedback to you about non-facilitative behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Helped you with personal problems that might have interfered with your counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Demonstrated techniques by role playing.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Helped you deal with your defensiveness when it arose in supervision	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Established clear goals conjointly with you against which progress in supervision was measured.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Evaluated you at mid-semester.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Renegotiated goals with you at mid-semester.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Was available for consulting at times other than regularly scheduled meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Labeled your counseling skills as effective or ineffective rather than right or wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Helped you develop self-confidence as an emerging counselor.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Helped you realized that trying new skills usually seems awkward at first.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Focused most of the supervision sessions on the relationship between you and him or her.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Confronted you when appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Helped you assess your own weaknesses.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Discussed with you experiences in the practicum or internship class in addition to clients.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Missed no more than one supervisory session per semester.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Established good rapport with you.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	Helped you to conceptualize cases.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	Focused most of the supervision sessions on conceptualizing the dynamics of the client's personality.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	Provided more structure during the initial sessions than during the later sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	Modeled within the supervision session good task-oriented skills	1	2	3	4	5
39.	Gave direct suggestions to you when appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	Helped you assess your own strengths.	1	2	3	4	5

41. Gave emotional support to you when appropriate.   1   2   3   4   5

42. Consulted with you when emergencies arose with your clients.   1   2   3   4   5

Adapted from the original form by Worthington, E.L., & Roehike, H.J. (1979).

APPENDIX H

Subject Demographic Form
For <u>Supervisees</u>

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Race: (choose all that apply)

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native

_____ Asian

_____ African American

_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

_____ Caucasian

_____ Do not wish to provide information

Course Status:

_____ Internship Course

_____ Practicum Course

Counselor Education Degree Being Pursued:

_____ Master of Science in Education in School Counseling

_____ Master of Science in Education in Community Counseling

_____ Master of Science in Education in Marriage and Family Therapy

_____ School Counselor Certification Only

Placement Start Date: _____

Placement Completion Date: _____

APPENDIX I

Subject Demographic Form
For <u>Supervisors</u>

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Race: (choose all that apply)

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native

_____ Asian

_____ African American

_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

_____ Caucasian

_____ Do not wish to provide information

Course For Which You Are Providing Supervision:

_____ Internship Course

_____ Practicum Course

Practicum / Internship Supervision Site:

_____ Community Mental Health Agency

_____ Drug and Alcohol Agency

_____ Hospital

_____ Elementary School

_____ Secondary School

_____ Other: Please Specify: _____

Years/Months Providing Supervision: _____years _____months

Please Provide Your Current Credentials: _____